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PART I

CH. 20 THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT
The Enlightenment

19.1: The Enlightenment

19.1.1: Introduction to the Enlightenment

The Enlightenment, a philosophical movement that dominated in Europe during the 18th century, was centered around the idea that reason is the primary source of authority and legitimacy, and advocated such ideals as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state.

Learning Objective

Explain the main ideas of the Age of Enlightenment

Key Points

- The Enlightenment was a philosophical movement that dominated in Europe during the 18th century. It was centered around the idea that reason is the primary source of authority and legitimacy, and it
advocated such ideals as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state. However, historians of race, gender, and class note that Enlightenment ideals were not originally envisioned as universal in today’s sense of the word.

• The Philosophic Movement advocated for a society based upon reason rather than faith and Catholic doctrine, for a new civil order based on natural law, and for science based on experiments and observation.

• There were two distinct lines of Enlightenment thought: the radical enlightenment, advocating democracy, individual liberty, freedom of expression, and eradication of religious authority. A second, more moderate variety sought accommodation between reform and the traditional systems of power and faith.

• While the Enlightenment cannot be pigeonholed into a specific doctrine or set of dogmas, science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and thought.

• The Enlightenment brought political modernization to the west, in terms of focusing on democratic values and institutions and the creation of modern, liberal democracies.

• Enlightenment thinkers sought to curtail the political power of organized religion, and thereby prevent another age of intolerant religious war. The radical Enlightenment promoted the concept of separating church and state.
**Key Terms**

**reductionism**

The term that refers to several related but distinct philosophical positions regarding the connections between phenomena, or theories, “reducing” one to another, usually considered “simpler” or more “basic.” *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* suggests a three part division: ontological (a belief that the whole of reality consists of a minimal number of parts); methodological (the scientific attempt to provide explanation in terms of ever smaller entities); and theory (the suggestion that a newer theory does not replace or absorb the old, but reduces it to more basic terms).

**Newtonianism**

A doctrine that involves following the principles and using the methods of natural philosopher Isaac Newton. Newton’s broad conception of the universe as being governed by rational and understandable laws laid the foundation for many strands of Enlightenment thought.

**Encyclopédie**

A general encyclopedia published in France between 1751 and 1772, with later supplements, revised editions, and translations. It had many writers and was edited by Denis Diderot, and, until 1759, co-edited by Jean le Rond d’Alembert. It is the most famous for representing the thought of the Enlightenment.
empiricism

A theory that states that knowledge comes only or primarily from sensory experience. One of several views of epistemology, the study of human knowledge, along with rationalism and skepticism, it emphasizes the role of experience and evidence (especially sensory experience), in the formation of ideas, over the notion of innate ideas or traditions.

scientific method

A body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, or correcting and integrating previous knowledge based on empirical or measurable evidence subject to specific principles of reasoning. The Oxford Dictionaries Online define it as “a method or procedure that has characterized natural science since the 17th century, consisting in systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses.”

Introduction

The Enlightenment, also known as the Age of Enlightenment, was a philosophical movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. It was
centered around the idea that reason is the primary source of authority and legitimacy, and it advocated such ideals as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state. The Enlightenment was marked by an emphasis on the scientific method and reductionism, along with increased questioning of religious orthodoxy. The ideas of the Enlightenment undermined the authority of the monarchy and the church, and paved the way for the political revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries. French historians traditionally place the Enlightenment between 1715, the year that Louis XIV died, and 1789, the beginning of the French Revolution. Some recent historians begin the period in the 1620s, with the start of the scientific revolution. However, different national varieties of the movement flourished between the first decades of the 18th century and the first decades of the 19th century. The ideas of the Enlightenment played a major role in inspiring the French
Revolution, which began in 1789 and emphasized the rights of the common men, as opposed to the exclusive rights of the elites. However, historians of race, gender, and class note that Enlightenment ideals were not originally envisioned as universal in the today’s sense of the word. Although they did eventually inspire the struggle for rights of people of color, women, or the working masses, most Enlightenment thinkers did not advocate equality for all, regardless of race, gender, or class, but rather insisted that rights and freedoms were not hereditary. This perspective directly attacked the traditionally exclusive position of the European aristocracy, but was still largely limited to expanding the political and individual rights of white males of particular social standing.

Philosophy

In the mid-18th century, Europe witnessed an explosion of philosophic and scientific activity that challenged traditional doctrines and dogmas. The philosophic movement was led by Voltaire
and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who argued for a society based upon reason rather than faith and Catholic doctrine, for a new civil order based on natural law, and for science based on experiments and observation. The political philosopher Montesquieu introduced the idea of a separation of powers in a government, a concept which was enthusiastically adopted by the authors of the United States Constitution. While the philosophers of the French Enlightenment were not revolutionaries, and many were members of the nobility, their ideas played an important part in undermining the legitimacy of the Old Regime and shaping the French Revolution. There were two distinct lines of Enlightenment thought: the radical enlightenment, inspired by the philosophy of Spinoza, advocating democracy, individual liberty, freedom of expression, and eradication of religious authority. A second, more moderate variety, supported by René Descartes, John Locke, Christian Wolff, Isaac Newton and others, sought accommodation between reform and the traditional systems of power and faith. Much of what is incorporated in the scientific method (the nature of knowledge, evidence, experience, and causation), and some modern attitudes towards the relationship between science and religion, were developed by David Hume and Adam
Smith. Hume became a major figure in the skeptical philosophical and empiricist traditions of philosophy. Immanuel Kant tried to reconcile rationalism and religious belief, individual freedom and political authority, as well as map out a view of the public sphere through private and public reason. Kant’s work continued to shape German thought, and indeed all of European philosophy, well into the 20th century. Mary Wollstonecraft was one of England’s earliest feminist philosophers. She argued for a society based on reason, and that women, as well as men, should be treated as rational beings.
Encyclopedie’s frontispiece, full version; engraving by Benoît Louis Prévost. “If there is something you know, communicate it. If there is something you don’t know, search for it.” An engraving from the 1772 edition of
the Encyclopédie. Truth, in the top center, is surrounded by light and unveiled by the figures to the right, Philosophy and Reason. Science

While the Enlightenment cannot be pigeonholed into a specific doctrine or set of dogmas, science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and thought. Many Enlightenment writers and thinkers had backgrounds in the sciences, and associated scientific advancement with the overthrow of religion and traditional authority in favor of the development of free speech and thought. Broadly speaking, Enlightenment science greatly valued empiricism and rational thought, and was embedded with the Enlightenment ideal of advancement and progress. As with most Enlightenment views, the benefits of science were not seen universally.

Science during the Enlightenment was dominated by scientific societies and academies, which had largely replaced universities as centers of scientific research and development. Societies and academies were also the backbone of the maturation of the scientific profession. Another important development was the popularization of science among an increasingly literate population. Many scientific theories reached the wide public, notably through the Encyclopédie (a general encyclopedia published in
France between 1751 and 1772) and the popularization of Newtonianism. The 18th century saw significant advancements in the practice of medicine, mathematics, and physics; the development of biological taxonomy; a new understanding of magnetism and electricity; and the maturation of chemistry as a discipline, which established the foundations of modern chemistry.

Modern Western Government The Enlightenment has long been hailed as the foundation of modern western political and intellectual culture. It brought political modernization to the west, in terms of focusing on democratic values and institutions, and the creation of modern, liberal democracies. The English philosopher Thomas Hobbes ushered in a new debate on government with his work Leviathan in 1651. Hobbes also developed some of the fundamentals of European liberal thought: the right of the individual; the natural equality of all men; the artificial character of the political order (which led to the later distinction between civil society and the state); the view that all legitimate political power must be “representative” and based on the consent of the people; and a liberal interpretation of law which leaves people free to do whatever the law does not explicitly forbid. John Locke and Rousseau
also developed social contract theories. While differing in details, Locke, Hobbes, and Rousseau agreed that a social contract, in which the government’s authority lies in the consent of the governed, is necessary for man to live in civil society. Locke is particularly known for his statement that individuals have a right to “Life, Liberty and Property,” and his belief that the natural right to property is derived from labor. His theory of natural rights has influenced many political documents, including the United States Declaration of Independence and the French National Constituent Assembly’s Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. Though much of Enlightenment’s political thought was dominated by social contract theorists, some Scottish philosophers, most notably David Hume and Adam Ferguson, criticized this camp. Theirs was the assumption that governments derived from a ruler’s authority and force (Hume) and polities grew out of social development rather than social contract (Ferguson). Religion Enlightenment era religious commentary was a response to the preceding century of religious conflict in Europe. Enlightenment thinkers sought to curtail the political power of organized religion, and thereby prevent another age of intolerant religious war. A number of novel ideas
developed, including Deism (belief in God the Creator, with no reference to the Bible or any other source) and atheism. The latter was much discussed but there were few proponents. Many, like Voltaire, held that without belief in a God who punishes evil, the moral order of society was undermined. The radical Enlightenment promoted the concept of separating church and state, an idea often credited to Locke. According to Locke’s principle of the social contract, the government lacked authority in the realm of individual conscience, as this was something rational people could not cede to the government for it or others to control. For Locke, this created a natural right in the liberty of conscience, which he said must therefore remain protected from any government authority. These views on religious tolerance and the importance of individual conscience, along with the social contract, became particularly influential in the American colonies and the drafting of the United States Constitution.
Mary Wollstonecraft by John Opie (c. 1797), National Portrait Gallery, London. While the philosophy of the Enlightenment was dominated by men, the question of women’s rights appeared as one of the most controversial ideas. Mary Wollstonecraft, one of few female thinkers of the time, was an English writer, philosopher, and advocate of women’s rights. She is best known for A Vindication of the Rights of Woman (1792), in which she argues that women are not naturally
inferior to men, but appear to be only because they lack education. She suggests that both men and women should be treated as rational beings and imagines a social order founded on reason. 

Attributions

Public domain.
“Mary_Wollstonecraft_by_John_Opie_c._1797.jpg.”
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
Mary_Wollstonecraft#/media/
File:Mary_Wollstonecraft_by_John_Opie_(c._1797)
.jpg. Wikipedia Public domain.
2. Rationalism

19.1.2: Rationalism

Rationalism, or a belief that we come to knowledge through the use of logic, and thus independently of sensory experience, was critical to the debates of the Enlightenment period, when most philosophers lauded the power of reason but insisted that knowledge comes from experience.

Learning Objective

Define rationalism and its role in the ideas of the Enlightenment

Key Points

- Rationalism—as an appeal to human reason as a way of obtaining knowledge—has a philosophical history dating from antiquity. While rationalism did not dominate the Enlightenment, it laid critical basis for the debates that developed over the course of the 18th century.
- René Descartes (1596-1650), the first of the modern
rationalists, laid the groundwork for debates developed during the Enlightenment. He thought that the knowledge of eternal truths could be attained by reason alone (no experience was necessary).

- Since the Enlightenment, rationalism is usually associated with the introduction of mathematical methods into philosophy as seen in the works of Descartes, Leibniz, and Spinoza. This is commonly called continental rationalism, because it was predominant in the continental schools of Europe, whereas in Britain empiricism dominated.

- Both Spinoza and Leibniz asserted that, in principle, all knowledge, including scientific knowledge, could be gained through the use of reason alone, though they both observed that this was not possible in practice for human beings, except in specific areas, such as mathematics.

- While empiricism (a theory that knowledge comes only or primarily from a sensory experience) dominated the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant, attempted to combine the principles of empiricism and rationalism. He concluded that both reason and experience are necessary for human knowledge.

- Since the Enlightenment, rationalism in politics historically emphasized a “politics of reason” centered upon rational choice, utilitarianism, and secularism.
Key Terms

cogito ergo sum
A Latin philosophical proposition by René Descartes, the first modern rationalist, usually translated into English as “I think, therefore I am.” This proposition became a fundamental element of western philosophy, as it purported to form a secure foundation for knowledge in the face of radical doubt. Descartes asserted that the very act of doubting one’s own existence served, at minimum, as proof of the reality of one’s own mind.

empiricism
A theory that states that knowledge comes only, or primarily, from sensory experience. One of several views of epistemology, the study of human knowledge, along with rationalism and skepticism, it emphasizes the role of experience and evidence, especially sensory experience, in the formation of ideas over the notion of innate ideas or traditions.

metaphysics
A traditional branch of philosophy concerned with explaining the fundamental nature of being and the world that encompasses it, although the term is not easily defined. Traditionally, it attempts to answer two basic questions in the broadest possible terms: “Ultimately, what is there?” and “What is it like?”
Introduction

Rationalism—as an appeal to human reason as a way of obtaining knowledge—has a philosophical history dating from antiquity. While rationalism, as the view that reason is the main source of knowledge, did not dominate the Enlightenment, it laid critical basis for the debates that developed over the course of the 18th century. As the Enlightenment centered on reason as the primary source of authority and legitimacy, many philosophers of the period drew from earlier philosophical contributions, most notably those of René Descartes (1596-1650), a French philosopher, mathematician, and scientist. Descartes was the first of the modern rationalists. He thought that only knowledge of eternal truths (including the truths of mathematics and the foundations of the sciences) could be attained by reason alone, while the knowledge of physics required experience of the world, aided by the scientific method. He argued that reason alone determined knowledge, and that this could be done independently of the senses. For instance, his famous dictum, cogito ergo sum, or “I think, therefore I am,” is a conclusion reached a priori (i.e., prior to any kind of experience on the matter). The simple meaning is that doubting one’s existence, in and of itself, proves that an “I” exists to do the thinking.
Descartes laid the foundation for 17th-century continental rationalism, later advocated by Baruch Spinoza and Gottfried Leibniz, and opposed by the empiricist school of thought consisting of Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Leibniz, Spinoza, and Descartes were all well-versed in mathematics, as well as philosophy, and Descartes and Leibniz contributed greatly to science as well.

