

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE – 1789 – 1919 CE

Author

Dr. P. RAMESH,

Assistant Professor, (T) , Department of History,
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Tirunelveli – Tamil Nadu.



**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TIRUNELVELI – TAMIL NADU - 627 012**

January - 2025

Unit - I

French Revolution – Causes - Course – Consequences – Napoleon Bonaparte - Napoleonic Wars – Continental System – Domestic Policy – Downfall

Unit – II

Age of Metternich- The Congress of Vienna - 1815 – The Holy and Quadruple Alliance Concert of Europe - The Revolution of 1830 and 1848- Napoleon III.

Unit – III

Unification of Germany – Bismarck's Blood and Iron policy – Unification of Italy - Mazzini – Garibaldi – Count Cavour – Victor Immanuel II

Unit – IV

Eastern Question – Greek War of Independence – Crimean War – Pan Slavism - The Russo Turkish War (1878) - The Congress of Berlin 1878

Unit – V

Age of Armed Peace - The Triple Alliance and Triple entente- Balkan wars – First World War - US Entry into First World War – Treaty of Versailles

UNIT- I

French Revolution – Causes - Course – Consequences – Napoleon Bonaparte - Napoleonic Wars
– Continental System – Domestic Policy – Downfall

Learning Objectives

- To understand the causes and background of the French Revolution.
- To examine the major events and phases in the course of the Revolution.
- To analyze the consequences and global impact of the Revolution.
- To study the rise and rule of Napoleon Bonaparte.
- To evaluate Napoleon's domestic and foreign policies and his downfall.

The French Revolution(1789–1799)

The French Revolution was a time of social and political upheaval in France and its colonies that began in 1789 and ended in 1799. Inspired by liberal and radical ideas, its overthrow of the Monarchy influenced the decline of absolute Monarchies in other parts of Europe. In reality it led to the loss of liberty, dictatorship and nationalism. The revolution was based on a hatred of tradition and desire to use the power of the state to create a new order. People were given new identities as citizens of the state. To crush the resistance to revolution and the new order about 18,000 - 40,000 people were executed. The revolution was unable to establish a durable system of governance, and in the following century, France would be governed variously as a republic, a dictatorship, a constitutional monarchy, and two different empires and under a dozen different constitutions. Subsequent events caused by the revolution include the Napoleonic wars, the restoration of the monarchy, and two additional revolutions as modern France took shape. The longer term European consequences include the counter-enlightenment and Romantic Movement in Germany which arose in reaction to the imposition of French rationalist culture. This was accompanied by the reunification of Germany as a defensive measure against a future Napoleon. French revolutionary ideas also inspired and influenced Marxist revolutionary movements such as the Bolsheviks in Russia who followed the pattern established in France of large scale executions of the enemies of the people by impersonal government organs. In France,

not everyone sympathized with or supported the Revolution and no single, dominant or shared vision of governance developed. There were too many monarchists to have a republic and too many republicans to have a monarch. What the Revolution did emphasize was the concepts of being a citizen with rights and of that nation as belonging to its citizens, who are not merely subjects of a ruler who more or less “owns” the state .

Background of France in 1789:

France was the most populated nation in Europe during this time and had been growing in wealth and prestige since the time of King Louis XIV. But this economic growth wasn't visible as the country was still very backward socially and politically. The social divide was because it was still divided into feudal classes of people clergy, those who pray, nobles, those who fight, and the peasants, the working class. And political backwardness was because they were still ruled by an absolute monarch who believed in the divine right of kings. But the French involvement in the American Revolution of 1776 was a costly affair and the extravagant lifestyle of King Louis XVI and the royal family was draining the coffers. The empty royal coffers, poor harvests, and rise in food prices had created feelings of unrest among the poor rural and urban populace. The matter was further worsened by the imposition of taxes that provided no relief. As a result rioting, looting and general strikes became the norm.

The major causes that led to the French Revolution:

Social – The social conditions in France in the late 18th century were extremely unequal and exploitative. The clergy and the nobility formed the first two Estates and were the most privileged classes in French society. They were exempt from payment of taxes to the State. On the other hand, the Third Estate that consisted of peasants and workers formed the majority of the population. They were burdened with excessive taxes with no political and social rights. As a result, they were extremely discontent. Economic – As a result of numerous wars waged by Louis XVI the State coffers were empty. The situation was made even more complex by France's involvement in the American War of Independence and the faulty system of taxation. While the privileged classes were excused from paying taxes the Third Estate was more and more burdened with them. Political – The Bourbon king of France, Louis XVI was an extremely autocratic and weak-willed king who led a life of obscene luxury. This led to a lot of disenchantment among the masses who then were leading life of extreme poverty and widespread hunger. Intellectual – The 18th century was marked by a conscious refusal by French

thinkers of the 'Divine Rights Theory'. Philosophers like Rousseau rejected the paradigm of absolute monarchy and promulgated the doctrine of equality of man and sovereignty of people. They played a pivotal role in exposing the fault lines of the old political system, i.e. the ancient regime, and articulating the popular discontent.

The meeting of the Estate Generals

The Estates-General was an assembly that represented the French nobility clergy and the middle class. They were called by Louis XVI to discuss the new tax measures in May 1789. The third estate was already gathering support for their involvement in the decision-making body and voting rights during this time. The middle class was in favour of the political and judicial reforms while the nobles did not want to give up their privileges. The talks with the third estate also failed. The Tennis court oath: The third estate and their support formed the National Assembly and took an oath of office in June 1789 and vowed not to disperse until reforms have been initiated. Seeing no other option Louis XVI had to absorb the three assemblies into the new order. The national assembly continued in Versailles as the nation was gripped in fear and uncertainty which led to the insurgency. This resulted in the taking of Bastille fortress on July 14, 1789. This event marked the beginning of the French Revolution. The peasants revolted, attacked the houses of nobles and tax collectors, and the upper class was forced to flee for their lives. This period is called the period of Great Fear.

The Declaration of Rights of the Man

The National Assembly adopted the Rights of Man and of the Citizen on August 4, 1789. The charter was based on democratic principles, drawing from philosophical as well as political ideas of Enlightenment thinkers like Jena-Jacques Rousseau. The French constitution was adopted on September 3, 1791. It was moderate in its stance by limiting the powers of the king, but it was not enough for the more radical members of the assembly, Robespierre who wanted Louis XVI to stand trial.

The Reign of Terror

A group of insurgents attacked the royal residence in Paris and arrested Louis XVI on August 10, 1792. The following month many who were accused of being the 'enemies of the revolution' were massacred in Paris. The Legislative Assembly was replaced by the National Convention which proclaimed the establishment of the Republic of France and the abolition of the Monarchy. King Louis XVI was condemned to death on January 21, 1793, and executed for

treason. His wife, Marie Antoinette was also executed nine months later. The execution of the king marked the beginning of the most violent and turbulent phase of the French Revolution. The National Convention was under the control of an extremist faction led by Robespierre. Under him, thousands were executed for suspected treason and counter-revolutionary activities. The Reign of Terror ended after Robespierre execution on July 28, 1794.

The end of the French Revolution

On August 22, 1795, the National Convention composed of moderates approved the creation of a new constitution that created France's bicameral legislature. A Directory, a five-member group was formed by the parliament, and an army was groomed under General Napoleon Bonaparte. The Directory became corrupt and the army had more powers with them. Napoleon appointed himself "first consul". The French Revolution was over and the Napoleonic era was about to begin. Women in the Third Estate worked for a living and didn't have access to education or training. Only daughters of the noblewomen and richer sections of society had access to any education. The wages for women were lower than those of men. Women were also mostly homemakers, hence they had to do all the housework, care for children. But during the Revolution, women played an active role in revolutionary activities. They started their own clubs and newspapers. One of the most famous political clubs was the Society of Revolutionary and Republican Women and they were disappointed by the Constitution of 1791 which designated them, passive citizens. This Society demanded equal political rights as men. They wanted to vote and stand in elections for political office. After the end of the revolution, the early revolutionary governments introduced many laws that improved the lives and status of women in society. Schools were created, and education was made compulsory for all girls. Marriage without consent was made illegal and divorce was made legal. Women were also allowed to be artisans and run small businesses.

Impact of the French Revolution:

The French revolution brought fundamental social, political, and economic changes in the history of France. End of the social divide: The French Revolution destroyed the social discriminative class system in France and declared equality for all. This led to the rise of the middle class who had acquired education to positions of responsibility. Declaration of rights of man: The constitutional assembly came out with the document of human rights which granted political liberty, like freedom of speech, press, association, worship, and ownership of property.

Revolutionary ideas:

The revolution gave birth to the revolutionary ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity. These ideas started in France and spread to other areas like Italy, Germany, etc. promoting equality, freedom and democracy, and good governance. France became the birthplace of democracy. End of Monarchy: The Bourbon monarch that had ruled France for over 400 years came to end by the French revolution. The monarchy rule was abolished in 1792 and replaced it with the Republican form of Government. Although the Bourbon monarch was restored by the great powers after the downfall of Napoleon, it could not survive beyond 1830 because the monarchs were already weakened by the changes caused by the French revolution. Political Parties: France became a multiparty state as a result of the revolution. The freedom of association led to the rise of political clubs such as the Jacobins, Cordeliers, etc that competed for power. These parties kept the government under check and balance by criticizing bad policies. Parliamentary Democracy: The French revolution led to the revival of the parliament which was abandoned for a period of over 175 years. The revolution gave France a functional parliament with representatives who are democratically elected. Constitution and Rule of Law: The French revolution introduced the rule of law. Before 1789, France had no constitution to safeguard people's rights and freedom. The constitution clearly separated the executive, the judiciary, and the legislature. Land ownership: The revolution brought new reforms and changes to land ownership in France. Before the revolution, the land was dominated by the clergy and the nobles who exploited the peasants. The working class was given equal rights to possess the land. National Guard: There was the formation of the National Guard that replaced the royal guard of the Bourbon monarchy. National Guard was the revolutionary army whose role was to protect the achievements of the French revolution.

The revolution achieved the good through a path of negatives nevertheless. There were losses of lives and properties, the reign of terror saw violence, the economy further declined to make the poor even poorer. The relationship between the church and the state deteriorated as the radical new laws and nationalization of church properties became a sour page. The revolution also led to poor relationships between France and other states. Revolutionary ideas of the French revolution were threats to other powers and monarchs in Europe, hence, Britain, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and other countries allied against France in order to prevent the spread of revolutionary

ideas to their countries. The French Revolution changed modern history forever and many nations took inspiration from the ideologies it gave birth to.

- The suppressive monarchies were being challenged everywhere by the people.
- The ideas of liberty and equality spread all around the world over the years through the French armies.
- The French became the dominant force to be reckoned with as it radicalized the political and social system of the 18th century.
- The French Revolution ended feudalism and made a path for future advances in individual freedoms, democratic principles, and equality of life.

Legacy of the French Revolution

The French Revolution made a lasting and mixed impact on France and the world. The most significant innovation was ideological, making abstract rational principles the ground for revolution and radical social change. This created instability as every new group of revolutionaries could claim it had as much right to impose its ideals as the group before. France has had about 11 constitutions since 1789. Respect for tradition, liberty and the achievements of previous generations was replaced by a "cult of change," progress and modernity. This outlook has been adopted up by revolutionaries around the world often with very destructive consequences for life, culture, social institutions and cultural artifacts. The Revolution was popular because people wanted freedom, but the result was a powerful State which was far more coercive and interfering than the old monarchy. Today the Revolution is an issue that still divides France with some defending it and others criticizing it. Around the world its interpretation is also contested as the extensive historiography shows. Conservatives such as Edmund Burke accepted that reform was necessary but regarded revolution as a mistake from which the Terror and dictatorship inevitably followed. The liberal approach to the Revolution such as that of Alexis de Tocqueville has typically been to support the achievements of the constitutional monarchy of the National Assembly but to disown the later actions of radical violence like the invasion of the Tuileries and the Terror. Socialists and Marxists such as Louis Blanc defend the revolution as an inevitable and progressive event. When China's Premier, Chou En Lai was asked in 1972 whether he thought the French Revolution had been a good or a bad thing. He mused for a few moments and then replied "It's too early to tell."

End of Absolute Monarchy:

The French Revolution dealt a death-blow to absolute monarchies all over Europe. Even though the monarchy was restored for a period in France, from that point on there was constant pressure on European monarchs to make concessions to some form of constitutional monarchy that limited their powers. The ones that did not respond were all overthrown. Professor Lynn Hunt of UCLA regarded the creation of a new democratic political culture from scratch as the Revolution's greatest achievement. At the same time she also interpreted the political Revolution as an enormous dysfunctional family haunted by patricide: Louis as father, Marie-Antoinette as mother, and the revolutionaries as an unruly mob of brothers.

Demise of the Feudal System:

The Revolution held up equality as an ideal for all the citizens of France and forcibly eliminated the traditional rights and privileges of the aristocratic class. Some revisionist historians such as Alfred Cobban have recently argued that feudalism had long since disappeared in France; that the Revolution did not transform French society, and that it was principally a political revolution and not a social one as socialists had previously believed.

Rights:

The Revolution made a significant contribution to the theory of human rights even if there were gross violations in the first few years of the Revolution. The language of abstract rights that has come to dominate current political discourse has its roots in the French Revolution. These are not discrete clearly described rights that are circumscribed by law and custom but abstractions bestowed by the State which may undercut tradition, custom, law and traditional liberties.

Modernization:

The French Revolution originated the idea that ancient regimes should be "modernized" according to the principles of a rational state. Modernization extended to the military, the administrative system, and other aspects of French life, with effective results. The very idea of modernity can be traced to the revolution

Administrative and judicial reforms:

These survive to this day as a positive legacy for France, having made the country's polity more rational and fair for all its citizens. The greater freedom and equality made society more meritocratic. The Civil Code remains the basis of French law and has influenced other European legal systems. Decimal and metric systems were first introduced in 1795 and have

been adopted by much of the world. Freedom of religion particularly for Protestants and Jews. Wherever Napoleon's armies went, Jews were emancipated and given the opportunity to participate as equals in European society. Disestablishment of the Church Education and social welfare programs that had traditionally been provided by the Catholic Church declined dramatically with the Revolution's attack on the church. The state was unable to provide alternative provision for many decades. The revolution destroyed the "religious, cultural and moral underpinnings of the communities" in which ordinary French people lived.

Violence

The Revolution's anticlericalism led to the repudiation of Christian virtues and sentiments. The revolution injected hate into the political process. The violence that characterized the revolution was a response to the resistance it encountered. It was naive to expect the nobility to welcome the abolition of their ancient status and privileges especially as the reforms were enforced hastily, without negotiation or compensation. This use of violence and terror has been adopted by revolutionaries around the world who regard it as legitimate and unavoidable.

War

The Revolutionary Wars and Napoleonic Wars convulsed and changed the map and future of Europe. The character of war itself was changed. France mobilized all its resources to fight the wars and other countries had to do the same to defend themselves and defeat France. This required a huge rise in taxation and expansion of the power of the state. The wars had a worldwide impact drawing in the colonies of both sides. These wars were also ideological and thus a precursor of the world wars of the next century.

Nationalism

French revolutionary principles were exported and imposed on much of Europe. It led to the rise of nationalism as one of the key principles of the revolution was that people should think of themselves as citizens and have as their highest and sole source of identity the nation state. This fostered national hatred and conflict. Germany for example was 'tidied up'. Napoleon abolished the Holy Roman Empire and reduced the 396 principalities and free cities to 40. This imposition French rationalism and culture stirred up a reaction which poisoned Europe in the following century. The counter- Enlightenment with its rejection of abstract rationalism and emphasis on romanticism and blood ties blossomed in Germany, leading to a wounded German

nationalism. Bismarck completed the unification so as to prevent the French, or anyone else, trampling over and humiliating Germany again.

Revolution

Revolutionaries for the past 200 years have regarded the French Revolution as a model to be emulated. Ever since there have been revolutionary figures hanging around plotting and waiting for the opportunity to seize power. These rebellions are against the supposed violation of abstract rights rather than existing laws. The revolution was a source of inspiration to radicals all over the world who wanted to destroy the ancient regimes in their countries. Some officers of the Russian Army that occupied Paris took home with them revolutionary ideas which fermented and directly contributed to the ideological background of the Russian Revolution. Historian François Furet in his work, *Le Passe d'une illusion* (1995) (*The Passing of An Illusion* (1999) in English translation) explores in detail the similarities between the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution of 1917 more than a century later, arguing that the former was taken as a model by Russian revolutionaries.

Secularization

The anti-clericalism and de-Christianization policies created a deep and lasting gulf in France pitting the two sides against each other. This had a social and political expression too. Socialists and trade unionists throughout continental Europe have tended to be atheists. The strict separation of church and state took traditional Christian values out of public life. Citizenship is still the only sort of identity recognized by the French State which has made it harder for France to integrate religious minorities such as Muslims who find their identity elsewhere..

Democracy

The revolution was carried out in the name of democracy and has spread the message to the world that the people are, or ought to be, sovereign. The French version of democracy has had a tendency to become intolerant of dissent and totalitarian. The modern democratic terminology of left-wing and right-wing comes from the seating arrangements of two main groupings in the Constituent Assembly.

2. Napoleon Bonaparte

In 1795, a young military man by the name of Napoleon Bonaparte was ordered to put down the Parisian mob that was storming the Tuileries Palace. Napoleon, already in 1795, would demonstrate the combination of ambition and ruthlessness that would characterize his entire

career. As the mob advanced on the Tuileries, Napoleon, without blinking an eye, ordered his troops to fire into the crowd. He had been born in Corsica, the second son in gentry's family, and following the traditional aristocratic pattern, the second son winds up with a career in the military. During Napoleon's early life he attended military academies in France. These somewhat humble origins would be one of Napoleon's great calling cards; Napoleon would become a great champion of the selfmade man. He would become the idol of a great many people, commoners who saw in Napoleon the possibilities of what a man of talent, what a man blessed with ability, with ambition, could do if he were unfettered by the structures of the old regime..

Napoleon's Early Military Victories

He was best known, however, for a string of very extraordinary military victories in 1796–97. In those years, he conquered all of northern Italy, forcing the Habsburgs to relinquish their territories there, and to seek control of the Netherlands as well. He also headed a military expedition to Egypt, seeking to weaken the British position there, and although his campaign in Egypt did not produce the results that he had hoped, he did achieve a series of very striking military victories. This was given very great coverage in France. This was not only a military expedition; he took, in effect, what we now would think of as a public relations staff that monitored his every move. These dramatic victories in Egypt and in northern Italy had made Napoleon a household name in France. By 1799, as the Directory continued to lose support and just was absolutely unable to inspire any sort of enthusiasm, Napoleon had become very well known and popular across all the country.

A Coup brings Napoleon to Power

In November of 1799, a number of the members of the Directory turned to Napoleon to help them establish some sort of stable government, capable of withstanding the recurrent threats of renewed radicalism and revived royalism. Two members of the Directory approached Napoleon, plotted with him and his brother Louis, to overthrow the weak government and establish some form of stronger regime capable of charting a new course for France. This coup would take place on November 9, 1799. The new government that was established called for power to be shared by three consuls. You already see a kind of terminology that's not harkening back to the revolution, or even to the old regime, but consuls harkening back to the Roman Empire. Power was to be shared by a triumvirate, and Napoleon was to be first consul, *primus inter pares*, first

among equals. Two things were already very clear about him at this point. One was his enormous ambition, and the other was his great charisma. One had seen this in his dealings with the troops his troops in northern Italy, his troops in Egypt and also, all sorts of contemporary evidence suggests that in dealing with people individually he exerted an enormous amount of charm, power, and charisma. It was hardly a mystery that he would very quickly outmanoeuvre his two partners in this triumvirate, as well as the legislative bodies of the regime.

Napoleon Tightens His Grasp on Power

In 1802, Napoleon had himself elected consul for life. And in a step that was really quite remarkable and was a preview of the way Napoleon wanted to reign, this step was to be ratified by a national plebiscite. The people were now called in to vote to ratify this step taken by the regime, taken by Napoleon. The outcome of the vote was 3,568,885 in favour, 8,374 against. One might suspect that there was a certain amount of manipulation and influence brought to bear on the outcome, but Napoleon was quite clearly very popular in France at this time. Portrait the Emperor Napoleon in His Study at the Tuileries by Jacques-Louis David 1812. During the coronation ceremony that crowned him Emperor, Napoleon broke with tradition and placed the crown upon his own head, rather than allow the Archbishop of Reims to place the crown on him. In 1804, he used a trumped up royalist plot to declare himself emperor. He claimed that there was a conspiracy to return the Bourbon monarchy, to overthrow the Revolution. Napoleon constantly talked about the Revolution, even the Republic at times and saw the great danger. But he always tried to present himself on the one hand as a military man, a man of affairs, a pragmatist in some ways, but also as the legitimate heir of the Revolution. Once again, this step was ratified by a plebiscite, and the first line of this new constitutional document read: “The government of the Republic is entrusted to an Emperor.”

The Constitution of 1791 had been based on universal suffrage. In this sense, it's consistent with the Revolution, the Great Revolution, but elections were very indirect. There was universal suffrage to elect electors, who would then elect a final legislature. This was the usual kind of compromised solution. The use of the plebiscite was novel; it gave Napoleon's regime a patina not only of democracy, but of radical democracy, almost the general will speak through the plebiscites. If one thinks about the period, this is absolutely a remarkable sort of phenomenon, of going directly to the people to say “Yea” or “Nay” to major matters of state.

The Napoleonic Code

The Napoleonic Code, created with the goal of being clearly written and accessible is considered one of the most influential documents ever written. Napoleon insisted upon the codification of law; the Napoleonic Code would become one of the great achievements of his regime, implemented not only in France, but also in the countries of Europe occupied by the French armies. That new code imposed upon France a uniform system of justice. It called for equality before the law. This was a major step. One thing that equality before the law meant to the Napoleonic regime was that no one would be tax-exempt. All French citizens were now going to bear the financial burdens of state. Freedom of religion was guaranteed under the new constitution; Protestants would be able to practice their religion, and Napoleon took steps to emancipate the Jews. This had been done initially during the Revolution itself in the first constitution. Napoleon would take additional steps in this direction. The new constitution also called for freedom of profession.

This doesn't sound very revolutionary, but it was. It dealt the final deathblow to the old guilds, and it was a bow toward the new forces of commercial capitalism and industrialization in France. What it did was to signal to liberal economic elements that this was going to be a regime that would adopt policies that were favorable to business, favorable to trade, to commerce, to break whatever residual powers lingered of the old guild system in France. For Napoleon, it was quite clear the genie could not be put back in the bottle; the Revolution had happened. Still, Napoleon believed you could not have a legitimate government, post-Revolution, without a constitution. His regime was built on a claim to popular sovereignty, embedded in the Constitution, embedded in the elections, embedded in the plebiscites, all of which gave to this Napoleonic regime a very radical progressive bent. Napoleon also would continue a policy that had really been emphasized during the Revolution: an emphasis on education. Napoleon would create the system of lycees under close government supervision, and this emphasis was on educating people so they could read, so they could participate, so they could be citizens.

This was also part of one of the other great social claims of the Napoleonic regime. This was to be a regime in which careers were open to talent. It wasn't heredity, it wasn't connections, and it was none of that. What really mattered was the man of talent, the man of ability, willing to take chances and to achieve.

Napoleon's Administrative Reforms and Peace with the Vatican

The regime also instituted a reform of the French administration. A rational centralized administration was created under Napoleon. He created a very efficient system of taxation, not a very exciting sort of reform, but obviously, considering the history of France in the 18th century, it was absolutely essential. He returned France to a system of centralized administration, where local officials were appointed from Paris. In fact, under Napoleon, one sees the most centralized of all the various French regimes of the 18th century and into the 19th century. In addition to these initiatives, though, and possibly one of the most important, if not the most important, in terms of sealing Napoleon's popularity at home, was his establishment of peace with the Church. The Concordat of 1801, which acknowledged Catholicism as the religion of the majority of French people, also required that Catholic leaders in France take a civil oath to the government. After a decade in which relations between the various French revolutionaries and the Church were strained (to put it mildly), Napoleon was determined to restore good relations with the papacy, to bring the Church back into the mainstream of French political life. In 1801, he signed a concordat with the Vatican, with Pius VII, in which the Napoleonic regime recognized Catholicism as "the religion of the majority of French people." It was not to be the state religion; the constitution that would be drafted called for freedom of religion but it acknowledged that Catholicism was the religion of the majority of the French people. This concordat with the Vatican was enormously popular in France.

Napoleon as an Oppressive but Popular Ruler

These aspects of the regime certainly solidified Napoleon's hold on the population. But if these factors were consistent with the Revolution, other aspects of this Napoleonic regime were not. His opponents claimed that Napoleon was really a dictator, if one with great popular support. Certainly the system was maintained by secret police and very strict censorship. The number of newspapers in Paris shrank from 73 in 1799 to 13, and then down to four. They were closely censored by the regime. Secret agents supervised the press and the arts under Napoleon. Surveillance of enemies was common, and arrest of enemies or potential enemies was also commonplace. One also sees a somewhat chilling development here, which was that some opponents or potential opponents of Napoleon were arrested or taken into a kind of protective custody, and then sent off to mental institutions not prisons, but mental institutions still, for whatever oppressive qualities this Napoleonic regime displayed, the Napoleonic Empire was enormously popular in France, certainly down to 1812–1813. Most of the population clearly

believed that the regime had consolidated the most positive gains made during the Revolution. In addition to this Napoleon had restored grandeur to France. Paris had once again become the centre of Western civilization. The grandeur of empire, the military glory of French armies marching over the breadth of the European continent all of these things cemented Napoleon's popularity in France.

Napoleonic Wars The Napoleonic Wars comprised a series of global conflicts fought during Napoleon Bonaparte's imperial rule over France (1805–1815). They formed to some extent an extension of the wars sparked by the French Revolution of 1789. These wars revolutionized European armies and artillery, as well as military systems, and took place on a scale never before seen, mainly due to the application of modern mass conscription. French power rose quickly, conquering most of Europe; and collapsed rapidly after the disastrous invasion of Russia (1812), and Napoleon's empire ultimately suffered complete military defeat, resulting in the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France in 1814 and 1815. The Napoleonic Wars brought great changes to Europe. Though Napoleon brought most of Western Europe under his rule (a feat not seen since the days of the Roman Empire), a state of constant warfare between France and the combined other major powers of Europe for over two decades finally took its toll. By the end of the Napoleonic Wars, France no longer held the role of the dominant power in Europe, as it had since the times of Louis XIV. The United Kingdom emerged as one of the most powerful countries in the world, effectively becoming the first real hyper power. The British Royal Navy held unquestioned naval superiority throughout the world, and Britain's industrial economy made it the most powerful commercial country.

Background 1789-1802

The French Revolution posed an implied threat to monarchies throughout Europe, which only increased with the arrest and execution of King Louis XVI of France in 1792 - 1793. The first attempt to crush the French Republic came in 1792 when Austria, Piedmont, the Kingdom of Naples, Prussia, Spain, and the Kingdom of Great Britain formed the First Coalition. French measures, including general conscription (*levee en masse*), military reform, and total war, contributed to the defeat of the First Coalition. The war ended when Bonaparte forced the Austrians to accept his terms in the Treaty of Campo Formio. The United Kingdom remained the only anti-French power still in the field by 1797. The Second Coalition, formed in 1798, consisted of the following nations or states: Austria, Great Britain, the Kingdom of Naples, the

Ottoman Empire, Papal States, Portugal, and Russia. During the War of the Second Coalition, the French Republic suffered from corruption and division under the Directory. France also lacked funds to prosecute the war and no longer had the services of Lazare Carnot, the warminister who had guided her to successive victories following extensive reforms during the early 1790s. Napoleon Bonaparte, the main architect of victory in the last years of the First Coalition, had gone to campaign in Egypt. Stripped of two of its most important military figures from the previous conflict, the Republic suffered successive defeats against revitalized enemies which British financial support brought back into the war.

Napoleon managed to return to France on August 23, 1799. He seized control of the French government on November 9, 1799 in the coup of 18 Brumaire, toppling the Directory. Napoleon reorganized the French military and created a reserve army positioned to support campaigns either on the Rhine or in Italy. On all fronts, French advances caught the Austrians off-guard. In Italy, Napoleon won a victory against the Austrians at Marengo (1800). However, the decisive battle came on the Rhine at Hohenlinden in 1800. The defeated Austrians left the conflict after the Treaty of Laneville (February 9, 1801). Thus the Second Coalition ended in another French triumph. However, the United Kingdom remained an important influence on the continental powers in encouraging their resistance to France. London had brought the Second Coalition together through subsidies, and Napoleon realized that without British defeat or a treaty with the UK he could not achieve a complete peace.

War with Britain 1803-1814

Unlike its many coalition partners, Britain remained at war throughout the entire period of the Napoleonic Wars. Protected by naval supremacy, the United Kingdom was able to maintain low-cost low-intensity warfare on a global scale for over a decade. Commitment increased in the Peninsula War, where, protected by topography, guerrilla activity, and sometimes massive earthworks, the British army succeeded in harassing French forces for several years. By 1815, the British army would play a central role in the final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo. The Treaty of Amiens (March 25, 1802) resulted in peace between the UK and France, and marked the final collapse of the Second Coalition. But the Treaty always seemed unlikely to endure: it satisfied neither side, and both sides dishonored parts of it. Military actions soon clouded the peace: the French intervened in the Swiss civil strife (Stecklikrieg) and occupied several coastal cities in Italy, while the United Kingdom occupied Malta. Napoleon

attempted to exploit the brief peace at sea to restore the colonial rule in the rebellious Antilles. The expedition, though initially successful, would soon turn to a disaster, with the French commander and Bonaparte's brother-in-law, Charles Leclerc, dying of yellow fever and almost his entire force destroyed by the disease combined with the fierce attacks by the rebels. Hostilities between Great Britain and France recommenced on May 18, 1803. The Allied war-aims changed over the course of the conflict: a general desire to restore the French monarchy became an almost Manichean struggle to stop Bonaparte. The series of naval and colonial conflicts, including a large number of minor naval actions (such as the Action of 1805) gave perhaps a clear sign of the new nature of war. Conflicts in the Caribbean, and in particular the seizure of colonial bases and islands throughout the wars, would directly and immediately have an effect upon the European conflict, and battles thousands of miles apart could influence each other's outcomes. The Napoleonic conflict had reached the point at which subsequent historians could talk of a "world war." Only the Seven Years' War offered a precedent for widespread conflict on such a scale.