Rationalism v. Empiricism

Since the Enlightenment, rationalism is usually associated with the
introduction of mathematical methods into philosophy, as seen in the works of Descartes, Leibniz, and Spinoza. This is commonly called continental rationalism, because it was predominant in the continental schools of Europe, whereas in Britain, empiricism, or a theory that knowledge comes only or primarily from a sensory experience, dominated. Although rationalism and empiricism are traditionally seen as opposing each other, the distinction between rationalists and empiricists was drawn at a later period, and would not have been recognized by philosophers involved in Enlightenment debates. Furthermore, the distinction between the two philosophies is not as clear-cut as is sometimes suggested. For example, Descartes and John Locke, one of the most important Enlightenment thinkers, have similar views about the nature of human ideas.

Proponents of some varieties of rationalism argue that, starting with foundational basic principles, like the axioms of geometry, one could deductively derive the rest of all possible knowledge. The philosophers who held this view most clearly were Baruch Spinoza and Gottfried Leibniz, whose attempts to grapple with the epistemological and metaphysical problems raised by Descartes led to a development of the fundamental approach of rationalism. Both Spinoza and Leibniz asserted that, in principle, all knowledge, including scientific knowledge, could be gained through the use of reason alone, though they both observed that this was not possible in practice for human beings, except in specific areas, such as mathematics. On the other hand, Leibniz admitted in his book, Monadology, that “we are all mere Empirics in three fourths of our actions.”

Immanuel Kant

Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz are usually credited for laying the groundwork for the 18th-century Enlightenment. During the mature
Enlightenment period, Immanuel Kant attempted to explain the relationship between reason and human experience, and to move beyond the failures of traditional philosophy and metaphysics. He wanted to put an end to an era of futile and speculative theories of human experience, and regarded himself as ending and showing the way beyond the impasse between rationalists and empiricists. He is widely held to have synthesized these two early modern traditions in his thought.

Kant named his brand of epistemology (theory of knowledge) “transcendental idealism,” and he first laid out these views in his famous work, *The Critique of Pure Reason*. In it, he argued that there were fundamental problems with both rationalist and empiricist dogma. To the rationalists he argued, broadly, that pure reason is flawed when it goes beyond its limits and claims to know those things that are necessarily beyond the realm of all possible experience (e.g., the existence of God, free will, or the immortality of the human soul). To the empiricist, he argued that while it is correct that experience is fundamentally necessary for human knowledge, reason is necessary for processing that experience into coherent thought. He therefore concluded that both reason and experience are necessary for human knowledge. In the same way, Kant also argued that it was wrong to regard thought as mere analysis. In his views, *a priori* concepts do exist, but if they are to lead to the amplification of knowledge, they must be brought into relation with empirical data.
Immanuel Kant, author unknown

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) rejected the dogmas of both rationalism and empiricism, and tried to reconcile rationalism and religious belief, and individual freedom and political authority, as well as map out a view of the public sphere through private and public reason. His work continued to shape German thought, and indeed all of European philosophy, well into the 20th century.

Politics

Since the Enlightenment, rationalism in politics historically emphasized a “politics of reason” centered upon rational choice,
utilitarianism, and secularism (later, relationship between rationalism and religion was ameliorated by the adoption of pluralistic rationalist methods practicable regardless of religious or irreligious ideology). Some philosophers today, most notably John Cottingham, note that rationalism, a methodology, became socially conflated with atheism, a worldview. Cottingham writes,

In the past, particularly in the 17th and 18th centuries, the term ‘rationalist’ was often used to refer to free thinkers of an anti-clerical and anti-religious outlook, and for a time the word acquired a distinctly pejorative force (...). The use of the label ‘rationalist’ to characterize a world outlook which has no place for the supernatural is becoming less popular today; terms like ‘humanist’ or ‘materialist’ seem largely to have taken its place. But the old usage still survives.

Attributions

- Rationalism
Natural rights, understood as those that are not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any particular culture or government, (and therefore, universal and inalienable) were central to the debates during the Enlightenment on the relationship between the individual and the government.

**Learning Objective**

Identify natural rights and why they were important to the philosophers of the Enlightenment.

**Key Points**

- Natural rights are those that are not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any particular culture or government, and are therefore universal and inalienable (i.e., rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws). They are usually defined in opposition to legal rights, or those bestowed onto a person by a given legal system.
Although natural rights have been discussed since antiquity, it was the philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment that developed the modern concept of natural rights, which has been critical to the modern republican government and civil society.

During the Enlightenment, natural rights developed as part of the social contract theory. The theory addressed the questions of the origin of society and the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual.

Thomas Hobbes’ conception of natural rights extended from his conception of man in a “state of nature.” He objected to the attempt to derive rights from “natural law,” arguing that law ("lex") and right ("jus") though often confused, signify opposites, with law referring to obligations, while rights refers to the absence of obligations.

The most famous natural right formulation comes from John Locke, who argued that the natural rights include perfect equality and freedom, and the right to preserve life and property. Other Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment philosophers that developed and complicated the concept of natural rights were John Lilburne, Francis Hutcheson, Georg Hegel, and Thomas Paine.

The modern European anti-slavery movement drew heavily from the concept of natural rights that became central to the efforts of European abolitionists.
**Key Terms**

**Natural rights**
The rights that are not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any particular culture or government, and are therefore universal and inalienable (i.e., rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws). Some, yet not all, see them as synonymous with human rights.

**natural law**
A philosophy that certain rights or values are inherent by virtue of human nature, and can be universally understood through human reason. Historically, it refers to the use of reason to analyze both social and personal human nature in order to deduce binding rules of moral behavior. The law of nature, like nature itself, is universal.

**Legal rights**
The rights bestowed onto a person by a given legal system (i.e., rights that can be modified, repealed, and restrained by human laws).

**social contract theory**
In moral and political philosophy, a theory or model originating during the Age of Enlightenment that typically addresses the questions of the origin of society and the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual. It typically posits that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the
authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority), in exchange for protection of their remaining rights.

Natural Rights and Natural Law

Natural rights are usually juxtaposed with the concept of legal rights. Legal rights are those bestowed onto a person by a given legal system (i.e., rights that can be modified, repealed, and restrained by human laws). Natural rights are those that are not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any particular culture or government, and are therefore universal and inalienable (i.e., rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws). Natural rights are closely related to the concept of natural law (or laws). During the Enlightenment, the concept of natural laws was used to challenge the divine right of kings, and became an alternative justification for the establishment of a social contract, positive law, and government (and thus, legal rights) in the form of classical republicanism (built around concepts such as civil society, civic virtue, and mixed government). Conversely, the concept of natural rights is used by others to challenge the legitimacy of all such establishments.

The idea of natural rights is also closely related to that of human rights; some acknowledge no difference between the two, while others choose to keep the terms separate to eliminate association with some features traditionally associated with natural rights. Natural rights, in particular, are considered beyond the authority of any government or international body to dismiss.
Natural Rights and Social Contract

Although natural rights have been discussed since antiquity, it was the philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment that developed the modern concept of natural rights, which has been critical to the modern republican government and civil society. At the time, natural rights developed as part of the social contract theory, which addressed the questions of the origin of society and the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual. Social contract arguments typically posit that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority), in exchange for protection of their remaining rights. The question of the relation between natural and legal rights, therefore, is often an aspect of social contract theory.

Thomas Hobbes’ conception of natural rights extended from his conception of man in a “state of nature.” He argued that the essential natural (human) right was “to use his own power, as he will himself, for the preservation of his own Nature; that is to say, of his own Life.” Hobbes sharply distinguished this natural “liberty” from natural “laws.” In his natural state, according to Hobbes, man’s life consisted entirely of liberties, and not at all of laws. He objected to the attempt to derive rights from “natural law,” arguing that law (“lex”) and right (“jus”) though often confused, signify opposites, with law referring to obligations, while rights refer to the absence of obligations. Since by our (human) nature, we seek to maximize our well being, rights are prior to law, natural or institutional, and people will not follow the laws of nature without first being subjected to a sovereign power, without which all ideas of right and wrong are meaningless.
Thomas Hobbes’ 1651 book Leviathan established social contract theory, the foundation of most later western political philosophy. Though on rational grounds a champion of absolutism for the sovereign, Hobbes also developed some of the fundamental ideas of European liberal thought: the right of the individual; the natural equality of all men; the artificial character of the political order (which led to the later distinction between civil society and the state);
The most famous natural right formulation comes from John Locke in his Second Treatise, when he introduces the state of nature. For Locke, the law of nature is grounded on mutual security, or the idea that one cannot infringe on another’s natural rights, as every man is equal and has the same inalienable rights. These natural rights include perfect equality and freedom and the right to preserve life and property. Such fundamental rights could not be surrendered in the social contract. Another 17th-century Englishman, John Lilburne (known as Freeborn John) argued for level human rights that he called “freeborn rights,” which he defined as being rights that every human being is born with, as opposed to rights bestowed by government or by human law. The distinction between alienable and unalienable rights was introduced by Francis Hutcheson, who argued that “Unalienable Rights are essential Limitations in all Governments.” In the German Enlightenment, Georg Hegel gave a highly developed treatment of the inalienability argument. Like Hutcheson, he based the theory of inalienable rights on the de facto inalienability of those aspects of personhood that distinguish persons from things. A thing, like a piece of property, can in fact be transferred from one person to another. According to Hegel, the same would not apply to those aspects that make one a person. Consequently, the question of whether property is an aspect of natural rights remains a matter of debate.

Thomas Paine further elaborated on natural rights in his influential work Rights of Man (1791), emphasizing that rights cannot be granted by any charter because this would legally imply they can also be revoked, and under such circumstances, they would be reduced to privileges.
The most famous natural right formulation comes from John Locke in his *Second Treatise*. For Locke, the natural rights include perfect equality and freedom, and the right to preserve life and property.
In discussion of social contract theory, “inalienable rights” were those rights that could not be surrendered by citizens to the sovereign. Such rights were thought to be natural rights, independent of positive law. Some social contract theorists reasoned, however, that in the natural state only the strongest could benefit from their rights. Thus, people form an implicit social contract, ceding their natural rights to the authority to protect the people from abuse, and living henceforth under the legal rights of that authority.

Many historical apologies for slavery and illiberal government were based on explicit or implicit voluntary contracts to alienate any natural rights to freedom and self-determination. Locke argued against slavery on the basis that enslaving yourself goes against the law of nature; you cannot surrender your own rights, your freedom is absolute and no one can take it from you. Additionally, Locke argues that one person cannot enslave another because it is morally reprehensible, although he introduces a caveat by saying that enslavement of a lawful captive in time of war would not go against one's natural rights. The de facto inalienability arguments of Hutcheson and his predecessors provided the basis for the anti-slavery movement to argue not simply against involuntary slavery but against any explicit or implied contractual forms of slavery. Any contract that tried to legally alienate such a right would be inherently invalid. Similarly, the argument was used by the democratic movement to argue against any explicit or implied social contracts of subjection by which a people would supposedly alienate their right of self-government to a sovereign.
Attributions

- Natural Rights
4. The Age of Discovery

19.2: The Age of Discovery

19.2.1: Europe’s Early Trade Links

A prelude to the Age of Discovery was a series of European land expeditions across Eurasia in the late Middle Ages. These expeditions were undertaken by a number of explorers, including Marco Polo, who left behind a detailed and inspiring record of his travels across Asia.

**Learning Objective**

Understand the exploration of Eurasia in the Middle Ages by Marco Polo, and why it was a prelude to the advent of the Age of Discovery in the 15th Century

**Key Points**

- European medieval knowledge about Asia beyond the reach of Byzantine Empire was sourced in partial
reports, often obscured by legends.

- In 1154, Arab geographer Muhammad al-Idrisi created what would be known as the Tabula Rogeriana—a description of the world and world map. It contains maps showing the Eurasian continent in its entirety, but only the northern part of the African continent. It remained the most accurate world map for the next three centuries.

- Indian Ocean trade routes were sailed by Arab traders. Between 1405 and 1421, the Yongle Emperor of Ming China sponsored a series of long range tributary missions. The fleets visited Arabia, East Africa, India, Maritime Southeast Asia, and Thailand.

- A series of European expeditions crossing Eurasia by land in the late Middle Ages marked a prelude to the Age of Discovery. Although the Mongols had threatened Europe with pillage and destruction, Mongol states also unified much of Eurasia and, from 1206 on, the Pax Mongolica allowed safe trade routes and communication lines stretching from the Middle East to China.

- Christian embassies were sent as far as Karakorum during the Mongol invasions of Syria. The first of these travelers was Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, who journeyed to Mongolia and back from 1241 to 1247. Others traveled to various regions of Asia between 13th and the third quarter of the 15th centuries; these travelers included Russian Yaroslav of Vladimir and his sons Alexander Nevsky and Andrey II of Vladimir, French André de Longjumeau and Flemish William of Rubruck, Moroccan Ibn Battuta, and Italian Niccolò de’ Conti.
Marco Polo, a Venetian merchant, dictated an account of journeys throughout Asia from 1271 to 1295. Although he was not the first European to reach China, he was the first to leave a detailed chronicle of his experience. The book inspired Christopher Columbus and many other travelers in the following Age of Discovery.