Third Coalition 1805

Napoleon planned an invasion of the British Isles, and massed 180,000 troops at Boulogne. However, in order to mount his invasion, he needed to achieve naval superiority or at least to pull the British fleet away from the English Channel. A complex plan to distract the British by threatening their possessions in the West Indies failed when a Franco-Spanish fleet under Admiral Villeneuve turned back after an indecisive action off Cape Finisterre on 22 July 1805. The Royal Navy blockaded Villeneuve in Cadiz until he left for Naples on October 19, but Lord Nelson caught and defeated his fleet at the Battle of Trafalgar on October 21. This battle cost Admiral Nelson his life as a result of a French bullet, but Napoleon would never again have the opportunity to challenge the British at sea. By this time, however, Napoleon had already all but abandoned plans to invade the British Isles, and had turned his attention to enemies on the Continent once again. The French army left Boulogne and moved towards Austria. In April 1805 the United Kingdom and Russia signed a treaty with the aim of removing the French from Holland and Switzerland. Austria joined the alliance after the annexation of Genoa and the proclamation of Napoleon as King of Italy on 17 March 1805. The Austrians began the war by invading Bavaria with an army of about 70,000 under Karl Mack von Leiberich, and the French army marched out from Boulogne in late July, 1805 to confront them. At Ulm (September 25 -

October 20) Napoleon managed to surround Mack's army in a brilliant envelopment, forcing its surrender without significant losses. With the main Austrian army north of the Alps defeated (another army under Archduke Charles maneuvered inconclusively against Andre Massena's French army in Italy), Napoleon occupied Vienna. Far from his supply lines, he faced a superior Austro-Russian army under the command of Mikhail Kutuzov, with the Emperor Alexander of Russia personally present. On December 2 Napoleon crushed the joint Austro-Russian army in Moravia at Austerlitz (usually considered his greatest victory). He inflicted a total of 25,000 casualties on a numerically superior enemy army while sustaining fewer than 7,000 in his own force. After Austerlitz, Austria signed the Treaty of Pressburg (December 26, 1805) and left the Coalition. The Treaty required the Austrians to give up Venetia to the French-dominated Kingdom of Italy and Tyrol to Bavaria. With the withdrawal of Austria from the war, stalemate ensued. Napoleon's army had a record of continuous unbroken victories on land, but the full force of the Russian army had not yet come into play.

Fourth Coalition 1806–1807

The Fourth Coalition (1806–1807) of Prussia, Russia, Saxony, Sweden and the United Kingdom against France formed within months of the collapse of the previous coalition. In July 1806 Napoleon formed the Confederation of the Rhine out of the many tiny German states which constituted the Rhineland and most other parts of western Germany. He amalgamated many of the smaller states into larger electorates, duchies and kingdoms to make the governance of non-Prussian Germany smoother. Napoleon elevated the rulers of the two largest Confederation states, Saxony and Bavaria, to the status of kings.

In August 1806 the Prussian king, Friedrich Wilhelm III made the decision to go to war independently of any other great power, save the distant Russia. A more sensible course of action might have involved declaring war the previous year and joining Austria and Russia. This might have contained Napoleon and prevented the Allied disaster at Austerlitz. In any event, the Russian army, an ally of Prussia, still remained far away when Prussia declared war. In September Napoleon unleashed all French forces east of the Rhine. Napoleon himself defeated a Prussian army at Jena (October 14 1806), and Davout defeated another at Auerstadt on the same day. Some 160,000 French soldiers (increasing in number as the campaign went on) went against Prussia and moved with such speed that Napoleon was able to destroy as an effective military force the entire quarter of a million strong Prussian army which sustained 25,000 casualties, lost

a further 150,000 prisoners and 4,000 artillery pieces, and over 100,000 muskets stockpiled in Berlin. In the former battle Napoleon only fought a detachment of the Prussian force. The latter battle involved a single French corps defeating the bulk of the Prussian army. Napoleon entered into Berlin on 27 October 1806 and visited the tomb of Frederick the Great, there instructing his marshals to remove their hats, saying, "If he was alive we wouldn't be here today." In total Napoleon had taken only 19 days from beginning his attack on Prussia until knocking it out of the war with the capture of Berlin and the destruction of its principal armies at Jena and Auerstadt. By contrast Prussia had fought for three years in the War of the First Coalition with little achievement.

In Berlin, Napoleon issued a series of decrees which, on November 21, 1806 brought into effect the Continental System. This policy aimed to eliminate the threat of the United Kingdom by closing French-controlled territory to its trade. The United Kingdom's army remained a minimal threat to France; the UK maintained a standing army of just 220,000 at the height of the Napoleonic Wars, whereas France's strength peaked at over 1,500,000 in addition to the armies of numerous allies and several hundred thousand national guards that Napoleon could draft into the military if necessary. The Royal Navy however was instrumental in disrupting France's extra-continental trade - both by seizing and threatening French shipping and by seizing French colonial possessions - but could do nothing about France's trade with the major continental economies and posed no threat to French territory in Europe. In addition France's population and agricultural capacity far outstripped that of the United Kingdom. However, the United Kingdom's industrial capacity was the greatest in Europe and its mastery of the seas allowed it to build up considerable economic strength through trade. That was sufficient to ensure that France was never able to consolidate its control over Europe in peace. However, many in the French government believed that cutting the United Kingdom off from the Continent would end its economic influence over Europe and isolate it. This was what the Continental System was designed to achieve, although it never succeeded in this objective.

The next stage of the war involved the French driving Russian forces out of Poland and creating a new Duchy of Warsaw. Napoleon then turned north to confront the remainder of the Russian army and to attempt to capture the temporary Prussian capital at Königsberg. A tactical draw at Eylau (February 7–8) forced the Russians to withdraw further north. Napoleon then routed the Russian army at Friedland (June 14). Following this defeat, Alexander had to make

peace with Napoleon at Tilsit (July 7, 1807). By September, Marshal Brune completed the occupation of Swedish Pomerania, allowing the Swedish army, however, to withdraw with all its munitions of war. At the Congress of Erfurt (September–October 1808) Napoleon and Alexander agreed that Russia should force Sweden to join the Continental System, which led to the Finnish War of 1808–1809 and to the division of Sweden into two parts separated by the Gulf of Bothnia.

Fifth Coalition 1809

The Fifth Coalition (1809) of the United Kingdom and Austria against France formed as the United Kingdom engaged in the Peninsular War against France. Once again, the United Kingdom stood alone, and the sea became the major theatre of war between the United Kingdom and Napoleon's allies. During the time of the Fifth Coalition, the Royal Navy won a succession of victories in the French colonies and another major naval victory against the neutral Denmark at the Battle of Copenhagen (September 2 1807). On land, the Fifth Coalition attempted few extensive military endeavours. One, the Walcheren Expedition of 1809, involved a dual effort by the British Army and the Royal Navy to relieve Austrian forces under intense French pressure. It ended in disaster after the Army commander John Pitt, 2nd Earl of Chatham failed to capture the objective, the naval base of French controlled Antwerp. For the most part of the years of the Fifth Coalition, British military operations on land outside of the Peninsular War remained restricted to hit-and-run operations. These were executed by the Royal Navy, who dominated the sea after having beaten down almost all substantial naval opposition from France and its allies and blockading what remained of the latter's naval forces in heavily fortified French-controlled ports. These rapid-attack operations were a sort of ex-territorial guerrilla strikes: they were aimed mostly at destroying blockaded French naval and mercantile shipping, and disrupting French supplies, communications, and military units stationed near the coasts. Often, when British allies attempted military actions within several dozen miles or so of the sea, the Royal Navy would be present and would land troops and supplies and aid the allied land forces in a concerted operation. Royal Navy ships were even known to provide artillery support against French units should fighting stray near enough to the coastline. However, these operations were limited to the ability and quality of the land forces. For example, when operating with inexperienced guerrilla forces in Spain, the Royal Navy sometimes failed to achieve their objectives simply for lack of

manpower that was supposed to have been supplied for the operation by the Navy's guerrilla allies.

The European strategic situation in February 1809.

The struggle also continued in the sphere of economic warfare the French Continental System and the British naval blockade of French-controlled territory. Due to military shortages and lack of organization in French territory, numerous breaches of the Continental System occurred as French-dominated states engaged in illicit (though often tolerated) trade with British smugglers. Both sides entered additional conflicts in attempts to enforce their blockade; the British fought the United States in the War of 1812 (1812- 1814), and the French engaged in the Peninsular War (1808-1814). The Iberian conflict began when Portugal continued trade with the United Kingdom despite French restrictions. When Spain failed to maintain the system the alliance with France came to an end and French troops gradually encroached on its territory until Madrid was occupied. British intervention soon followed. Austria, previously an ally of the French, took the opportunity to attempt to restore its imperial territories in Germany as held prior to Austerlitz. Austria achieved a number of initial victories against the thinly-spread army of Marshal Davout. Napoleon had left Davout with only 170,000 troops to defend France's entire eastern frontier. (In the 1790s, 800,000 troops had carried out the same task, but holding a much shorter front.).

Napoleon had enjoyed easy success in Spain, retaking Madrid, defeating the Spanish and consequently forcing a withdrawal of the heavily out-numbered British army from the Iberian Peninsula (Battle of Corunna, January 16, 1809). Austria's attack prevented Napoleon from successfully wrapping up operations against British forces by necessitating his departure for Austria, and he never returned to the Peninsula theatre. In his absence and in the absence of his best marshals (Davout remained in the east throughout the war) the French situation deteriorated, especially when the prodigious British general, Sir Arthur Wellesley, arrived to command the British forces. The French Empire in Europe in 1811, near its peak extent. Dark and light green areas indicate the French Empire and its territories; blue, pink and yellow areas indicate French client and satellite states.

Napoleon assumed personal command in the east and bolstered the army there for his counter-attack on Austria. After a well-run campaign that, after a few small battles, forced the Austrians to withdraw from Bavaria, Napoleon advanced into Austria. His hurried attempt to cross the Danube resulted in the massive Battle of Aspern-Essling (22 May 1809) Napoleon's

first significant tactical defeat. Failure by the Austrian commander, Archduke Karl, to follow up on his indecisive victory meant that Napoleon could prepare for a renewed attempt to seize Vienna, and in early July he did so. He defeated the Austrians at Wagram, on July 5 - 6. (During this battle Napoleon stripped Marshal Bernadotte of his title and ridiculed him in front of other senior officers. Shortly thereafter, Bernadotte took up the offer from Sweden to fill the vacant position of Crown Prince there. Later he would actively participate in wars against his former Emperor.)

The War of the Fifth Coalition ended with the Treaty of Schonbrunn (October 14, 1809). In the east only the Tyrolese rebels led by Andreas Hofer continued to fight the French-Bavarian army until finally defeated in November 1809, while in the west the Peninsular War continued. In 1810 the French Empire reached its greatest extent. On the continent, the British and Portuguese remained restricted to the area around Lisbon behind their impregnable lines of Torres Vedras. Napoleon married Marie-Louise, an Austrian Archduchess, in order to ensure a more stable alliance with Austria and to provide the Emperor with an heir, something his first wife, Josephine, had failed to do. As well as the French empire, Napoleon controlled the Swiss Confederation, the Confederation of the Rhine, the Duchy of Warsaw and the Kingdom of Italy. Allied territories included: the Kingdom of Spain (Joseph Bonaparte); Kingdom of Westphalia (Jerome Bonaparte); the Kingdom of Naples (Joachim Murat, brother-in-law); Principality of Lucca and Piombino (Felix Bacciochi, brother-in-law); and his former enemies, Prussia and Austria.

Sixth Coalition 1812–1814

The Sixth Coalition (1812–1814) consisted of the United Kingdom and Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Austria and a number of German States. In 1812 Napoleon invaded Russia. He aimed to compel Emperor Alexander I to remain in the Continental System and to remove the imminent threat of a Russian invasion of Poland. The French-led Grande Armee, consisting of 650,000 men (270,000 Frenchmen and many soldiers of allies or subject areas), crossed the Niemen River on June 23 1812. Russia proclaimed a Patriotic War, while Napoleon proclaimed a Second Polish war, but against the expectations of the Poles (who supplied almost 100,000 troops for the invasion-force) he avoided any concessions to Poland, having in mind further negotiations with Russia. Russia maintained a scorched-earth policy of retreat, broken only by the Borodino on 7th September. This bloody confrontation ended in a tactical draw, but Napoleon eventually forced

the Russians to back down, thus opening the road to Moscow. By September 14, 1812 the Grande Armée had captured Moscow; although by this point the Russians had largely abandoned the city, even releasing prisoners from Moscow's prisons to inconvenience the French. Alexander I refused to capitulate, and with no sign of clear victory in sight Napoleon had to withdraw from Moscow after the governor, Count Fyodor Vasilievich Rostopchin, allegedly ordered the city burnt to the ground. So the disastrous Great Retreat began, with 370,000 casualties largely as a result of starvation and the freezing weather conditions, and 200,000 captured. By November, when the remnants of the Grande Armée crossed the Berezina River, only 27,000 fit soldiers remained. Napoleon then left his army and returned to Paris to prepare the defense of Poland from the advancing Russians. The situation was not as dire as it might at first have seemed the Russians had lost around 400,000 men and their army was similarly depleted.

Peninsular War (1808 – 1814)

As Portugal disobeyed the decrees, Napoleon conquered and occupied Portugal. He forced the King of Spain to abdicate and placed his brother, Joseph Bonaparte, on the throne. The rise of national feeling made Portugal and Spain in the Iberian Peninsula revolt against Napoleon. Taking advantage of these opportunities, Britain sent Arthur Wellesley (made Lord Wellington in 1809 and Duke in 1814) to the Peninsula. He defeated the French army in Portugal and the French evacuated Portugal. Napoleon's attempt to recapture Portugal failed. Arthur Wellesley entered Spain and defeated the French in the battles of Talavera (1809), Salamanca (1812) and Vittoria (1813). The French forces were driven out of the Iberian Peninsula.

Austrian Revolt (1809)

The reverses of France in the Iberian Peninsula roused Austria into action. She rose into open revolt. Napoleon defeated Austria in the battle of Wagram in 1809. He married Marie Louise, the daughter of Emperor Francis I of Austria, in 1810. In the previous year, he had divorced Josephine as she proved incurably barren.

Russian Campaign, Leipzig and Waterloo

As Russia openly defied the Continental System, Napoleon marched into Russia in 1812. It was a fatal step. It was the winter in Russia that made Napoleon taste his first defeat on land. In 1813 the Fourth Coalition was formed by Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria against France. Napoleon was defeated in Germany in 1813 at Leipzig which is often called the "Battle of the Nations" and was driven back to France. This was Napoleon's second defeat. The victorious

Allies occupied Paris and Napoleon was forced to abdicate in 1814. He was exiled to the island of Elba. Louis XVIII, the brother of Louis XVI, was made King of France. In the meantime, Napoleon escaped from Elba and returned to France in 1815 and remained as Emperor for 100 days. But the allied nations of Europe got alarmed. They united together and completely defeated him in the battle of Waterloo in 1815. He was exiled to St. Helena where he died in 1821.

Centralisation

The Keynote of Napoleon's administration was centralisation. He wielded legislative, executive and judicial powers. In 1800 he brought the local government under his direct control. The departments and smaller districts (arrondissements) each under a Prefect and Sub-prefect respectively were made answerable to him. While the Mayors of small communes were appointed by the Prefect, those of the bigger ones were appointed directly by the Central Government. Napoleon introduced a uniform system of administration throughout the country.

Finance

Financial administration was in a state of chaos when Napoleon became the first Consul. He remedied many of the defects in the financial system. He increased the state revenue by a careful collection of taxes. By economy drives by severe punishment of corrupt officials and by compelling the vanquished countries for the paying the French army, he reduced public expenditure. In 1800 he set up the Bank of France on a sound basis.

Education

Napoleon brought education under the control of the State. The imperial University, which he set up, controlled public instruction throughout the French Empire. Primary or elementary schools, secondary or grammar schools, high schools, and special schools such as technical schools, civil service schools and military schools were set up. Napoleon liberally endowed museums and libraries. As a part of State control of education, he vigorously censored the press and the theatre.

Public works

Napoleon undertook a large number of public works. He constructed 229 broad military roads. Thirty of these roads radiated from Paris to the borders of France. He constructed two trans-Alpine roads connecting Paris with Turin, Milan, Rome and Naples. He also undertook other works of public utility such as the construction of bridges, draining of marshes, strengthening of

canals and improving ports. These works provided work for the unemployed, promoted trade and commerce, and improved agriculture.

Industry

Napoleon did much to promote the economic prosperity of the country. By the Continental System, trade with England came to standstill. To make France stand on her own legs, he promoted industries, set up technical schools, offered prizes to inventors and gave loans and bounties to industrialists to increase production.

The Legion of Honour

The revolution had abolished all titles and honours. To strengthen the bonds of loyalty to the Emperor and provide an incentive for hard work, Napoleon instituted the Legion of Honour in 1802. It awarded decorations and titles to men who distinguished themselves in Civil and Military Services.

Literature and Art

In the midst of his preoccupations, Napoleon did not neglect the fine arts. He was a patron of art, literature and science. Sculpture, architecture, painting and music made great progress during the Napoleonic period. State palaces were restored and enlarged. He beautified the city of Paris with work of art taken as spoils from different countries.

Concordat and Code Napoleon

The two greatest works which had kept the memory of Napoleon still green in the minds of the People are the Concordat and the Code Napoleon. He knew that an established Church would be a tower of strength to the State. So he entered in an agreement with the Pope in 1801 known as the Concordat. The Roman Catholic religion was recognised as the religion of France by the Concordat. The Pope agreed not to advance his claims to the restoration of Church property and the State undertook the payment of salaries to the clergy. Bishops were to be nominated by the Consul and the Pope invested them with their office. The priests were to be appointed by the Bishops. To put the new scheme into effect, it became necessary to make both constitutional and non-juring bishops to resign. Many non-juring priests refused to resign. So the Pope was forced to depose them. New appointments were made mainly from the non-juring bishops. The constitutional bishops were also admitted. Thus Napoleon patched up the schism in the Church for which he was hailed a "Second Constantine". The codification of the French law was the most outstanding work of Napoleon. The Code Napoleon is still the basis of the Civil law of

France. His code gave France a common legal and judicial system. IT was no wonder that he was hailed as a “Second Jusstinian”. For the hero of hundered battles, neither the Nile not Trafalgar proved to be the Waterloo. Napoleon’s downfall came gradually. The ill-contrived Continental System, estranging the feelings of the Catholic world by imprisoning the Pope, the misdirected Russian expedition, the growth of national feeling and the supremacy of Britain on the sea were some of the causes for his downfall. It was the “Spanish Ulcer” which ruined him to great extent. HE was too ambitious and hence his downfall.

Estimate

Napoleon was a military genius. The French Empire reached the zenith of its glory and fame during his rule. He was not merely a distinguished general but also an excellent administrator. “If the conquests of Napoleon were ephemeral, his civilian work in france was built upon granite”. He indirectly paved the way for the unification of Italy and Germany. He evolved order out of chaos and created a strong centralised state. He laid the foundation of a strong government rooting out corruption and inefficiency. In the words of Grant and Temperly, “Napoleon was without question a man of extraordinary force of brian and character, who under all circumstances and in all countries whould have won for himself a high position. The instances that are usually quoted in comparison with Napoleon’s life history are the establishment of the Roman Empire by Julius Caesar after a century of confusion and revolution in Rome and the personal rule of Oliver Cromwell which followed the puritan revolution”. Napoleon, the Lieutenant, Consul and the Emperor is one of then most striking personalities in the history of Europe.

Course Outcomes

- CO1:** Explain the causes of the French Revolution.
- CO2:** Describe the course and major events of the Revolution.
- CO3:** Analyze the consequences of the Revolution.
- CO4:** Examine the role of Napoleon Bonaparte in European history.
- CO5:** Evaluate the impact of the Napoleonic Wars and Napoleon’s policies.

Programme Outcome

PO: To develop students' understanding of revolutionary movements and leadership, enabling critical analysis of historical changes and their global impact.

S. No	Question (5 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
1.	Explain the causes of the French Revolution.	CO2	PO1	K2
2.	Discuss the course of the French Revolution.	CO3	PO1	K3
3.	Analyze the consequences of the French Revolution.	CO4	PO1	K4
4.	Explain the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte.	CO3	PO1	K3
5.	Discuss the Napoleonic Wars and their impact.	CO4	PO1	K4

S. No	Question (8 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
1.	Analyze the Continental System introduced by Napoleon.	CO4	PO1	K4
2.	Examine the domestic policies of Napoleon.	CO4	PO1	K4
3.	Discuss the causes for the downfall of Napoleon.	CO4	PO1	K4
4.	Evaluate the impact of the French Revolution on Europe.	CO5	PO1	K5
5.	Analyze the role of Napoleon in shaping modern Europe.	CO4	PO1	K4

Unit – II

Age of Metternich- The Congress of Vienna - 1815 -- The Holy and Quadruple Alliance
Concert of Europe - The Revolution of 1830 and 1848- Napoleon III.

Learning Objectives

- To understand the significance of the Congress of Vienna (1815) in restoring Europe.
- To examine the role of Klemens von Metternich and the Age of Metternich.
- To study the formation and objectives of the Holy Alliance and Quadruple Alliance.
- To analyze the working of the Concert of Europe.
- To evaluate the causes and impact of the Revolutions of 1830 and Revolutions of 1848, and the role of Napoleon III.

Age of Metternich

Introduction

The Metternich System, also known as the Congress System after the Congress of Vienna, was the balance of power that existed in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the outbreak of World War I (1914), albeit with major alterations after the revolutions of 1848. The purpose of Metternich's plan was to keep control of Europe in the hands of conservatives through "Concert of Europe". It was a peacekeeping alliance pledging to maintain a "balance of power" and suppress uprisings. Its founding powers were Austria, Prussia, the Russian Empire and the United Kingdom, the members of the Quadruple Alliance responsible for the downfall of the First French Empire. In time France was established as a fifth member of the concert. At first, the leading personalities of the system were British foreign secretary Lord Castlereagh, Austrian chancellor Klemens von Metternich and Russian tsar Alexander I. The Congress of Vienna established an international system of reactionary governments dedicated to maintaining a set of European boundaries, preventing revolutions and changes in government, and stopping any one power from becoming too powerful. To this end, the Congress powers agreed to meet whenever trouble should crop up in Europe to discuss how to fix it.

Early Life of Metternich

The French Revolution of 1789 and its consequences were referred to by Metternich as the “hateful time”. Metternich's family was directly affected by both the Revolution and the fighting. The revolutionary wars forced the Metternich family to flee from Germany into Austria. The young Metternich never forgot this trauma. The rest of his career was, in a sense, one long reaction. Once Metternich was back in Vienna, his career as a statesman and politician advanced rapidly. His marriage in 1795 to Eleonore von Kaunitz, granddaughter of the Austrian state chancellor, gave him access to the highest social and political circles in the Austrian Empire. His wife's contacts and knowledge were important for an ambitious man who had never before lived in Austria's capital city. After serving as Austrian ambassador to Berlin and Dresden, Metternich was appointed ambassador to France in 1806. In April of 1809, he appealed to the French emperor's vanity (and cemented a temporary French-Austrian alliance) by marrying Napoleon to Marie Louise, daughter of the Austrian emperor Francis I. But diplomatic success did not come as easily. He sent such optimistic reports back to Vienna portraying a vulnerable Napoleon who was in danger of being overthrown by a resurgent revolutionary movement in France that the Austrian government went to war against France and lost. Yet when Metternich gained favorable peace terms from Napoleon, he was rewarded by being appointed the Austrian minister of foreign affairs in October 1809. At that time the Habsburg Empire was at its lowest point in its struggle against Napoleon. Within a few years, he had pulled the Empire back from the brink of possible extinction. In short, Metternich used his diplomatic skills to outgeneral Napoleon. In 1810 he persuaded the Habsburg Emperor, Francis I, to ally with Napoleon. But when it became clear that the French leader was not prepared to settle down and play the part of an old-fashioned absolute monarch he turned against him and joined the Fourth Coalition, which eventually defeated France. In 1813, he was given the hereditary title of prince. The year 1815 saw Metternich at the peak of his power and popularity in Austria. In 1810, Napoleon had been master of much of Europe, and Austria had been a virtual puppet of French foreign policy; five years later, Metternich had become a key leader in the coalition of countries which defeated the French emperor twice. Now the victors held the fate of Europe in their hands. When the victorious countries agreed to hold a diplomatic conference at Vienna (the Congress of Vienna), Metternich saw it as a personal triumph.

Metternich's system

The period from 1815 to 1848 has usually been called the 'Era of Metternich' for during these years he was the central figure in European politics. For the preservation of Habsburg dominion inhabited by Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Rumanians, and Poles, Metternich devised his famous system. He was the apostle of conservatism. 'Govern and change nothing' was his watchword. Believing that nationalism and liberalism and other revolutionary principles were responsible for disturbances in Europe since 1789, Metternich wanted that all Europe must be rid of these contagions. His ideal was a reactionary Europe propped up under the hegemony of Austria. In Germany Metternich frustrated the fulfillment of nationalist hopes. At his initiative, the German Diet in September 1819 passed the Carlsbad Decrees. These decrees dissolved the patriotic student societies and enforced rigid censorship of the press. These decrees remained in force for nearly twenty years. The following year Metternich persuaded the German States to restrict the subjects that might be discussed in parliamentary assemblies.

It was in Italy that Metternich made his influence felt through the Habsburg princes restored to power in 1815. Everywhere there was censorship, popular ignorance and poverty. The strength of Metternich's system in Italy lay in the division which prevented any concerted nationalist movement of independence. To sustain Habsburg domination in Austria and elsewhere called for constant vigilance and fixed determination. Both of these qualities Metternich had in his vision internal and international affairs were inseparable. He wanted to crush the spirit of revolution everywhere and to maintain the balance of power in Europe.

Estimate

Metternich came to the conclusion that the restored monarchs must combine themselves and prepare machinery for concerted action. It was Metternich who invented the periodic Congresses to resolve all disputes that might endanger the peace of Europe. The fundamental weakness of the Metternich System was that it only postponed the day of reckoning. It secured a false appearance of unity. The forces of revolution, driven underground, erupted with so violent force in 1848 that the system crumbled.

THE CONGRESSES OF VIENNA

Introduction

After defeating Napoleon in the battle of Waterloo, the victors resumed the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to redraw the map of Europe. All the European states were represented in the Congress except Turkey. "the sickman of Europe". It was a motley collection of princes and

pretenders, priests and professors, soldiers and statesmen and ambassadors and adventurers. The Congress was dominated by the „Big Four”, viz., Austria, Russia, Prussia and England. Metternich of Austria, Alexander I of Russia, Talleyrand of France and Castlereagh of Britain were the chief personalities of the Congress. Francis I, the Emperor of Austria, played the part of the host. But the Congress was presided over and dominated by his Chancellor, Metternich. He handled the knotty problems of the Congress in such a way that it was remarked that he could “swim like a fish in the sparkling whirlpool of Vienna”.

Aims of the Congress

The Congress has as its chief the establishment of an ever-lasting peace in Europe. “No more Revolution” was the clarion call of all assembled in the Congress. This inevitably meant the end of democracy and nationalism and the suppression of such liberal ideas like liberty, equality and fraternity. It was a return to the status quo by which the boundaries of countries were fixed on the principle of restorations as it were prior to the outbreak of the French Revolution. Further, the old Kings were to be reinstated on the principle of legitimacy. The second object of the Congress was to preserve the “Balance of power” in Europe by which no state was to become too strong and big at the expense of other states. Thirdly to prevent France from staging another outburst, the Congress set as its goal to make the border states of France bigger and stronger. It was based on this principle that stronger states were created on the east of France bigger and stronger. It was based on this principle that stronger states were created on the east of France such as Holland, Prussia, Switzerland and Piedmont. Fourthly, the Congress showed a natural tendency to reward those states which had opposed Napoleon and penalise those which had supported him. It was on this principle of compensation that Prussia and Sweden received compensations. Denmark and Saxony which sided with Napoleon had to pay a heavy penalty in the form of loss of territories. Finally, the delegates of the Congress attempted to set up a permanent organisation to maintain peace in Europe.

Vienna Settlement

Austria got Lombardy, Venetia and Illyria. But she gave Austrian Netherlands (Belgium) to Holland. Russia negotiated with the sword in her hand and she got a larger share. She received a large part of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw (Central Poland) and Finland. Prussia got Westphalia, a large part of Saxony, Western Pomerania (Swedish Pomerania), and the Rhenish lands. Great Britain retained Heligoland, Malta, St. Lucia, Tobago and Trinidad; got Cape

Colony. Ceylon, British Guiana, Mauritius and Honduras (British) and a protectorate over the Ionian Islands. Thus the Big Four got the lion's share of the spoils.

In France, the Bourbon King Louis XVIII was restored to the throne. The French territories were reduced to the size of what they were in 1792. She was made to pay a huge war indemnity. It was Napoleon Bonaparte who put an end to the Holy Roman Empire in 1806. He had reduced the number of states in Germany from 360 to 39 and organized them into a strong confederation. The Vienna Congress retained the confederation but placed it under the control of Austria. Napoleon conquered Italy and had united all the small states for a short while. But his good work was undone by the Vienna Settlement. It broke up Italian unity and made it a mere geographical expression. It divided Italy into: (1) the kingdom of Piedmont and Sardinia ruled by Victor Emmanuel I, an Italian Prince; Nice, Savoy and Genoa were added to his territories (2) the kingdom of Lombardy and Venetia under the Austrian Emperor (3) Tuscany, Parma and Modena under the indirect control of Austria. The ex-Empress Marie Louise (daughter of Emperor Francis I of Austria and wife of Napoleon) became the Duchess of Parma. Tuscany and Modena were ruled by members of the Austrian Hapsburg family. (4) Naples and Sicily ruled by a Bourbon prince and (5) the Papal States including Romagna under the pope. Thus the Austrian rule was predominant in Italy.

Spain and Portugal recovered their old boundaries. Holland, and Belgium were united to form the single state of Netherlands and made independent. Norway was separated from Denmark and united with Sweden. Finland which now went to Russia. Hanover, now, recognised as kingdom passed under the rule of George III of England. Switzerland was allowed to continue as an independent republic. Monarchy was restored in Spain, Portugal, France, Holland, Sardinia and Naples and Sicily. To prevent the revival and spread of revolutionary ideas, the „Big Four“ formed the „Quadruple Alliance.“ It was a permanent body which stood for the enforcement of the Vienna Settlement. Russia, Prussia and Austria formed the „Holy Alliance“. The object of this alliance was the introduction of Christian doctrines in the politics of Europe.

Criticism of the Vienna Settlement

The Vienna Settlement did not offer a panacea for the political ills of Europe. It failed in its chief aim of preserving peace in Europe. Revolution broke out in almost all countries that came under it. Thus it collapsed like a house of cards. In the words of Fisher; “The plant of

legitimacy failed to flourish upon soil still covered by the lava of Revolution". Revolution broke out in France in 1830 and 1848. The Union of Holland and Belgium lasted for only 15 years. Italy and Germany threw off the foreign yoke and became independent in the course of half a century. Poland which was placed under the control of Russia became independent after the First World War. The Union of Russia and Finland was dissolved in 1917 and that of Sweden and Norway in 1905. The Settlement unconsciously buried deep the ideas of democracy, nationalism and liberalism. The Settlement was a mere return to the old order. Monarchy was restored to the old dynasties on the principle of legitimacy. Liberal and democratic ideas were ruthlessly crushed. But the Statesmen failed to note that such ideas were becoming determining political factors.

The real aim of the Congress was to divide among the conquerors the spoils of the conquered. This was daylight robbery. To the defeated it added insult to injury. Denmark and Saxony which sided with Napoleon were severely penalized. In redrawing the map of Europe, the "Big Four" were mainly guided by selfish motives. The big powers not only got new places but retained old ones. The smaller states were not given a fair deal. Austria which played the part of the host virtually became a ghost to the smaller countries. In the distribution of spoils, the Congress bid farewell to the Principle of liberalism. Territories were separated or united much against the wishes of the affected countries. Catholic Belgium was united with Protestant Holland. Denmark was penalized by uniting Norway with Sweden. Italian unity was broken. Poland was placed under the tutelage of Russia. Genoa was united with her foe, Savoy. The "Holy League" set up to enforce the settlement proved to be neither holy nor a league. It only "aspired to bind Europe in chains". Castlereagh called it "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense". Metternich called it "a loud-sounding nothing". In spite of the defects of the Congress, it at least prevented a general European war or a world conflagration for a century. The first half of the 20th century itself had witnessed two world wars. So the importance of the settlement cannot be undermined. It made a bold start in settling disputes by convening conferences. It may legitimately be considered as the precursor of the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization.

CONCERT OF EUROPE (1815 – 1822)

After defeating Napoleon in the battle of Leipzig, the Big Four – England, Austria, Russia and Prussia – entered into a secret treaty at Chaumont in 1814. According to the treaty, it was agreed that the Big Four should remain united for a period of 20 years and strive for the

regeneration of Europe. In short, they assumed for themselves the responsibility of being the arbiters of the destiny of Europe. After defeating Napoleon in the battle of Waterloo, the victors resumed the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to redraw the map of Europe. TO prevent the revival and spread of revolutionary ideas, the Big Four formed the Quadruple Alliance in 1815. The alliance which was made in secret at Chaumont in 1814 was made public by this alliance. The members of the alliance agreed to remain united for a period of 20 years. It was to be a permanent body to see to the enforcement of the Vienna Settlement. The members of alliance agreed to hold at fixed intervals meetings to discuss matters of common interest among themselves, take suitable steps for the tranquility and prosperity of nations and maintain peace in Europe. Thus the Concert of Europe came into existence. As France fulfilled all her treaty obligations, she was admitted into the Concert. Thus the Quadruple Alliance was transformed into the Quintuple Alliance.

Holy Alliance

The Holy Alliance formed hardly two months before the Quadruple Alliance should not be confused with the Concert of Europe. It was “the hoppy of Tsar Alexander I, and it came to an end with his death”. It was she outcome of the mystical ideas and religious notions of the Tsar. Only Prussia and Austria joined the alliance. The object of this alliance was to introduce Christian doctrines into the politics of Europe. According to this new doctrine, the sovereigns in their relations with their respective states and in their political relations with other states should take as their sole guide the precepts of the Christian religion, viz., justice, good will and peace. But the Holy Alliance proved to be neither holy nor an alliance. It only “aspired to bound Europe in chains”. Castleragh, the British delegate at the Congress of Vienna, called it “a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense”. Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor, called it “a loud-sounding nothing.”

The Congress of the Concert

The members of the concert of Europe held four congresses at different places. They were the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818); Congress of Troppau(1820), Congress of Laibach (1821) and Congress of Verona (1822). Difference of opinion cropped up among the members even in the very first Congress. With every successive Congress, the concept of the Concert of Europe crumbled to pieces.

Causes of the failure of the Concer

Right from the beginning, there was no proper understanding among the members of the Concert. Outwardly, they feigned comradely but inwardly inhale supreme hatred by the one for the others. Under the guise of maintaining the balance of power in Europe, each member tried to outwit the other by advancing his own interests. They talked highly but acted meanly in their relation with minor states. By raising their finger of protest against revolutions, they buried deep the ideas of democracy, nationalism and liberalism. But they failed to realize that such ideas were becoming determining political factors.

In spite of the fact that the Concert some problems concerning Europe, difference of opinion cropped up even in the first Congress which met at Aix-la-Chapelle. When some of the colonies of South America rebelled against Spain, Britain refused to be bound, by any proposal that was detrimental to her trading interests in those colonies. For the suppression of slave trade, Britain suggested a scheme empowering the four powers to mutual right of search of slaves. As the other powers were quite conscious of the naval strength of Britain which necessarily meant interference in their commerce, they brushed aside the proposal. Britain turned down the suggestion of Russia for stationing an international fleet of the powers in the Mediterranean to ward off the Barbary pirates as she did not relish the idea of awing of the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean- Moreover, her interests were not at stake, because the Barbary Pirates honoured the Union Jack. Britain turned down the proposal of Russia which aimed at maintaining the status quo with regard to the territorial boundaries of the powers. This proposal inevitably meant the death knell to national, liberal and democratic ideas in Europe. Britain which was stepped in such ideas found it difficult to reconcile with her friends who stood for autocracy.

In the second Congress held at Troppau, the rift among the members became still wider. Mutual jealousies among the powers made matters still worse. The people of Spain, Naples and Portugal had raised the standard of revolt against their rulers. Russia came forward with armed assistance to Spain. The Austrian Chancellor, who was no votary of entertaining revolutions, was frightened by the prospect of the increase in the power of Russia. So he held her back. The revolt at Naples was considered by the powers as the most urgent problem. As Austria had vested interests in Italy and as the revolt was detrimental to the safety and security of her territories in Italy such as Lombardy and Venitia, Austria was given a free hand to deal with the situation in Naples. The Congress also passed the Protocol of Troppau which justified the intervention of one State in the internal affairs of another State. The Protocol declared that if any State underwent a

change in government due to revolution, such a State would automatically lose its membership in the European Alliance, and it was made the duty of the other States to resort to the status quo in the troubled State by peaceful means or by resort to arms. Great Britain opposed tooth and nail the declaration on the ground that it aimed at suppressing all revolutions without ascertaining their individual merits. But the principle was put into practice in 1821 when the Laibach Congress allowed Austria to quell the revolt in Naples. This was promptly done by Austria.

The last Congress was held at Verona in 1822. The Spanish problem still remained unsolved. The Greeks revolted against Turkey. The Greek question was brought to the notice of the Congress. As Russia had great interests in the Balkans, she wanted to be left alone to deal with the affairs as was previously done by Austria with regard to Naples. But the move was bitterly opposed by Britain and Austria, because they did not like the intervention of Russia in the Balkans. So the Greek question was not taken up for further discussion. The outcome of the revolt in Spain was that Ferdinand VII, the king of Spain, was forced to give a liberal constitution. Spain appealed to France, for help. France responded and her step was approved by Austria, Russia and Prussia. Britain raised a storm of protest against the intervention. But as her protest went unheeded, she withdrew from the Concert.

In a jubilant mood, Canning the Foreign Minister of England exclaimed thus: "The issue of Verona split the one and indivisible Alliance into three parts as distinct as the Constitutions of England, France and Muscovy". He added: "Things are getting back to a whole-some state again. Every nation for itself and God for us all". Though Canning failed in Europe, he was a success in America. The Latin American states would have an easy prey to Spain again, had it not been for the liberal policy followed by Canning, who strongly protested against European intervention in South American affairs. His policy was reaffirmed by the Monroe doctrine. President Monroe of the United States proclaimed in his doctrine issued in 1823 that any interference in Latin America by an European power would be "dangerous to the peace and safety of the united States". The Monroe doctrine sealed the doom of the Concert of Europe. In spite of the defects of the Concert, it made a bold start in settling disputes by convening conferences.

THE JULY REVOLUTION OF 1830

The first Empire set up in 1804 came to an end with the fall of Napoleon in 1814 except for a brief period of occupation for 100 days in 1815 by him. The Vienna Settlement of 1814 – 1815 restored monarchy in France Louis XVIII, the brother of Louis XVI who became the new

King in 1814, never forgot the lessons of the French Revolution. He issued a Charter in 1814 which made provision for setting up a Parliament on the British model, guaranteed the rights of the people and assured equality before law. But his reign was marred by the clash of interests between two parties – the Moderates and Ultra Royalists. (The UltraRoyalists were the nobles of the ancient regime during the days of the Revolution of 1789). While the Moderates upheld the Charter of 1814, the Ultra- Royalists stood for royal absolutism and the recovery of their lost privileges. They created a reign of terror called the “White Terror” after the defeat of Napoleon in the battle of Waterloo in 1815. The Royalists attacked the Bonapartists and the Catholics attacked the Protestants. Murder became the order of the day. In spite of the fact that the Ultra-Royalists were “more royalist than the King”, Louis XVIII took a moderate stand and never conceded to their demands. The acknowledged leader of the Ultra-Royalists was the Count of Artois, the brother of Louis XVIII. He subsequently became the king of France in 1824 under of the title, Charles X, another incident which marred the reign of Louis XVIII was the murder of the Duke of Berry, the son of the Count of Artois. The Royalists attributed the cause of the murder to the moderate and liberal stand taken by the king. Louis XVIII died in 1824. In 1824, he was succeeded by his brother Charles X who set: he clock back. He wanted to revive the Divine Right Theory of monarchy. It was remarked of him that he “had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing”. He was a staunch Catholic like Philip II of Spain and tried his best to uphold the supremacy of the Church. In the international field, the prestige of France rose to considerable heights due to its participation in the Greek War of Independence. Her fleet joined with the fleets of Britain and Russia and destroyed the Turkish fleet in the battle of Navarino in 1827.

In spite of the fact that France won laurels in the international field, it was marred at home by some unhappy events which took an ugly turn. Villele held office as Prime Minister from 1821 to 1827. As the press vigorously criticized the Church policy of the King, steps were taken to curb its powers. The contents of the news papers were censored. A motion was carried through in the Chamber of Deputies in 1827 to completely put an end to the liberty of the Press. But as the House of Peers vehemently opposed the measure, it was dropped.

An act was passed in 1825 to compensate the émigrés (nobles of the ancient regime) who had lost lands during the days of the Revolution of 1789. As the restoration of lands to them inevitably meant injustice to the existing landowners, it was decided to reduce the National Debt. With the amount so obtained, it was decided to award pensions as compensation to the émigrés.

But the lowering of the rate of interest on Public debts hit hard the middle classes. The National Guard was disbanded in 1827 due to the shouting of antigovernment slogans like „Down with the Ministers“, and “Down with Jesuits”. The disbandment of the National Guard infuriated the people of Paris. Martignac who succeeded Villele held office from 1828 to 1829. Being a moderate, his policy was one of compromise. He relaxed the regulations regarding the censorship of the Press, and limited the educational activities of the Jesuits. But quite unfortunately, he wounded the feelings of one party without any corresponding benefit to the other party. So the two parties sank their differences, united together and drove Martignac out of office. In 1829 Martignac was succeeded by Polignac. He was a former émigré and a reactionary to the core. He let loose such repression that the Chamber of Deputies petitioned the King to dismiss him. But Charles X dissolved the House and fresh elections were ordered. The new Chamber which met in 1830 had a more determined opposition than in the previous House.

On 25th July 1830 Charles X issued four ordinances. The first ordinance banned the publication of newspapers without the assent of the Government. By the second ordinance the legislature was dissolved. The third altered the electoral laws and the fourth fixed the date for new elections. The people raised a storm of protest against the new ordinances. The Paris mob raised the standard of revolt. Barricades appeared on the streets. But they were removed. The National Guard and the regular troops swelled the rank of the agitators. Charles X realized his error too late. He ordered for the withdrawal of Government troops. He abdicated the throne in favour of his grandson Henry, the Count of Chambord. But his nomination was shown the least regard. Charles X fled to England. His cousin Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, was placed on the throne.

Importance of the July Revolution

The July Revolution sounded the death-knell of the Divine Right Theory of Kingship. The reins of Government passed on from the hands of the Bourbons to the Orleanists. Many changes were introduced in the constitution. The powers of the King were reduced. His power of issuing ordinances was taken off. The Press was given back its freedom. The franchise was extended. The “King of France” was henceforth to be known as “the King of the French”. The continuance of monarchy was to depend on the support to the nation. It shattered to pieces the attempts of the Ultra-Royalists to recover their privileges. The principle of legitimacy which had played a dominant part in the Congress of Vienna of 1815 was discarded. This was quite evident

from the change in the line of Kings from the Bourbons to the Orleanists In short, the July Revolution of 1830 was a complement to the French Revolution 1789.

Effects of the Revolution

The Revolution was not without its repercussions in other part of Europe. It is a common saying that whenever France sneezes, Europe catches cold. It 1830 Catholic Belgium revolted against protestant Holland. By the treaty of London signed in 1830, the powers of Europe including Holland recognized not only the independence of Belgium but also its neutrality. Spain and Portugal obtained liberal constitutions within a few years after the Revolution of 1830. The Poles revolted against the Tsar in 1830. But the revolt was ruthlessly crushed. The Revolution in France was a signal to similar revolutions in Italy also. They Revolution spread to Germany also. Many of the smaller German states agitated and obtained liberal constitutions. But Prussia remained unaffected. The net effect of the Revolution of 1830 was that while some headway was made in constitutionalism in some parts of Europe , it registered a remarkable victory for nationalism in Belgium. The example of Belgium served as a beacon light to the nationalists of Europe in the succeeding years.

THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION OF 1848

After the abdication of Charles X, his cousin Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, came to throne in 1830, Louis Philippe, “King of the French, by the Grace of God and by the will of the people” posed as a democratic ruler in the beginning. Soon he changed his colour. The Orleanist monarchy hinged mainly on the support extended to it by the middle classes. But it had to face the opposition of the working classes right form the beginning. During the Prime Minister ship of Casimir-Perier, things went on smoothly. His death in 1832 was a terrible blow to the country. After him Thiers and Guizot were the two prominent ministers under Louis Philippe All opposition and insurrection against the King during the early part of his reign were ruthlessly crushed by Thiers. The Press and the plays were vigorously censored. The liberty of the people was trampled under the foot. In order to divert the attention of the people, Louis Philippe carefully nursed the Napoleonic legend. Streets were named after Napoleon“s battles. His dead body was brought from St. Helena and was given a ceremonial reburial.

The prestige of France sank to a low level in the international field. She incurred the displeasure of Britain as a result of her stand taken in the Turko-Egyptain War and in her dealings with Spain. The condition at home was far from satisfactory. Corruption ate into the

vitals of the country. Both legislators and electors were bribed to extend their support to the Government. France at that time was passing through the Industrial Revolution. The condition of the working classes was miserable. A new movement called Socialism gained ground among the workers. They demanded increased wages, better conditions of work and the extension of franchise to them. But the King paid no heed to the demands of the workers. "Reform banquets" were arranged by the reformers. The cry of the day was for reforms. One such banquet was banned by the Government in February 1848. So the people entered into direct action and started the February Revolution of 1848. Paris as usual rose and barricades appeared on the streets. The National Guard sent to restore order joined the people. The people demanded the resignation of Guizot. The King yielded to the popular will and started granting reforms. But it was too late. Affairs also drifted from bad to worse. The soldiers who were guarding the residence of Guizot opened fire against the agitators and killed 23 persons. The angry demonstrators piled the dead bodies on a cart and paraded it round the streets in order to incite the people. Louis Philippe abdicated and fled to England in 1848. A new government was set up. France became a Republic for the second time. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, a nephew of the Corsican prodigy, was elected President of the Second Republic.

Effects of the Revolution

The Revolution served as a signal to similar revolts throughout Europe. Austria was the worst affected by the wave of this revolution. Austria at that time was inhabited by people of different races – Germans in Austria, Czechs in Bohemia, Magyrs in Hungary and Italians in Lombardy and Venetia. The national consciousness of the people was already boiling and when the opportune moment came, Vienna raised the standard of rebellion in 1848. Metternich and the Austrian Emperor fled from the country. Similar revolts broke out in Hungary, Bohemia and Italy. Under the leadership of Kossuth, Hungary unfurled the banner of revolt and made some headway. But the revolt was ruthlessly put down by Francis Joseph, the Austrian emperor. A revolt in Bohemia was warded off by purchasing peace after conceding certain demands to the people.

Italy also did not escape from the storm, Charles Albert, the King of Sardinia, declared war on Austria. But he was defeated by the Austrian forces at Custoza in 1848. He again declared war against Austria but was again defeated in the Battle of Novara in 1849. He then abdicated the throne in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel II.

In Germany the revolt occurred in Berlin in 1848 with the King of Prussia at its head. A Parliament consisting of all the representatives of Germany met at Frankfurt and offered the throne to the King of Prussia. Fearing the might of Austria, he declined the offer. The King of Prussia induced the four Kingdoms of Hanover, Saxony, Wurtemberg and Bavaria to form a union with Prussia. But it was vehemently opposed by Austria. Prussia yielded. The supremacy of Austria in Germany was again re-established. In spite of the threats and ruthless measures adopted by reactionary forces to suppress the revolts, the forces of liberalism and nationalism gained fresh momentum and huge dimensions with the passage of time.

Course Outcomes

CO1: Explain the objectives and decisions of the Congress of Vienna.

CO2: Describe the role of Klemens von Metternich in European politics.

CO3: Analyze the significance of the Concert of Europe.

CO4: Examine the causes and outcomes of the Revolutions of 1830 and Revolutions of 1848.

CO5: Evaluate the rise and role of Napoleon III in France.

Programme Outcome

PO: To develop students' understanding of European political developments and diplomatic systems, enabling critical analysis of revolutionary movements and international relations.

S. No	Question (5 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
		CO2	PO1	K2
1.	Explain the objectives and decisions of the Congress of Vienna.	CO2	PO1	K2
2.	Discuss the role of Klemens von Metternich in European politics.	CO4	PO1	K4
3.	Analyze the aims and functions of the Holy Alliance	CO4	PO1	K4

	and Quadruple Alliance.			
4.	Examine the working of the Concert of Europe.	CO4	PO1	K4
5.	Discuss the causes and results of the Revolutions of 1830.	CO4	PO1	K4

S. No	Question (8 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
1.	Analyze the causes and impact of the Revolutions of 1848.	CO4	PO1	K4
2.	Explain the rise of Napoleon III.	CO2	PO1	K2
3.	Evaluate the success and failure of the Vienna settlement.	CO5	PO1	K5
4.	Discuss the impact of revolutionary movements on Europe.	CO4	PO1	K4
5.	Analyze the decline of Metternich's system.	CO4	PO1	K4

UNIT- III

Unification of Germany – Bismarck’s Blood and Iron policy – Unification of Italy -
Mazzini – Garibaldi – Count Cavour – Victor Immanuel II

Learning Objectives

- To understand the process of Unification of Germany.
- To examine the role of Otto von Bismarck and his “Blood and Iron” policy.
- To study the causes and stages of Unification of Italy.
- To analyze the contributions of Giuseppe Mazzini, Giuseppe Garibaldi, and Count Camillo di Cavour.
- To evaluate the role of Victor Emmanuel II in the unification process.

UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

Introduction

Germany was split up into several independent kingdoms, duchies, principalities and free states in the Middle Ages and long after. The symbol of German unity, however, remained in the name of the Holy Roman Emperor. Napoleon Bonaparte abolished the title of the Holy Roman Emperor in 1806. He reduced the number of German states from 360 to 39 and organised them into the Confederation of the Rhine. He unconsciously roused the spirit of nationalism in the minds of the people. The Congress of Vienna retained the Confederation but placed it under the control of Austria. Every year the delegates of the various states met in a Diet at Frankfurt to resolve important measures. But the veto power exercised by each member acted as a check on the good work that might have been otherwise achieved by it. Frederick William III (1797 – 1840), King of Prussia, joined hands with Austria and crushed the forces of Nationalism and liberalism in the country.

Customs Union

The first step towards German unity was taken in the sphere of commerce. Prussia took the lead and other states followed suit. Most of the states entered into a Customs Union or Zollverein in 1834 to avoid the tariff duties levied by each member of the Confederation against

the goods of others members. Austria kept herself out of the Union. The commercial unity of most of the German states sowed the seeds for the political unity of Germany.

The Effect of the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848

When the July Revolution of 1830 broke out in France, it spread to Germany also. Many of the smaller German states agitated and obtained liberal constitutions. But Prussia remained unaffected. The February Revolution of 1848 brought Germany also under its influence. Some More states obtained liberal constitutions. Prussia, too, obtained a liberal constitution, Austria was excluded from the German confederation, The Frankfurt Parliament offered the Crown to Frederick William IV (1840 – 1861) in 1849. But he rejected the offer in the same year. Due to the interference of Austria, the German Confederation of 1815 was restored in 1850. Once again Austria got the upper hand. Frederick William IV died in 1861. His brother William I (1861 – 88) became the King of Prussia. He was a man of different stamp. The Confederation stood more as an obstacle than a means towards German unification. There was jealousy between Austria and Prussia. Prussia was the strongest of the states in the Confederation. It was under the able leadership of Prussia that German Unity was achieved. The twin principles of popular sovereignty and nationalism prepared the ground for the political unification of Germany.

BISMARCK

William I, the King of Prussia, appointed Bismarck as his Prime Minister in 1862. With him dawned a new era of progress in the history of Germany. He believed in a policy of blood and iron. He was a man of iron with nerves of steel. He was no believer in parliaments and liberalism. But he had unlimited faith in Prussia and Prussianism. The first task of Bismarck was to build up German national unity under the leadership of Prussia. He firmly believed that the unification of Germany could be achieved only under the leadership of Prussia. The solution of this problem lay in snatching the German leadership from Austria which in turn depended on a strong army and sound finance. He increased the finances of the country by collecting new taxes disregarding the protests of the Diet, and strengthened the army by enlarging the Prussian forces. All opposition was ruthlessly crushed immediately after he became the Prime Minister, he declared: "The great questions of our time will be decided not by speeches and resolutions of majorities, but by blood and iron". He waged three wars to achieve German unity.

War With Denmark (1864)

As long as foreign Kings held possessions in Germany, national unification was out of question. Schleswig and Holstein were two German duchies held by the King OF Denmark . The two duchies were mostly inhabited dy the Germans, Holstein, was a member of the German CInfederation. The King of Denmark made an attempt in 1848 to incorporate the two duchies. But ut was bitterly opposed by the Germans. By the treaty of London, 1852, in which most of the powers of Europe participated, it was decided that the King of Denmark should ot incorporate the two duchies. In 1863 Christian IX (1863 – 1906), the King of Denmark, announced a new constitution incorporating Schleswing with Denmark and granting self-government to Holstein. This was a gross vilation of the treaty of London. A strong demand arose that Schleswig and hosltein should be freed from the control of Denmark and made part and parcel of Germany. The dispute dfrified to a war between Prussia and Denmark. Austrua as the official head of the German Confederation made common cause with Prussia. In a way, the war proved to be a blessing in disguise. Austria which had so far kept herself out of the scene joined Prussia at the hour of crisis . Bismarck sent an ultimatum to Denmark to hononr the London Treaty within 48 hours. But as Denmark was not able to do anything within 48 hours, Prussia and Austria declared war against Denmark. Denmark was no match for the combined might of Prussia and Austria. She surrendered Schleswing and Holstein. Prussia and Austria soon quarrelled on the distribution of spoils. By the convention of Gastein, 1865, it was agreed that Prussia should rule over Schleswig, and Austria, Holstein.

The Austro –Prussian War (1866)

Austria grew jealous of the rising power of Prussia A war between the two was wuite inevitable, Bismark secured the neutrality of Russia on the strength of the support rendered to her in suppressing the Polish revolt of 1863. He also secured the neutrality of Napoleon III of France of France by allowing him to cherish false hipe about further French acquisitions. He also made friendship with Italy by promising Venitia to her . After the preliminaries were settled he dragged Austria into war on the Holstein affair . On the flimsy pretext that an agitation was going on in Holstein, Prussia assumed full responsibility of Holstein also. As Austria opposed it. Prussia declared war on Austria in 1866. The strength of the Austrian army was double than that of Prussia. But in the Austro-Prussian war which lasted for seven weeks, Bismarck inflicted a crushing defeat on the Austrian at Sadowa. Austria was forced to sue fro peace. By the treaty of Prague (1866), Prussia annexed Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, Frankfurt and the duchies of

Schleswig and Holstein. Italy received Venetia from Austria. Austria was solved and the New North German Confederation was formed under the leadership of Prussia, the four Southern German states of Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria and Hesse Darmstadt remained neutral. But Bismarck appealed and emphasized to them their common origin and kindled the fire of nationalism. This had the desired effect. They promised to join with Prussia in the event of war.

The Franco – Prussian War (1870 – 1871)

Bismarck had only one more enemy to deal with and that was Napoleon III of France. Napoleon III grew jealous of the rising power of Prussia. He demanded at different times Platinat, Luxemburg and Belgium as the prize of his neutrality. But Bismarck refused to give him anything > he was waiting for an opportunity to crush the power of France. He had not to wait for long. In 1869 a revolution occurred in Spain. The Spanish throne was offered to Leopold of the Hohenzollern family Napoleon III objected it on the ground that a prospective union of Spain and Prussia under the Hohenzollern family would upset the balance of power in Europe . To get a diplomatic victory, he asked his ambassador to demand from King William I that he would never support a Hohenzollern to the Spanish throne. The Prussian King turned down the French request and sent a telegram to Bismarck informing him of the latest developments. Bismarck was only waiting for such an opportunity. He published the telegram in such a way that it wounded the feelings of both the French and the Germans. SO France declared war on Prussia.

The war kindled the patriotism of the Germans and the Southern German States made common cause with the North. Prussia inflicted a crushing defeat on the French at Sedan. Napoleon III became a prisoner. The victorious German army marched into Paris. While the siege of Paris was going on, the Southern German States of Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria and Hesse- Darmstadt joined with the North German Confederation. Paris fell after some resistance. By the treaty of Frankfurt, peace was concluded in 1871 France surrendered Alsace to Germany. She had also to pay a huge war indemnity. The finishing touch to the unification of Germany was given in 1871 by the Proclamation of Kaiser William I as the first Emperor of United Germany in the famous “ Hall of Mirrors” at Versailles. Bismarck , the Iron Chancellor, richly deserves to be called the “Maker of Modern Germany”.

Bismarck

Early life

Otto Von Bismarck was born in a noble family in 1815. By dint of his ability, he rose from position to position and finally became the Chancellor of Germany. In 1845 he became a member of the provincial Diet of Pomerania. In 1847 he became a member of the Imperial Diet of Berlin. He was elected a member of the lower chamber of Prussia in 1849. In 1851 he was appointed the representative of Prussia in the Federal Diet at Frankfurt. He served as Ambassador of Prussia in Russia from 1859 to 1862 and in France in 1862. During his term as Ambassador, he mastered the most knotty problems of contemporary European diplomacy. In 1862 itself he became the Prime Minister of Prussia.

Policy of Bismarck

With Bismarck as the Prime Minister dawned a new era of Progress in the history of Germany. The German Confederation under the leadership of Austria stood more as an obstacle than a means towards German unification. There was jealousy between Austria and Prussia. Bismarck believed in a policy of blood and iron. He was a man of iron with nerves of steel. He was no believer in parliaments and in liberalism. But he had unlimited faith in Prussia and Prussianism . The first task of Bismarck was to build up German national unity under the leadership of Prussia. The solution to this problem lay in snatching the German leadership from Austria, which in turn depended on a strong army and sound finance. He increased the finances of the army by collecting new taxes disregarding the protests of the Diet and strengthened the army by enlarging the Prussian forces. All opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Immediately after he became the Prime Minister he declared: “The great questions of our times will be decided not by speeches and resolutions of majorities, but by blood and iron”.

Bismarck’s part in the Unification of Germany

Bismarck waged three wars to achieve German unity. He waged a war with Denmark in 1864 and took over the administration of Schleswig and Holstein. In the Austro-Prussian war of 1866, he inflicted a crushing defeat on Austria at Sadowa. Prussia annexed Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau and Frankfurt. Austria was excluded from Germany. The old German Confederation was dissolved and the New North German Confederation was formed under the leadership of Prussia. In the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 -71, Bismarck defeated France in the battle of Sedan. France surrendered Alsace and Lorraine to Germany. The four southern states of Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt joined the North German Federation. The

finishing touch to the unification of Germany was given in 1871 by the proclamation of Kaiser William I as the first emperor of United Germany in the famous “Hall of Mirrors” at Versailles. (For details – refer Unification of Germany).

Domestic Policy Constitutional Reforms

Bismarck was appointed Chancellor in 1871 in which capacity he continued till his resignation in 1890. It was constitutional reforms which drew his immediate attention. He gave a federal touch to the New German Confederation of 1871. But the paramount power of Prussia was secured by giving her greater representation in the Bundesrat – the Upper House – which was the more powerful House. The interests of the states were safeguarded by giving them provincial autonomy. The national solidarity of Germany was preserved by giving more powers to the Emperor, The Chancellor was made answerable to the Emperor. In spite of his anxiety to reconcile the conflicting interests in the German federation of 1871, it looked as “an alliance between a lion, half a dozen foxes and a score of Mice”.

Law, Coinage, Railway and Banking

To introduce a uniform system of administration in the country, Bismarck reformed the Law, coinage, railway and banking systems. He laid down a uniform code of law for the German empire by replacing the diverse system of laws that prevailed in different states. He introduced a uniform coinage. In 1873 he established an Imperial Railway Bureau which linked up the different railway systems in the country. The network of railways was also closely linked up with the postal, telegraphic and military organizations of the Empire. To regulate banking operations, the Imperial Bank was set up in 1876.