**Key Terms**

**Pax Mongolica**
A historiographical term, modeled after the original phrase *Pax Romana*, which describes the stabilizing effects of the conquests of the Mongol Empire on the social, cultural, and economic life of the inhabitants of the vast Eurasian territory that the Mongols conquered in the 13th and 14th centuries. The term is used to describe the eased communication and commerce that the unified administration helped to create, and the period of relative peace that followed the Mongols’ vast conquests.

**Tabula Rogeriana**
A book containing a description of the world and world map created by the Arab geographer, Muhammad al-Idrisi, in 1154. Written in Arabic, it is divided into seven climate zones and contains maps showing the Eurasian continent in its entirety, but only
the northern part of the African continent. The map is oriented with the North at the bottom. It remained the most accurate world map for the next three centuries.

**Maritime republics**

City-states that flourished in Italy and across the Mediterranean. From the 10th to the 13th centuries, they built fleets of ships both for their own protection and to support extensive trade networks across the Mediterranean, giving them an essential role in the Crusades.

**Background**

European medieval knowledge about Asia beyond the reach of Byzantine Empire was sourced in partial reports, often obscured by legends, dating back from the time of the conquests of Alexander the Great and his successors. In 1154, Arab geographer Muhammad al-Idrisi created what would be known as the *Tabula Rogeriana* at the court of King Roger II of Sicily. The book, written in Arabic, is a description of the world and world map. It is divided into seven climate zones and contains maps showing the Eurasian continent in its entirety, but only the northern part of the African continent. It remained the most accurate world map for the next three centuries, but it also demonstrated that Africa was only partially known to either Christians, Genoese and Venetians, or the Arab seamen, and its southern extent was unknown. Knowledge about the Atlantic African coast was fragmented, and derived mainly from old Greek and Roman maps based on Carthaginian knowledge, including the
time of Roman exploration of Mauritania. The Red Sea was barely known and only trade links with the Maritime republics, the Republic of Venice especially, fostered collection of accurate maritime knowledge.

Indian Ocean trade routes were sailed by Arab traders. Between 1405 and 1421, the Yongle Emperor of Ming China sponsored a series of long-range tributary missions. The fleets visited Arabia, East Africa, India, Maritime Southeast Asia, and Thailand. But the journeys, reported by Ma Huan, a Muslim voyager and translator, were halted abruptly after the emperor's death, and were not followed up, as the Chinese Ming Dynasty retreated in the haijin, a policy of isolationism, having limited maritime trade.

Prelude to the Age of Discovery

A series of European expeditions crossing Eurasia by land in the late Middle Ages marked a prelude to the Age of Discovery. Although the Mongols had threatened Europe with pillage and destruction, Mongol states also unified much of Eurasia and, from 1206 on, the Pax Mongolica allowed safe trade routes and communication lines stretching from the Middle East to China. A series of Europeans took advantage of these in order to explore eastward. Most were Italians, as trade between Europe and the Middle East was controlled mainly by the Maritime republics.

Christian embassies were sent as far as Karakorum during the Mongol invasions of Syria, from which they gained a greater understanding of the world. The first of these travelers was Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, who journeyed to Mongolia and back from 1241 to 1247. About the same time, Russian prince Yaroslav of Vladimir, and subsequently his sons, Alexander Nevsky and Andrey II of Vladimir, traveled to the Mongolian capital. Though having strong political implications, their journeys left no detailed accounts. Other travelers followed, like French André de Longjumeau and Flemish
William of Rubruck, who reached China through Central Asia. From 1325 to 1354, a Moroccan scholar from Tangier, Ibn Battuta, journeyed through North Africa, the Sahara desert, West Africa, Southern Europe, Eastern Europe, the Horn of Africa, the Middle East and Asia, having reached China. In 1439, Niccolò de’ Conti published an account of his travels as a Muslim merchant to India and Southeast Asia and, later in 1466-1472, Russian merchant Afanasy Nikitin of Tver travelled to India.

Marco Polo, a Venetian merchant, dictated an account of journeys throughout Asia from 1271 to 1295. His travels are recorded in Book of the Marvels of the World, (also known as The Travels of Marco Polo, c. 1300), a book which did much to introduce Europeans to Central Asia and China. Marco Polo was not the first European to reach China, but he was the first to leave a detailed chronicle of his experience. The book inspired Christopher Columbus and many other travelers.
The Age of Discovery

The geographical exploration of the late Middle Ages eventually led to what today is known as the Age of Discovery: a loosely defined European historical period, from the 15th century to the 18th century, that witnessed extensive overseas exploration emerge as a powerful factor in European culture and globalization. Many lands previously unknown to Europeans were discovered during this period, though most were already inhabited, and, from the perspective of non-Europeans, the period was not one of discovery, but one of invasion and the arrival of settlers from a previously unknown continent. Global exploration started with the successful Portuguese travels to the Atlantic archipelagos of Madeira and the Azores, the coast of Africa, and the sea route to India in 1498; and, on behalf of the Crown of Castile (Spain), the trans-Atlantic Voyages of Christopher Columbus between 1492 and 1502, as well as the first circumnavigation of the globe in 1519-1522. These discoveries led to numerous naval expeditions across the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific oceans, and land expeditions in the Americas, Asia, Africa, and Australia that continued into the late 19th century, and ended with the exploration of the polar regions in the 20th century.

Attributions
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Maritime republics. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

- “Marco Polo traveling.”
During the 15th and 16th centuries, Portuguese explorers were at the forefront of European overseas exploration, which led them to reach India, establish multiple trading posts in Asia and Africa, and settle what would become Brazil, creating one of the most powerful empires.

**Learning Objective**

Compare the Portuguese Atlantic explorations from 1415-1488 with the Indian Exploration, led by Vasco da Gama from 1497-1542

**Key Points**

- Portuguese sailors were at the vanguard of European overseas exploration, discovering and mapping the coasts of Africa, Asia, and Brazil. As early as 1317, King Denis made an agreement with Genoese merchant sailor Manuel Pessanha, laying the basis for the Portuguese Navy and the establishment of a
powerful Genoese merchant community in Portugal.

- In 1415, the city of Ceuta was occupied by the Portuguese in an effort to control navigation of the African coast. Henry the Navigator, aware of profit possibilities in the Saharan trade routes, invested in sponsoring voyages that, within two decades of exploration, allowed Portuguese ships to bypass the Sahara.

- The Portuguese goal of finding a sea route to Asia was finally achieved in a ground-breaking voyage commanded by Vasco da Gama, who reached Calicut in western India in 1498, becoming the first European to reach India.

- The second voyage to India was dispatched in 1500 under Pedro Álvares Cabral. While following the same south-westerly route as Gama across the Atlantic Ocean, Cabral made landfall on the Brazilian coast—the territory that he recommended Portugal settle.

- Portugal’s purpose in the Indian Ocean was to ensure the monopoly of the spice trade. Taking advantage of the rivalries that pitted Hindus against Muslims, the Portuguese established several forts and trading posts between 1500 and 1510.

- Portugal established trading ports at far-flung locations like Goa, Ormuz, Malacca, Kochi, the Maluku Islands, Macau, and Nagasaki. Guarding its trade from both European and Asian competitors, it dominated not only the trade between Asia and Europe, but also much of the trade between different regions of Asia, such as India, Indonesia, China, and Japan.
Key Terms

**Cape of Good Hope**
A rocky headland on the Atlantic coast of the Cape Peninsula, South Africa, named because of the great optimism engendered by the opening of a sea route to India and the East.

**Vasco da Gama**
A Portuguese explorer and one of the most famous and celebrated explorers from the Age of Discovery; the first European to reach India by sea.

Introduction

Portuguese sailors were at the vanguard of European overseas exploration, discovering and mapping the coasts of Africa, Asia, and Brazil. As early as 1317, King Denis made an agreement with Genoese merchant sailor Manuel Pessanha (Pesagno), appointing him first Admiral with trade privileges with his homeland, in return for twenty war ships and crews, with the goal of defending the country against Muslim pirate raids. This created the basis for the Portuguese Navy and the establishment of a Genoese merchant community in Portugal.

In the second half of the 14th century, outbreaks of bubonic plague led to severe depopulation; the economy was extremely localized in a few towns, unemployment rose, and migration led to agricultural land abandonment. Only the sea offered alternatives, with most people settling in fishing and trading in coastal areas.
Between 1325-1357, Afonso IV of Portugal granted public funding to raise a proper commercial fleet, and ordered the first maritime explorations, with the help of Genoese, under command of admiral Pessanha. In 1341, the Canary Islands, already known to Genoese, were officially explored under the patronage of the Portuguese king, but in 1344, Castile disputed them, further propelling the Portuguese navy efforts.

Atlantic Exploration

In 1415, the city of Ceuta (north coast of Africa) was occupied by the Portuguese aiming to control navigation of the African coast. Young Prince Henry the Navigator was there and became aware of profit possibilities in the Saharan trade routes. He invested in sponsoring voyages down the coast of Mauritania, gathering a group of merchants, shipowners, stakeholders, and participants interested in the sea lanes.

Henry the Navigator took the lead role in encouraging Portuguese maritime exploration, until his death in 1460. At the time, Europeans did not know what lay beyond Cape Bojador on the African coast. In 1419, two of Henry’s captains, João Gonçalves Zarco and Tristão Vaz Teixeira, were driven by a storm to Madeira, an uninhabited island off the coast of Africa, which had probably been known to Europeans since the 14th century. In 1420, Zarco and Teixeira returned with Bartolomeu Perestrelo and began Portuguese settlement of the islands. A Portuguese attempt to capture Grand Canary, one of the nearby Canary Islands, which had been partially settled by Spaniards in 1402, was unsuccessful and met with protests from Castile. Around the same time, the Portuguese began to explore the North African coast. Diogo Silves reached the Azores island of Santa Maria in 1427, and in the following years, Portuguese discovered and settled the rest of the Azores. Within two decades of exploration, Portuguese ships bypassed the Sahara.
In 1443, Prince Pedro, Henry's brother, granted him the monopoly of navigation, war, and trade in the lands south of Cape Bojador. Later, this monopoly would be enforced by two Papal bulls (1452 and 1455), giving Portugal the trade monopoly for the newly appropriated territories, laying the foundations for the Portuguese empire.

India and Brazil

The long-standing Portuguese goal of finding a sea route to Asia was finally achieved in a ground-breaking voyage commanded by Vasco da Gama. His squadron left Portugal in 1497, rounded the Cape and continued along the coast of East Africa, where a local pilot was brought on board who guided them across the Indian Ocean, reaching Calicut in western India in May 1498. Reaching the legendary Indian spice routes unopposed helped the Portuguese improve their economy that, until Gama, was mainly based on trades along Northern and coastal West Africa. These spices were at first mostly pepper and cinnamon, but soon included other products, all new to Europe. This led to a commercial monopoly for several decades.

The second voyage to India was dispatched in 1500 under Pedro Álvares Cabral. While following the same south-westerly route as Gama across the Atlantic Ocean, Cabral made landfall on the Brazilian coast. This was probably an accident but it has been speculated that the Portuguese knew of Brazil's existence. Cabral recommended to the Portuguese king that the land be settled, and two follow-up voyages were sent in 1501 and 1503. The land was found to be abundant in pau-brasil, or brazilwood, from which it later inherited its name, but the failure to find gold or silver meant that for the time being Portuguese efforts were concentrated on India.

Gama's voyage was significant and paved the way for the
Portuguese to establish a long-lasting colonial empire in Asia. The route meant that the Portuguese would not need to cross the highly disputed Mediterranean, or the dangerous Arabian Peninsula, and that the entire voyage would be made by sea.

Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia Explorations

The aim of Portugal in the Indian Ocean was to ensure the monopoly of the spice trade. Taking advantage of the rivalries that pitted Hindus against Muslims, the Portuguese established several forts and trading posts between 1500 and 1510. After the victorious sea Battle of Diu, Turks and Egyptians withdrew their navies from India, setting the Portuguese trade dominance for almost a century, and greatly contributing to the growth of the Portuguese Empire. It also
marked the beginning of the European colonial dominance in Asia. A second Battle of Diu in 1538 ended Ottoman ambitions in India, and confirmed Portuguese hegemony in the Indian Ocean.

In 1511, Albuquerque sailed to Malacca in Malaysia, the most important eastern point in the trade network, where Malay met Gujarati, Chinese, Japanese, Javan, Bengali, Persian, and Arabic traders. The port of Malacca became the strategic base for Portuguese trade expansion with China and Southeast Asia. Eventually, the Portuguese Empire expanded into the Persian Gulf as Portugal contested control of the spice trade with the Ottoman Empire. In a shifting series of alliances, the Portuguese dominated much of the southern Persian Gulf for the next hundred years.

A Portuguese explorer funded by the Spanish Crown, Ferdinand Magellan, organized the Castilian (Spanish) expedition to the East Indies from 1519 to 1522. Selected by King Charles I of Spain to search for a westward route to the Maluku Islands (the “Spice Islands,” today’s Indonesia), he headed south through the Atlantic Ocean to Patagonia, passing through the Strait of Magellan into a body of water he named the “peaceful sea” (the modern Pacific Ocean). Despite a series of storms and mutinies, the expedition reached the Spice Islands in 1521, and returned home via the Indian Ocean to complete the first circuit of the globe.