Bismarck and Church

Bismarck adopted a hostile attitude to the Roman Catholic Church as it openly supported Austria in the Austro-Prussian War of 1865. The Pope wielded great authority within Germany and exercised considerable influence over laymen. The declaration of the Papal Infallibility in 1870 brought the Pope into headlong collision with Bismarck. The decree of the Pope on matters concerning religion. Church and morality was made binding on the Roman Catholics. As the spiritual law ran counter to some of the temporal laws, Bismarck was no able to tolerate such gross discrimination. He girded up his loins and prepared himself for a struggle with Papacy. This struggle was label led Kulturkampf or “Battle for Civilization”. The Catholics in their turn in order to safeguard their interests and to retaliate found a party called the “Centre”.

Bismarck passed a party of orders to bring the Catholic Church under the dependence of the State. In 1872, he expelled the Jesuits from the country and cut off diplomatic ties with the Pope. As a follow-up measure the May Laws or Falk Laws. The May Laws were so called because they were passed in the month of May and Falk Laws after the name of the Prussian Minister of education were passed in 1873, 1874 and 1875 to bring the Catholics to their knees. The control of education was wrested from religious hands and brought under state control. Civil marriage was made compulsory, Every Catholic priest or bishop was expected to undergo a course in theology for three years in a German University. Public excommunication by the Jesuits was forbidden. In 1875 all religious orders were dissolved with the exception of those serving the sick. The Pope opposed the May Laws root and branch. The unexpected turn of events in the political scene forced Bismarck to abandon the Kulturkampf. The Liberal party in the Reichstag (Lower House) which hitherto supported the anti-Catholic measure of Bismarck turned against him in his socialist measures. So there was no course open to him except to woo the "Centre" to his side. At a heavy price, the "Centre" was won over to his side. The May Laws were suspended in 1879 and repealed in 1886.

Bismarck and Socialism

The Socialist Democratic Party founded by Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle gained in strength with the march of the Industrial revolution in the country. The democratic set-up of the party with its bitter opposition against German militarism and imperial powers was viewed with great concern by Bismarck. As no believer in democratic principles. He resorted to repression to crush socialistic ideas. But the inevitable turn in the tide in the country towards socialistic ideas forced him to undertake some piece of social legislation to appease the socialistic hunger of the people. Repressive laws were passed against the socialists for a period of four years in the first instance in 1878 and renewed from time to time till 1890. The laws forbade meetings, societies and publication of literature which aimed at giving publicity to socialist principles. The police was kept alert to punish would-be offenders. The repressive measures were followed by socialistic legislation which aimed at placating the gullible workers. An insurance scheme against sickness was introduced in 1883, against accidents in 1884 and old age pension in 1889. But these measures were branded by the advocates of socialism as "Bastard Socialism". Repression and social legislation failed to satisfy the urge of the people for more socialism. The Socialist Democratic Party gained in strength and number with the march of time.

Economic measures

The economic measures of Bismarck contributed to the material prosperity of the country. A great boost was given to the iron-steel and textile industries. The country was covered with a network of railways. He bid farewell to the policy of “ free trade” and offered protection to the infant German industries by erecting high tariff walls by an act passed in 1879. The high tariffs not only yielded income to the Government but also promoted the rapid industrialization of the country. Soon Germany became one of the leading manufacturing countries in the world. Her goods flooded the international market.

Colonial Policy

Bismarck was not an imperialist by instinct. The growth of Industrial Revolution increased the demand for raw materials and markets for manufactured goods. Germany. Moreover, needed new space not only as a sign of her world importance but also for her growing population. The solution to these problems lay in the acquisition of new colonies. Bismarck was rather forced by the sudden turn of events to follow a policy of colonial expansion. Germany soon found colonies in Togoland, Cameroons, East Africa, South West Africa, a part of Guinea, the Marshall Islands and the islands named Bismarck Archipelago.

FOREIGN POLICY AFTER UNIFICATION

After achieving the unification of Germany. Bismarck renounced the policy of “blood and iron”. But he did not allow the grass to grow under his feet. He stood for the maintenance of the status quo in Europe. France and Austria could never forget the harsh treatment meted out to them. But he kept France in good humour by encouraging her colonial enterprises. He wooed Austria to his side by drawing nearer to her. But in his heart of hearts, he wanted to isolate France. The keynote of the foreign policy of Bismarck after 1871 was the maintenance of peace in Europe and the prevention of any anti-German coalition. encouraging her colonial enterprises. He wooed Austria to his side by drawing nearer to her. But in his heart of hearts, he wanted to isolate France. The keynote of the foreign policy of Bismarck after 1871 was the maintenance of peace in Europe and the prevention of any anti-German coalition.

The Three Emperor’s League (Dreikaiserbund) (1872)

Bismarck formed in 1872 the Three Emperors’ League consisting of the rulers of Germany, Austria and Russia. It was only a loose organization of the three rulers to maintain the status quo in Europe and settle problems connected with the Eastern Question. The main aim of

Bismarck in the formation of the League was to isolate France, Make Austria forget her bitterness and woo a new ally (Russia) to counteract any flare- up in Europe. The League was not in its nature to last long, because of the conflicting interests of Russia and Austria in the Balkans, IN 1877 Russia declared war on Turkey. The war came to an end by the treaty of San Stefano which resulted in the formation of a new state called Bulgaria. As the treaty was unacceptable to the powers, a revision of the treaty was made in the Congress of Berlin in 1878 under the presidency of Bismarck Austria which did not participate in the war, received Bosnia and Herzegovina. The new settlement stung Russia to the quick, and with that the cause of the League also got weakened.

Austro – German Alliance (1879)

In 1879 Bismarck formed an alliance between Austria and Germany. The terms of the alliance were that if power was attacked by Russia, the other would come to its support, and if either power was engaged in a clash with any power other than Russia, the other would remain neutral. But if Russia extended support to the enemy, it was made obligatory for the two powers to act jointly.

Triple Alliance (1882)

Bismarck also intrigued to avert a possible alliance between France and Italy. In order to estrange their relationship. Bismarck encouraged France to capture Tunis. Italy which coveted Tunis was disappointed. So in her wrath, Italy joined the Austro –German alliance in 1882, thus transforming it into the Triple Alliance.

The Three Emperors“ League (1881)

Tsar Alexander III who came to power in (1881) bitterly hated the republican from of government in France seeing that the wind was blowing in a favorable direction. Bismarck made capital out of this and revived the Emperor“s League in 1881. It was agreed by the three 39 rulers that if any one of them was attacked by a fourth power, the other two would remain neutral. This arrangement was to hold good for three years. It was renewed in 1884 for a similar period.

Reinsurance Compact (1887)

The Reinsurance Compact was entered into by the three powers for the same period practically confirming the obligations outlined in the League. It was dissolved in 1890.

Downfall of Bismarck

In 1888 William II became the new Kaiser. As difference of opinion between the new Emperor and Bismarck cropped up the latter resigned in 1890. "The pilot who had steered the ship through so many storms and so many shoals was dropped". He died in 1898 at the ripe old age of 83.

Estimate

Bismarck was one of the greatest statesmen that Germany ever produced. By his policy of "blood and iron". He unified Germany. As the most faithful servant of William I, he raised the power and prestige of the Emperor. By his policy of industrialization, he made Germany one of the leading manufacturing countries in the world. He was a master diplomat. According to Marriott: "In the history of the nineteenth century, Bismarck will always claim a foremost place; in the sphere of diplomacy no one except Cavour could dispute with him to the first place. That he was a great patriot will be denied only by those to whom patriotism is an exploded superstition". He kept Britain, the bull dog, on tender-hooks, fooled the Russian bear. Lured Austria. The fox, into his den, trapped Italy, the wounded bird and kept France the wounded tiger, in good humour. For the glorious and meritorious services rendered by him, he richly deserves the title "the maker of modern Germany".

Unification of Italy

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The term Industrial Revolution refers to a series of far reaching economic changes that occurred in England in the middle of the 18th century. Until the middle of the 18th century England was mainly an agricultural country. Towns were few and four fifths of the people lived in villages. Textile work was in the cottages by people who were engaged in agriculture.

Many object to the use of the term revolution because it can never take place in the economic development of a nation. But it is pointed out that the British industry underwent changes so remarkable in character and so extensive that the term Industrial Revolution has been applied to them. It produced a change in industrial method, from handwork to work done by machine, from work at home to work in factories, from internal market to international market. "The effects of these economic changes on the large masses of men and women were so profound and so dramatic in industrial progress and social suffering, that the movement may will be described as revolutionary". It will also be clear to any keen student of economic history that the industrial progress that took place in the 18th and 18th centuries was far greater than in the

previous centuries. The revolution is still going on. The movement transformed England from an agricultural into an industrial country and increased her foreign trade enormously. The real importance of the industrial Revolution in England lies not so much in introducing new processes of manufacture as in creating a new industrial society which dominated all phases of English life and was therefore soon able to introduce fundamental reforms. Even the various political reforms effected by the Parliament in the 19th century may be regarded as the outcome of the new society, created by the Industrial Revolution. The common people in Britain began to enjoy the same political rights.

Causes for the Industrial Revolution

- The relative abundance of surplus capital. England had amassed huge surplus capital during the 18th century on account of her extensive foreign trade. She exported large quantities of manufactured goods and imported largely raw materials from her colonies.
- Her extensive overseas trade. There was a great demand for English goods in the foreign markets, especially from her colonies. The goods exported were quite suited for mass production. The cotton mills in Lancashire and Manchester had a very prosperous trade in the Indian market. "India came to be associated with the growing prosperity of England.
- Her Excellent banking system made the best use of the great financial resources seeking for investment; Englishmen who had money were willing to take the risk in investing funds in industries and encouraged inventors of new machines.
- There was a large number of skilled labour. In the 17th and 18th centuries England attracted many of the best artisans of Europe, especially Huguenots from France. Again it is believed that the cotton manufacturing industry was planted in Lancashire in 1685 by emigrants from Antwerp.
- There was free movement of goods without any let or hindrance. Hundreds of internal tariffs obstructed traffic in Germany up to 1834 and the innumerable tolls and charges hindered trade in France before 1789. The market was limited in these countries in the earlier stages. On the other hand English merchants enjoyed complete freedom of trade and the country's insular position saved her from the disastrous consequences of wars which ravaged the continent.
- Great Britain had coal and iron in abundance. Without these basic raw materials, which are rightly considered the bread of all industries, England could hardly have achieved her

industrial pre-eminence. Coal and iron were not only available in plenty but they were also lying in close proximity which minimized the cost and trouble of transport.

- The Government encouraged inventions by granting patent rights for a period of fourteen years. Liberal grants of money were also made to the inventors. A society for the encouragement of arts, manufactures and commerce was founded in London in 1754. This body is now called the “Royal Society of Arts”.

Inventions

Some of the inventions made in the 18th century have not only transformed the English industry but the industries in the world were also affected. It heralded a new era in international trade. The combined effect of the various inventions was seen on agriculture, industry, transport, and indeed every department of national activity. England had produced a galaxy of inventions like Kay, Hargreaves, Arkwright, Crompton, Cartwright, Newcomen, Watt, and Bolton and a host of others in the 18th century who converted England as the workshop of the world, and who secured for England unrivalled leadership in industries. But the effect produced particularly in two groups of industries was profound, i.e., textile group and the mineral group.

Textile Inventions

The introduction of the Spinning Wheel in the beginning of the 18th century made some improvement in spinning. Till 1773 it was not possible to produce cotton thread strong enough to be used for the warp. The invention of “ Flying Shuttle” 1773 by John Kay (a clock maker) enabled the weaver to weave the cloth speedily. This invention disturbed the balance between the weaver and the spinner. The increased speed of the weaver naturally increased the demand for yarn.

“Spinning Jenny” (named after his wife) a very simple spinning machine was invented by James Hargreaves in 1764. The Spinning Jenny enabled one man to spin six threads simultaneously. This number was ultimately increased to 120. But the thread produced by the Jenny was not strong enough to be used in the warp. Linen had still to be used in the warp.

In 1771 Richard Arkwright patented his “Water-Frame”. This machine was worked by water –power and hence the “twist” yarn produced by this machine was strong enough to be used for the warp. It was for the first time possible to produce cloth made entirely of cotton. Till now linen thread had to be used for warps in the production of cotton goods, the introduction of Water-Frame is of great importance in the history of textile trade. Because neither it nor only

demonstrated the practicability steam powers to work this new machine. A machine of this kind cannot be erected in the ordinary cottage. The working of this type of machine will be profitable in only a factory.

In 1779 Samuel Crompton introduced his famous “Mule” which combined the best features of the Jenny and those of the Water-Frame. It was Crompton’s Mule which enabled the production of the finest yarn. The very fine and soft thread spun by the Mule led to the manufacture of beautiful muslins produced in India. These inventions revolutionized the English textile industry. Now more yarn was produced and the handloom Weavers in the cottages could not keep pace with the production of yarn. “The traditional relation between the spinner and weaver was reversed. Now it was the weaver who lagged behind.”

E. Cartwright (a clergyman) patented his power - loom in 1784but unfortunately it was not a complete success. It was clumsy and never had any commercial success. A long series of improvements by Johnson Radcliffe and others paved the way for the first commercial success in 1822. By 1845 power-loom became supreme in cotton weaving. The application of water power to cotton spinning led to the erection of cotton factories in Lancashire and in areas where water was available.

Steam power was first used in Nottingham in 1785. The use of steam in cotton industry became rapid since then. No mechanical device has wrought greater changes in industries than the steam engine. In 1705 Thomas Newcomen introduced the Principal of cylinder and piston and produced an engine which was of great use in pumping. in 1763 James Watt improved Newcomen’s Engine and made it widely available for factories. The most important thins was J. Watt adapted the piston to a rotary motion and made it capable of turning a wheel and driving the machine. In 1763 J. Watt took out his first patent for his Steam Engine. It was now made possible to operate spinning machines, power-looms and other mechanical devices. The number of steam engines rose from 47 in 1795 to 92 in 1800.

Cotton Industry

Manufacture of cotton goods in England was unimportant till the early years of the 18th century. Till 1770 a fabric which was a mixture of linen and cotton was produced. She has not yet succeeded in producing cotton yarn strong enough for the warp. Till the 18th century cotton industry was localized in the eastern nations. Only after the textile inventions of the 18th century, cotton industry began to grow in the western countries. In 1700 the consumption of cotton in

England was only 2,000,000 pounds. Even by 1750 it remained as a cottage industry but after the inventions in spinning and weaving it became a factory industry by 1820. It must also be remembered that the country does not produce even a single bale of cotton. She had to depend largely on U.S.A. for her cotton inn supplies. But with her imported raw cotton she was able to develop her industries in a remarkable manner very rapidly. In 1832 out of a total export of 300 million Ibs. Of cotton in U.S.A. England purchased 220 million Ibs. After 1830 the use of steam power in the textile industry became very wide-spread. Power was now rapidly applied to weaving also. The number of power looms jumped from 60,000 in 1830 to 100,000 in 1834 and to 250,000 by 1850. Between 1830 and 1850 the weaving of woolen, silk, and linen goods was done by factory methods but the change was slower. The cotton industry which was consuming 100,000 tons of raw cotton in 1830 consumed more than three times in 1850. Similarly the consumption of wool increased from 11,000 tons to 33,000 tons during the same period. Besides iron and coal, cotton and woolen goods were exported in ever-increasing quantities.

Coal Industry

Coal supplies the fuel for driving the machines and iron is required to construct them. Unless these materials are supplied cheaply, large scale industries cannot develop. In England the average annual output of coal in 1551 – 60 was 2,10,000 tons and it went up to 3 million tons by 1690. About one-third of this quantity was produced in North-umber land and Durham while the rest was produced in Scotland, North and South Wales, Cumberland, and West Country. The larger demand for coal was due to the short age and rising price of timber. By 1650 coal was being used for soap-boiling, sugar-refining, dyeing and brewing. Towards the close of the 17th century about one million tons of coal (about a third of the total production) was being used for industrial purposes. The foreign market for coal was slow in expansion as compared with the domestic market.

By the close of the 18th century steam-engines were introduced in the coal-mines and the production of coal shot up . The invention of steam-boring machine in 1830 and the Davy's Safety Lamp in 1815 revolutionized the coal industry. the latter invention not only gave protection to the workers in the mines but also enabled the excavation of coal at very low depths. In 1820 the mechanized haulage of coal from underground replaced the practice of carrying the coal by workers from the deep pits. Previously women and children had to carry heavy loads of coal on their back through flights of stairs from the bottom of the mines. As a result of better

methods of production, the total output of coal rose from 10million tons in 1795 to 56 millions in 1850 and to 200 millions in 1897. Till the year 1913 the coal industry had an uninterrupted expansion. Her production reached 287 million tons in that year and she exported 98 million tons. But the firs World War affected this industry very badly.

Iron and Steel Industry

Iron and coal are important raw materials for the industrial development of any country. “Coal and iron are twin foundation of modern industrialism. A country which is weak in either is at a fatal disadvantage in the struggle for industrial supremacy”. England had rich deposits of iron and coal. Proper modes of utilizing these resources were unknown before 1750. Till the close of the 18th century iron was scarce, costly, and was sparingly used. The English supply was imported from Sweden due to the backwardness of English melting industry. Until the beginning of the 18th century iron ore was smelted with charcoal. The amount of forest that had to be cut down for charcoal production was considerable. Forests in England were faced with extinction. The demand for charcoal increased while the available supplies diminished. In Elizabeth’s time actually proposals were made to banish the iron 44 mills out of the country. So the British Government imposed restrictions on the use of forests for charcoal production. The British Iron and Steel Federation were created in 1934 with the object of modernizing the industry and increasing production to 16 million tons a year.

Victor Immanuel II

Victor Emmanuel II (born March 14, 1820, Turin, Piedmont, Kingdom of Sardinia—died January 9, 1878, Rome, Italy) was the king of Sardinia–Piedmont who became the first king of a united Italy.

Brought up in the court of his father, Charles Albert, and given a conventional monarchical education emphasizing religious and military training, he was married to his cousin Maria Adelaide, daughter of an Austrian archduke. After the Revolution of 1848, when war broke out with Austria, Victor Emmanuel was given command of a division. In the luckless campaign that followed he proved a brave soldier but an indifferent general.

Ascending the throne on his father’s abdication, he consolidated his position by suppressing the republican left and paying an indemnity to Austria, which brought him considerable opprobrium in Italy. In November 1852 he made the momentous decision to turn the government over to the able, determined Count Cavour, whose skillful manoeuvres over the

next few years made him king of Italy. At the decisive battles of Magenta and Solferino, he commanded the Piedmontese corps in person, and following the armistice of Villafranca, he exercised a valuable restraint on Cavour, who wanted to continue the war alone. The following year Victor Emmanuel secretly encouraged Garibaldi in the conquest of Sicily and Naples; he then led his Piedmontese army into papal territory to link up with Garibaldi in the face of an excommunication by Pius IX.

Following Cavour's death in 1861, Victor Emmanuel played a more direct role in government and despite setbacks achieved two notable triumphs: the acquisition of Venetia through war on the side of Bismarck's Prussia in 1866, and of Rome after the withdrawal of the French garrison in 1870. The occupation of Rome as the national capital so antagonized Pius IX that he refused all overtures toward reconciliation, and no meeting ever took place between the two sovereigns; nevertheless, on Victor Emmanuel's death in 1878 Pius permitted his burial in the Pantheon.

Risorgimento, (Italian: "Rising Again"), 19th-century movement for Italian unification that culminated in the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861. The Risorgimento was an ideological and literary movement that helped to arouse the national consciousness of the Italian people, and it led to a series of political events that freed the Italian states from foreign domination and united them politically. Although the Risorgimento has attained the status of a national myth, its essential meaning remains a controversial question. The classic interpretation (expressed in the writings of the philosopher Benedetto Croce) sees the Risorgimento as the triumph of liberalism, but more recent views criticize it as an aristocratic and bourgeois revolution that failed to include the masses.

The main impetus to the Risorgimento came from reforms introduced by the French when they dominated Italy during the period of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars (1796–1815). A number of Italian states were briefly consolidated, first as republics and then as satellite states of the French empire, and, even more importantly, the Italian middle class grew in numbers and was allowed to participate in government.

Course Outcomes

CO1: Explain the process of Unification of Germany.

CO2: Describe the role of Otto von Bismarck in German unification.

CO3: Analyze the stages of Unification of Italy.

CO4: Examine the contributions of Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour.

CO5: Evaluate the role of Victor Emmanuel II in Italian unification.

Programme Outcome

PO: To develop students' understanding of nationalism and state formation, enabling critical analysis of unification movements in Europe.

S. No	Question (5 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
		CO	PO	K
1.	Explain the process of Unification of Germany.	CO2	PO1	K2
2.	Discuss the role of Otto von Bismarck in German unification.	CO4	PO1	K4
3.	Analyze the "Blood and Iron" policy of Bismarck.	CO4	PO1	K4
4.	Explain the causes and stages of Unification of Italy.	CO2	PO1	K2
5.	Discuss the contribution of Giuseppe Mazzini to Italian nationalism.	CO4	PO1	K4

S. No	Question (8 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
		CO	PO	K
1.	Analyze the role of Giuseppe Garibaldi in Italian unification.	CO4	PO1	K4
2.	Examine the contribution of Count Camillo di Cavour.	CO4	PO1	K4
3.	Evaluate the role of Victor Emmanuel II in unification.	CO5	PO1	K5
4.	Compare the unification of Germany and Italy.	CO4	PO1	K4

5.	Analyze the impact of unification on European politics.	CO4	PO1	K4
----	---	-----	-----	----

UNIT- IV

Eastern Question – Greek War of Independence – Crimean War – Pan Slavism - The Russo Turkish War (1878) - The Congress of Berlin 1878

Learning Objectives

- To understand the concept of the Eastern Question in European diplomacy.
- To examine the causes and significance of the Greek War of Independence.
- To study the background and impact of the Crimean War.
- To analyze the ideology of Pan-Slavism and its influence.
- To evaluate the outcomes of the Russo-Turkish War (1877–1878) and the Congress of Berlin (1878).

Greek War of Independence

The Greek War of Independence, also known as the Greek Revolution or the Greek Revolution of 1821, was a successful war of independence by Greek revolutionaries against the Ottoman Empire between 1821 and 1829. In 1826, the Greeks were assisted by the British Empire, Kingdom of France, and the Russian Empire, while the Ottomans were aided by their vassals, especially by the Eyalet of Egypt. The war led to the formation of modern Greece, which would be expanded to its modern size in later years. The revolution is celebrated by Greeks around the world as independence day on 25 March.

All Greek territory, except the Ionian Islands, the Mani Peninsula, and mountainous regions in Epirus, came under Ottoman rule in the 15th century. Greek War of Independence

The Greek War of Independence, also known as the Greek Revolution or the Greek Revolution of 1821, was a successful war of independence by Greek revolutionaries against the Ottoman Empire between 1821 and 1829. In 1826, the Greeks were assisted by the British Empire, Kingdom of France, and the Russian Empire, while the Ottomans were aided by their vassals, especially by the Eyalet of Egypt. The war led to the formation of modern Greece, which would be expanded to its modern size in later years. The revolution is celebrated by Greeks around the world as independence day on 25 March.

All Greek territory, except the Ionian Islands, the Mani Peninsula, and mountainous regions in Epirus, came under Ottoman rule in the 15th century. During the following centuries, there were Greek uprisings against Ottoman rule. Most uprisings began in the independent Greek realm of the Mani Peninsula, which was never conquered by the Ottomans. In 1814, a secret organization called the Filiki Eteria (Society of Friends) was founded with the aim of liberating Greece. It planned to launch revolts in the Peloponnese, the Danubian Principalities, and Constantinople. The insurrection was planned for 25 March 1821, the Orthodox Christian Feast of the Annunciation. However, the plans were discovered by the Ottoman authorities, forcing it to start earlier.

The first revolt began on 21 February 1821 in the Danubian Principalities, but it was soon put down by the Ottomans. These events urged Greeks in the Peloponnese into action and on 17 March 1821, the Maniots were first to declare war. In September 1821, the Greeks, under the leadership of Theodoros Kolokotronis, captured Tripolitsa. Revolts in Crete, Macedonia, and Central Greece broke out, but were suppressed. Greek fleets achieved success against the Ottoman navy in the Aegean Sea and prevented Ottoman reinforcements from arriving by sea. Tensions developed among Greek factions, leading to two consecutive civil wars. The Ottoman Sultan called in Muhammad Ali of Egypt, who agreed to send his son, Ibrahim Pasha, to Greece with an army to suppress the revolt in return for territorial gains. Ibrahim landed in the Peloponnese in February 1825 and brought most of the peninsula under Egyptian control by the end of that year. Despite a failed invasion of Mani, Athens also fell and revolutionary morale decreased.

The three great powers—Russia, Britain, and France—decided to intervene, sending their naval squadrons to Greece in 1827. They destroyed the Ottoman–Egyptian fleet at the Battle of Navarino, and turned the tide in favor of the revolutionaries. In 1828, the Egyptian army withdrew under pressure from a French expeditionary force. The Ottoman garrisons in the Peloponnese surrendered and the Greek revolutionaries retook central Greece. The Ottoman Empire declared war on Russia allowing for the Russian army to move into the Balkans. This forced the Ottomans to accept Greek autonomy in the Treaty of Adrianople and semi-autonomy for Serbia and the Romanian principalities.[6] After nine years of war, Greece was recognized as an independent state under the London Protocol of February 1830. Further negotiations in 1832

led to the London Conference and the Treaty of Constantinople, which defined the final borders of the new state and established Prince Otto of Bavaria as the first king of Greece.

Ottoman rule over Greece

The Fall of Constantinople on 29 May 1453 and the subsequent fall of the successor states of the Byzantine Empire marked the end of Byzantine sovereignty. After that, the Ottoman Empire ruled the Balkans and Anatolia (Asia Minor), with some exceptions.[c] Orthodox Christians were granted some political rights under Ottoman rule, but they were considered inferior subjects.[8] The majority of Greeks were called Rayah by the Turks, a name that referred to the large mass of non-Muslim subjects under the Ottoman ruling class.

Meanwhile, Greek intellectuals and humanists, who had migrated west before or during the Ottoman invasions, such as Demetrios Chalkokondyles and Leonardos Philaras, began to call for the liberation of their homeland. Demetrius Chalcondyles called on Venice and "all of the Latins" to aid the Greeks against "the abominable, monstrous, and impious barbarian Turks". However, Greece was to remain under Ottoman rule for several more centuries.

The Greek Revolution was not an isolated event; numerous failed attempts at regaining independence took place throughout the Ottoman era. Throughout the 17th century, there was great resistance to the Ottomans in the Morea and elsewhere, as evidenced by revolts led by Dionysius the Philosopher. After the Morean War, the Peloponnese came under Venetian rule for 30 years, and remained in turmoil from then on and throughout the 17th century, as bands of klephts multiplied.

The first great uprising was the Russian-sponsored Orlov Revolt of the 1770s, which was crushed by the Ottomans after having limited success. After the suppression of the uprising, Muslim Albanians ravaged many regions of mainland Greece. However, the Maniots continually resisted Ottoman rule and defeated several Ottoman incursions into their region, the most famous of which was the invasion of 1770. During the Second Russo-Turkish War, the Greek community of Trieste financed a small fleet under Lambros Katsonis, which was a nuisance for the Ottoman navy; during the war klephts and *armatoloi* (guerilla fighters in mountainous areas) rose once again.

At the same time, a number of Greeks enjoyed a privileged position in the Ottoman state as members of the Ottoman bureaucracy. Greeks controlled the affairs of the Orthodox Church through the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, as the higher clergy of the Orthodox

Church was mostly of Greek origin. Thus, as a result of the Ottoman millet system, the predominantly Greek hierarchy of the Patriarchate enjoyed control over the Empire's Orthodox subjects (the Rum millet.

The Greek Orthodox Church played a pivotal role in the preservation of national identity, the development of Greek society and the resurgence of Greek nationalism. From the early 18th century and onwards, members of prominent Greek families in Constantinople, known as Phanariotes (after the Phanar district of the city), gained considerable control over Ottoman foreign policy and eventually over the bureaucracy as a whole.

Klephts and armatoloi

In times of militarily weak central authority, the Balkan countryside became infested by groups of bandits called "klephts" (Greek: κλέφτες) (the Greek equivalent of the hajduks) that struck at Muslims and Christians alike. Defying Ottoman rule, the klephts were highly admired and held a significant place in popular lore.

Christian militias, known as "armatoloi" (Greek: αρματολοί), to secure endangered areas, especially mountain passes.[f] The area under their control was called an "armatolik",[22] the oldest known being established in Agrafta during the reign of Murad II (r. 1421–1451). The distinction between klephts and armatoloi was not clear, as the latter would often turn into klephts to extort more benefits from the authorities, while, conversely, another klepht group would be appointed to the armatolik to confront their predecessors.

Nevertheless, klephts and armatoloi formed a provincial elite, though not a social class, whose members would muster under a common goal.[25] As the armatoloi's position gradually turned into a hereditary one, some captains took care of their armatolik as their personal property. A great deal of power was placed in their hands and they integrated in the network of clientelist relationships that formed the Ottoman administration. Some managed to establish exclusive control in their armatolik, forcing the Porte to try repeatedly, though unsuccessfully, to eliminate them.

By the time of the War of Independence, powerful armatoloi could be traced in Rumeli, Thessaly, Epirus and southern Macedonia.[27] To the revolutionary leader and writer Yannis Makriyannis, klephts and armatoloi—being the only available major military force on the side of the Greeks—played such a crucial role in the Greek revolution that he referred to them as the "yeast of liberty". Contrary to conventional Greek history, many of the klephts and armatoles

participated at the Greek War of Independence according to their own militaristic patron-client terms. They saw the war as an economic and political opportunity to expand their areas of operation. Balkan bandits such as the klephts and armatoles glorified in nationalist historiography as national heroes—were actually driven by economic interests, were not aware of national projects, made alliances with the Ottomans and robbed Christians as much as Muslims.

Nevertheless, they seldom robbed common folk, from whose ranks they came, and more often raided Turks, with whom they were separated by religion, nationality, and social class. They enjoyed the support of the generally oppressed common folk, as they were in opposition to established authority. A vast oral tradition of folk poetry attests to the sympathy they evoked and their reputation for patriotism. Some famous armatoles leaders were Odysseas Androutsos, Georgios Karaiskakis, Athanasios Diakos, Markos Botsaris and Giannis Stathasa.

CRIMEAN WAR (1854 – 1856)

The Crimean War was one of the important flash lights in the eastern Question. It is interesting to note that the Crimean War was precipitated due to the clash of political interests of the European Powers. Tsar Nicholas I made two attempts to partition Turkey's territories with Britain between 1841 and 1854. According to him Turkey was "the sick man of Europe" and as such it was imperative to partition her possessions. But Britain wanted to keep the balance of power in the Near East by setting Turkey as a bulwark against Russian penetration in the Balkans. The conflicting interests between the two sowed the seeds for the Crimean War.

One of the causes for the Crimean War was a religious issue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox Church over the management of the Holy places in Palestine. Napoleon III of France, in order to earn the goodwill of the Catholics, put Pressure on the Sultan of Turkey and wrested the concession from his as the champion of the Christians in the east. Tsar Nicholas I raised his protest against this right conceded to France. In order to win his point, he sent his ambassador Menschikov to Constantinople to demand from the Sultan his right as the protector of the entire Orthodox Christian subjects of the Sultan. Britain got alarmed at the prospect of Russia getting a firm foothold in the Balkans. So she strongly supported the cause of France and induced the Sultan not to concede the demand to Russia.

As the Russian demand was turned down, Russian troops occupied Moldavia and Wallachia, the Turkish territories. Turkey declared war against Russia in 1853. A Turkish squadron was destroyed by the Russians off Sinope. British and French fleets moved to the Black

sea. An Anglo-French ultimatum was sent to Russia in 1854 to evacuate the principalities occupied by Russia. Not give a reply and as she crossed the Danube, Britain and France declared war on Russia. Sardinia joined the allies in Russian advance. Fearing an attack from Austria, Russia withdrew from the two principalities. The Russian fleet withdrew to Sebastopol in Crimea. In the battle of the Alma River (1854), the Allies defeated Russia. The first bombardment to Sebastopol began in 1854. But the Allies failed to make any headway. In the battles of Balaclava and Inker-man – both in 1854 – Russia was defeated. The siege of Sebastopol was renewed with redoubled vigour in 1855. After bitter fighting and privation on both sides, Russia abandoned Sebastopol. The Allies captured Sebastopol. Tsar Nicholas I died in 1855 and Alexander II became the new Tsar. He sued for peace. The war came to an end by the Treaty of Paris signed in 1856.

According to the terms of the treaty, the territorial integrity of Turkey was guaranteed. The Tsar renounced his claim to protect the Christians in the Balkans. Moldavia and Wallachia were granted self-government. In 1862 the two principalities united together under the name of Rumania and declared its independence. This was a gross violation of the guarantee given to the territorial integrity of Turkey. The Black Sea was neutralized for all merchant ships. But no warships were to be allowed in it. Russia ceded a part of Bessarabia to Moldavia. The net effect of the treaty was that the downfall of Turkey was postponed.

RUSSO – TURKISH WAR (1877)

The Franco – Prussian War of 1870 – 1871 gave an opportunity to Russia which was smarting under the disgrace caused in the Crimean War to abrogate the terms of the treaty of Paris. She started building a fleet in the Black Sea. Due to the oppression of the tax-gatherers of Turkey, a rising broke out in Herzegovina in 1875. Soon it spread to Bosnia and the entire Balkans. Bulgaria rose in revolt in 1876. The rising was put down with the utmost barbarity. Thousands of Bulgars were murdered. The “Bulgarian atrocities” roused the indignation of Christian Europe. In 1876 Serbia and Montenegro declared war against the sultan. In 1877 Russia declared war against Turkey. The Russian army crossed the Danube and invaded Plevna. After the fall of Plevna, the Russian army entered Adrianople, and the Sultan was forced to sign the dictated Treaty of San Stefano in 1878,. The treaty made provision for the independence of Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania. Rumania was to cede Bessarabia to Russia in return for Dobrudja. A new state called Bulgaria was created. As the treaty was unacceptable to the

European powers, a revision of the treaty was made in the Congress of Berlin in 1878. According to the Treaty of Berlin, Bulgaria was reduced in size. Eastern Roumelia, a small slice of territory which was formerly assigned to Bulgaria, was brought within the Turkish territory but was to be administered by a Christian Governor appointed by the Sultan. Macedonia was brought under the direct rule of Turkey. Austria which did not participate in the war received Bosnia and Herzegovina. Rumania handed over Bessarabia to Russia in return for Dobrudja. Great Britain occupied Cyprus.

BALKAN WARS

The treaty of Berlin which ended Russo-Turkish war was quite unsatisfactory. In 1885 eastern Roumelia joined Bulgaria. The Sultan ceded Thessaly to Greece in 1881. Between 1894 and 1896 the Armenians in Asia Minor rose in revolt. But the Sultan put down the revolt. In 1896 Crete rose in revolt against the Sultan. Greece lent support to Crete. This drifted to a war between Greece and Turkey. The former was defeated. The European powers intervened and the Greeks were forced to withdraw from Crete and surrender a part of Thessaly to Turkey. However, Crete was united with Greece in 1913. An interesting sidelight in the Eastern Question at this time was the rise of the Young Turk Movement in the Ottoman Empire. The movement aimed at infusing new life by removing the political ills in Turkey. The Sultan was forced to give a new constitution for the country. The possibility of the rise of a regenerated Turkey with its faith in democratic principles was viewed with great concern by the European powers. Haunted by the fear that

might recover her lost territories, Bulgaria proclaimed monarchy in the country. Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. Italy captured Tripoli in North Africa from Turkey in 1911.

Macedonia still chafed under the tutelage of Turkey. Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia and Greece wanted to devour at least a part of Macedonia. The Balkan states for the time being sank their minor differences, formed a League in 1912 and declared war against Turkey. In the war that ensued, called the First Balkan War, Turkey was defeated. By the Treaty of London (1913), Turkey surrendered almost all her European possessions to them. A new state called Albania came into existence. The victors soon quarrelled on the distribution of the spoils of war. This drifted to the Second Balkan War. Bulgaria attacked Serbia. But she was beaten by the combined forces of Serbia, Greece and Rumania. The war came to an end by the Treaty of Bucharest in

1913. Serbia obtained Northern and Central Macedonia. Southern Macedonia along with the port of the Salonika was taken by Greece. Bulgaria was given eastern Macedonia and a part of Thrace. With the exception of a small strip of land around Constantinople, all the other territories in the Balkan Peninsula hook off the Turkish yoke before 1914.

The Congress of Berlin 1878. Congress of Berlin, (June 13–July 13, 1878), diplomatic meeting of the major European powers at which the Treaty of Berlin replaced the Treaty of San Stefano, which had been signed by Russia and Turkey (March 3, 1878) at the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. Officially convoked by the Austrian foreign minister, Count Gyula Andrassy, the congress met in Berlin on June 13.

Dominated by the German chancellor Otto von Bismarck, the congress solved an international crisis caused by the San Stefano treaty by revising the peace settlement to satisfy the interests of Great Britain (by denying Russia the means to extend its naval power and by maintaining the Ottoman Empire as a European power) and to satisfy the interests of Austria-Hungary (by allowing it to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina and thereby increase its influence in the Balkans). In acting so, however, the congress left Russia humiliated by substantially reducing the gains that it had made under the San Stefano treaty. Furthermore, the congress failed to consider adequately the aspirations of the Balkan peoples themselves and, thereby, laid the foundation for future crises in the Balkans.

Otto von Bismarck (born April 1, 1815, Schönhausen, Altmark, Prussia [Germany]—died July 30, 1898, Friedrichsruh, near Hamburg) was the prime minister of Prussia (1862–73, 1873–90) and founder and first chancellor (1871–90) of the German Empire. Once the empire was established, he actively and skillfully pursued pacific policies in foreign affairs, succeeding in preserving the peace in Europe for about two decades. But in domestic policies his patrimony was less benign, for he failed to rise above the authoritarian proclivities of the landed squirearchy to which he was born.

Life

Early years

Bismarck was born at Schönhausen, in the Kingdom of Prussia. His father, Ferdinand von Bismarck-Schönhausen, was a Junker squire descended from a Swabian family that had ultimately settled as estate owners in Pomerania. Ferdinand was a typical member of the Prussian landowning elite. The family's economic circumstances were modest—Ferdinand's farming

skills being perhaps less than average—and Bismarck was not to know real wealth until the rewards flowed in after the achievement of German unification. His mother, Wilhelmine Mencken, came from an educated bourgeois family that had produced a number of higher civil servants and academics. She had been married to Ferdinand von Bismarck at age 16 and found provincial life confining. When her son Otto was seven, she enrolled him in the progressive Plamann Institute in Berlin and moved to the capital to be near him. The young Bismarck resented exchanging an easy life in the country for a more circumscribed life in a large city, where in school he was pitted against the sons of Berlin's best-educated families. He spent five years at the school and went on to the Frederick William gymnasium for three years. He took his university entrance examination (Abitur) in 1832.

With his mother's encouragement, he took up the study of law at the University of Göttingen in the kingdom of Hanover. Evidently Bismarck was a mediocre student who spent much of his time drinking with his comrades in an aristocratic fraternity. After a brief stint at the university in Berlin, he entered the Prussian civil service, where he was plagued by boredom and an inability to adhere to the hierarchical principles of the bureaucracy. His mother's death in 1839 gave him the opportunity of resigning in order to come to the assistance of his father, who was experiencing financial difficulties in the management of his estate. From 1839 to 1847 Bismarck lived the ordinary life of a Prussian country squire. Subsequently he romanticized these years on the land and wondered why he had abandoned an idyllic existence for the insecurities of a life in politics. This frequently expressed nostalgia may have been more guise than reality.

During this period he met and married Johanna von Puttkamer, the daughter of a conservative aristocratic family famed for its devout pietism. While courting Johanna, Bismarck experienced a religious conversion that was to give him inner strength and security. A subsequent critic was to remark that Bismarck believed in a God who invariably agreed with him on all issues. There is no question that the marriage was a very happy one. In fact, Bismarck's last words before dying in 1898 expressed the wish that he would once again see Johanna, who had passed away some years earlier.

His politics during the 1840s did not diverge substantially from those of a typical country squire. If anything, his politics were more conservative. He believed in a Christian state that received its sanction ultimately from the deity. The existing social and political order was to be

defended in order to prevent a Hobbesian chaos of all against all. Given his views, Bismarck was welcomed as a member of the religious conservative circle around the brothers von Gerlach, who were stout defenders of the noble estate against the encroachments of bureaucratic centralization. Bismarck had nothing but sarcasm for aristocratic liberals who viewed England as a model for Prussia. In 1847 he attended the Prussian United Diet, where his speeches against Jewish emancipation and contemporary liberalism gained him the reputation of a backwoods conservative, out of touch with the dynamic forces of his age.

Bismarck's response to the liberal revolution that swept through Europe in 1848 confirmed his image as a reactionary. He opposed any concessions to the liberals and expressed contempt for the king's willingness to bargain with the revolutionaries. He even considered marching his peasants to Berlin to free Frederick William IV from the baneful influence of the rebels. With other archconservatives, including Ernst Ludwig von Gerlach, he began contributing to the *Kreuzzeitung* newspaper (1848) as an organ of antirevolutionary sentiment.

For Bismarck's future role, it is important to understand his analysis of the revolution. He identified the forces of change as confined solely to the educated and propertied middle class. The vast majority of Prussians, however, were peasants and artisans, who, in Bismarck's view, were loyal monarchists. The task of the forces of order was to confirm the loyalty of these two groups by means of material concessions. The economic policies of the urban middle-class radicals were rooted in pure self-interest, he maintained. The radicals would spur industrial growth at the expense of the lower middle class and the farm population. Ultimately, even the middle class itself might be won over by tactical concessions and success in foreign policy. This strategic and opportunist thinking distanced Bismarck from the ideological conservatives, who were wedded to traditional concepts of authority. His vision of a manipulative state that sustained its power by rewarding obedient groups remained with him throughout his political career.

Early career

In 1849 he was elected to the Prussian Chamber of Deputies (the lower chamber of the Prussian Diet) and moved his family to Berlin. At this stage he was far from a German nationalist. He told one of his fellow conservatives, "We are Prussians, and Prussians we shall remain.... We do not wish to see the Kingdom of Prussia obliterated in the putrid brew of cosy

south German sentimentality.” In 1851 Frederick William IV appointed Bismarck as the Prussian representative to the federal Diet in Frankfurt, a clear reward for his loyalty to the monarchy.

With the defeat of the revolution in central Europe, Austria had reasserted its supremacy in the German Confederation, and Bismarck, being an archconservative, was assumed to support the status quo, which included Austrian hegemony. He lived in Frankfurt for eight years, where he experienced a commercial and cultural environment quite different from that of a Prussian estate.

It was in Frankfurt that Bismarck began to reassess his view of German nationalism and the goals of Prussian foreign policy. Not only did he find the constant deference to the Austrians in Frankfurt demeaning, but he also realized that the status quo meant acceptance of Prussia as a second-rate power in central Europe. In 1854 he opposed close cooperation with Austria, arguing that it entailed “binding our spruce and seaworthy frigate to the wormy old warship of Austria.” Gradually he began to consider the options that would make Prussia the undisputed power in Germany. A vision of a Prussian-dominated northern Europe and a redirection of Austrian power to the Slavic areas in the south took shape in his mind. If necessary, a war with Austria to destroy its hegemony was not to be excluded. Implementation of such a policy would be anything but conservative because it would entail radical changes in the map of Europe as it had been drawn by the conservative powers at Vienna, Austria, in 1815.

Prime minister

In 1859 Bismarck was sent to Russia as Prussian ambassador, and not long thereafter (May 1862) he moved to Paris as ambassador to the court of Napoleon III. Thus, he had 11 years of experience in foreign affairs before he became prime minister and foreign minister of Prussia in September 1862. He had come to know personally the architects of French, Russian, and Austrian foreign policy. Ironically, Bismarck was called back by Emperor William I (1861–88) to the reigns of power at a critical juncture in Prussia’s internal development.

For more than two years William had been locked in a battle with the Chamber of Deputies over military reform. Having been in the army much of his adult life, the monarch (similar to earlier Prussian kings) considered it entirely within his prerogative to increase the size of the military and the years of service. warship of Austria.” Gradually he began to consider the options that would make Prussia the undisputed power in Germany. A vision of a Prussian-dominated northern Europe and a redirection of Austrian power to the Slavic areas in the south

took shape in his mind. If necessary, a war with Austria to destroy its hegemony was not to be excluded. Implementation of such a policy would be anything but conservative because it would entail radical changes in the map of Europe as it had been drawn by the conservative powers at Vienna, Austria, in 1815.

Prime minister

In 1859 Bismarck was sent to Russia as Prussian ambassador, and not long thereafter (May 1862) he moved to Paris as ambassador to the court of Napoleon III. Thus, he had 11 years of experience in foreign affairs before he became prime minister and foreign minister of Prussia in September 1862. He had come to know personally the architects of French, Russian, and Austrian foreign policy. Ironically, Bismarck was called back by Emperor William I (1861–88) to the reigns of power at a critical juncture in Prussia's internal development.

For more than two years William had been locked in a battle with the Chamber of Deputies over military reform. Having been in the army much of his adult life, the monarch (similar to earlier Prussian kings) considered it entirely within his prerogative to increase the size of the military and the years of service. Civil servants had to be paid and the government had to continue functioning. This tactic, applied from 1863 to 1866, allowed him to implement the military reforms without the sanction of Parliament. Bismarck did, indeed, appear to be the reactionary, confrontational aristocrat out of tune with his time.

But there were hints that this was more appearance than reality. Bismarck said that "Prussia must collect and keep its strength for the right moment, which has been missed several times already; Prussia's frontiers as laid down by the Vienna treaties are not conducive to a healthy national life; it is not by means of speeches and majority resolutions that the great issues of the day will be decided—that was the great mistake of 1848 and 1849—but by blood and iron." He was giving the opposition evidence that he intended to use Prussia's military might not for internal suppression but for the liberal goal of achieving national unification. The liberal opposition, however, chose to ignore these hints, and on May 22, 1863, by a vote of 239 to 61, they informed William I that they would not deal with his prime minister any further. After eight months in office, Bismarck had failed to achieve any agreement with the parliamentary opposition.

Bismarck now turned to foreign policy in the hope that success on this front would weaken the electorate's clear desire for political reform. Trouble had been brewing since 1848

between the Danes and the German population of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. (Both duchies were in union with Denmark; Schleswig, however, had a large German population, and Holstein was a member of the German Confederation.) When the Danish king acted rashly, Bismarck made sure that it was Prussia and Austria rather than the German Confederation which represented German interests. Liberal leaders like Rudolf Virchow still saw Bismarck as an unrepentant reactionary who was “no longer the man who joined us with feeling that he was going to accomplish something with an energetic foreign policy.”

A quick successful war against Denmark left the fate of Schleswig and Holstein up to Bismarck and the Austrians. After much haggling, the Convention of Gastein was signed on August 20, 1865; it provided for Schleswig to be administered by Prussia and Holstein by Austria. Liberals remained unappeased by Prussian military prowess and once again defeated the army bill in January 1865.

In 1866 Bismarck nonetheless continued his efforts to divert liberal interest from the budget conflict and toward the success of Prussian arms. He repeatedly told the Austrians that their future lay in the south and that they would be wise to yield dominance in Germany. But in both cases his words fell on deaf ears. Bismarck had clearly decided to play the German national card in order to achieve a Prussian-dominated Germany. After making sure that Russia would not intervene and after gaining an alliance with Italy, he set about fostering conflict with the Austrians. He stirred up Hungarian nationalism against Austria—a policy that showed how radical means could be used in the service of his own conservative ends. On June 9, 1866, Prussian troops invaded Holstein, and a few days later Austria, supported by the smaller states of Saxony, Hesse-Kassel, and Hanover, went to war. Within six weeks Prussia had inflicted a major defeat on the Austrians at Königgrätz (Sadowa). Bismarck then counseled moderation so that Austria would not be humiliated. Against a king and generals who wanted to march to Vienna, he urged a quick cessation of hostilities, recognizing that other powers might intervene if the war continued. Europe was stunned: in a few weeks Prussia had transformed the distribution of power in central Europe. Austria, the major power in Germany for centuries, was now relegated to secondary status.

Bismarck now showed both ruthlessness and moderation. The Peace of Nikolsburg scarcely demanded anything from Austria. But Hanover, Hesse-Kassel, Nassau, and Frankfurt, all of which had fought against Prussia, were annexed, to the shock of conservatives. The king of

Hanover was removed from power, as was the ruling house in Hesse. While conservatives were appalled at the German civil war between the two powers who had been opposed to revolution, the liberal middle class flocked to support Bismarck. Their goal of German unification seemed close at hand. Bismarck, moreover, now apologized for his high-handedness over the issue of the military budget and offered an olive branch of peace to the liberals. The party divided over Bismarck's offer. He had achieved one of his major goals—gaining a large part of the middle class to see the Prussian monarchy as their ally.

The North German Confederation was established in 1867 with Prussia as its matrix. Its constitution, on the surface, appeared progressive. To begin with, it established universal manhood suffrage with a secret ballot. But this was a result of Bismarck's belief that the vast majority of Prussians, if enfranchised, would vote conservative. From this perspective, a restricted ballot aided the liberals. (Of course, in 1867 neither the socialists nor the Catholic Centre had established political parties.) Moreover, whereas in theory the lower house (Reichstag) seemed an important reservoir of power given its ability to reject any bill, in practice its powers were circumscribed in the areas of military and foreign policy. Ministers were chosen by and responsible to the emperor and not the legislature. Nevertheless, the constitution provided a basis for evolution in a democratic direction.

Although Bismarck voiced doubts whether unification would occur in his lifetime, he actually set about tying the southern states to the north almost immediately. An all-German customs parliament was proposed, joint military training was negotiated, and a plan was advanced which entailed that the southern states recognize William as German emperor. All these efforts failed because of popular opposition in the south. Bismarck then sought to propel history a bit faster by seeking conflict with France. If he could not bring the south into a united German nation by reason, he would rely on the passions aroused by war. Ever the master tactician, he worked behind the scenes to be certain that neither Russia nor Austria would intervene in such a war. Nor did he have to work hard to produce a conflict, because the French emperor, Napoleon III, was indignant at the sudden emergence of Prussia, especially since he did not receive the compensation he sought—the annexation of Luxembourg.

When in 1869 the Spanish throne was offered to the king's cousin, Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, Napoleon III perceived this as an effort to encircle France. He twice sent his ambassador, Vincent Benedetti, to the Prussian king at Bad Ems, once to demand that

acceptance of the offer be withdrawn (which it was on July 12) and a second time to demand that under no circumstances should a member of the Hohenzollern family accept the Spanish throne in the future. The king politely refused the second request. Bismarck received a telegram from Bad Ems (the Ems telegram) giving a detailed account of the interview between William I and the French ambassador, which he proceeded to edit and abridge for the press in such a way that the French appeared to seek a humiliation of the Prussian monarch, and the monarch's rejection of Napoleon's demands seemed insultingly brusque to the French. The French responded by declaring war on Prussia on July 19, 1870. When the French were decisively defeated at Sedan in September, it appeared as though Bismarck would be able to score a third rapid victory in seven years. But guerrilla warfare broke out, and Paris held out despite the capture of the emperor. Bismarck, however, stirred anti-French passions to such a fever pitch that in January 1871 the four southern states joined the North German Confederation to create the German Empire. The lesser German solution, with seven million German-speaking Austrians excluded, was the result of Bismarck's three wars. He was showered with honours and hailed as a national hero.

Key Objectives:

1. Revising the Treaty of San Stefano to reduce Russian dominance in the Balkans.
2. Maintaining the balance of power in Europe by preventing a major expansion of Russian influence.
3. Protecting the interests of the Ottoman Empire while allowing certain territorial changes in the Balkans.

Major Decisions and Outcomes:

1. Bulgaria was divided into three parts:
 - o A smaller, autonomous Principality of Bulgaria under Ottoman suzerainty.
 - o Eastern Rumelia, which remained under Ottoman control but had administrative autonomy.
 - o Macedonia, which was returned entirely to the Ottoman Empire.
2. Serbia, Montenegro, and Romania gained full independence from the Ottoman Empire.
3. Austria-Hungary was allowed to administer Bosnia and Herzegovina, though it remained officially under Ottoman sovereignty.
4. Britain took control of Cyprus, in exchange for supporting the Ottoman Empire.

5. Russia retained control over Bessarabia but had to give up some of its territorial gains in the Balkans.
6. The Ottoman Empire remained weakened, but its territorial losses were limited compared to the Treaty of San Stefano.

Significance:

1. The Congress of Berlin temporarily maintained peace in Europe but created tensions between Russia and other European powers, especially Austria-Hungary and Britain.
2. It marked the rise of Germany as a key mediator in European diplomacy.
3. The decisions angered Slavic nationalists and fueled tensions in the Balkans, eventually contributing to the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

Course Outcomes

CO1: Explain the concept and significance of the Eastern Question.

CO2: Describe the causes and results of the Greek War of Independence.

CO3: Analyze the causes and consequences of the Crimean War.

CO4: Examine the role of Pan-Slavism in European politics.

CO5: Evaluate the significance of the Congress of Berlin in reshaping Europe.

Programme Outcome

PO: To develop students' understanding of 19th-century European diplomacy and conflicts, enabling critical analysis of international relations and geopolitical changes.

S. No	Question (5 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
		CO2	PO1	K2
1.	Explain the concept of the Eastern Question.	CO2	PO1	K2
2.	Discuss the causes and results of the Greek War of Independence.	CO4	PO1	CO4
3.	Analyze the causes and consequences of the Crimean War.	CO4	PO1	CO4
4.	Analyze the causes and consequences of the Crimean	CO4	PO1	CO4

	War.			
5.	Discuss the causes and results of the Russo-Turkish War (1877–1878).	CO4	PO1	CO4

S. No	Question (8 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
1.	Analyze the decisions of the Congress of Berlin (1878).	CO4	PO1	CO4
2.	Evaluate the role of great powers in the Eastern Question.	CO5	PO1	CO5
3.	Discuss the impact of the Eastern Question on European diplomacy.	CO4	PO1	CO4
4.	Examine the relationship between Pan-Slavism and the Russo-Turkish War.	CO4	PO1	CO4
5.	Analyze the long-term impact of the Congress of Berlin on Europe.	CO4	PO1	CO4

UNIT- V

Age of Armed Peace - The Triple Alliance and Triple entente- Balkan wars – First World War - US Entry into First World War – Treaty of Versailles

Learning Objectives

- To understand the concept of the Age of Armed Peace in Europe.
- To examine the formation and significance of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente.
- To study the causes and impact of the Balkan Wars.
- To analyze the causes, course, and consequences of the First World War.
- To evaluate the role of the United States entry and the significance of the Treaty of Versailles.

Triple entente

Triple Entente, association between Great Britain, France, and Russia, the nucleus of the Allied Powers in World War I. It developed from the Franco-Russian alliance that gradually developed and was formalized in 1894, the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale of 1904, and an Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907, which brought the Triple Entente into existence. See also international relations: The Triple Entente.

World War I, an international conflict that in 1914–18 embroiled most of the nations of Europe along with Russia, the United States, the Middle East, and other regions. The war pitted the Central Powers—mainly Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey—against the Allies—mainly France, Great Britain, Russia, Italy, Japan, and, from 1917, the United States. It ended with the defeat of the Central Powers. The war was virtually unprecedented in the slaughter, carnage, and destruction it caused.

Women of World War I: Marie Curie, Mabel St. Clair Stobart, and Aileen Cole Stewart
Three notable women of World War I: Marie Curie, Mabel St. Clair Stobart, and Aileen Cole Stewart.(more)

See all videos for this article

World War I was one of the great watersheds of 20th-century geopolitical history. It led to the fall of four great imperial dynasties (in Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey),

resulted in the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, and, in its destabilization of European society, laid the groundwork for World War II.

The last surviving veterans of World War I were American serviceman Frank Buckles (died in February 2011), British-born Australian serviceman Claude Choules (died in May 2011), and British servicewoman Florence Green (died in February 2012), the last surviving veteran of the war.

The outbreak of war

With Serbia already much aggrandized by the two Balkan Wars (1912–13, 1913), Serbian nationalists turned their attention back to the idea of “liberating” the South Slavs of Austria-Hungary. Colonel Dragutin Dimitrijević, head of Serbia’s military intelligence, was also, under the alias “Apis,” head of the secret society Union or Death, pledged to the pursuit of this pan-Serbian ambition. Believing that the Serbs’ cause would be served by the death of the Austrian archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir presumptive to the Austrian emperor Franz Joseph, and learning that the Archduke was about to visit Bosnia on a tour of military inspection, Apis plotted his assassination. Nikola Pašić, the Serbian prime minister and an enemy of Apis, heard of the plot and warned the Austrian government of it, but his message was too cautiously worded to be understood.

At 11:15 AM on June 28, 1914, in the Bosnian capital, Sarajevo, Franz Ferdinand and his morganatic wife, Sophie, duchess of Hohenberg, were shot dead by a Bosnian Serb, Gavrilo Princip. The chief of the Austro-Hungarian general staff, Franz, Graf (count) Conrad von Hötzendorf, and the foreign minister, Leopold, Graf von Berchtold, saw the crime as the occasion for measures to humiliate Serbia and so to enhance Austria-Hungary’s prestige in the Balkans. Conrad had already (October 1913) been assured by William II of Germany’s support if Austria-Hungary should start a preventive war against Serbia. This assurance was confirmed in the week following the assassination, before William, on July 6, set off upon his annual cruise to the North Cape, off Norway.

The Austrians decided to present an unacceptable ultimatum to Serbia and then to declare war, relying on Germany to deter Russia from intervention. Though the terms of the ultimatum were finally approved on July 19, its delivery was postponed to the evening of July 23, since by that time the French president, Raymond Poincaré, and his premier, René Viviani, who had set off on a state visit to Russia on July 15, would be on their way home and therefore unable to

concert an immediate reaction with their Russian allies. When the delivery was announced, on July 24, Russia declared that Austria-Hungary must not be allowed to crush Serbia.

Serbia replied to the ultimatum on July 25, accepting most of its demands but protesting against two of them—namely, that Serbian officials (unnamed) should be dismissed at Austria-Hungary's behest and that Austro-Hungarian officials should take part, on Serbian soil, in proceedings against organizations hostile to Austria-Hungary. Though Serbia offered to submit the issue to international arbitration, Austria-Hungary promptly severed diplomatic relations and ordered partial mobilization.

Home from his cruise on July 27, William learned on July 28 how Serbia had replied to the ultimatum. At once he instructed the German Foreign Office to tell Austria-Hungary that there was no longer any justification for war and that it should content itself with a temporary occupation of Belgrade. But, meanwhile, the German Foreign Office had been giving such encouragement to Berchtold that already on July 27 he had persuaded Franz Joseph to authorize war against Serbia. War was in fact declared on July 28, and Austro-Hungarian artillery began to bombard Belgrade the next day. Russia then ordered partial mobilization against Austria-Hungary, and on July 30, when Austria-Hungary was riposting conventionally with an order of mobilization on its Russian frontier, Russia ordered general mobilization. Germany, which since July 28 had still been hoping, in disregard of earlier warning hints from Great Britain, that Austria-Hungary's war against Serbia could be "localized" to the Balkans, was now disillusioned insofar as eastern Europe was concerned. On July 31 Germany sent a 24-hour ultimatum requiring Russia to halt its mobilization and an 18-hour ultimatum requiring France to promise neutrality in the event of war between Russia and Germany.

Both Russia and France predictably ignored these demands. On August 1 Germany ordered general mobilization and declared war against Russia, and France likewise ordered general mobilization. The next day Germany sent troops into Luxembourg and demanded from Belgium free passage for German troops across its neutral territory. On August 3 Germany declared war against **France**.

In the night of August 3–4 German forces invaded Belgium. Thereupon, Great Britain, which had no concern with Serbia and no express obligation to fight either for Russia or for

France but was expressly committed to defend Belgium, on August 4 declared war against Germany.

Austria-Hungary declared war against Russia on August 5; Serbia against Germany on August 6; Montenegro against Austria-Hungary on August 7 and against Germany on August 12; France and Great Britain against Austria-Hungary on August 10 and on August 12, respectively; Japan against Germany on August 23; Austria-Hungary against Japan on August 25 and against Belgium on August 28.

Romania had renewed its secret anti-Russian alliance of 1883 with the Central Powers on February 26, 1914, but now chose to remain neutral. Italy had confirmed the Triple Alliance on December 7, 1912, but could now propound formal arguments for disregarding it: first, Italy was not obliged to support its allies in a war of aggression; second, the original treaty of 1882 had stated expressly that the alliance was not against England.