In 1525, after Magellan’s expedition, Spain, under Charles V, sent an expedition to colonize the Maluku islands. García Jofre de Loaís reached the islands and the conflict with the Portuguese was inevitable, starting nearly a decade of skirmishes. An agreement was reached only with the Treaty of Zaragoza (1529), attributing the Maluku to Portugal, and the Philippines to Spain.

Portugal established trading ports at far-flung locations like Goa, Ormuz, Malacca, Kochi, the Maluku Islands, Macau, and Nagasaki. Guarding its trade from both European and Asian competitors, it dominated not only the trade between Asia and Europe, but also much of the trade between different regions of Asia, such as India, Indonesia, China, and Japan. Jesuit missionaries followed the
Portuguese to spread Roman Catholic Christianity to Asia, with mixed success.
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6. Spanish Exploration

19.2.3: Spanish Exploration

The voyages of Christopher Columbus initiated the European exploration and colonization of the American continents that eventually turned Spain into the most powerful European empire.

**Learning Objective**

Outline the successes and failures of Christopher Columbus during his four voyages to the Americas

**Key Points**

- Only late in the 15th century did an emerging modern Spain become fully committed to the search for new trade routes overseas. In 1492, Christopher Columbus’s expedition was funded in the hope of bypassing Portugal’s monopoly on west African sea routes, to reach “the Indies.”
- On the evening of August 3, 1492, Columbus departed from Palos de la Frontera with three ships. Land was sighted on October 12, 1492 and Columbus
called the island (now The Bahamas) San Salvador, in what he thought to be the “West Indies.” Following the first American voyage, Columbus made three more.

- A division of influence became necessary to avoid conflict between the Spanish and Portuguese. An agreement was reached in 1494, with the Treaty of Tordesillas dividing the world between the two powers.

- After Columbus, the Spanish colonization of the Americas was led by a series of soldier-explorers, called conquistadors. The Spanish forces, in addition to significant armament and equestrian advantages, exploited the rivalries between competing indigenous peoples, tribes, and nations.

- One of the most accomplished conquistadors was Hernán Cortés, who achieved the Spanish conquest of the Aztec Empire. Of equal importance was the Spanish conquest of the Inca Empire under Francisco Pizarro.

- In 1565, the first permanent Spanish settlement in the Philippines was founded, which added a critical Asian post to the empire. The Manilla Galleons shipped goods from all over Asia, across the Pacific to Acapulco on the coast of Mexico.
**Key Terms**

**Christopher Columbus**
An Italian explorer, navigator, and colonizer who completed four voyages across the Atlantic Ocean under the monarchy of Spain, which led to general European awareness of the American continents.

**Treaty of Tordesillas**
A 1494 treaty that divided the newly discovered lands outside Europe between Portugal and the Crown of Castile, along a meridian 370 leagues west of the Cape Verde islands, off the west coast of Africa. This line of demarcation was about halfway between the Cape Verde islands (already Portuguese) and the islands entered by Christopher Columbus on his first voyage (claimed for Castile and León).

**Treaty of Zaragoza**
A 1529 peace treaty between the Spanish Crown and Portugal that defined the areas of Castilian (Spanish) and Portuguese influence in Asia to resolve the “Moluccas issue,” when both kingdoms claimed the Moluccas islands for themselves, considering it within their exploration area established by the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494. The conflict sprang in 1520, when the expeditions of both kingdoms reached the Pacific Ocean, since there was not a set limit to the east.

**reconquista**
A period in the history of the Iberian Peninsula, spanning approximately 770 years, between the initial
Umayyad conquest of Hispания in the 710s, and the fall of the Emirate of Granada, the last Islamic state on the peninsula, to expanding Christian kingdoms in 1492.

Introduction

While Portugal led European explorations of non-European territories, its neighboring fellow Iberian rival, Castile, embarked upon its own mission to create an overseas empire. It began to establish its rule over the Canary Islands, located off the West African coast, in 1402, but then became distracted by internal Iberian politics and the repelling of Islamic invasion attempts and raids through most of the 15th century. Only late in the century, following the unification of the crowns of Castile and Aragon and the completion of the reconquista, did an emerging modern Spain become fully committed to the search for new trade routes overseas. In 1492, the joint rulers conquered the Moorish kingdom of Granada, which had been providing Castile with African goods through tribute, and decided to fund Christopher Columbus’s expedition in the hope of bypassing Portugal’s monopoly on west African sea routes, to reach “the Indies” (east and south Asia) by traveling west. Twice before, in 1485 and 1488, Columbus had presented the project to king John II of Portugal, who rejected it.

Columbus’s Voyages

On the evening of August 3, 1492, Columbus departed from Palos
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de la Frontera with three ships: *Santa María*, *Pinta (the Painted)* and *Santa Clara*. Columbus first sailed to the Canary Islands, where he restocked for what turned out to be a five-week voyage across the ocean, crossing a section of the Atlantic that became known as the Sargasso Sea. Land was sighted on October 12, 1492, and Columbus called the island (now The Bahamas) *San Salvador*, in what he thought to be the “West Indies.” He also explored the northeast coast of Cuba and the northern coast of Hispaniola. Columbus left 39 men behind and founded the settlement of *La Navidad* in what is present-day Haiti.

Following the first American voyage, Columbus made three more. During the second, 1493, voyage, he enslaved 560 native Americans, in spite of the Queen’s explicit opposition to the idea. Their transfer to Spain resulted in the death and disease of hundreds of the captives. The object of the third voyage was to verify the existence of a continent that King John II of Portugal claimed was located to the southwest of the Cape Verde Islands. In 1498, Columbus left port with a fleet of six ships. He explored the Gulf of Paria, which separates Trinidad from mainland Venezuela, and then the mainland of South America. Columbus described these new lands as belonging to a previously unknown new continent, but he pictured them hanging from China. Finally, the fourth voyage, nominally in search of a westward passage to the Indian Ocean, left Spain in 1502. Columbus spent two months exploring the coasts of Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, before arriving in Almirante Bay, Panama. After his ships sustained serious damage in a storm off the coast of Cuba, Columbus and his men remained stranded on Jamaica for a year. Help finally arrived and Columbus and his men arrived in Castile in November 1504.
The Treaty of Tordesillas

Shortly after Columbus’s arrival from the “West Indies,” a division of influence became necessary to avoid conflict between the Spanish and Portuguese. An agreement was reached in 1494 with the Treaty of Tordesillas, which divided the world between the two powers. In the treaty, the Portuguese received everything outside Europe east of a line that ran 370 leagues west of the Cape Verde islands (already Portuguese), and the islands reached by Christopher Columbus on his first voyage (claimed for Spain—Cuba, and Hispaniola). This gave them control over Africa, Asia, and eastern South America (Brazil). The Spanish (Castile) received everything west of this line, territory that was still almost completely unknown, and proved to be mostly the western part of the Americas, plus the Pacific Ocean islands.
Further Explorations of the Americas

After Columbus, the Spanish colonization of the Americas was led by a series of soldier-explorers, called conquistadors. The Spanish forces, in addition to significant armament and equestrian advantages, exploited the rivalries between competing indigenous peoples, tribes, and nations, some of which were willing to form alliances with the Spanish in order to defeat their more powerful enemies, such as the Aztecs or Incas—a tactic that would be extensively used by later European colonial powers. The Spanish conquest was also facilitated by the spread of diseases (e.g., smallpox), common in Europe but never present in the New World, which reduced the indigenous populations in the Americas. This caused labor shortages for plantations and public works, and so the colonists initiated the Atlantic slave trade.

One of the most accomplished conquistadors was Hernán Cortés, who led a relatively small Spanish force, but with local translators and the crucial support of thousands of native allies, achieved the Spanish conquest of the Aztec Empire in the campaigns of 1519–1521 (present day Mexico). Of equal importance was the Spanish conquest of the Inca Empire. After years of preliminary exploration and military skirmishes, 168 Spanish soldiers under Francisco Pizarro, and their native allies, captured the Sapa Inca Atahualpa in the 1532 Battle of Cajamarca. It was the first step in a long campaign that took decades of fighting, but ended in Spanish victory in 1572 and colonization of the region as the Viceroyalty of Peru. The conquest of the Inca Empire led to spin-off campaigns into present-day Chile and Colombia, as well as expeditions towards the Amazon Basin.

Further Spanish settlements were progressively established in the New World: New Granada in the 1530s (later in the Viceroyalty of New Granada in 1717 and present day Colombia), Lima in 1535 as the capital of the Viceroyalty of Peru, Buenos Aires in 1536 (later in
the Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata in 1776), and Santiago in 1541. Florida was colonized in 1565 by Pedro Menéndez de Avilés.

The Portuguese Ferdinand Magellan died while in the Philippines commanding a Castilian expedition in 1522, which was the first to circumnavigate the globe. The Basque commander, Juan Sebastián Elcano, would lead the expedition to success. Therefore, Spain sought to enforce their rights in the Moluccan islands, which led a conflict with the Portuguese, but the issue was resolved with the Treaty of Zaragoza (1525). In 1565, the first permanent Spanish settlement in the Philippines was founded by Miguel López de Legazpi, and the service of Manila Galleons was inaugurated. The Manilla Galleons shipped goods from all over Asia across the Pacific to Acapulco on the coast of Mexico. From there, the goods were transshipped across Mexico to the Spanish treasure fleets, for shipment to Spain. The Spanish trading post of Manila was established to facilitate this trade in 1572.

Attributions

- Spanish Exploration

- “Spanish conquest of the Inca Empire.”
- “Voyages of Christopher Columbus.”
- “First Voyage, Departure for the New World, August 3, 1492.”
19.2.4: England and the High Seas

Throughout the 17th century, the British established numerous successful American colonies and dominated the Atlantic slave trade, which eventually led to creating the most powerful European empire.

**Learning Objective**

Explain why England was interested in establishing a maritime empire

**Key Points**

- In 1496, King Henry VII of England, following the successes of Spain and Portugal in overseas exploration, commissioned John Cabot to lead a voyage to discover a route to Asia via the North Atlantic. Cabot sailed in 1497 and he successfully made landfall on the coast of Newfoundland but did not establish a colony.
- In 1562, the English Crown encouraged the
privateers John Hawkins and Francis Drake to engage in slave-raiding attacks against Spanish and Portuguese ships off the coast of West Africa, with the aim of breaking into the Atlantic trade system. Drake carried out the second circumnavigation of the world in a single expedition, from 1577 to 1580.

- In 1578, Elizabeth I granted a patent to Humphrey Gilbert for discovery and overseas exploration. In 1583, he claimed the harbor of Newfoundland for England, but no settlers were left behind. Gilbert did not survive the return journey to England, and was succeeded by his half-brother, Walter Raleigh, who founded the colony of Roanoke, the first but failed British settlement.

- In the first decade of the 17th century, English attention shifted from preying on other nations’ colonial infrastructures to the business of establishing its own overseas colonies. The Caribbean initially provided England’s most important and lucrative colonies.

- The introduction of the 1951 Navigation Acts led to war with the Dutch Republic, which was the first war fought largely, on the English side, by purpose-built, state-owned warships. After the English monarchy was restored in 1660, Charles II re-established the Navy, but as a national institution known, since then, as “The Royal Navy.”

- Throughout the 17th century, the British established numerous successful American colonies, all based largely on slave labor. The colonization of the Americas and the participation in the Atlantic slave trade allowed the British to gradually build the
most powerful European empire.

**Key Terms**

**First Anglo-Dutch War**

A 1652–1654 conflict fought entirely at sea between the navies of the Commonwealth of England and the United Provinces of the Netherlands. Caused by disputes over trade, the war began with English attacks on Dutch merchant shipping, but expanded to vast fleet actions. Ultimately, it resulted in the English Navy gaining control of the seas around England, and forced the Dutch to accept an English monopoly on trade with England and her colonies.

**Navigation Acts**

A series of English laws that restricted the use of foreign ships for trade between every country except England. They were first enacted in 1651, and were repealed nearly 200 years later in 1849. They reflected the policy of mercantilism, which sought to keep all the benefits of trade inside the empire, and minimize the loss of gold and silver to foreigners.

**Roanoke**

Also known as the Lost Colony; a late 16th-century attempt by Queen Elizabeth I to establish a permanent English settlement in the Americas. The colony was founded by Sir Walter Raleigh. The colonists
disappeared during the Anglo-Spanish War, three years after the last shipment of supplies from England.

**Plymouth**

An English colonial venture in North America from 1620 to 1691, first surveyed and named by Captain John Smith. The settlement served as the capital of the colony and at its height, it occupied most of the southeastern portion of the modern state of Massachusetts.

**Jamestown**

The first permanent English settlement in the Americas, established by the Virginia Company of London as “James Fort” on May 4, 1607, and considered permanent after brief abandonment in 1610. It followed several earlier failed attempts, including the Lost Colony of Roanoke.