On September 5, 1914, Russia, France, and Great Britain concluded the Treaty of London, each promising not to make a separate peace with the Central Powers. Thenceforth, they could be called the Allied, or Entente, powers, or simply the Allies.

The outbreak of war in August 1914 was generally greeted with confidence and jubilation by the peoples of Europe, among whom it inspired a wave of patriotic feeling and celebration. Few people imagined how long or how disastrous a war between the great nations of Europe could be, and most believed that their country's side would be victorious within a matter of months. The war was welcomed either patriotically, as a defensive one imposed by national necessity, or idealistically, as one for upholding right against might, the sanctity of treaties, and international morality.

Forces and resources of the combatant nations in 1914

When war broke out, the Allied powers possessed greater overall demographic, industrial, and military resources than the Central Powers and enjoyed easier access to the oceans for trade with neutral countries, particularly with the United States.

All the initial belligerents in World War I were self-sufficient in food except Great Britain and Germany. Great Britain's industrial establishment was slightly superior to Germany's (17 percent of world trade in 1913 as compared with 12 percent for Germany), but Germany's diversified chemical industry facilitated the production of ersatz, or substitute, materials, which compensated for the worst shortages ensuing from the British wartime blockade. The German

chemist Fritz Haber was already developing a process for the fixation of nitrogen from air; this process made Germany self-sufficient in explosives and thus no longer dependent on imports of nitrates from Chile..

Of all the initial belligerent nations, only Great Britain had a volunteer army, and this was quite small at the start of the war. The other nations had much larger conscript armies that required three to four years of service from able-bodied males of military age, to be followed by several years in reserve formations. Military strength on land was counted in terms of divisions composed of 12,000–20,000 officers and men. Two or more divisions made up an army corps, and two or more corps made up an army. An army could thus comprise anywhere from 50,000 to 250,000 men.

The higher state of discipline, training, leadership, and armament of the German army reduced the importance of the initial numerical inferiority of the armies of the Central Powers. Because of the comparative slowness of mobilization, poor higher leadership, and lower scale of armament of the Russian armies, there was an approximate balance of forces between the Central Powers and the Allies in August 1914 that prevented either side from gaining a quick victory.

Germany and Austria also enjoyed the advantage of “interior lines of communication,” which enabled them to send their forces to critical points on the battlefronts by the shortest route. According to one estimate, Germany’s railway network made it possible to move eight divisions simultaneously from the Western Front to the Eastern Front in four and a half days.

Even greater in importance was the advantage that Germany derived from its strong military traditions and its cadre of highly efficient and disciplined regular officers. Skilled in directing a war of movement and quick to exploit the advantages of flank attacks, German senior officers were to prove generally more capable than their Allied counterparts at directing the operations of large troop formations.

Sea power was largely reckoned in terms of capital ships, or dreadnought battleships and battle cruisers having extremely large guns. Despite intensive competition from the Germans, the British had maintained their superiority in numbers, with the result that, in capital ships, the Allies had an almost two-to-one advantage over the Central Powers.

The numerical superiority of the British navy, however, was offset by the technological lead of the German navy in many categories, such as range-finding equipment, magazine protection, searchlights, torpedoes, and mines. Great Britain relied on the Royal Navy not only to

ensure necessary imports of food and other supplies in wartime but also to sever the Central Powers' access to the markets of the world. With superior numbers of warships, Great Britain could impose a blockade that gradually weakened Germany by preventing imports from overseas.

Technology of war in 1914

Cannon

The French 75-mm cannon, the archetypal rapid-firing gun from its introduction in 1897 through World War I.(more) The planning and conduct of war in 1914 were crucially influenced by the invention of new weapons and the improvement of existing types since the Franco-German War of 1870–71. The chief developments of the intervening period had been the machine gun and the rapid-fire field artillery gun. The modern machine gun, which had been developed in the 1880s and '90s, was a reliable belt-fed gun capable of sustained rates of extremely rapid fire; it could fire 600 bullets per minute with a range of more than 1,000 yards (900 metres). In the realm of field artillery, the period leading up to the war saw the introduction of improved breech-loading mechanisms and brakes. Without a brake or recoil mechanism, a gun lurched out of position during firing and had to be re-aimed after each round. The new improvements were epitomized in the French 75-millimetre field gun; it remained motionless during firing, and it was not necessary to readjust the aim in order to bring sustained fire on a target.

See how No Man's Land between World War I trenches led to the use of chemical weapons, tanks, and warplanesHeavy fighting on what became known as “No Man's Land” spawned the first military use of airplanes, tanks, and many other deadly weapons.(more)

See all videos for this article

Machine guns and rapid-firing artillery, when used in combination with trenches and barbed-wire emplacements, gave a decided advantage to the defense, since these weapons' rapid and sustained firepower could decimate a frontal assault by either infantry or cavalry.

When was the motorized ambulance invented?Learn about the medical innovations that came from World War I.

See all videos for this article

There was a considerable disparity in 1914 between the deadly effectiveness of modern armaments and the doctrinal teachings of some armies. The South African War and the Russo-

Japanese War had revealed the futility of frontal infantry or cavalry attacks on prepared positions when unaccompanied by surprise, but few military leaders foresaw that the machine gun and the rapid-firing field gun would force armies into trenches in order to survive. Instead, war was looked upon by many leaders in 1914 as a contest of national wills, spirit, and courage. A prime example of this attitude was the French army, which was dominated by the doctrine of the offensive. French military doctrine called for headlong bayonet charges of French infantrymen against the German rifles, machine guns, and artillery. German military thinking, under the influence of Alfred, Graf von Schlieffen, sought, unlike the French, to avoid frontal assaults but rather to achieve an early decision by deep flanking attacks; and at the same time to make use of reserve divisions alongside regular formations from the outset of war. The Germans paid greater attention to training their officers in defensive tactics using machine guns, barbed wire, and fortifications.

The initial stages of the war

Initial strategies

The Schlieffen Plan of 1905 Years before 1914, successive chiefs of the German general staff had been foreseeing Germany's having to fight a war on two fronts at the same time, against Russia in the east and France in the west, whose combined strength was numerically superior to the Central Powers'. The elder Helmuth von Moltke, chief of the German general staff from 1858 to 1888, decided that Germany should stay at first on the defensive in the west and deal a crippling blow to Russia's advanced forces before turning to counterattack the French advance. His immediate successor, Alfred von Waldersee, also believed in staying on the defensive in the west. Alfred, Graf von Schlieffen, who served as chief of the German general staff from 1891 to 1905, took a contrary view, and it was the plan he developed that was to guide Germany's initial wartime strategy. but rather to achieve an early decision by deep flanking attacks; and at the same time to make use of reserve divisions alongside regular formations from the outset of war. The Germans paid greater attention to training their officers in defensive tactics using machine guns, barbed wire, and fortifications. Schlieffen realized that on the outbreak of war Russia would need six full weeks to mobilize and assemble its vast armies, given the immense Russian countryside and population, the sparsity of the rail network, and the inefficiency of the government bureaucracy. Taking advantage of this fact, Schlieffen planned to initially adopt a purely defensive posture on the Eastern Front with a minimal number of troops facing Russia's

slowly gathering armies. Germany would instead concentrate almost all of its troops in the west against France and would seek to bypass France's frontier fortifications by an offensive through neutral Belgium to the north. This offensive would sweep westward and then southward through the heart of northern France, capturing the capital and knocking that country out of the war within a few weeks. Having gained security in the west, Germany would then shift its troops to the east and destroy the Russian menace with a similar concentration of forces.

By the time of his retirement in 1905, Schlieffen had elaborated a plan for a great wheeling movement of the right (northern) wing of the German armies not only through central Belgium but also, in order to bypass the Belgian fortresses of Liège and Namur in the Meuse valley, through the southernmost part of the Netherlands. With their right wing entering France near Lille, the Germans would continue to wheel westward until they were near the English Channel; they would then turn southward so as to sever the French armies' line of retreat from France's eastern frontier to the south; and the outermost arc of the wheel would sweep southward west of Paris, in order to avoid exposing the German right flank to a counterstroke launched from the city's outskirts. If the Schlieffen Plan succeeded, Germany's armies would simultaneously encircle the French army from the north, overrun all of northeastern France, and capture Paris, thus forcing France into a humiliating surrender. The large wheeling movement that the plan envisaged required correspondingly large forces for its execution, in view of the need to keep up the numerical strength of the long-stretched marching line and the need to leave adequate detachments on guard over the Belgian fortresses that had been bypassed. Accordingly, Schlieffen allocated nearly seven-eighths of Germany's available troop strength to the execution of the wheeling movement by the right and centre wings, leaving only one-eighth to face a possible French offensive on Germany's western frontier. Thus, the maximum of strength was allocated to the wheel's edge—that is, to the right. Schlieffen's plan was observed by the younger Helmuth von Moltke, who became chief of the general staff in 1906. Moltke was still in office when war broke out in 1914.

Eastern Front strategy, 1914

Russian Poland, the westernmost part of the Russian Empire, was a thick tongue of land enclosed to the north by East Prussia, to the west by German Poland (Poznanian) and by Silesia, and to the south by Austrian Poland (Galicia). It was thus obviously exposed to a two-pronged invasion by the Central Powers, but the Germans, apart from their grand strategy of crushing

France before attempting anything against Russia, took note of the poverty of Russian Poland's transportation network and so were disinclined to overrun that vulnerable area prematurely. Austria-Hungary, however, whose frontier with Russia lay much farther east than Germany's and who was moreover afraid of disaffection among the Slav minorities, urged some immediate action to forestall a Russian offensive. Moltke therefore agreed to the Austrian general staff's suggestion for a northeastward thrust by the Austrian army into Russian Poland—the more readily because it would occupy the Russians during the crisis in France.

The Russians, for their part, would have preferred to concentrate their immediately available forces against Austria and to leave Germany undisturbed until their mobilization should have been completed. The French were anxious to relieve the German pressure against themselves, however, and so they persuaded the Russians to undertake an offensive involving two armies against the Germans in East Prussia simultaneously with one involving four armies against the Austrians in Galicia. The Russian army, whose proverbial slowness and unwieldy organization dictated a cautious strategy, thus undertook an extra offensive against East Prussia that only an army of high mobility and tight organization could have hoped to execute successfully.

The strategy of the Western Allies, 1914

The war in the west, 1914

The German invasion World War I; German sailors German sailors marching through the streets of Brussels, 1914.

For the smooth working of their plan for the invasion of France, the Germans had preliminarily to reduce the ring fortress of Liège, which commanded the route prescribed for their 1st and 2nd armies and which was the foremost stronghold of the Belgian defenses. German troops crossed the frontier into Belgium on the morning of August 4. Thanks to the resolution of a middle-aged staff officer, Erich Ludendorff, a German brigade occupied the town of Liège itself in the night of August 5–6 and the citadel on August 7, but the surrounding forts held out stubbornly until the Germans brought their heavy howitzers into action against them on August 12. These 420-millimetre siege guns proved too formidable for the forts, which one by one succumbed. The vanguard of the German invasion was already pressing the Belgian field army between the Gete River and Brussels, when the last of the Liège forts fell on August 16. The Belgians then withdrew northward to the entrenched camp of Antwerp. On August 20 the

German 1st Army entered Brussels while the 2nd Army appeared before Namur, the one remaining fortress barring the Meuse route into France.

The initial clashes between the French and German armies along the Franco-German and Franco-Belgian frontiers are collectively known as the Battle of the Frontiers. This group of engagements, which lasted from August 14 until the beginning of the First Battle of the Marne on September 6, was to be the largest battle of the war and was perhaps the largest battle in human history up to that time, given the fact that a total of more than two million troops were involved.

The planned French thrust into Lorraine, totaling 19 divisions, started on August 14 but was shattered by the German 6th and 7th armies in the Battle of Morhange-Sarrebourg (August 20–22). Yet this abortive French offensive had an indirect effect on the German plan. For when the French attack in Lorraine developed, Moltke was tempted momentarily to postpone the right-wing sweep and instead to seek a victory in Lorraine. This fleeting impulse led him to divert to Lorraine the six newly formed Ersatz divisions that had been intended to increase the weight of his right wing. This was the first of several impromptu decisions by Moltke that were to fatally impair the execution of the Schlieffen Plan.

Meanwhile, the German imperial princes who commanded armies on the Germans' left (southern) wing in Lorraine were proving unwilling to forfeit their opportunity for personal glory. Crown Prince Rupert of Bavaria on August 20 ordered his 6th Army to counterattack instead of continuing to fall back before the French advance as planned, and Crown Prince William of Germany ordered his 5th Army to do the same. The strategic result of these unplanned German offensives was merely to throw the French back onto a fortified barrier that both restored and augmented their power of resistance. Thus, the French were soon afterward enabled to dispatch troops to reinforce their left flank—a redistribution of strength that was to have far-reaching results in the decisive Battle of the Marne. Learn how the Triple Entente and Triple Alliance evolved into the Allies and Central Powers in World War I Europeans were fighting heavily on two fronts before the U.S. entered the war in 1917.(more)

See all videos for this article

While this seesaw campaign in Lorraine was taking place, more decisive events were occurring to the northwest. The German attack on Liège had awakened Joffre to the reality of a German advance through Belgium, but not to its strength or to the wideness of its sweep. In

preparing a counterattack against the German advance through Belgium, Joffre envisaged a pincer movement, with the French 3rd and 4th armies on the right and the 5th, supported by the BEF, on the left, to trap the Germans in the Meuse–Ardennes area south of Liège. The fundamental flaw in this new French plan was that the Germans had deployed about 50 percent more troops than the French had estimated, and for a vaster enveloping movement. Consequently, while the right-hand claw of the French pincer (23 divisions) collided with the German 5th and 4th armies (20 divisions) in the Ardennes and was thrown back, the left-hand claw (13 French and four British divisions) found itself nearly trapped between the German 1st and 2nd armies, with a total of 30 divisions, on the one hand, and the 3rd, on the other. As the French 5th Army, under General Charles Lanrezac, was checked in its offensive south of the Sambre River by a German attack on August 21, the British, who reached Mons on August 22, at first agreed to stand there to cover Lanrezac's left; but on August 23 news of the fall of Namur and of the German 3rd Army's presence near Dinant induced Lanrezac to wisely order a general retreat; and on August 24 the British began their retreat from Mons, just in time to escape envelopment by the German 1st Army's westward march around their unprotected left flank.

At last Joffre realized the truth and the utter collapse of Plan XVII. Resolution was his greatest asset, and with imperturbable coolness he formed a new plan out of the wreckage. Joffre decided to swing the Allied centre and left back southwestward from the Belgian frontier to a line pivoted on the French fortress of Verdun and at the same time to withdraw some strength from the right wing so as to be able to station a newly created 6th Army on the extreme left, north of Paris. This plan might, in turn, have collapsed if the Germans had not themselves departed from Schlieffen's original plan due to a combination of Moltke's indecisiveness, poor communications between his headquarters and the field army commanders of the German right wing, and Moltke's resulting confusion about the developing tactical situation. In the first place, the German right wing was weakened by the subtraction of 11 divisions; four were detached to watch Antwerp and to invest French fortresses near the Belgian frontier, instead of using reserve and Ersatz troops for this as earlier intended, and seven more regular divisions were transferred to check the Russian advance into East Prussia (see below). In the second place, Alexander von Kluck, in command of the 1st Army, did in fact wheel inward north of Paris rather than southwest of the city.

Kluck's change of direction meant the inevitable abandonment of the original wide sweep around the far (western) side of Paris. Now the flank of this wheeling German line would pass the near side of Paris and across the face of the Paris defenses into the valley of the Marne River. The premature inward wheel of Kluck's 1st Army before Paris had been reached thus exposed the German extreme right wing to a flank attack and a possible counter-envelopment. On September 4 Moltke decided to abandon the original Schlieffen Plan and substituted a new one: the German 4th and 5th armies should drive southeastward from the Ardennes into French Lorraine west of Verdun and then converge with the southwestward advance of the 6th and 7th armies from Alsace against the Toul-Épinal line of fortifications, so as to envelop the whole French right wing; the 1st and 2nd armies, in the Marne valley, should stand guard, meanwhile, against any French countermove from the vicinity of Paris. But such an Allied countermove had already begun before the new German plan could be put into effect.

The First Battle of the Marne

Already on September 3, General J.-S. Gallieni, the military governor of Paris, had guessed the significance of the German 1st Army's swing inward to the Marne east of Paris. On September 4 Joffre, convinced by Gallieni's arguments, decisively ordered his whole left wing to turn about from their retreat and to begin a general offensive against the Germans' exposed right flank on September 6. The French 6th Army, under M.-J. Maunoury, forewarned by Gallieni, had actually begun attacking on September 5, and its pressure caused Kluck finally to engage the whole 1st Army in support of his right flank when he was still no farther up the Marne valley than Meaux, with nothing but a cavalry screen stretched across the 30 miles between him and Karl von Bülow's 2nd Army (at Montmirail). While the French 5th Army was turning to attack Bülow, the BEF (between the 5th and the 6th armies) was still continuing its retreat for another day, but on September 9 Bülow learned that the British too had turned and were advancing into the gap between him and Kluck. He therefore ordered the 2nd Army to retreat, thus obliging Kluck to do likewise with the 1st. The counterattack of the French 5th and 6th armies and the BEF developed into a general counterattack by the entire left and centre of the French army. This counterattack is known as the First Battle of the Marne. By September 11 the German retreat extended to all the German armies.

There were several reasons for this extraordinary turn of events. Chief among them was the utter exhaustion of the German soldiery of the right wing, some of whom had marched more

than 150 miles (240 kilometres) under conditions of frequent battle. Their fatigue was ultimately a by-product of the Schlieffen Plan itself, for while the retreating French had been able to move troops by rail to various points within the circle formed by the front, the German troops had found their advance hampered by demolished bridges and destroyed rail lines. Their food and ammunition supply was consequently restricted, and the troops also had to make their advance by foot. Moreover, the Germans had underestimated the resilient spirit of the French troops, who had maintained their courage and morale and their confidence in their commanders. This fact was strikingly evidenced by the comparatively small number of prisoners taken by the Germans in the course of what was undeniably a precipitous French retreat.

Meanwhile, the assault by the German 6th and 7th armies on the defenses of the French eastern frontier had already proved a predictably expensive failure, and the German attempt at a partial envelopment pivoted on Verdun was abandoned. The German right wing withdrew northward from the Marne and made a firm stand along the Lower Aisne River and the Chemin des Dames ridge. Along the Aisne the preponderant power of the defense over the offense was reemphasized as the Germans repelled successive Allied attacks from the shelter of trenches. The First Battle of the Aisne marked the real beginning of trench warfare on the Western Front. Both sides were in the process of discovering that, in lieu of frontal assaults for which neither had the manpower readily available, the only alternative was to try to overlap and envelop the other's flank, in this case the one on the side pointing toward the North Sea and the English Channel. Thus began the "Race to the Sea," in which the developing trench networks of both sides were quickly extended northwestward until they reached the Atlantic at a point just inside coastal Belgium, west of Ostend.

The First Battle of the Marne succeeded in pushing the Germans back for a distance of 40 to 50 miles and thus saved the capital city of Paris from capture. In this respect it was a great strategic victory, since it enabled the French to renew their confidence and to continue the war. But the great German offensive, though unsuccessful in its object of knocking France out of the war, had enabled the Germans to capture a large portion of northeastern France. The loss of this heavily industrialized region, which contained much of the country's coal, iron, and steel production, was a serious blow to the continuation of the French war effort.

The Belgian army, meanwhile, had fallen back to the fortress city of Antwerp, which ended up behind the German lines. The Germans began a heavy bombardment of Antwerp on September 28, and Antwerp surrendered to the Germans on October 10.

After the failure of his first two attempts to turn the Germans' western flank (one on the Somme, the other near Arras), Joffre obstinately decided to try again yet farther north with the BEF—which in any case was being moved northward from the Aisne. The BEF, accordingly, was deployed between La Bassée and Ypres, while on the left the Belgians—who had wisely declined to participate in the projected attack—continued the front along the Yser down to the Channel. Erich von Falkenhayn, however, who on September 14 had succeeded Moltke as chief of the German general staff, had foreseen what was coming and had prepared a counterplan: one of his armies, transferred from Lorraine, was to check the expected offensive, while another was to sweep down the coast and crush the attackers' left flank. The British attack was launched from Ypres on October 19, the German thrust the next day. Though the Belgians of the Yser had been under increasing pressure for two days already, both Sir John French and Ferdinand Foch, Joffre's deputy in the north, were slow to appreciate what was happening to their "offensive," but in the night of October 29–30 the Belgians had to open the sluices on the Yser River to save themselves by flooding the Germans' path down the coast. The Battle of Ypres had its worst crises on October 31 and November 11 and did not die down into trench warfare until November 22.

By the end of 1914 the casualties the French had so far sustained in the war totaled about 380,000 killed and 600,000 wounded; the Germans had lost a slightly smaller number. With the repulse of the German attempt to break through at the Battle of Ypres, the strained and exhausted armies of both sides settled down into trench warfare. The trench barrier was consolidated from the Swiss frontier to the Atlantic; the power of modern defense had triumphed over the attack, and stalemate ensued. The military history of the Western Front during the next three years was to be a story of the Allies' attempts to break this deadlock.

The Eastern and other fronts, 1914

The war in the east, 1914

On the Eastern Front, greater distances and quite considerable differences between the equipment and quality of the opposing armies ensured a fluidity of the front that was lacking in

the west. Trench lines might form, but to break them was not difficult, particularly for the German army, and then mobile operations of the old style could be undertaken.

Urged by the French to take offensive action against the Germans, the Russian commander in chief, Grand Duke Nicholas, took it loyally but prematurely, before the cumbersome Russian war machine was ready, by launching a pincer movement against East Prussia. Under the higher control of General Ya.G. Zhilinsky, two armies, the 1st, or Vilna, Army under P.K. Rennenkampf and the 2nd, or Warsaw, Army under A.V. Samsonov, were to converge, with a two-to-one superiority in numbers, on the German 8th Army in East Prussia from the east and the south, respectively. Rennenkampf's left flank would be separated by 50 miles from Samsonov's right flank.

Max von Prittwitz und Gaffron, commander of the 8th Army, with his headquarters at Neidenburg (Nidzica), had seven divisions and one cavalry division on his eastern front but only the three divisions of Friedrich von Scholtz's XX Corps on his southern. He was therefore dismayed to learn, on August 20, when the bulk of his forces had been repulsed at Gumbinnen (August 19–20) by Rennenkampf's attack from the east, that Samsonov's 13 divisions had crossed the southern frontier of East Prussia and were thus threatening his rear. He initially considered a general retreat, but when his staff objected to this, he approved their counterproposal of an attack on Samsonov's left flank, for which purpose three divisions were to be switched in haste by rail from the Gumbinnen front to reinforce Scholtz (the rest of the Gumbinnen troops could make their retreat by road). The principal exponent of this counterproposal was Lieutenant Colonel Max Hoffmann. Prittwitz, having moved his headquarters northward to Mühlhausen (Młynary), was surprised on August 22 by a telegram announcing that General Paul von Hindenburg, with Ludendorff as his chief of staff, was coming to supersede him in command. Arriving the next day, Ludendorff readily confirmed Hoffmann's dispositions for the blow at Samsonov's left.

Meanwhile, Zhilinsky was not only giving Rennenkampf time to reorganize after Gumbinnen but even instructing him to invest Königsberg instead of pressing on to the west. When the Germans on August 25 learned from an intercepted Russian wireless message (the Russians habitually transmitted combat directives "in clear," not in code) that Rennenkampf was in no hurry to advance, Ludendorff saw a new opportunity. Developing the plan put forward by Hoffmann, Ludendorff concentrated about six divisions against Samsonov's left wing. This

force, inferior in strength, could not have been decisive, but Ludendorff then took the calculated risk of withdrawing the rest of the German troops, except for a cavalry screen, from their confrontation with Rennenkampf and rushing them southwestward against Samsonov's right wing. Thus, August von Mackensen's XVII Corps was taken from near Gumbinnen and moved southward to duplicate the planned German attack on Samsonov's left with an attack on his right, thus completely enveloping the Russian 2nd Army. This daring move was made possible by the notable absence of communication between the two Russian field commanders, whom Hoffmann knew to personally dislike each other. Under the Germans' converging blows Samsonov's flanks were crushed and his centre surrounded during August 26–31. The outcome of this military masterpiece, called the Battle of Tannenberg, was the destruction or capture of almost the whole of Samsonov's army. The history of imperial Russia's unfortunate participation in World War I is epitomized in the ignominious outcome of the Battle of Tannenberg.

The progress of the battle was as follows. Samsonov, his forces spread out along a front 60 miles long, was gradually pushing Scholtz back toward the Allenstein–Osterode (Olsztyn–Ostróda) line when, on August 26, Ludendorff ordered General Hermann von François, with the I Corps on Scholtz's right, to attack Samsonov's left wing near Usdau (Uzdowo). There, on August 27, German artillery bombardments threw the hungry and weary Russians into precipitate flight. François started to pursue them toward Neidenburg, in the rear of the Russian centre, and then made a momentary diversion southward, to check a Russian counterattack from Soldau (Działdowo). Two of the Russian 2nd Army's six army corps managed to escape southeastward at this point, and François then resumed his pursuit to the east. By nightfall on August 29 his troops were in control of the road leading from Neidenburg eastward to Willenberg (Wielbark). The Russian centre, amounting to three army corps, was now caught in the maze of forest between Allenstein and the frontier of Russian Poland. It had no line of retreat, was surrounded by the Germans, and soon dissolved into mobs of hungry and exhausted men who beat feebly against the encircling German ring and then allowed themselves to be taken prisoner by the thousands. Samsonov shot himself in despair on August 29. By the end of August the Germans had taken 92,000 prisoners and annihilated half of the Russian 2nd Army. Ludendorff's bold recall of the last German forces facing Rennenkampf's army was wholly justified in the event, since Rennenkampf remained utterly passive while Samsonov's army was surrounded.

Having received two fresh army corps (seven divisions) from the Western Front, the Germans now turned on the slowly advancing 1st Army under Rennenkampf. The latter was attacked on a line extending from east of Königsberg to the southern end of the chain of the Masurian Lakes during September 1–15 and was driven from East Prussia. As a result of these East Prussian battles Russia had lost about 250,000 men and, what could be afforded still less, much war matériel. But the invasion of East Prussia had at least helped to make possible the French comeback on the Marne by causing the dispatch of two German army corps from the Western Front.

Having ended the Russian threat to East Prussia, the Germans could afford to switch the bulk of their forces from that area to the Częstochowa–Kraków front in southwestern Poland, where the Austrian offensive, launched on August 20, had been rolled back by Russian counterattacks. A new plan for simultaneous thrusts by the Germans toward Warsaw and by the Austrians toward Przemyśl was brought to nothing by the end of October, as the Russians could now mount counterattacks in overwhelming strength, their mobilization being at last nearly completed. The Russians then mounted a powerful effort to invade Prussian Silesia with a huge phalanx of seven armies. Allied hopes rose high as the much-heralded “Russian steamroller” (as the huge Russian army was called) began its ponderous advance. The Russian armies were advancing toward Silesia when Hindenburg and Ludendorff, in November, exploited the superiority of the German railway network: when the retreating German forces had crossed the frontier back into Prussian Silesia, they were promptly moved northward into Prussian Poland and thence sent southeastward to drive a wedge between the two armies of the Russian right flank. The massive Russian operation against Silesia was disorganized, and within a week four new German army corps had arrived from the Western Front. Ludendorff was able to use them to press the Russians back by mid-December to the Bzura–Rawka (rivers) line in front of Warsaw, and the depletion of their munition supplies compelled the Russians to also fall back in Galicia to trench lines along the Nida and Dunajec rivers.

The Serbian campaign, 1914

The first Austrian invasion of Serbia was launched with numerical inferiority (part of one of the armies originally destined for the Balkan front having been diverted to the Eastern Front on August 18), and the able Serbian commander, Radomir Putnik, brought the invasion to an early end by his victories on the Cer Mountain (August 15–20) and at Šabac (August 21–24). In

early September, however, Putnik's subsequent northward offensive on the Sava River, in the north, had to be broken off when the Austrians began a second offensive, against the Serbs' western front on the Drina River. After some weeks of deadlock, the Austrians began a third offensive, which had some success in the Battle of the Kolubara, and forced the Serbs to evacuate Belgrade on November 30, but by December 15 a Serbian counterattack had retaken Belgrade and forced the Austrians to retreat. Mud and exhaustion kept the Serbs from turning the Austrian retreat into a rout, but the victory sufficed to allow Serbia a long spell of freedom from further Austrian advances.

The Turkish entry

The entry of Turkey (or the Ottoman Empire, as it was then called) into the war as a German ally was the one great success of German wartime diplomacy. Since 1909 Turkey had been under the control of the Young Turks, over whom Germany had skillfully gained a dominating influence. German military instructors permeated the Turkish army, and Enver Paşa, the leader of the Young Turks, saw alliance with Germany as the best way of serving Turkey's interests, in particular for protection against the Russian threat to the straits. He therefore persuaded the grand vizier, Said Halim Paşa, to make a secret treaty (negotiated late in July, signed on August 2) pledging Turkey to the German side if Germany should have to take Austria-Hungary's side against Russia. The unforeseen entry of Great Britain into the war against Germany alarmed the Turks, but the timely arrival of two German warships, the Goeben and the Breslau, in the Dardanelles on August 10 turned the scales in favour of Enver's policy. The ships were ostensibly sold to Turkey, but they retained their German crews. The Turks began detaining British ships, and more anti-British provocations followed, both in the straits and on the Egyptian frontier. Finally the Goeben led the Turkish fleet across the Black Sea to bombard Odessa and other Russian ports (October 29–30). Russia declared war against Turkey on November 1; and the western Allies, after an ineffective bombardment of the outer forts of the Dardanelles on November 3, declared war likewise on November 5. A British force from India occupied Basra, on the Persian Gulf, on November 21. In the winter of 1914–15 Turkish offensives in the Caucasus and in the Sinai Desert, albeit abortive, served German strategy well by tying Russian and British forces down in those peripheral areas.

The war at sea, 1914–15

World War I; Royal Navy Assembly of the Royal Navy at Spithead for fleet review, July 1914. World War I: torpedo boat German torpedo boats assembled at port during World War I. In August 1914 Great Britain, with 29 capital ships ready and 13 under construction, and Germany, with 18 and nine, were the two great rival sea powers. Neither of them at first wanted a direct confrontation: the British were chiefly concerned with the protection of their trade routes; the Germans hoped that mines and submarine attacks would gradually destroy Great Britain's numerical superiority, so that confrontation could eventually take place on equal terms.