---

**Introduction**

The foundations of the British Empire were laid when England and Scotland were separate kingdoms. In 1496, King Henry VII of England, following the successes of Spain and Portugal in overseas exploration, commissioned John Cabot (Venetian born as Giovanni Caboto) to lead a voyage to discover a route to Asia via the North Atlantic. Spain put limited efforts into exploring the northern part of the Americas, as its resources were concentrated in Central and South America where more wealth had been found. Cabot sailed
in 1497, five years after Europeans reached America, and although he successfully made landfall on the coast of Newfoundland (mistakenly believing, like Christopher Columbus, that he had reached Asia), there was no attempt to found a colony. Cabot led another voyage to the Americas the following year, but nothing was heard of his ships again.

The Early Empire

No further attempts to establish English colonies in the Americas were made until well into the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, during the last decades of the 16th century. In the meantime, the Protestant Reformation had turned England and Catholic Spain into implacable enemies. In 1562, the English Crown encouraged the privateers John Hawkins and Francis Drake to engage in slave-raiding attacks against Spanish and Portuguese ships off the coast of West Africa, with the aim of breaking into the Atlantic trade system. Drake carried out the second circumnavigation of the world in a single expedition, from 1577 to 1580, and was the first to complete the voyage as captain while leading the expedition throughout the entire circumnavigation. With his incursion into the Pacific, he inaugurated an era of privateering and piracy in the western coast of the Americas—an area that had previously been free of piracy.

In 1578, Elizabeth I granted a patent to Humphrey Gilbert for discovery and overseas exploration. That year, Gilbert sailed for the West Indies with the intention of engaging in piracy and establishing a colony in North America, but the expedition was aborted before it had crossed the Atlantic. In 1583, he embarked on a second attempt, on this occasion to the island of Newfoundland whose harbor he formally claimed for England, although no settlers were left behind. Gilbert did not survive the return journey to England, and was succeeded by his half-brother, Walter Raleigh, who was granted his own patent by Elizabeth in 1584. Later that
year, Raleigh founded the colony of Roanoke on the coast of present-day North Carolina, but lack of supplies caused the colony to fail.

Empire in the Americas

In 1603, James VI, King of Scots, ascended (as James I) to the English throne, and in 1604 negotiated the Treaty of London, ending hostilities with Spain. Now at peace with its main rival, English attention shifted from preying on other nations’ colonial infrastructures, to the business of establishing its own overseas colonies. The Caribbean initially provided England’s most important and lucrative colonies. Colonies in Guiana, St Lucia, and Grenada failed but settlements were successfully established in St. Kitts (1624), Barbados (1627), and Nevis (1628). The colonies soon adopted the system of sugar plantations, successfully used by the Portuguese in Brazil, which depended on slave labor, and—at first—Dutch ships, to sell the slaves and buy the sugar. To ensure that the increasingly healthy profits of this trade remained in English hands, Parliament decreed in the 1651 Navigation Acts that only English ships would be able to ply their trade in English colonies. In 1655, England annexed the island of Jamaica from the Spanish, and in 1666 succeeded in colonizing the Bahamas.
In 1672, the Royal African Company was inaugurated, receiving from King Charles a monopoly of the trade to supply slaves to the British colonies of the Caribbean. From the outset, slavery was the basis of the British Empire in the West Indies and later in North America. Until the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, Britain was responsible for the transportation of 3.5 million African slaves to the Americas, a third of all slaves transported across the Atlantic.

The introduction of the Navigation Acts led to war with the Dutch Republic. In the early stages of this First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654), the superiority of the large, heavily armed English ships was offset by superior Dutch tactical organization. English tactical improvements resulted in a series of crushing victories in 1653, bringing peace on favorable terms. This was the first war fought largely, on the English side, by purpose-built, state-owned warships. After the English monarchy was restored in 1660, Charles II re-established the navy, but from this point on, it ceased to be the personal possession of the reigning monarch, and instead became a national institution, with the title of “The Royal Navy.”

England's first permanent settlement in the Americas was founded in 1607 in Jamestown, led by Captain John Smith and managed by the Virginia Company. Bermuda was settled and claimed by England as a result of the 1609 shipwreck there of the Virginia Company's flagship. The Virginia Company's charter was revoked in 1624 and direct control of Virginia was assumed by the crown, thereby founding the Colony of Virginia. In 1620, Plymouth was founded as a haven for puritan religious separatists, later known as the Pilgrims. Fleeing from religious persecution would become the motive of many English would-be colonists to risk the arduous trans-Atlantic voyage; Maryland was founded as a haven for Roman Catholics (1634), Rhode Island (1636) as a colony tolerant of all religions, and Connecticut (1639) for Congregationalists. The Province of Carolina was founded in 1663. With the surrender of Fort Amsterdam in 1664, England gained control of the Dutch colony of New Netherland, renaming it New York. In 1681, the colony of
Pennsylvania was founded by William Penn. The American colonies were less financially successful than those of the Caribbean, but had large areas of good agricultural land and attracted far larger numbers of English emigrants who preferred their temperate climates.

From the outset, slavery was the basis of the British Empire in the West Indies. Until the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, Britain was responsible for the transportation of 3.5 million African slaves to the Americas, a third of all slaves transported across the Atlantic. In the British Caribbean, the percentage of the population of African descent rose from 25% in 1650 to around 80% in 1780, and in the 13 Colonies from 10% to 40% over the same period (the majority in the southern colonies). For the slave traders, the trade was extremely profitable, and became a major economic mainstay.

Although Britain was relatively late in its efforts to explore and
colonize the New World, lagging behind Spain and Portugal, it eventually gained significant territories in North America and the Caribbean.

Attributions

- **England and the High Seas**
8. French Explorers

19.2.5: French Explorers

France established colonies in North America, the Caribbean, and India in the 17th century, and while it lost most of its American holdings to Spain and Great Britain before the end of the 18th century, it eventually expanded its Asian and African territories in the 19th century.

Learning Objective

Describe some of the discoveries made by French explorers

Key Points

- Competing with Spain, Portugal, the Dutch Republic, and later Britain, France began to establish colonies in North America, the Caribbean, and India in the 17th century. Major French exploration of North America began under the rule of Francis I of France. In 1524, he sent Italian-born Giovanni da Verrazzano to explore the region between Florida and
Newfoundland for a route to the Pacific Ocean.

- In 1534, Francis sent Jacques Cartier on the first of three voyages to explore the coast of Newfoundland and the St. Lawrence River. Cartier founded New France and was the first European to travel inland in North America.
- Cartier attempted to create the first permanent European settlement in North America at Cap-Rouge (Quebec City) in 1541, but the settlement was abandoned the next year. A number of other failed attempts to establish French settlements in North America followed throughout the rest of the 16th century.
- Prior to the establishment of the 1663 Sovereign Council, the territories of New France were developed as mercantile colonies. It was only after 1665 that France gave its American colonies the proper means to develop population colonies comparable to that of the British. By the first decades of the 18th century, the French created and controlled a number of settlement colonies in North America.
- As the French empire in North America grew, the French also began to build a smaller but more profitable empire in the West Indies.
- While the French quite rapidly lost nearly all of its colonial gains in the Americas, their colonial expansion also covered territories in Africa and Asia where France grew to be a major colonial power in the 19th century.
Key Terms

**New France**

The area colonized by France in North America during a period beginning with the exploration of the Saint Lawrence River by Jacques Cartier in 1534, and ending with the cession of New France to Spain and Great Britain in 1763. At its peak in 1712, the territory extended from Newfoundland to the Rocky Mountains, and from Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, including all the Great Lakes of North America.

**Sovereign Council**

A governing body in New France. It acted as both Supreme Court for the colony of New France and as a policy making body, although, its policy role diminished over time. Though officially established in 1663 by King Louis XIV, it was not created whole cloth, but rather evolved from earlier governing bodies.

**mercantile colonies**

Colonies that sought to derive the maximum material benefit from the colony, for the homeland, with a minimum of imperial investment in the colony itself. The mercantilist ideology at its foundations was embodied in New France through the establishment under Royal Charter of a number of corporate trading monopolies.

**Carib Expulsion**

The French-led ethnic cleansing that terminated most of the Carib population in 1660 from present-day
The French in the New World: New France

Competing with Spain, Portugal, the United Provinces (the Dutch Republic), and later Britain, France began to establish colonies in North America, the Caribbean, and India in the 17th century. The French first came to the New World as explorers, seeking a route to the Pacific Ocean and wealth. Major French exploration of North America began under the rule of Francis I of France. In 1524, Francis sent Italian-born Giovanni da Verrazzano to explore the region between Florida and Newfoundland for a route to the Pacific Ocean. Verrazzano gave the names Francesca and Nova Gallia to the land between New Spain and English Newfoundland, thus promoting French interests.

In 1534, Francis sent Jacques Cartier on the first of three voyages to explore the coast of Newfoundland and the St. Lawrence River. Cartier founded New France by planting a cross on the shore of the Gaspé Peninsula. He is believed to have accompanied Verrazzano to Nova Scotia and Brazil, and was the first European to travel inland in North America, describing the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, which he named “The Country of Canadas” after Iroquois names, and claiming what is now Canada for France. He attempted to create the first permanent European settlement in North America at Cap-Rouge (Quebec City) in 1541 with 400 settlers, but the settlement was abandoned the next year. A number of other failed attempts to
establish French settlement in North America followed throughout the rest of the 16th century.

Portait of Jacques Cartier by Théophile Hamel (1844), Library and Archives Canada (there are no known paintings of Cartier that were created during his lifetime) In 1534, Jacques Cartier planted a cross in the Gaspé Peninsula and claimed the land in the name of King Francis I. It was the first province of New France. However, initial French attempts at settling the region met with failure.

Although, through alliances with various Native American tribes, the French were able to exert a loose control over much of the North American continent, areas of French settlement were generally limited to the St. Lawrence River Valley. Prior to the establishment of the 1663 Sovereign Council, the territories of New
France were developed as mercantile colonies. It was only after 1665 that France gave its American colonies the proper means to develop population colonies comparable to that of the British. By the first decades of the 18th century, the French created and controlled such colonies as Quebec, La Baye des Puants (present-day Green Bay), Ville-Marie (Montreal), Fort Pontchartrain du Détroit (modern-day Detroit), or La Nouvelle Orléans (New Orleans) and Baton Rouge. However, there was relatively little interest in colonialism in France, which concentrated on dominance within Europe, and for most of its history, New France was far behind the British North American colonies in both population and economic development. Acadia itself was lost to the British in 1713.

In 1699, French territorial claims in North America expanded still further, with the foundation of Louisiana in the basin of the Mississippi River. The extensive trading network throughout the region connected to Canada through the Great Lakes, was maintained through a vast system of fortifications, many of them centered in the Illinois Country and in present-day Arkansas.

New France was the area colonized by France in North America during a period beginning with the exploration of the Saint
Lawrence River by Jacques Cartier in 1534, and ending with the cession of New France to Spain and Great Britain in 1763. At its peak in 1712, the territory of New France extended from Newfoundland to the Rocky Mountains, and from Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, including all the Great Lakes of North America.

The West Indies

As the French empire in North America grew, the French also began to build a smaller but more profitable empire in the West Indies. Settlement along the South American coast in what is today French Guiana began in 1624, and a colony was founded on Saint Kitts in 1625. Colonies in Guadeloupe and Martinique were founded in 1635 and on Saint Lucia in 1650. The food-producing plantations of these colonies were built and sustained through slavery, with the supply of slaves dependent on the African slave trade. Local resistance by the indigenous peoples resulted in the Carib Expulsion of 1660.

France's most important Caribbean colonial possession was established in 1664, when the colony of Saint-Domingue (today's Haiti) was founded on the western half of the Spanish island of Hispaniola. In the 18th century, Saint-Domingue grew to be the richest sugar colony in the Caribbean. The eastern half of Hispaniola (today's Dominican Republic) also came under French rule for a short period, after being given to France by Spain in 1795.

In the middle of the 18th century, a series of colonial conflicts began between France and Britain, which ultimately resulted in the destruction of most of the first French colonial empire and the near complete expulsion of France from the Americas.
Africa and Asia

French colonial expansion wasn’t limited to the New World. In Senegal in West Africa, the French began to establish trading posts along the coast in 1624. In 1664, the French East India Company was established to compete for trade in the east. With the decay of the Ottoman Empire, in 1830 the French seized Algiers, thus beginning the colonization of French North Africa. Colonies were also established in India in Chandernagore (1673) and Pondichéry in the south east (1674), and later at Yanam (1723), Mahe (1725), and Karikal (1739). Finally, colonies were founded in the Indian Ocean, on the Île de Bourbon (Réunion, 1664), Isle de France (Mauritius, 1718), and the Seychelles (1756).

While the French never rebuilt its American gains, their influence in Africa and Asia expanded significantly over the course of the 19th century.

Attributions

- French Explorers

- “French colonization of the Americas.”
  https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
  French_colonization_of_the_Americas. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

  Mercantilism. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

  French_colonization_of_the_Americas#/media/
  File:Cartier.png. Wikipedia Public domain.

- “1024px-Nouvelle-France_map-en.svg.png.”
  https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
  French_colonization_of_the_Americas#/media/
9. The Scientific Revolution

19.3: The Scientific Revolution

19.3.1: Roots of the Scientific Revolution

The scientific revolution, which emphasized systematic experimentation as the most valid research method, resulted in developments in mathematics, physics, astronomy, biology, and chemistry. These developments transformed the views of society about nature.