The first significant encounter between the two navies was that of the Helgoland Bight, on August 28, 1914, when a British force under Admiral Sir David Beatty, having entered German home waters, sank or damaged several German light cruisers and killed or captured 1,000 men at a cost of one British ship damaged and 35 deaths. For the following months the Germans in European or British waters confined themselves to submarine warfare—not without some notable successes: on September 22 a single German submarine, or U-boat, sank three British cruisers within an hour; on October 7 a U-boat made its way into the anchorage of Loch Ewe, on the west coast of Scotland; on October 15 the British cruiser Hawke was torpedoed; and on October 27 the British battleship Audacious was sunk by a mine.

On December 15 battle cruisers of the German High Seas Fleet set off on a sortie across the North Sea, under the command of Admiral Franz von Hipper: they bombarded several British towns and then made their way home safely. Hipper's next sortie, however, was intercepted on its way out: on January 24, 1915, in the Battle of the Dogger Bank, the German cruiser Blücher was sunk and two other cruisers damaged before the Germans could make their escape.

Abroad on the high seas, the Germans' most powerful surface force was the East Asiatic squadron of fast cruisers, including the Scharnhorst, the Gneisenau, and the Nürnberg, under Admiral Graf Maximilian von Spee. For four months this fleet ranged almost unhindered over the Pacific Ocean, while the Emden, having joined the squadron in August 1914, was detached for service in the Indian Ocean. The Germans could thus threaten not only merchant shipping on the British trade routes but also troopships on their way to Europe or the Middle East from India, New Zealand, or Australia. The Emden sank merchant ships in the Bay of Bengal, bombarded Madras (September 22; now Chennai, India), haunted the approaches to Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and had destroyed 15 Allied ships in all before it was caught and sunk off the Cocos Islands on November 9 by the Australian cruiser Sydney.

Meanwhile, Admiral von Spee's main squadron since August had been threading a devious course in the Pacific from the Caroline Islands toward the Chilean coast and had been joined by two more cruisers, the Leipzig and the Dresden. On November 1, in the Battle of Coronel, it inflicted a sensational defeat on a British force, under Sir Christopher Cradock, which had sailed from the Atlantic to hunt it down: without losing a single ship, it sank Cradock's two major cruisers, Cradock himself being killed. But the fortunes of the war on the high seas were reversed when, on December 8, the German squadron attacked the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands in the South Atlantic, probably unaware of the naval strength that the British, since Coronel, had been concentrating there under Admiral Sir Doveton Sturdee: two battle cruisers (the Invincible and Inflexible, each equipped with eight 12-inch guns) and six other cruisers. The German ships were suffering from wear and tear after their long cruise in the Pacific and were no match for the newer, faster British ships, which soon overtook them. The Scharnhorst, with Admiral von Spee aboard, was the first ship to be sunk, then the Gneisenau, followed by the Nürnberg and the Leipzig. The British ships, which had fought at long range so as to render useless the smaller guns of the Germans, sustained only 25 casualties in this engagement. When the German light cruiser Dresden was caught and sunk off the Juan Fernández Islands on March 14, 1915, commerce raiding by German surface ships on the high seas was at an end. It was just beginning by German submarines, however.

The belligerent navies were employed as much in interfering with commerce as in fighting each other. Immediately after the outbreak of war, the British had instituted an economic blockade of Germany, with the aim of preventing all supplies reaching that country from the outside world. The two routes by which supplies could reach German ports were: (1) through the English Channel and the Strait of Dover and (2) around the north of Scotland. A minefield laid in the Strait of Dover with a narrow free lane made it fairly easy to intercept and search ships using the Channel. To the north of Scotland, however, there was an area of more than 200,000 square miles (520,000 square kilometres) to be patrolled, and the task was assigned to a squadron of armed merchant cruisers. During the early months of the war, only absolute contraband such as guns and ammunition was restricted, but the list was gradually extended to include almost all material that might be of use to the enemy.

The prevention of the free passage of trading ships led to considerable difficulties among the neutral nations, particularly with the United States, whose trading interests were hampered by

British policy. Nevertheless, the British blockade was extremely effective, and during 1915 the British patrols stopped and inspected more than 3,000 vessels, of which 743 were sent into port for examination. Outward-bound trade from Germany was brought to a complete standstill.

The Germans similarly sought to attack Great Britain's economy with a campaign against its supply lines of merchant shipping. In 1915, however, with their surface commerce raiders eliminated from the conflict, they were forced to rely entirely on the submarine.

The Germans began their submarine campaign against commerce by sinking a British merchant steamship (Glitra), after evacuating the crew, on October 20, 1914. A number of other sinkings followed, and the Germans soon became convinced that the submarine would be able to bring the British to an early peace where the commerce raiders on the high seas had failed. On January 30, 1915, Germany carried the campaign a stage further by torpedoing three British steamers (Tokomaru, Ikaria, and Oriole) without warning. They next announced, on February 4, that from February 18 they would treat the waters around the British Isles as a war zone in which all Allied merchant ships were to be destroyed, and in which no ship, whether enemy or not, would be immune.

Yet, whereas the Allied blockade was preventing almost all trade for Germany from reaching that nation's ports, the German submarine campaign yielded less satisfactory results. During the first week of the campaign seven Allied or Allied-bound ships were sunk out of 11 attacked, but 1,370 others sailed without being harassed by the German submarines. In the whole of March 1915, during which 6,000 sailings were recorded, only 21 ships were sunk, and in April only 23 ships from a similar number. Apart from its lack of positive success, the U-boat arm was continuously harried by Great Britain's extensive antisubmarine measures, which included nets, specially armed merchant ships, hydrophones for locating the noise of a submarine's engines, and depth bombs for destroying it underwater.

For the Germans, a worse result than any of the British countermeasures imposed on them was the long-term growth of hostility on the part of the neutral countries. Certainly the neutrals were far from happy with the British blockade, but the German declaration of the war zone and subsequent events turned them progressively away from their attitude of sympathy for Germany. The hardening of their outlook began in February 1915, when the Norwegian steamship Belridge, carrying oil from New Orleans to Amsterdam, was torpedoed and sunk in the English Channel. The Germans continued to sink neutral ships occasionally, and undecided

countries soon began to adopt a hostile outlook toward this activity when the safety of their own shipping was threatened. Sinking of the LusitaniaThe New York Herald reporting the sinking of the Lusitania, a British ocean liner, by a German submarine on May 7, 1915.(more)

Much more serious was an action that confirmed the inability of the German command to perceive that a minor tactical success could constitute a strategic blunder of the most extreme magnitude. This was the sinking by a German submarine on May 7, 1915, of the British liner Lusitania, which was on its way from New York to Liverpool: though the ship was in fact carrying 173 tons of ammunition, it had nearly 2,000 civilian passengers, and the 1,198 people who were drowned included 128 U.S. citizens. The loss of the liner and so many of its passengers, including the Americans, aroused a wave of indignation in the United States, and it was fully expected that a declaration of war might follow. But the U.S. government clung to its policy of neutrality and contented itself with sending several notes of protest to Germany. Despite this, the Germans persisted in their intention and, on August 17, sank the Arabic, which also had U.S. and other neutral passengers. Following a new U.S. protest, the Germans undertook to ensure the safety of passengers before sinking liners henceforth; but only after the torpedoing of yet another liner, the Hesperia, did Germany, on September 18, decide to suspend its submarine campaign in the English Channel and west of the British Isles, for fear of provoking the United States further. The German civilian statesmen had temporarily prevailed over the naval high command, which advocated “unrestricted” submarine warfare.

The loss of the German colonies

Germany’s overseas colonies, virtually without hope of reinforcement from Europe, defended themselves with varying degrees of success against Allied attack.

Togoland was conquered by British forces from the Gold Coast (now Ghana) and by French forces from Dahomey (now Benin) in the first month of the war. In the Cameroons (German: Kamerun), invaded by Allied forces from the south, the east, and the northwest in August 1914 and attacked from the sea in the west, the Germans put up a more effective resistance, and the last German stronghold there, Mora, held out until February 18, 1916.

Operations by South African forces in huge numerical superiority were launched against German South West Africa (Namibia) in September 1914 but were held up by the pro-German rebellion of certain South African officers who had fought against the British in the South

African War of 1899–1902. The rebellion died out in February 1915, but the Germans in South West Africa nevertheless did not capitulate until July 9.

In Jiaozhou (Kiaochow) Bay a small German enclave on the Chinese coast, the port of Qingdao (Tsingtao) was the object of Japanese attack from September 1914. With some help from British troops and from Allied warships, the Japanese captured it on November 7. In October, meanwhile, the Japanese had occupied the Marianas, the Caroline Islands, and the Marshalls in the North Pacific, these islands being defenseless since the departure of Admiral von Spee's naval squadron.

In the South Pacific, Western Samoa (now Samoa) fell without blood at the end of August 1914 to a New Zealand force supported by Australian, British, and French warships. In September an Australian invasion of Neu-Pommern (New Britain) won the surrender of the whole colony of German New Guinea within a few weeks.

The story of German East Africa (comprising present-day Rwanda, Burundi, and continental Tanzania) was very different, thanks to the quality of the local askaris (European-trained African troops) and to the military genius of the German commander Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck. A landing of troops from India was repelled with ignominy by the Germans in November 1914. A massive invasion from the north, comprising British and colonial troops under the South African J.C. Smuts, was launched in February 1916, to be coordinated with a Belgian invasion from the west and with an independent British one from Nyasaland in the south, but, though Dar es Salaam fell to Smuts and Tabora to the Belgians in September, Lettow-Vorbeck maintained his small force in being. In November 1917 he began to move southward across Portuguese East Africa (Germany had declared war on Portugal in March 1916), and, after crossing back into German East Africa in September 1918, he turned southwestward to invade Northern Rhodesia in October. Having taken Kasama on November 9 (two days before the German armistice in Europe), he finally surrendered on November 25. With some 12,000 men at the outset, he eventually tied down 130,000 or more Allied troops.

The years of stalemate

Rival strategies and the Dardanelles campaign, 1915–16

By late 1914 the state of deadlock on the Western Front had become clear to the governments of the warring countries and even to many members of their general staffs. Each side sought a solution to this deadlock, and the solutions varied in form and manner.

Erich von Falkenhayn had succeeded the dispirited Moltke as chief of the German general staff in September 1914. By the end of 1914 Falkenhayn seems to have concluded that although the final decision would be reached in the West, Germany had no immediate prospect of success there, and that the only practicable theatre of operations in the near future was the Eastern Front, however inconclusive those operations might be. Falkenhayn was convinced of the strength of the Allied trench barrier in France, so he took the momentous decision to stand on the defensive in the West.

Falkenhayn saw that a long war was now inevitable and set to work to develop Germany's resources for such a warfare of attrition. Thus, the technique of field entrenchment was carried to a higher pitch by the Germans than by any other country; Germany's military railways were expanded for the lateral movement of reserves; and the problem of the supply of munitions and of the raw materials for their manufacture was tackled so energetically and comprehensively that an ample flow was ensured from the spring of 1915 onward—a time when the British were only awakening to the problem. Here were laid the foundations of that economic organization and utilization of resources that was to be the secret of Germany's power to resist the pressure of the British blockade.

The western Allies were divided into two camps about strategy. Joffre and most of the French general staff, backed by the British field marshal Sir John French, argued for continuing assaults on the Germans' entrenched line in France, despite the continued attrition of French forces that this strategy entailed. Apart from this, the French high command was singularly lacking in ideas to break the deadlock of trench warfare. While desire to hold on to territorial gains governed the German strategy, the desire to recover lost territory dominated the French. British-inspired solutions to the deadlock crystallized into two main groups, one tactical, the other strategical. The first was to unlock the trench barrier by inventing a machine that would be invulnerable to machine guns and capable of crossing trenches and would thus restore the tactical balance upset by the new preponderance of defensive over offensive power. Such a machine had long been contemplated, and the early years of the 20th century saw the first attempts at a practical armoured fighting vehicle. British efforts were nourished and tended in infancy by Winston Churchill, then first lord of the Admiralty, and ultimately, after months of experiment hampered by official opposition, came to maturity in 1916 in the weapon known as the tank. Some of the British strategists, on the other hand, argued that instead of seeking a breakthrough on the

Germans' impregnable Western Front, the Allies should turn the whole position of the Central Powers either by an offensive through the Balkans or even by a landing on Germany's Baltic coast. Joffre and his supporters won the argument, and the Balkan projects were relinquished in favour of a concentration of effort on the Western Front. But misgivings were not silenced, and a situation arose that revived the Middle Eastern scheme in a new if attenuated form. Know about the disastrous Gallipoli Campaign and the role of ANZAC troops in the battles of World War I. An overview of the 1915–16 Gallipoli Campaign of World War I, with a focus on ANZAC troops.(more)

See all videos for this article

World War I: Allied troops on the Gallipoli Peninsula. Allied troops lining the shore at "ANZAC Cove" on the Gallipoli Peninsula. The cove was named after the ANZAC (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) troops that were part of the Allied forces. The Dardanelles Campaign against the Turks was a bloody defeat for the Allies.(more)

Early in January 1915 the Russians, threatened by the Turks in the Caucasus, appealed to the British for some relieving action against Turkey. The British, after acrimonious argument among themselves, decided in favour of "a naval expedition in February to bombard and take the Gallipoli Peninsula (the western shore of the Dardanelles), with Constantinople as its objective." Though subsequently it was agreed that army troops might be provided to hold the shores if the fleet forced the Straits, the naval attack began on February 19 without army support. When at last Sir Ian Hamilton's troops from Egypt began to land on the Turkish shores, on April 25, the Turks and their German commander, Otto Liman von Sanders, had had ample time to prepare adequate fortifications, and the defending armies were now six times as large as when the campaign opened. Listen to a Turkish perspective on the Gallipoli Campaign, known to Turkish people as the Battle of Çanakkale, 1915–16. A Turkish perspective on the Gallipoli Campaign (1915–16), widely known among Turks as the Battle of Çanakkale.(more)

See all videos for this article

Against resolute opposition from the local Turkish commander (Mustafa Kemal, the future Atatürk), Australian and New Zealand troops won a bridgehead at "Anzac Cove," north of Kaba Tepe, on the Aegean side of the peninsula, with some 20,000 men landing in the first two days. The British, meanwhile, tried to land at five points around Cape Helles but established footholds only at three of them and then asked for reinforcements. Thereafter little progress was

made, and the Turks took advantage of the British halt to bring into the peninsula as many troops as possible. The standstill of the enterprise led to a political crisis in London between Churchill, the Liberal government's first lord of the Admiralty, who, after earlier doubts, had made himself the foremost spokesman of the Dardanelles operation, and John, Lord Fisher, the first sea lord, who had always expressed doubts about it. Fisher demanded on May 14 that the operation be discontinued and, when he was overruled, resigned the next day. The Liberal government was replaced by a coalition, but Churchill, though relieved of his former post, remained in the War Council of the Cabinet.

Learn about the use of animals especially among the ANZAC soldiers during World War I
The use of animals during World War I, especially among ANZAC troops.(more) Gallipoli 50,000 men. For the British, Sir Douglas Haig's 1st Army, between Armentières and Lens, tried a new experiment at Neuve-Chapelle on March 10, when its artillery opened an intense bombardment on a 2,000-yard front and then, after 35 minutes, lengthened its range, so that the attacking British infantry, behind the second screen of shells, could overrun the trenches ravaged by the first. But the experiment's immediate result was merely loss of life, both because shortage of munitions made the second barrage inadequate and because there was a five-hour delay in launching the infantry assault, against which the Germans, having overcome their initial surprise, had time to rally their resistance. It was clear to the Allies that this small-scale tactical experiment had missed success only by a narrow margin and that there was scope for its development. But the Allied commands missed the true lesson, which was that a surprise attack could be successfully made immediately following a short bombardment that compensated for its brevity by its intensity. Instead, they drew the superficial deduction that mere volume of shellfire was the key to reducing a trench line prior to an assault. Not until 1917 did they revert to the Neuve-Chapelle method. It was left to the Germans to profit from the experiment. In the meantime, a French offensive in April against the Germans' Saint-Mihiel salient, southeast of Verdun, sacrificed 64,000 men to no effect.

The Germans, in accordance with Falkenhayn's strategy, remained generally on the defensive in the West. They did, however, launch an attack on the Allies' Campaign: "ANZAC Cove" British army officers in a trench at "ANZAC Cove" during the Gallipoli Campaign of World War I.(more)

In July the British began sending five more divisions to the peninsula, and a new plan was hatched. In the hope of cutting the Turks' north–south communications down the peninsula by seizing the Sari Bair heights, which commanded the Straits from the west, the British reinforced the bridgehead at “Anzac Cove” and, in the night of August 6–7, landed more troops at Suvla Bay (Anafarta Limani), farther to the north. Within a few days, both the offensive from “Anzac” and the new landing had proved ineffectual. More argument ensued in the War Council, and only late in the year was it acknowledged that the initially promising but ill-conducted enterprise should be given up. The evacuation of the troops was carried out from Suvla Bay and from “Anzac Cove” under cover of darkness in December 1915, and from the Cape Helles beaches in January 1916. The Dardanelles campaign thus came to a frustrating end. Had it succeeded it might well have ended Turkey's participation in the war. In failing, it had cost about 214,000 casualties and achieved nothing.

The Western and Eastern fronts, 1915

The Western Front, 1915

Repeated French attacks in February–March 1915 on the Germans' trench barrier in Champagne won only 500 yards (460 metres) of ground at a cost of 50,000 men. For the British, Sir Douglas Haig's 1st Army, between Armentières and Lens, tried a new experiment at Neuve-Chapelle on March 10, when its artillery opened an intense bombardment on a 2,000-yard front and then, after 35 minutes, lengthened its range, so that the attacking British infantry, behind the second screen of shells, could overrun the trenches ravaged by the first. But the experiment's immediate result was merely loss of life, both because shortage of munitions made the second barrage inadequate and because there was a five-hour delay in launching the infantry assault, against which the Germans, having overcome their initial surprise, had time to rally their resistance. It was clear to the Allies that this small-scale tactical experiment had missed success only by a narrow margin and that there was scope for its development. But the Allied commands missed the true lesson, which was that a surprise attack could be successfully made immediately following a short bombardment that compensated for its brevity by its intensity. Instead, they drew the superficial deduction that mere volume of shellfire was the key to reducing a trench line prior to an assault. Not until 1917 did they revert to the Neuve-Chapelle method. It was left to the Germans to profit from the experiment. In the meantime, a French offensive in April against the Germans' Saint-Mihiel salient, southeast of Verdun, sacrificed 64,000 men to no effect.

The Germans, in accordance with Falkenhayn's strategy, remained generally on the defensive in the West. They did, however, launch an attack on the Allies' Ypres salient (where the French had in November 1914 taken the place of the British). There, on April 22, 1915, they used chlorine gas for the first time on the Western Front, but they made the mistake of discharging it from cylinders (which were dependent on a favourable wind) rather than lobbing it onto the enemy trenches in artillery shells. The gas did throw the agonized defenders into chaotic flight; but the German high command, having been disappointed by the new weapon's performance under adverse conditions in Poland earlier in the year, had failed to provide adequate reserves to exploit its unforeseen success. By the end of a month-long battle, the Allies' front was only slightly retracted.

On May 9, meanwhile, the Allies had launched yet another premature offensive, combining a major French onslaught between Lens and Arras with two thrusts by Haig's 1st Army, from Festubert and from Fromelles, against the Aubers Ridge north of Lens. The French prolonged their effort until June 18, losing 102,000 men without securing any gain; the British, still short of shells against the Germans' mass of machine guns, had suspended their attacks three weeks earlier.

An even worse military failure was the joint offensive launched by the Allies on September 25, 1915. While 27 French divisions with 850 heavy guns attacked on a front 18 miles long in Champagne, north and east of Reims, simultaneous blows were delivered in distant Artois by 14 French divisions with 420 heavy guns on a 12-mile front south of Lens and by six British divisions with only 117 guns at Loos north of Lens. All of these attacks were disappointing failures, partly because they were preceded by prolonged bombardments that gave away any chance of surprise and allowed time for German reserves to be sent forward to close up the gaps that had been opened in the trench defenders' ranks by the artillery bombardment. At Loos the British use of chlorine gas was less effective than Haig had hoped, and his engagement of all his own available forces for his first assault came to nothing when his commander in chief, Sir John French, was too slow in sending up reserves; the French on both their fronts likewise lost, through lack of timely support, most of what they had won by their first attacks. In all, for a little ground, the Allies paid 242,000 men, against the defenders' loss of 141,000.

Having subsequently complained bitterly about Sir John French's management of operations, Haig was appointed British commander in chief in his place in December.

The Eastern Front, 1915

Russian troops; World War I Russian troops in the trenches at the East Prussian frontier. The Russians' plans for 1915 prescribed the strengthening of their flanks in the north and in Galicia before driving westward again toward Silesia. Their preparations for a blow at East Prussia's southern frontier were forestalled, as Ludendorff, striking suddenly eastward from East Prussia, enveloped four Russian divisions in the Augustów forests, east of the Masurian Lakes, in the second week of February; but in Galicia the winter's fighting culminated, on March 22, in the fall of Przemyśl to the Russians.

World War I Historical map of the Eastern Front during World War I.

For the Central Powers, the Austrian spokesman, Conrad, primarily required some action to relieve the pressure on his Galician front, and Falkenhayn was willing to help him for that purpose without departing from his own general strategy of attrition—which was already coming into conflict with Ludendorff's desire for a sustained effort toward decisive victory over Russia. The plan finally adopted, with the aim of smashing the Russian centre in the Dunajec River sector of Galicia by an attack on the 18-mile front from Gorlice to Tuchów (south of Tarnów), was conceived with tactical originality: in order to maintain the momentum of advance, no daily objectives were to be set for individual corps or divisions; instead, each should make all possible progress before the Russians could bring their reserves up, on the assumption that the rapid advance of some attacking units would contagiously promote the subsequent advance of others that had at first met more resistance. Late in April, 14 divisions, with 1,500 guns, were quietly concentrated for the stroke against the six Russian divisions present. Mackensen was in command, with Hans von Seeckt, sponsor of the new tactic of infiltration, as his chief of staff.

The Gorlice attack was launched on May 2 and achieved success beyond all expectation. Routed on the Dunajec, the Russians tried to stand on the Wisłoka, then fell back again. By May 14, Mackensen's forces were on the San, 80 miles from their starting point, and at Jarosław they even forced a crossing of that river. Strengthened with more German troops from France, Mackensen then struck again, taking Przemyśl on June 3 and Lemberg (Lvov) on June 22. The Russian front was now bisected, but Falkenhayn and Conrad had foreseen no such result and had made no preparations to exploit it promptly. Their consequent delays enabled the Russian armies to retreat without breaking up entirely.

Falkenhayn then decided to pursue a new offensive. Mackensen was instructed to veer northward, so as to catch the Russian armies in the Warsaw salient between his forces and Hindenburg's, which were to drive southeastward from East Prussia. Ludendorff disliked the plan as being too much of a frontal assault: the Russians might be squeezed by the closing-in of the two wings, but their retreat to the east would not be cut off. He once more urged his spring scheme for a wide enveloping maneuver through Kovno (Kaunas) on Vilna (Vilnius) and Minsk, in the north. Falkenhayn opposed this plan, fearing that it would mean more troops and a deeper commitment, and on July 2 the German emperor decided in favour of Falkenhayn's plan.

The results justified Ludendorff's reservations. The Russians held Mackensen at Brest-Litovsk and Hindenburg on the Narew River long enough to enable the main body of their troops to escape through the unclosed gap to the east. Though by the end of August all of Poland had been occupied and 750,000 Russians had been taken prisoner in four months of fighting, the Central Powers had missed their opportunity to break Russia's ability to carry on the war.

Too late, Falkenhayn in September allowed Ludendorff to try what he had been urging much earlier, a wider enveloping movement to the north on the Kovno–Dvinsk–Vilna triangle. The German cavalry, in fact, approached the Minsk railway, far beyond Vilna; but the Russians' power of resistance was too great for Ludendorff's slender forces, whose supplies moreover began to run out, and by the end of the month his operations were suspended. The crux of this situation was that the Russian armies had been allowed to draw back almost out of the net before the long-delayed Vilna maneuver was attempted. Meanwhile, an Austrian attack eastward from Lutsk (Luck), begun later in September and continued into October, incurred heavy losses for no advantage at all. By October 1915 the Russian retreat, after a nerve-racking series of escapes from the salients the Germans had systematically created and then sought to cut off, had come to a definite halt along a line running from the Baltic Sea just west of Riga southward to Czernowitz (Chernovtsy) on the Romanian border.

Other fronts, 1915–16

The Caucasus, 1914–16

The Caucasian front between Russia and Turkey comprised two battlegrounds: Armenia in the west, Azerbaijan in the east. While the ultimate strategic objectives for the Turks were to capture the Baku oilfields in Azerbaijan and to penetrate Central Asia and Afghanistan in order

to threaten British India, they needed first to capture the Armenian fortress of Kars, which, together with that of Ardahan, had been a Russian possession since 1878.

A Russian advance from Sarıkamış (Sarykamysh, south of Kars) toward Erzurum in Turkish Armenia in November 1914 was countered in December when the Turkish 3rd Army, under Enver himself, launched a three-pronged offensive against the Kars–Ardahan position. This offensive was catastrophically defeated in battles at Sarıkamış and at Ardahan in January 1915; but the Turks, ill-clad and ill-supplied in the Caucasian winter, lost many more men through exposure and exhaustion than in fighting (their 3rd Army was reduced in one month from 190,000 to 12,400 men, the battle casualties being 30,000). Turkish forces, which had meanwhile invaded neutral Persia's part of Azerbaijan and taken Tabriz on January 14, were expelled by a Russian counterinvasion in March.

During this campaign the Armenians had created disturbances behind the Turkish lines in support of the Russians and had threatened the already arduous Turkish communications. The Turkish government on June 11, 1915, decided to deport the Armenians. In the process of deportation, the Turkish authorities committed atrocities on a vast scale: most estimates of Armenian deaths have ranged from 600,000 to 1,500,000 for this period.

Grand Duke Nicholas, who had hitherto been commander in chief of all Russia's armies, was superseded by Emperor Nicholas himself in September 1915; the Grand Duke was then sent to command in the Caucasus. He and General N.N. Yudenich, the victor of Sarıkamış, started a major assault on Turkish Armenia in January 1916; Erzurum was taken on February 16, Trabzon on April 18, Erzincan on August 2; and a long-delayed Turkish counterattack was held at Oğnut. Stabilized to Russia's great advantage in the autumn, the new front in Armenia was thereafter affected less by Russo.

Mesopotamia, 1914–April 1916

The British occupation of Basra, Turkey's port at the head of the Persian Gulf, in November 1914 had been justifiable strategically because of the need to protect the oil wells of southern Persia and the Abadan refinery. The British advance of 46 miles northward from Basra to al-Qurnah in December and the further advance of 90 miles up the Tigris to al-‘Amārah in May–June 1915 ought to have been reckoned enough for all practical purposes, but the advance was continued in the direction of the fatally magnetic Baghdad, ancient capital of the Arab caliphs of Islām. Al-Kūt was occupied in September 1915, and the advance was pushed on until

the British, under Major General Charles Townshend, were 500 miles away from their base at Basra. They fought a profitless battle at Ctesiphon, only 18 miles from Baghdad, on November 22 but then had to retreat to al-Kūt. There, from December 7, Townshend's 10,000 men were besieged by the Turks; and there, on April 29, 1916, they surrendered themselves into captivity.

The Egyptian frontiers, 1915–July 1917

Even after the evacuation from Gallipoli, the British maintained 250,000 troops in Egypt. A major source of worry to the British was the danger of a Turkish threat from Palestine across the Sinai Desert to the Suez Canal. That danger waned, however, when the initially unpromising rebellion of the Hāshimite amir Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī against the Turks in the Hejaz was developed by the personal enterprise of an unprofessional soldier of genius, T.E. Lawrence, into a revolt infecting the whole Arabian hinterland of Palestine and Syria and threatening to sever the Turks' vital Hejaz Railway (Damascus–Amman–Ma'ān–Medina). Sir Archibald Murray's British troops at last started a massive advance in December 1916 and captured some Turkish outposts on the northeastern edge of the Sinai Desert but made a pusillanimous withdrawal from Gaza in March 1917 at the very moment when the Turks were about to surrender the place to them; the attempt the next month to retrieve the mistake was repulsed with heavy losses. In June the command was transferred from Murray to Sir Edmund Allenby. In striking contrast to Murray's performance was Lawrence's capture of Aqaba (al-'Aqabah) on July 6, 1917: his handful of Arabs got the better of 1,200 Turks there.

Italy and the Italian front, 1915–16

Great Britain, France, and Russia concluded on April 26, 1915, the secret Treaty of London with Italy, inducing the latter to discard the obligations of the Triple Alliance and to enter the war on the side of the Allies by the promise of territorial aggrandizement at Austria-Hungary's expense. Italy was offered not only the Italian-populated Trentino and Trieste but also South Tirol (to consolidate the Alpine frontier), Gorizia, Istria, and northern Dalmatia. On May 23, 1915, Italy accordingly declared war on Austria-Hungary.

The Italian commander, General Luigi Cadorna, decided to concentrate his effort on an offensive eastward from the province of Venetia across the comparatively low ground between the head of the Adriatic and the foothills of the Julian Alps; that is to say, across the lower valley of the Isonzo (Soča) River. Against the risk of an Austrian descent on his rear from the Trentino

(which bordered Venetia to the northwest) or on his left flank from the Carnic Alps (to the north), he thought that limited advances would be precaution enough.

The Italians' initial advance eastward, begun late in May 1915, was soon halted, largely because of the flooding of the Isonzo, and trench warfare set in. Cadorna, however, was determined to make progress and so embarked on a series of persistent renewals of the offensive, known as the Battles of the Isonzo. The first four of these (June 23–July 7; July 18–August 3; October 18–November 4; and November 10–December 2) achieved nothing worth the cost of 280,000 men; and the fifth (March 1916) was equally fruitless. The Austrians had shown on this front a fierce resolution that was often lacking when they faced the Russians. In mid-May 1916 Cadorna's program was interrupted by an Austrian offensive from the Trentino into the Asiago region of western Venetia. Though the danger of an Austrian breakthrough from the mountainous borderland into the Venetian plain in the rear of the Italians' Isonzo front was averted, the Italian counteroffensive in mid-June recovered only one-third of the territory overrun by the Austrians north and southwest of Asiago. The Sixth Battle of the Isonzo (August 6–17), however, did win Gorizia for the Italians. On August 28 Italy declared war on Germany. The next three months saw three more Italian offensives on the Isonzo, none of them really profitable. In the course of 1916 the Italians had sustained 500,000 casualties, twice as many as the Austrians, and were still on the Isonzo.