Learning Objective

Outline the changes that occurred during the Scientific Revolution that resulted in developments towards a new means for experimentation

Key Points

- The scientific revolution was the emergence of modern science during the early modern period,
when developments in mathematics, physics, astronomy, biology (including human anatomy), and chemistry transformed societal views about nature.

- The change to the medieval idea of science occurred for four reasons: collaboration, the derivation of new experimental methods, the ability to build on the legacy of existing scientific philosophy, and institutions that enabled academic publishing.
- Under the scientific method, which was defined and applied in the 17th century, natural and artificial circumstances were abandoned and a research tradition of systematic experimentation was slowly accepted throughout the scientific community.
- During the scientific revolution, changing perceptions about the role of the scientist in respect to nature, and the value of experimental or observed evidence, led to a scientific methodology in which empiricism played a large, but not absolute, role.
- As the scientific revolution was not marked by any single change, many new ideas contributed. Some of them were revolutions in their own fields.
- Science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and thought. Many Enlightenment writers and thinkers had backgrounds in the sciences, and associated scientific advancement with the overthrow of religion and traditional authority in favor of the development of free speech and thought.
Key Terms

**scientific method**
A body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, or correcting and integrating previous knowledge, through the application of empirical or measurable evidence subject to specific principles of reasoning. It has characterized natural science since the 17th century, consisting in systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses.

**Baconian method**
The investigative method developed by Sir Francis Bacon. It was put forward in Bacon’s book *Novum Organum* (1620), (or *New Method*), and was supposed to replace the methods put forward in Aristotle’s *Organon*. This method was influential upon the development of the scientific method in modern science, but also more generally in the early modern rejection of medieval Aristotelianism.

**Galileo**
An Italian thinker (1564-1642) and key figure in the scientific revolution who improved the telescope, made astronomical observations, and put forward the basic principle of relativity in physics.

**empiricism**
A theory stating that knowledge comes only, or primarily, from sensory experience. It emphasizes
evidence, especially the kind of evidence gathered through experimentation and by use of the scientific method.

**British Royal Society**

A British learned society for science; possibly the oldest such society still in existence, having been founded in November 1660.

---

**The Scientific Revolution**

The scientific revolution was the emergence of modern science during the early modern period, when developments in mathematics, physics, astronomy, biology (including human anatomy), and chemistry transformed societal views about nature. The scientific revolution began in Europe toward the end of the Renaissance period, and continued through the late 18th century, influencing the intellectual social movement known as the Enlightenment. While its dates are disputed, the publication in 1543 of Nicolaus Copernicus’s *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (*On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres*) is often cited as marking the beginning of the scientific revolution.

The scientific revolution was built upon the foundation of ancient Greek learning and science in the Middle Ages, as it had been elaborated and further developed by Roman/Byzantine science and medieval Islamic science. The Aristotelian tradition was still an important intellectual framework in the 17th century, although by that time natural philosophers had moved away from much of it. Key scientific ideas dating back to classical antiquity had changed
drastically over the years, and in many cases been discredited. The ideas that remained (for example, Aristotle’s cosmology, which placed the Earth at the center of a spherical hierarchic cosmos, or the Ptolemaic model of planetary motion) were transformed fundamentally during the scientific revolution.

The change to the medieval idea of science occurred for four reasons:

1. Seventeenth century scientists and philosophers were able to collaborate with members of the mathematical and astronomical communities to effect advances in all fields.
2. Scientists realized the inadequacy of medieval experimental methods for their work and so felt the need to devise new methods (some of which we use today).
3. Academics had access to a legacy of European, Greek, and Middle Eastern scientific philosophy that they could use as a starting point (either by disproving or building on the theorems).
4. Institutions (for example, the British Royal Society) helped validate science as a field by providing an outlet for the publication of scientists’ work.

**New Methods**

Under the scientific method that was defined and applied in the 17th century, natural and artificial circumstances were abandoned, and a research tradition of systematic experimentation was slowly accepted throughout the scientific community. The philosophy of using an inductive approach to nature (to abandon assumption and to attempt to simply observe with an open mind) was in strict
contrast with the earlier, Aristotelian approach of deduction, by which analysis of known facts produced further understanding. In practice, many scientists and philosophers believed that a healthy mix of both was needed—the willingness to both question assumptions, and to interpret observations assumed to have some degree of validity.

During the scientific revolution, changing perceptions about the role of the scientist in respect to nature, the value of evidence, experimental or observed, led towards a scientific methodology in which empiricism played a large, but not absolute, role. The term British empiricism came into use to describe philosophical differences perceived between two of its founders—Francis Bacon, described as empiricist, and René Descartes, who was described as a rationalist. Bacon’s works established and popularized inductive methodologies for scientific inquiry, often called the Baconian method, or sometimes simply the scientific method. His demand for a planned procedure of investigating all things natural marked a new turn in the rhetorical and theoretical framework for science, much of which still surrounds conceptions of proper methodology today. Correspondingly, Descartes distinguished between the knowledge that could be attained by reason alone (rationalist approach), as, for example, in mathematics, and the knowledge that required experience of the world, as in physics.

Thomas Hobbes, George Berkeley, and David Hume were the primary exponents of empiricism, and developed a sophisticated empirical tradition as the basis of human knowledge. The recognized founder of the approach was John Locke, who proposed in An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1689) that the only true knowledge that could be accessible to the human mind was that which was based on experience.
New Ideas

Many new ideas contributed to what is called the scientific revolution. Some of them were revolutions in their own fields. These include:

- The heliocentric model that involved the radical displacement of the earth to an orbit around the sun (as opposed to being seen as the center of the universe). Copernicus' 1543 work on the heliocentric model of the solar system tried to demonstrate that the sun was the center of the universe. The discoveries of Johannes Kepler and Galileo gave the theory credibility and the work culminated in Isaac Newton's *Principia*, which formulated the laws of motion and universal gravitation that dominated scientists' view of the physical universe for the next three centuries.
- Studying human anatomy based upon the dissection of human corpses, rather than the animal dissections, as practiced for centuries.
- Discovering and studying magnetism and electricity, and thus, electric properties of various materials.
- Modernization of disciplines (making them more as what they are today), including dentistry, physiology, chemistry, or optics.
- Invention of tools that deepened the understating of sciences, including mechanical calculator, steam digester (the forerunner of the steam engine), refracting and reflecting telescopes, vacuum pump, or mercury barometer.
Robert Boyle (1627-1691), an Irish-born English scientist, was an early supporter of the scientific method and founder of modern chemistry. Boyle is known for his pioneering experiments on the physical properties of gases, his authorship of the Sceptical Chymist, his role in creating the Royal Society of London, and his philanthropy in the American colonies.

The Scientific Revolution and the Enlightenment

The scientific revolution laid the foundations for the Age of Enlightenment, which centered on reason as the primary source
of authority and legitimacy, and emphasized the importance of the scientific method. By the 18th century, when the Enlightenment flourished, scientific authority began to displace religious authority, and disciplines until then seen as legitimately scientific (e.g., alchemy and astrology) lost scientific credibility.

Science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and thought. Many Enlightenment writers and thinkers had backgrounds in the sciences, and associated scientific advancement with the overthrow of religion and traditional authority in favor of the development of free speech and thought. Broadly speaking, Enlightenment science greatly valued empiricism and rational thought, and was embedded with the Enlightenment ideal of advancement and progress. At the time, science was dominated by scientific societies and academies, which had largely replaced universities as centers of scientific research and development. Societies and academies were also the backbone of the maturation of the scientific profession. Another important development was the popularization of science among an increasingly literate population. The century saw significant advancements in the practice of medicine, mathematics, and physics; the development of biological taxonomy; a new understanding of magnetism and electricity; and the maturation of chemistry as a discipline, which established the foundations of modern chemistry.
Newton’s *Principia* formulated the laws of motion and universal gravitation, which dominated scientists’ view of the physical universe for the next three centuries. By deriving Kepler’s laws of planetary motion from his mathematical description of gravity, and then using the same principles to account for the trajectories of comets, the tides, the precession of the equinoxes, and other phenomena, Newton removed the last doubts about the validity of the heliocentric model of the cosmos. This work also demonstrated that the motion of objects on Earth and of celestial bodies could be described by the same principles. His laws of motion were to be the solid foundation of mechanics.

**Attributions**

- **Roots of the Scientific Revolution**


In the 16th and 17th centuries, European scientists began increasingly applying quantitative measurements to the measurement of physical phenomena on the earth, which translated into the rapid development of mathematics and physics.

**Learning Objective**

Distinguish between the different key figures of the scientific revolution and their achievements in mathematics and physics

**Key Points**

- The philosophy of using an inductive approach to nature was in strict contrast with the earlier, Aristotelian approach of deduction, by which analysis of known facts produced further understanding. In practice, scientists believed that a healthy mix of both was needed—the willingness to question assumptions, yet also to interpret observations.
assumed to have some degree of validity. That principle was particularly true for mathematics and physics.

- In the 16th and 17th centuries, European scientists began increasingly applying quantitative measurements to the measurement of physical phenomena on the earth.
- The Copernican Revolution, or the paradigm shift from the Ptolemaic model of the heavens to the heliocentric model with the sun at the center of the solar system, began with the publication of Copernicus’s De revolutionibus orbium coelestium, and ended with Newton's work over a century later.
- Galileo showed a remarkably modern appreciation for the proper relationship between mathematics, theoretical physics, and experimental physics. His contributions to observational astronomy include the telescopic confirmation of the phases of Venus, the discovery of the four largest satellites of Jupiter, and the observation and analysis of sunspots.
- Newton's Principia formulated the laws of motion and universal gravitation, which dominated scientists' view of the physical universe for the next three centuries. He removed the last doubts about the validity of the heliocentric model of the solar system.
- The electrical science developed rapidly following the first discoveries of William Gilbert.


**Key Terms**

**Scientific revolution**

The emergence of modern science during the early modern period, when developments in mathematics, physics, astronomy, biology (including human anatomy), and chemistry transformed societal views about nature. It began in Europe towards the end of the Renaissance period, and continued through the late 18th century, influencing the intellectual social movement known as the Enlightenment.

**Scientific method**

A body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, or correcting and integrating previous knowledge that apply empirical or measurable evidence subject to specific principles of reasoning. It has characterized natural science since the 17th century, consisting in systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses.

**Copernican Revolution**

The paradigm shift from the Ptolemaic model of the heavens, which described the cosmos as having Earth stationary at the center of the universe, to the heliocentric model with the sun at the center of the solar system. Beginning with the publication of Nicolaus Copernicus’s *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, contributions to the “revolution” continued, until finally ending with Isaac Newton’s work over a century later.
Introduction

Under the scientific method that was defined and applied in the 17th century, natural and artificial circumstances were abandoned, and a research tradition of systematic experimentation was slowly accepted throughout the scientific community. The philosophy of using an inductive approach to nature—to abandon assumption and to attempt to simply observe with an open mind—was in strict contrast with the earlier, Aristotelian approach of deduction, by which analysis of known facts produced further understanding. In practice, many scientists (and philosophers) believed that a healthy mix of both was needed—the willingness to question assumptions, yet also to interpret observations assumed to have some degree of validity. That principle was particularly true for mathematics and physics. René Descartes, whose thought emphasized the power of reasoning but also helped establish the scientific method, distinguished between the knowledge that could be attained by reason alone (rationalist approach), which he thought was mathematics, and the knowledge that required experience of the world, which he thought was physics.

Mathematization

To the extent that medieval natural philosophers used mathematical problems, they limited social studies to theoretical analyses of local speed and other aspects of life. The actual measurement of a physical quantity, and the comparison of that measurement to a value computed on the basis of theory, was largely limited to the
mathematical disciplines of astronomy and optics in Europe. In the 16th and 17th centuries, European scientists began increasingly applying quantitative measurements to the measurement of physical phenomena on Earth.

The Copernican Revolution

While the dates of the scientific revolution are disputed, the publication in 1543 of Nicolaus Copernicus's *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres) is often cited as marking the beginning of the scientific revolution. The book proposed a heliocentric system contrary to the widely accepted geocentric system of that time. Tycho Brahe accepted Copernicus's model but reasserted geocentricity. However, Tycho challenged the Aristotelian model when he observed a comet that went through the region of the planets. This region was said to only have uniform circular motion on solid spheres, which meant that it would be impossible for a comet to enter into the area. Johannes Kepler followed Tycho and developed the three laws of planetary motion. Kepler would not have been able to produce his laws without the observations of Tycho, because they allowed Kepler to prove that planets traveled in ellipses, and that the sun does not sit directly in the center of an orbit, but at a focus. Galileo Galilei came after Kepler and developed his own telescope with enough magnification to allow him to study Venus and discover that it has phases like a moon. The discovery of the phases of Venus was one of the more influential reasons for the transition from geocentrism to heliocentrism. Isaac Newton's *Philosophiæ Naturalis Princípia Mathematica* concluded the Copernican Revolution. The development of his laws of planetary motion and universal gravitation explained the presumed motion related to the heavens by asserting a gravitational force of attraction between two objects.
Other Advancements in Physics and Mathematics

Galileo was one of the first modern thinkers to clearly state that the laws of nature are mathematical. In broader terms, his work marked another step towards the eventual separation of science from both philosophy and religion, a major development in human thought. Galileo showed a remarkably modern appreciation for the proper relationship between mathematics, theoretical physics, and experimental physics. He understood the parabola, both in terms of conic sections and in terms of the ordinate \( y \) varying as the square of the abscissa \( x \). He further asserted that the parabola was the theoretically ideal trajectory of a uniformly accelerated projectile in the absence of friction and other disturbances.