Serbia and the Salonika expedition, 1915–17

Austria's three attempted invasions of Serbia in 1914 had been brusquely repulsed by Serbian counterattacks. By the summer of 1915 the Central Powers were doubly concerned to close the account with Serbia, both for reasons of prestige and for the sake of establishing secure rail communications with Turkey across the Balkans. In August, Germany sent reinforcements to Austria's southern front; and, on September 6, 1915, the Central Powers concluded a treaty with Bulgaria, whom they drew to their side by the offer of territory to be taken from Serbia. The Austro-German forces attacked southward from the Danube on October 6; and the Bulgars, undeterred by a Russian ultimatum, struck at eastern Serbia on October 11 and at Serbian Macedonia on October 14.

Sarrail, Maurice Maurice Sarrail, World War I.

The western Allies, surprised in September by the prospect of a Bulgarian attack on Serbia, hastily decided to send help through neutral Greece's Macedonian port of Salonika,

relying on the collusion of Greece's pro-Entente prime minister, Eleuthérios Venizélos. Troops from Gallipoli, under the French general Maurice Sarrail, reached Salonika on October 5, but on that day Venizélos fell from power.

Mabel St. Clair Stobart Mabel St. Clair Stobart (left), founder of the Women's Sick and Wounded Convoy Corps and the Women's National Service League. (more)

Mabel St. Clair Stobart: Women's fight for rights on the battlefield Learn more about the life of Mabel St. Clair Stobart.

See all videos for this article

The Allies advanced northward up the Vardar into Serbian Macedonia but found themselves prevented from junction with the Serbs by the westward thrust of the Bulgars. Driven back over the Greek frontier, the Allies were merely occupying the Salonika region by mid-December. The Serbian Army, meanwhile, to avoid double envelopment, had begun an arduous winter retreat westward over the Albanian mountains to refuge on the island of Corfu. English relief worker Mabel St. Clair Stobart, who had been commissioned a major in the Serbian army, led the First Serbian-English Field Hospital (Front) during the retreat. Stobart achieved some renown for the feat, as her unit was one of the few to reach the Albanian coast without suffering any losses or desertions.

In the spring of 1916 the Allies at Salonika were reinforced by the revived Serbs from Corfu as well as by French, British, and some Russian troops, and the bridgehead was expanded westward to Vodena (Edessa) and eastward to Kilkis; but the Bulgars, who in May obtained Fort Rupel (Klidhi, on the Struma) from the Greeks, in mid-August not only overran Greek Macedonia east of the Struma but also, from Monastir (Bitola), invaded the Florina region of Greek Macedonia, to the west of the Allies' Vodena wing. The Allied counteroffensive took Monastir from the Bulgars in November 1916, but more ambitious operations, from March to May 1917, proved abortive. The Salonika front was tying down some 500,000 Allied troops without troubling the Central Powers in any significant way.

Major developments in 1916

The Western Front, 1916

In 1914 the centre of gravity of World War I had been on the Western Front, in 1915 it shifted to the Eastern, and in 1916 it once more moved back to France. Though the western Allies had dissipated some of their strength in the Dardanelles, Salonika, and Mesopotamia, the

rising tide of Britain's new armies and of its increased munition supplies promised the means for an offensive far larger in scale than any before to break the trench deadlock. Britain's armies in France had grown to 36 divisions by the end of 1915. By that time voluntary enlistments, though massive, had nevertheless proved to be inadequate to meet Britain's needs, so in January 1916, by the Military Service Act, voluntary service was replaced by conscription.

In December 1915 a conference of the leaders of the French, British, Belgian, and Italian armies, with representatives present from the Russian and Japanese armies, was held at Joffre's headquarters. They adopted the principle of a simultaneous general offensive in 1916 by France, Great Britain, Russia, and Italy. But military action by Germany was to dislocate this scheme, and only the British offensive came fully into operation.

Brutal truths of the Battle of Verdun Overview of the Battle of Verdun, 1916.

By the winter of 1915–16, Falkenhayn regarded Russia as paralyzed and Italy as inconsiderable. He considered the time at last ripe for positive action against France, after whose collapse Great Britain would have no effective military ally on the European continent and would be brought to terms rather by submarine warfare than by land operations. For his offensive in the West, however, Falkenhayn clung always to his method of attrition. He believed that a mass breakthrough was unnecessary and that instead the Germans should aim to bleed France of its manpower by choosing a point of attack “for the retention of which the French Command would be compelled to throw in every man they have.” The town of Verdun and its surrounding complex of forts was chosen, because it was a menace to the main German lines of communications, because it was within a French salient and thus cramped the defenders, and because of the certainty that the French would sacrifice any number of men to defend Verdun for reasons of patriotism associated with the town itself.

The keynote of Falkenhayn's tactical plan was to place a dense semicircle of German heavy and medium artillery to the north and east of Verdun and its outlying fortresses and then to stage a continuous series of limited infantry advances upon the forts. These advances would draw the French infantry into defending or trying to retake the forts, in the process of which they would be pulverized by German artillery fire. In addition, each German infantry advance would have its way smoothed by a brief but extremely intense artillery bombardment that would clear the targeted ground of defenders.

Verdun, France French troops passing through the ruins of Verdun, France, 1916.

Although French Intelligence had given early warnings of the Germans' offensive preparations, the French high command was so preoccupied with its own projected offensive scheme that the warning fell on deaf ears. At 7:15 AM on February 21, 1916, the heaviest German artillery bombardment yet seen in the war began on a front of eight miles around Verdun, and the French trenches and barbed wire fields there were flattened out or upheaved in a chaos of tumbled earth. At 4:45 PM the German infantry advanced—although for the first day only on a front of two and a half miles. From then until February 24 the French defenders' lines east of the Meuse River crumbled away. Fort-Douaumont, one of the most important fortresses, was occupied by the Germans on February 25. By March 6, when the Germans began to attack on the west bank of the Meuse as well as on the east bank, the French had come to see that something more than a feint was intended. To relieve the pressure on France, the Russians made a sacrificial attack on the Eastern Front at Lake Naroch (see below *The Eastern Front, 1916*); the Italians began their fifth offensive on the Isonzo (see above *Italy and the Italian front, 1915–16*); and the British took over the Arras sector of the Western Front, thus becoming responsible for the whole line from the Yser southward to the Somme. Meanwhile, General Philippe Pétain was entrusted with commanding the defense of Verdun. He organized repeated counterattacks that slowed the German advance, and, more importantly, he worked to keep open the one road leading into Verdun that had not been closed by German shelling. This was the Bar-le-Duc road, which became known as *La Voie Sacrée* (the “Sacred Way”) because vital supplies and reinforcements continued to be sent to the Verdun front along it despite constant harassment from the German artillery.

Slowly but steadily the Germans moved forward on Verdun: they took Fort-Vaux, southeast of Fort-Douaumont, on June 7 and almost reached the Belleville heights, the last stronghold before Verdun itself, on June 23. Pétain was preparing to evacuate the east bank of the Meuse when the Allies' offensive on the Somme River was at last launched. Thereafter, the Germans assigned no more divisions to the Verdun attack.

Preceded by a week's bombardment, which gave ample warning of its advent, the Somme offensive was begun on July 1, 1916, by the 11 British divisions of Rawlinson's new 4th Army on a 15-mile front between Serre, north of the Ancre, and Curlu, north of the Somme, while five French divisions attacked at the same time on an eight-mile front mainly south of the Somme, between Curlu and Péronne. With incredibly misplaced optimism, Haig had convinced

himself that the British infantry would be able to walk forward irresistibly over ground cleared of defenders by the artillery. But the unconcealed preparations for the assault and the long preliminary bombardment had given away any chance of surprise, and the German defenders were well prepared for what was to come. In the event, the 60,000 attacking British infantrymen moving forward in symmetrical alignment at a snail's pace enforced by each man's 66 pounds (30 kilograms) of cumbrous equipment were mowed down in masses by the German machine guns, and the day's casualties were the heaviest ever sustained by a British army. The French participants in the attack had twice as many guns as the British and did better against a weaker system of defenses, but almost nothing could be done to exploit this comparative success.

Resigning himself now to limited advances, Haig concentrated his next effort on the southern sector of his Somme front. The Germans' second position there (Longueval, Bazentin, and Ovillers) fell on July 14, but again the opportunity of exploitation was missed. Thenceforward, at great cost in lives, a methodical advance was continued, gaining little ground but straining the German resistance. The first tanks to be used in the war, though in numbers far too small to be effective, were thrown into the battle by the British on September 15. In mid-November early rains halted operations. The four-month Battle of the Somme was a miserable failure except that it diverted German resources from the attack on Verdun. It cost the British 420,000 casualties, the French 195,000, and the Germans 650,000.

At Verdun, the summer slackening of German pressure enabled the French to organize counterattacks. Surprise attacks directed by General Robert-Georges Nivelle and launched by General Charles Mangin's army corps recovered Fort-Douaumont on October 24, Fort-Vaux on November 2, and places north of Douaumont in mid-December. Pétain's adroit defense of Verdun and these counterattacks had deprived Falkenhayn's offensive of its strategic fulfillment; but France had been so much weakened in the first half of 1916 that it could scarcely satisfy the Allies' expectations in the second. Verdun was one of the longest, bloodiest, and most ferocious battles of the war; French casualties amounted to about 400,000, German ones to about 350,000.

The Battle of Jutland

The summer of 1916 saw the long-deferred confrontation of Germany's High Seas Fleet and Great Britain's Grand Fleet in the Battle of Jutland—history's biggest naval battle, which both sides claimed as a victory.

Admiral Reinhard Scheer, who became commander in chief of the High Seas Fleet in January 1916, planned to contrive an encounter on the open sea between his fleet and some part of the British fleet in separation from the whole, so that the Germans could exploit their momentary superiority in numbers to achieve victory. Scheer's plan was to ensnare Admiral Beatty's squadron of battle cruisers at Rosyth, midway up Britain's eastern coast, by stratagem and destroy it before any reinforcements from the Grand Fleet's main base at Scapa Flow could reach it.

To set the trap, five battle cruisers of the German High Seas Fleet, together with four light cruisers, were to sail northward, under Hipper's command, from Wilhelmshaven, Ger., to a point off the southwestern coast of Norway. Scheer himself, with the battle squadrons of the High Seas Fleet, was to follow, 50 miles behind, to catch Beatty's forces in the gap once they had been lured eastward across the North Sea in pursuit of Hipper. But the signal for the German operation to begin, made in the afternoon of May 30, was intercepted and partially decoded by the British; and before midnight the whole British Grand Fleet was on its way to a rendezvous off Norway's southwestern coast and roughly across the planned route of the German fleet.

At 2:20 PM on May 31, when Admiral John Jellicoe's Grand Fleet squadrons from Scapa Flow were still 65 miles away to the north, Beatty's advance guard of light cruisers—five miles ahead of his heavier ships—and Hipper's scouting group learned quite accidentally of one another's proximity. An hour later the two lines were drawn up for battle, and in the next 50 minutes the British suffered severely, and the *Indefatigable* was sunk. When Beatty's battle cruisers came up, however, the German cruisers, in their turn, sustained such damage that Hipper sent a protective screen of German destroyers in to launch a torpedo attack. The British had lost another battle cruiser, the *Queen Mary*, before the German High Seas Fleet was sighted by a British patrol to the south, at 4:35 PM. On this report Beatty ordered his ships northward, to lure the Germans toward the Grand Fleet under Jellicoe's command.

Not until 6:14 PM, after Jellicoe's squadrons and Beatty's had been within sight of one another for nearly a quarter of an hour, was the German fleet precisely located—only just in time for Jellicoe to deploy his ships to the best advantage. Jellicoe arrayed the Grand Fleet end-to-end in a line so that their combined broadsides could be brought to bear on the approaching German ships, who could in turn reply only with the forward guns of their leading ships. The British ships in effect formed the horizontal stroke and the German ships the vertical stroke of the letter

“T,” with the British having deployed into line at a right angle to the German ships’ forward progress. This maneuver was in fact known as “crossing the enemy’s T” and was the ideal situation dreamed of by the tacticians of both navies, since by “crossing the T” one’s forces temporarily gained an overwhelming superiority of firepower.

For the Germans this was a moment of unparalleled risk. Three factors helped prevent the destruction of the German ships in this trap: their own excellent construction, the steadiness and discipline of their crews, and the poor quality of the British shells. The Lützow, the Derfflinger, and the battleship König led the line and were under broadside fire from some 10 British battleships, yet their main guns remained undamaged and they fought back to such effect that one of their salvos fell full on the Invincible and blew it up. This success, however, did little to relieve the intense bombardment from the other British ships, and the German fleet was still pressing forward into the steel trap of the Grand Fleet.

Relying on the magnificent seamanship of the German crews, Scheer extricated his fleet from the appalling danger into which it had run by a simple but, in practice, extremely difficult maneuver. At 6:30 PM he ordered a turn of 180° for all his ships at once; it was executed without collision; and the German battleships reversed course in unison and steamed out of the jaws of the trap, while German destroyers spread a smoke screen across their rear. The smoke and worsening visibility left Jellicoe in doubt about what had happened, and the British had lost contact with the Germans by 6:45 PM.

Yet the British Grand Fleet had maneuvered in such a way that it ended up between the German High Seas Fleet and the German ports, and this was the situation Scheer most dreaded, so at 6:55 PM Scheer ordered another reverse turn, perhaps hoping to pass around the rear of the British fleet. But the result for him was a worse position than that from which he had just escaped: his battle line had become compressed, and his leading ships found themselves again under intense bombardment from the broadside array of the British ships. Jellicoe had succeeded in crossing the Germans’ “T” again. The Lützow now received irreparable damage, and many other German ships were damaged at this point. At 7:15 PM, therefore, to cause a diversion and win time, Scheer ordered his battle cruisers and destroyers ahead to virtually immolate themselves in a massed charge against the British ships.

This was the crisis of the Battle of Jutland. As the German battle cruisers and destroyers steamed forward, the German battleships astern became confused and disorganized in trying to

execute their reverse turn. Had Jellicoe ordered the Grand Fleet forward through the screen of charging German battle cruisers at that moment, the fate of the German High Seas Fleet would likely have been sealed. As it was, fearing and overestimating the danger of torpedo attacks from the approaching destroyers, he ordered his fleet to turn away, and the two lines of battleships steamed apart at a speed of more than 20 knots. They did not meet again, and when darkness fell, Jellicoe could not be sure of the route of the German retreat. By 3:00 AM on June 1 the Germans had safely eluded their pursuers.

The British had sustained greater losses than the Germans in both ships and men. In all, the British lost three battle cruisers, three cruisers, eight destroyers, and 6,274 officers and men in the Battle of Jutland. The Germans lost one battleship, one battle cruiser, four light cruisers, five destroyers, and 2,545 officers and men. The losses inflicted on the British, however, were not enough to affect the numerical superiority of their fleet over the German in the North Sea, where their domination remained practically unchallengeable during the course of the war. Henceforth, the German High Seas Fleet chose not to venture out from the safety of its home ports.

The Eastern Front, 1916

In the hope of diverting German strength from the attack at Verdun on the Western Front, the Russians gallantly but prematurely opened an offensive north and south of Lake Naroch (Narocz, east of Vilna) on March 18, 1916, and continued it until March 27, though they won very little ground at great cost and only for a short time. They then reverted to preparations for a major offensive in July. The main blow, it was planned, should be delivered by A.E. Evert's central group of armies, assisted by an inward movement of A.N. Kuropatkin's army in the northern sector of the front. But at the same time, A.A. Brusilov's southwestern army group was authorized to make a supposedly diversionary attack in its own sectors. In the event, Brusilov's attack became by far the more important operation of the offensive.

Surprised by the Austrians' Asiago offensive in May, Italy promptly appealed to the Russians for action to draw the enemy's reserves away from the Italian fronts, and the Russians responded by advancing their timetable again. Brusilov undertook to start his attack on June 4, on the understanding that Evert's should be launched 10 days later.

Thus began an offensive on the Eastern Front that was to be imperial Russia's last really effective military effort. Popularly known as Brusilov's offensive, it had such an astonishing

initial success as to revive Allied dreams about the irresistible Russian “steamroller.” Instead, its ultimate achievement was to sound the death knell of the Russian monarchy. Brusilov’s four armies were distributed along a very wide front, with Lutsk at the northern end, Tarnopol and Buchach (Buczacz) in the central sector, and Czernowitz at the southern end. Having struck first in the Tarnopol and Czernowitz sectors on June 4, Brusilov on June 5 took the Austrians wholly by surprise when he launched A.M. Kaledin’s army toward Lutsk: the defenses crumbled at once, and the attackers pushed their way between two Austrian armies. As the offensive was developed, the Russians were equally successful in the Buchach sector and in their thrust into Bukovina, which culminated in the capture of Czernowitz. By June 20, Brusilov’s forces had captured 200,000 prisoners.

Evert and Kuropatkin, however, instead of striking in accordance with the agreed plan, found excuses for procrastination. The Russian chief of general staff, M.V. Alekseyev, therefore tried to transfer this inert couple’s reserves to Brusilov, but the Russians’ lateral communications were so poor that the Germans had time to reinforce the Austrians before Brusilov was strong enough to make the most of his victory. Though his forces in Bukovina advanced as far as the Carpathian Mountains, a counterstroke by Alexander von Linsingen’s Germans in the Lutsk sector checked Russian progress at the decisive point. Further Russian drives from the centre of Brusilov’s front were launched in July; but by early September the opportunity of exploiting the summer’s victory was lost. Brusilov had driven the Austrians from Bukovina and from much of eastern Galicia and had inflicted huge losses of men and equipment on them, but he had depleted Russia’s armies by about 1,000,000 men in doing so. (A large portion of this number consisted of deserters or prisoners.) This loss seriously undermined both the morale and the material strength of Russia. Brusilov’s offensive also had indirect results of great consequence. First, it had compelled the Germans to withdraw at least seven divisions from the Western Front, where they could ill be spared from the Verdun and Somme battles. Second, it hastened Romania’s unfortunate entry into the war.

Disregarding Romania’s military backwardness, the Romanian government of Ionel Brătianu declared war against Austria-Hungary on August 27, 1916. In entering the war, Romania succumbed to the Allies’ offers of Austro-Hungarian territory and to the belief that the Central Powers would be too much preoccupied with other fronts to mount any serious riposte against a Romanian offensive. Some 12 of Romania’s 23 divisions, in three columns, thus began

on August 28 a slow westward advance across Transylvania, where at first there were only five Austro-Hungarian divisions to oppose them.

The riposte of the Central Powers was swifter than the progress of the invasion: Germany, Turkey, and Bulgaria declared war against Romania on August 28, August 30, and September 1, respectively; and Falkenhayn had plans already prepared. Though the miscarriage of his overall program for the year led to his being replaced by Hindenburg as chief of the German general staff on August 29, Falkenhayn's recommendation that Mackensen should direct a Bulgarian attack on southern Romania was approved; and Falkenhayn himself went to command on the Transylvanian front, for which five German as well as two more Austrian divisions were found available as reinforcements.

Mackensen's forces from Bulgaria stormed the Turtucaia (Tutrakan) bridgehead on the Danube southeast of Bucharest on September 5. His subsequent advance eastward into the Dobruja caused the Romanians to switch their reserves to that quarter instead of reinforcing their Transylvanian enterprise, which thereupon came to a halt. Falkenhayn soon attacked: first at the southern end of the 200-mile front, where he threw one of the Romanian columns back into the Roter Turm (Turnu Roșu) Pass, then in the centre, where by October 9 he had defeated another at Kronstadt (Brașov). For a month, however, the Romanians withstood Falkenhayn's attempts to drive them out of the Vulcan and Szurduk (Surduc) passes into Walachia. But just before winter snows blocked the way, the Germans took the two passes and advanced southward to Tîrgu Jiu, where they won another victory. Then Mackensen, having turned westward from the Dobruja, crossed the Danube near Bucharest, on which his and Falkenhayn's armies converged. Bucharest fell on December 6, and the Romanian Army, a crippled force, could only fall back northeastward into Moldavia, where it had the belated support of Russian troops. The Central Powers had access to Romania's wheat fields and oil wells, and the Russians had 300 more miles of front to defend.

German strategy and the submarine war, 1916–January 1917

Both Admiral Scheer and General Falkenhayn doubted whether the German submarines could do any decisive damage to Great Britain so long as their warfare was restricted in deference to the protests of the United States; and, after a tentative reopening of the submarine campaign on February 4, 1916, the German naval authorities in March gave the U-boats permission to sink without warning all ships except passenger vessels. The German civilian

statesmen, however, who paid due attention to their diplomats' warnings about U.S. opinion, were soon able to prevail over the generals and the admirals: on May 4 the scope of the submarine campaign was again severely restricted.

The controversy between the statesmen and the advocates of unrestricted warfare was not dead yet. Hindenburg, chief of the general staff from August 29, had Ludendorff as his quartermaster general, and Ludendorff was quickly won over to supporting the chief of the Admiralty staff, Henning von Holtzendorff, in his arguments against the German chancellor, Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg, and the foreign minister, Gottlieb von Jagow. Whereas Bethmann and some other statesmen were hoping for a negotiated peace (see below), Hindenburg and Ludendorff were committed to a military victory. The British naval blockade, however, threatened to starve Germany into collapse before a military victory could be achieved, and soon Hindenburg and Ludendorff got their way: it was decided that, from February 1, 1917, submarine warfare should be unrestrict

For some 30 years after 1870, considering the likelihood of another German war, the French high command had subscribed to the strategy of an initial defensive to be followed by a counterstroke against the expected invasion: a great system of fortresses was created on the frontier, but gaps were left in order to "canalize" the German attack. France's alliance with Russia and its entente with Great Britain, however, encouraged a reversal of plan, and after the turn of the century a new school of military thinkers began to argue for an offensive strategy. The advocates of the offensive à l'outrance ("to the utmost") gained control of the French military machine, and in 1911 a spokesman of this school, General J.-J.-C. Joffre, was designated chief of the general staff. He sponsored the notorious Plan XVII, with which France went to war in 1914.

Plan XVII gravely underestimated the strength that the Germans would deploy against France. Accepting the possibility that the Germans might employ their reserve troops along with regular troops at the outset, Plan XVII estimated the strength of the German army in the west at a possible maximum of 68 infantry divisions. The Germans actually deployed the equivalent of 83 1/2 divisions, counting Landwehr (reserve troops) and Ersatz (low-grade substitute troops) divisions, but French military opinion ignored or doubted this possibility; during the war's crucial opening days, when the rival armies were concentrating and moving forward, the French Intelligence counted only Germany's regular divisions in its estimates of the enemy strength.

This was a serious miscalculation. Plan XVII also miscalculated the direction and scope of the coming onslaught: though it foresaw an invasion through Belgium, it assumed that the Germans would take the route through the Ardennes, thereby exposing their communications to attack. Basing itself on the idea of an immediate and general offensive, Plan XVII called for a French thrust toward the Saar into Lorraine by the 1st and 2nd armies, while on the French left (the north) the 3rd and 5th armies, facing Metz and the Ardennes, respectively, stood ready either to launch an offensive between Metz and Thionville or to strike from the north at the flank of any German drive through the Ardennes. When war broke out, it was taken for granted that the small British Expeditionary Force (BEF) under Sir John French should be used as an adjunct to France's forces, more or less as the French might see fit. It is clearly evident that the French were oblivious to the gigantic German offensive that was being aimed at their left (northern) wing.

TREATY OF VERSAILLES

THE PEACE SETTLEMENT OF 1919-1920 After the overthrow of Germany Austria-Hungary, Germany, Turkey and other allied statesmen met at Paris to decide the future map of Europe. The choice of Paris was not a happy one. However the conference met at Paris and president Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando played a very important role in the deliberations of the conference. The work of the negotiations was not an easy one. Germany had surrendered on the basis of fourteen points of Wilson. But, those could not be made as the basis of the settlement. They had to be adjusted to fit in with the secret treaties among the allies. The forces compelled president Wilson to compromise on many points. Speaking of the stalwarts who conducted the Paris Conference, President Wilson was resolute and formidable. He could break, but not bend. He was an orator but he had no precision of mind. He was stiff. This was both a virtue and a defeat. He was responsible for the Covenant of the League of Nations into the Treaty of Versailles. He was no match for Clemenceau and Lloyd George. Clemenceau was satirical and cynical. He knew, when and where to change his moods. He treated the small powers with difference. He wished for peace, based on force alone. He laughed at the 14 points of President Wilson. He had well understood the limits to which Great Britain and U.S.A were prepared to go and he did not go beyond them. A part of the unhappy terms of the Treaty of Versailles were due to his influence. Lloyd George was a great statesman. He was not in favour of exacting of impossible amount of money from Germany as reparation. He was asked by his

country men to exact the best possible terms from Germany. He had very difficult time at the peace conference. He found that both Clemenceau and Wilson differed from each other.

TREATY OF VERSAILLES

The signing of the treaty of Versailles was not an easy one. When the draft treaty was ready, Germany was asked to send her delegates. She sent subordinate officials. This was considered as an insult by the allies. Ultimately, Germany sent a delegation led by foreign minister to Versailles. The Germany's delegation was not treated well. They were strictly watched. They were kept in a hotel behind barbed wires. They were not allowed to communicate to anybody. On 7th May 1919, the peace terms were handed to the German delegation. The German delegation was informed that they must send their reply within three weeks. Again the German delegation headed by the foreign minister went to Versailles. For the second time also they were treated like prisoners. It was in these humiliating situations, the Germans signed the Treaty of Versailles on 28th June, 1919.

PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY

Germany had to give Alsace-Lorraine to France, Euphen and Malmady to Belgium, Memel to Lithuania and Western Prussia to Poland. She also agreed to give upper Silesia and the southern part of East Prussia to Poland. If the people concerned were in favour of joining of it. When plebiscite was taken, more people were in favour of joining Germany. Hence there was a dead lock. Ultimately, it was decided to partition Silesia. In the partition of Silesia, more than half of the people and the land were given to Germany. But, Poland got the areas with more economic resources. Poland got 53 out of 67 coal mines, and many zinc and lead mines. The important area known as Danzig was taken away from Germany and was put under the control of League of Nations. Poland was given special rights in the city of Danzig. Rhineland was demilitarised. Germany was prevented to make any fortifications. The existing fortifications were to be destroyed. There was to be no military force. No army was to be maintained in Rhineland. It was charged that, Germany had destroyed a number of coal mines in the Northern part of France. As compensation for the damages of the coal mines, Germany was compelled for payment. Besides. Germany was also forced to give reparation amount also. For all these, Germany had to give the Saar Valley in full. The Saar Valley too was put under the control of the League of Nations for fifteen years, then a plebiscite was taken. In the plebiscite, the people of Saar Valley voted for Germany. The allies were benefited by taking all the overseas possessions

of Germany. Germany was forced to give up all the rights over her overseas possessions. These were divided by the allies, Great Britain, France, Japan, Austria, Newzealand, South Africa and Belgium.

Newzealand got the German portion of the island of Samoa. England got the German West Africa. Both England and France divided Kamerons and Togoland. Germany gave up her special rights and privileges in China, Thailand, Egypt, Morocco and Libera. In this treaty, the crippling of the military strength of Germany was made. Germany's army was reduced. The army's strength in Germany was limited to one lakh only. The army was restricted only to maintain law and order within the country. The manufacturing of armaments and other war materials by Germany were also restricted. The import and export of war materials was also banned. Germany was not allowed tanks, poison gas and armoured cars from other countries. The German Navy was also reduced. It was allowed to have only 6 battleships, 12 destroyers and 12 torpedo boats. Submarines were not allowed. All submarine cables were asked to surrender. Only 15000 men including officers were allowed to serve in the navy. Merchantships were not given any naval training. The surplus war vessels were to be destroyed. Germany should not have any military, naval or air force. The German Emperor William II was charged with supreme offence against international morality. He was to be tried by a tribunal. Hence he fled to Netherlands. But the government of Netherlands refused to hand over the German emperor to the Allies. Germany had to accept that she was responsible for the war of 1914- 1918. However it was realised that she could not pay for all losses and damages. She was allowed to make compensation for all damages done to the civilian population of the allied and associated powers. There were ten categories of the losses. She was also to pay an interest of 5%. She was to compensate Belgium for the money borrowed by the latter. All steps were, taken to make Germany to pay war Reparation. A special commission was appointed to determine the total amount of reparation to be paid by Germany. Germany was also required to pay 500 Million dollars. The Reparation commission was duly appointed. The rivers of Elbe, Danube, Oder and Nienan were internationalised. The River Rhine was put under the control of an international commission. The Kel canal and its approaches were opened to all nations. The allied goods were to be given favourable treatment on the German Railways. The German territory, west of Rhine, together with Bridgeheads was to be occupied by the allied troops for a period of 15 years. Thus the treaty of Versailles was nothing but a treaty of revenge.

Course Outcomes

CO1: Explain the concept of the Age of Armed Peace.

CO2: Describe the formation and importance of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente.

CO3: Analyze the causes and results of the Balkan Wars.

CO4: Examine the causes, course, and impact of the First World War.

CO5: Evaluate the significance of the Treaty of Versailles.

Programme Outcome

PO: To develop students' understanding of global conflicts and international alliances, enabling critical analysis of war, diplomacy, and peace settlements.

S. No	Question (5 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
		CO	PO	K
1.	Explain the concept of the Age of Armed Peace.	CO2	PO1	K2
2.	Discuss the formation and significance of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente.	CO4	PO1	K4
3.	Analyze the causes and consequences of the Balkan Wars.	CO4	PO1	K4
4.	Explain the causes of the First World War.	CO2	PO1	K2
5.	Discuss the course of the First World War.	CO2	PO1	K2

S. No	Question (8 Mark)	LOCF Mapping		
		CO	PO	K
1.	Analyze the reasons for the United States entry into the war.	CO4	PO1	K4
2.	Explain the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles.	CO2	PO1	K2
3.	Evaluate the impact of the Treaty of Versailles.	CO5	PO1	K5
4.	Analyze the consequences of World War I on Europe.	CO4	PO1	K4

5.	Examine how alliances contributed to the outbreak of World War	CO4	PO1	K4
----	--	-----	-----	----