Newton's *Principia* formulated the laws of motion and universal gravitation, which dominated scientists' view of the physical universe for the next three centuries. By deriving Kepler's laws of planetary motion from his mathematical description of gravity, and then using the same principles to account for the trajectories of comets, the tides, the precession of the equinoxes, and other phenomena, Newton removed the last doubts about the validity of the heliocentric model of the cosmos. This work also demonstrated that the motion of objects on Earth, and of celestial bodies, could be described by the same principles. His prediction that Earth should be shaped as an oblate spheroid was later vindicated by other scientists. His laws of motion were to be the solid foundation of mechanics; his law of universal gravitation combined terrestrial and celestial mechanics into one great system that seemed to be able to describe the whole world in mathematical formulae. Newton also developed the theory of gravitation. After the exchanges with Robert Hooke, English natural philosopher, architect and polymath, he worked out proof that the elliptical form of planetary orbits would result from a centripetal force inversely proportional to the square of the radius vector.
The scientific revolution also witnessed the development of modern optics. Kepler published *Astronomiae Pars Optica* (*The Optical Part of Astronomy*) in 1604. In it, he described the inverse-square law governing the intensity of light, reflection by flat and curved mirrors, and principles of pinhole cameras, as well as the astronomical implications of optics, such as parallax and the apparent sizes of heavenly bodies. Willebrord Snellius found the mathematical law of refraction, now known as Snell's law, in 1621. Subsequently, Descartes showed, by using geometric construction and the law of refraction (also known as Descartes' law), that the angular radius of a rainbow is 42°. He also independently discovered the law of reflection. Finally, Newton investigated the refraction of light, demonstrating that a prism could decompose white light into a spectrum of colors, and that a lens and a second prism could recompose the multicolored spectrum into white light. He also showed that the colored light does not change its properties by separating out a colored beam and shining it on various objects.
Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) improved the telescope, with which he made several important astronomical discoveries, including the four largest moons of Jupiter, the phases of Venus, and the rings of Saturn, and made detailed observations of sunspots. He developed the laws for falling bodies based on pioneering quantitative experiments, which he analyzed mathematically.

Dr. William Gilbert, in De Magnete, invented the New Latin word *electricus* from ἕλεκτρον (elektron), the Greek word for “amber.” Gilbert undertook a number of careful electrical experiments, in the course of which he discovered that many substances were capable of manifesting electrical properties. He also discovered that a
heated body lost its electricity, and that moisture prevented the electrification of all bodies, due to the now well-known fact that moisture impaired the insulation of such bodies. He also noticed that electrified substances attracted all other substances indiscriminately, whereas a magnet only attracted iron. The many discoveries of this nature earned for Gilbert the title of “founder of the electrical science.”

Robert Boyle also worked frequently at the new science of electricity, and added several substances to Gilbert’s list of electrics. In 1675, he stated that electric attraction and repulsion can act across a vacuum. One of his important discoveries was that electrified bodies in a vacuum would attract light substances, this indicating that the electrical effect did not depend upon the air as a medium. He also added resin to the then known list of electrics. By the end of the 17th Century, researchers had developed practical means of generating electricity by friction with an anelectrostatic generator, but the development of electrostatic machines did not begin in earnest until the 18th century, when they became fundamental instruments in the studies about the new science of electricity. The first usage of the word electricity is ascribed to Thomas Browne in 1646 work. In 1729, Stephen Gray demonstrated that electricity could be “transmitted” through metal filaments.
Treasures of the RAS: Starry Messenger by Galileo Galilei: In 1610, Galileo published this book describing his observations of the sky with a new invention – the telescope. In it he describes his discovery of the moons of Jupiter, of stars too faint to be seen by the naked eye, and of mountains on the moon. The book was the first scientific publication to be based on data from a telescope. It was an important step towards our modern understanding of the solar system. The Latin title is Sidereus Nuncius, which translates as Starry Messenger, or Sidereal Message.
Attributions

- Physics and Mathematics
II. Astronomy

19.3.3: Astronomy

Though astronomy is the oldest of the natural sciences, its development during the scientific revolution entirely transformed societal views about nature by moving from geocentrism to heliocentrism.

Learning Objective

Assess the work of both Copernicus and Kepler and their revolutionary ideas

Key Points

- The development of astronomy during the period of the scientific revolution entirely transformed societal views about nature. The publication of Nicolaus Copernicus’ *De revolutionibus* in 1543 is often seen as marking the beginning of the time when scientific disciplines gradually transformed into the modern sciences as we know them today.

- Copernican heliocentrism is the name given to the
astronomical model developed by Copernicus that positioned the sun near the center of the universe, motionless, with Earth and the other planets rotating around it in circular paths, modified by epicycles and at uniform speeds.

• For over a century, few astronomers were convinced by the Copernican system. Tycho Brahe went so far as to construct a cosmology precisely equivalent to that of Copernicus, but with the earth held fixed in the center of the celestial sphere, instead of the sun. However, Tycho's idea also contributed to the defense of the heliocentric model.

• In 1596, Johannes Kepler published his first book, which was the first to openly endorse Copernican cosmology by an astronomer since the 1540s. Kepler's work on Mars and planetary motion further confirmed the heliocentric theory.

• Galileo Galilei designed his own telescope, with which he made a number of critical astronomical observations. His observations and discoveries were among the most influential in the transition from geocentrism to heliocentrism.

• Isaac Newton developed further ties between physics and astronomy through his law of universal gravitation, and irreversibly confirmed and further developed heliocentrism.
Key Terms

Copernican heliocentrism
The name given to the astronomical model developed by Nicolaus Copernicus and published in 1543. It positioned the sun near the center of the universe, motionless, with Earth and the other planets rotating around it in circular paths, modified by epicycles and at uniform speeds. It departed from the Ptolemaic system that prevailed in western culture for centuries, placing Earth at the center of the universe.

Copernicus
A Renaissance mathematician and astronomer (1473-1543), who formulated a heliocentric model of the universe which placed the sun, rather than the earth, at the center.

Epicycles
The geometric model used to explain the variations in speed and direction of the apparent motion of the moon, sun, and planets in the Ptolemaic system of astronomy.

The Emergence of Modern Astronomy

While astronomy is the oldest of the natural sciences, dating back to antiquity, its development during the period of the scientific revolution entirely transformed the views of society about nature. The publication of the seminal work in the field of astronomy,
Nicolaus Copernicus' *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* (On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres) published in 1543, is, in fact, often seen as marking the beginning of the time when scientific disciplines, including astronomy, began to apply modern empirical research methods, and gradually transformed into the modern sciences as we know them today.

### The Copernican Heliocentrism

Copernican heliocentrism is the name given to the astronomical model developed by Nicolaus Copernicus and published in 1543. It positioned the sun near the center of the universe, motionless, with Earth and the other planets rotating around it in circular paths, modified by epicycles and at uniform speeds. The Copernican model departed from the Ptolemaic system that prevailed in western culture for centuries, placing Earth at the center of the universe. Copernicus' *De revolutionibus* marks the beginning of the shift away from a geocentric (and anthropocentric) universe with Earth at its center. Copernicus held that Earth is another planet revolving around the fixed sun once a year, and turning on its axis once a day. But while he put the sun at the center of the celestial spheres, he did not put it at the exact center of the universe, but near it. His system used only uniform circular motions, correcting what was seen by many as the chief inelegance in Ptolemy's system.

### The Copernican Revolution

From 1543 until about 1700, few astronomers were convinced by the Copernican system. Forty-five years after the publication of *De Revolutionibus*, the astronomer Tycho Brahe went so far as to construct a cosmology precisely equivalent to that of Copernicus,
but with Earth held fixed in the center of the celestial sphere instead of the sun. However, Tycho challenged the Aristotelian model when he observed a comet that went through the region of the planets. This region was said to only have uniform circular motion on solid spheres, which meant that it would be impossible for a comet to enter into the area. Following Copernicus and Tycho, Johannes Kepler and Galileo Galilei, both working in the first decades of the 17th century, influentially defended, expanded and modified the heliocentric theory.

**Johannes Kepler**

Johannes Kepler was a German scientist who initially worked as Tycho’s assistant. In 1596, he published his first book, the *Mysterium cosmographicum*, which was the first to openly endorse Copernican cosmology by an astronomer since the 1540s. The book described his model that used Pythagorean mathematics and the five Platonic solids to explain the number of planets, their proportions, and their order. In 1600, Kepler set to work on the orbit of Mars, the second most eccentric of the six planets known at that time. This work was the basis of his next book, the *Astronomia nova* (1609). The book argued heliocentrism and ellipses for planetary orbits, instead of circles modified by epicycles. It contains the first two of his eponymous three laws of planetary motion (in 1619, the third law was published). The laws state the following:

- All planets move in elliptical orbits, with the sun at one focus.
- A line that connects a planet to the sun sweeps out equal areas in equal times.
- The time required for a planet to orbit the sun, called its period, is proportional to long axis of the ellipse raised to the $3/2$ power. The constant of proportionality is the same for all the planets.
Galileo Galilei

Galileo Galilei was an Italian scientist who is sometimes referred to as the “father of modern observational astronomy.” Based on the designs of Hans Lippershey, he designed his own telescope, which he had improved to 30x magnification. Using this new instrument, Galileo made a number of astronomical observations, which he published in the *Sidereus Nuncius* in 1610. In this book, he described the surface of the moon as rough, uneven, and imperfect. His observations challenged Aristotle’s claim that the moon was a perfect sphere, and the larger idea that the heavens were perfect and unchanging. While observing Jupiter over the course of several days, Galileo noticed four stars close to Jupiter whose positions were changing in a way that would be impossible if they were fixed stars. After much observation, he concluded these four stars were orbiting the planet Jupiter and were in fact moons, not stars. This was a radical discovery because, according to Aristotelian cosmology, all heavenly bodies revolve around Earth, and a planet with moons obviously contradicted that popular belief. While contradicting Aristotelian belief, it supported Copernican cosmology, which stated that Earth is a planet like all others.

In 1610, Galileo also observed that Venus had a full set of phases, similar to the phases of the moon, that we can observe from Earth. This was explainable by the Copernican system, which said that all phases of Venus would be visible due to the nature of its orbit around the sun, unlike the Ptolemaic system, which stated only some of Venus’s phases would be visible. Due to Galileo’s observations of Venus, Ptolemy’s system became highly suspect and the majority of leading astronomers subsequently converted to various heliocentric models, making his discovery one of the most influential in the transition from geocentrism to heliocentrism.
Copernicus was a polyglot and polymath who obtained a doctorate in canon law and also practiced as a physician, classics scholar, translator, governor, diplomat, and economist. In 1517 he derived a quantity theory of money—a key concept in economics—and in 1519, he formulated a version of what later became known as Gresham’s law (also in economics).
Uniting Astronomy and Physics: Isaac Newton

Although the motions of celestial bodies had been qualitatively explained in physical terms since Aristotle introduced celestial movers in his Metaphysics and a fifth element in his On the Heavens, Johannes Kepler was the first to attempt to derive mathematical predictions of celestial motions from assumed physical causes. This led to the discovery of the three laws of planetary motion that carry his name.

Isaac Newton developed further ties between physics and astronomy through his law of universal gravitation. Realizing that the same force that attracted objects to the surface of Earth held the moon in orbit around the Earth, Newton was able to explain, in one theoretical framework, all known gravitational phenomena. Newton’s Principia (1687) formulated the laws of motion and universal gravitation, which dominated scientists’ view of the physical universe for the next three centuries. By deriving Kepler’s laws of planetary motion from his mathematical description of gravity, and then using the same principles to account for the trajectories of comets, the tides, the precession of the equinoxes, and other phenomena, Newton removed the last doubts about the validity of the heliocentric model of the cosmos. This work also demonstrated that the motion of objects on Earth and of celestial bodies could be described by the same principles. His laws of motion were to be the solid foundation of mechanics; his law of universal gravitation combined terrestrial and celestial mechanics into one great system that seemed to be able to describe the whole world in mathematical formulae.
Johannes Kepler Biography (1571-1630): Johannes Kepler was a German astronomer and mathematician, who played an important role in the 17th century scientific revolution.

Attributions

- Astronomy
History of astronomy. WikipediaCC BY-SA 3.0.

12. The Medical Renaissance

19.3.4: The Medical Renaissance

The Renaissance period witnessed groundbreaking developments in medical sciences, including advancements in human anatomy, physiology, surgery, dentistry, and microbiology.

Learning Objective

List the discoveries and progress made by leading medical professionals during the Early Modern era

Key Points

- During the Renaissance, experimental investigation, particularly in the field of dissection and body examination, advanced the knowledge of human anatomy and modernized medical research.
- *De humani corporis fabrica* by Andreas Vesalius emphasized the priority of dissection and what has come to be called the “anatomical” view of the body. It laid the foundations for the modern study of human anatomy.
Further groundbreaking work was carried out by William Harvey, who published *De Motu Cordis* in 1628. Harvey made a detailed analysis of the overall structure of the heart and blood circulation.

French surgeon Ambroise Paré (c. 1510-1590) is considered one of the fathers of surgery and modern forensic pathology, and a pioneer in surgical techniques and battlefield medicine, especially in the treatment of wounds.

Herman Boerhaave (1668-1738) is regarded as the founder of clinical teaching, and of the modern academic hospital. He is sometimes referred to as “the father of physiology.”

French physician Pierre Fauchard started dentistry science as we know it today, and he has been named “the father of modern dentistry.”

**Key Terms**

**William Harvey**

An English physician (1578-1657), and the first to describe completely and in detail the systemic circulation and properties of blood being pumped to the brain and body by the heart.

**Ambroise Paré**

A French surgeon (1510-1590) who is considered one of the fathers of surgery and modern forensic
pathology, and a pioneer in surgical techniques and battlefield medicine, especially in the treatment of wounds.

**Galen**
A prominent Greek physician (129 CE-c. 216 CE), surgeon, and philosopher in the Roman Empire. Arguably the most accomplished of all medical researchers of antiquity, he influenced the development of various scientific disciplines, including anatomy, physiology, pathology, pharmacology, and neurology, as well as philosophy and logic.

**Andreas Vesalius**
A Belgian anatomist (1514-1564), physician, and author of one of the most influential books on human anatomy, *De humani corporis fabrica* (On the Fabric of the Human Body).

**humorism**
A system of medicine detailing the makeup and workings of the human body, adopted by the Indian Ayurveda system of medicine, and Ancient Greek and Roman physicians and philosophers. It posits that an excess or deficiency of any of four distinct bodily fluids in a person—known as humors or humoursdirectly influences their temperament and health.
The Renaissance and Medical Sciences

The Renaissance brought an intense focus on varied scholarship to Christian Europe. A major effort to translate the Arabic and Greek scientific works into Latin emerged, and Europeans gradually became experts not only in the ancient writings of the Romans and Greeks, but also in the contemporary writings of Islamic scientists. During the later centuries of the Renaissance, which overlapped with the scientific revolution, experimental investigation, particularly in the field of dissection and body examination, advanced the knowledge of human anatomy. Other developments of the period also contributed to the modernization of medical research, including printed books that allowed for a wider distribution of medical ideas and anatomical diagrams, more open attitudes of Renaissance humanism, and the Church’s diminishing impact on the teachings of the medical profession and universities. In addition, the invention and popularization of microscope in the 17th century greatly advanced medical research.

Human Anatomy

The writings of ancient Greek physician Galen had dominated European thinking in medicine. Galen’s understanding of anatomy and medicine was principally influenced by the then-current theory of humorism (also known as the four humors: black bile, yellow bile, blood, and phlegm), as advanced by ancient Greek physicians, such as Hippocrates. His theories dominated and influenced western medical science for more than 1,300 years. His anatomical reports, based mainly on dissection of monkeys and pigs, remained uncontested until 1543, when printed descriptions and illustrations of human dissections were published in the seminal work De humani corporis fabrica by Andreas Vesalius, who first
demonstrated the mistakes in the Galenic model. His anatomical teachings were based upon the dissection of human corpses, rather than the animal dissections that Galen had used as a guide. Vesalius' work emphasized the priority of dissection and what has come to be called the “anatomical” view of the body, seeing human internal functioning as an essentially corporeal structure filled with organs arranged in three-dimensional space. This was in stark contrast to many of the anatomical models used previously.

Further groundbreaking work was carried out by William Harvey, who published De Motu Cordis in 1628. Harvey made a detailed analysis of the overall structure of the heart, going on to an analysis of the arteries, showing how their pulsation depends upon the contraction of the left ventricle, while the contraction of the right ventricle propels its charge of blood into the pulmonary artery. He noticed that the two ventricles move together almost simultaneously and not independently like had been thought previously by his predecessors. Harvey also estimated the capacity of the heart, how much blood is expelled through each pump of the heart, and the number of times the heart beats in a half an hour. From these estimations, he went on to prove how the blood circulated in a circle.
Andreas Vesalius, De humani corporis fabrica, 1543, p. 174 In 1543, Vesalius asked Johannes
Oporinus to publish the seven-volume De humani corporis fabrica (On the fabric of the human body), a groundbreaking work of human anatomy. It emphasized the priority of dissection and what has come to be called the “anatomical view” of the human body. Other Medical Advances

Various other advances in medical understanding and practice were made. French surgeon Ambroise Paré (c. 1510-1590) is considered one of the fathers of surgery and modern forensic pathology, and a pioneer in surgical techniques and battlefield medicine, especially in the treatment of wounds. He was also an anatomist and invented several surgical instruments, and was part of the Parisian Barber Surgeon guild. Paré was also an important figure in the progress of obstetrics in the middle of the 16th century.

Herman Boerhaave (1668-1738), a Dutch botanist, chemist, Christian humanist and physician of European fame, is regarded as the founder of clinical teaching and of the modern academic hospital. He is sometimes referred to as “the father of physiology,” along with the Venetian physician Santorio Santorio (1561-1636), who introduced the quantitative approach into medicine, and with his pupil Albrecht von Haller (1708-1777). He is best known for demonstrating the relation of symptoms to lesions and, in addition, he was the first to isolate the chemical urea from urine. He was the first physician that put thermometer measurements to clinical practice.

Bacteria and protists were first observed with a microscope by Antonie van Leeuwenhoek in 1676, initiating the scientific field of microbiology.

French physician Pierre Fauchard started dentistry science as we know it today, and he has been named “the father of modern dentistry.” He is widely known for writing the first complete
Attributions

• The Medical Renaissance
13. Enlightenment Thinkers

19.4: Enlightenment Thinkers

19.4.1: Thomas Hobbes

Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher and scientist, was one of the key figures in the political debates of the Enlightenment period. He introduced a social contract theory based on the relation between the absolute sovereign and the civil society.

**Learning Objective**

Describe Thomas Hobbes' beliefs on the relationship between government and the people

**Key Points**

- Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher and scientist, was one of the key figures in the political debates of the Enlightenment period. Despite advocating the idea of absolutism of the sovereign, he
developed some of the fundamentals of European liberal thought.

• Hobbes was the first modern philosopher to articulate a detailed social contract theory that appeared in his 1651 work Leviathan. In it, Hobbes set out his doctrine of the foundation of states and legitimate governments and creating an objective science of morality.

• Hobbes argued that in order to avoid chaos, which he associated with the state of nature, people accede to a social contract and establish a civil society.

• One of the most influential tensions in Hobbes’ argument is a relation between the absolute sovereign and the society. According to Hobbes, society is a population beneath a sovereign authority, to whom all individuals in that society cede some rights for the sake of protection. Any power exercised by this authority cannot be resisted because the protector’s sovereign power derives from individuals’ surrendering their own sovereign power for protection.

• Hobbes also included a discussion of natural rights in his moral and political philosophy. While he recognized the inalienable rights of the human, he argued that if humans wished to live peacefully, they had to give up most of their natural rights and create moral obligations, in order to establish political and civil society.
Key Terms

Leviathan
A book written by Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and published in 1651. The work concerns the structure of society and legitimate government, and is regarded as one of the earliest and most influential examples of social contract theory. It argues for a social contract and rule by an absolute sovereign.

**social contract theory**
A theory or a model that typically posits that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority), in exchange for protection of their remaining rights.

**natural rights**
The rights that are not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any particular culture or government, and are therefore universal and inalienable (i.e., rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws).

**English Civil War**
A series of armed conflicts and political machinations between Parliamentarians (“Roundheads”) and Royalists (“Cavaliers”) over, principally, the manner of England’s government. The first (1642-1646) and second (1648-1649) conflicts pitted the supporters of King Charles I against the supporters
of the Long Parliament, while the third (1649-1651) saw fighting between supporters of King Charles II and supporters of the Rump Parliament.

Background: The Age of Enlightenment

The Enlightenment was a philosophical movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. It included a range of ideas centered on reason as the primary source of authority and legitimacy, and came to advance ideals, such as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state. The Enlightenment has also been hailed as the foundation of modern western political and intellectual culture. It brought political modernization to the west by introducing democratic values and institutions and the creation of modern, liberal democracies. Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher and scientist, was one of the key figures in the political debates of the period. Despite advocating the idea of absolutism of the sovereign, Hobbes developed some of the fundamentals of European liberal thought: the right of the individual; the natural equality of all men; the artificial character of the political order (which led to the later distinction between civil society and the state); the view that all legitimate political power must be “representative” and based on the consent of the people; and a liberal interpretation of law that leaves people free to do whatever the law does not explicitly forbid.
Leviathan: Social Contract

Hobbes was the first modern philosopher to articulate a detailed social contract theory that appeared in his 1651 work *Leviathan*. In it, Hobbes set out his doctrine of the foundation of states and legitimate governments and creating an objective science of morality. As *Leviathan* was written during the English Civil War, much of the book is occupied with demonstrating the necessity of a strong central authority to avoid the evil of discord and civil war.

Beginning from a mechanistic understanding of human beings and the passions, Hobbes postulates what life would be like without government, a condition which he calls the state of nature. In that state, each person would have a right, or license, to everything in the world. This, Hobbes argues, would lead to a “war of all against all.” In such a state, people fear death and lack both the things necessary to commodious living and the hope of being able to toil to obtain them. So, in order to avoid it, people accede to a social contract and establish a civil society. According to Hobbes, society is a population beneath a sovereign authority, to whom all individuals in that society cede some rights for the sake of protection. Any power exercised by this authority cannot be resisted because the protector's sovereign power derives from individuals' surrendering their own sovereign power for protection. The individuals are thereby the authors of all decisions made by the sovereign. There is no doctrine of separation of powers in Hobbes's discussion. According to Hobbes, the sovereign must control civil, military, judicial, and ecclesiastical powers.
Hobbes also included a discussion of natural rights in his moral and political philosophy. His’ conception of natural rights extended from his conception of man in a “state of nature.” He argued that the essential natural (human) right was “to use his own power, as he will himself, for the preservation of his own Nature; that is to say, of his own Life (...).” Hobbes sharply distinguished this natural “liberty” from natural “laws.” In his natural state, man’s life consisted entirely of liberties and not at all of laws, which leads to the world of chaos.
created by unlimited rights. Consequently, if humans wish to live peacefully, they must give up most of their natural rights and create moral obligations in order to establish political and civil society.

Hobbes objected to the attempt to derive rights from “natural law,” arguing that law (“lex”) and right (“jus”) though often confused, signify opposites, with law referring to obligations, while rights refer to the absence of obligations. Since by our (human) nature, we seek to maximize our well being, rights are prior to law, natural or institutional, and people will not follow the laws of nature without first being subjected to a sovereign power, without which all ideas of right and wrong are meaningless. This marked an important departure from medieval natural law theories which gave precedence to obligations over rights.

Attributions

• Thomas Hobbes
14. John Locke

19.4.2: John Locke

John Locke, an English philosopher and physician, is regarded as one of the most influential Enlightenment thinkers, whose work greatly contributed to the development of the notions of social contract and natural rights.

Learning Objective

Explain Locke’s conception of the social contract

Key Points

- John Locke was an English philosopher and physician, widely regarded as one of the most influential of Enlightenment thinkers, and commonly known as the “Father of Liberalism.” His writings were immensely influential for the development of social contract theory.
- Two Treatises of Government, Locke’s most important work on political theory, is divided into the First Treatise and the Second Treatise. The First
Treatise is focused on the refutation of Sir Robert Filmer, in particular his Patriarcha, which argued that civil society was founded on a divinely sanctioned patriarchalism. The Second Treatise outlines a theory of civil society.

• Locke's political theory was founded on social contract theory. He believed that human nature is characterized by reason and tolerance, but he assumed that the sole right to defend in the state of nature was not enough, so people established a civil society to resolve conflicts in a civil way with help from government in a state of society.

• Locke's conception of natural rights is captured in his best known statement that individuals have a right to protect their “life, health, liberty, or possessions” and in his belief that the natural right to property is derived from labor.

• The debate continues among scholars over the disparities between Locke’s philosophical arguments and his personal involvement in the slave trade and slavery in North American colonies, and over whether his writings provide, in fact, justification of slavery.

**Key Terms**

**social contract theory**
A theory or a model that typically posits that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly,
to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority), in exchange for protection of their remaining rights.

**Two Treatises of Government**

A work of political philosophy published anonymously in 1689 by John Locke. The first section attacks patriarchalism in the form of sentence-by-sentence refutation of Robert Filmer’s *Patriarcha*, while the second outlines Locke’s ideas for a more civilized society based on natural rights and contract theory.

**empiricism**

A theory that states that knowledge comes only or primarily from sensory experience. It is a fundamental part of the scientific method that all hypotheses and theories must be tested against observations of the natural world, rather than resting solely on *a priori* reasoning, intuition, or revelation.

**natural rights**

The rights that are not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any particular culture or government, and are therefore universal and inalienable (i.e., rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws).

**Rye House Plot**

A 1683 plan to assassinate King Charles II of England and his brother (and heir to the throne) James, Duke of York. Historians vary in their assessment of the degree to which details of the conspiracy were finalized.
John Locke: Introduction

John Locke was an English philosopher and physician, widely regarded as one of the most influential of Enlightenment thinkers and commonly known as the “Father of Liberalism.” Considered one of the first of the British empiricists, he is equally important to social contract theory. His work greatly affected the development of epistemology and political philosophy. His writings influenced Voltaire and Rousseau, many Scottish Enlightenment thinkers, as well as the American revolutionaries. His contributions to classical republicanism and liberal theory are reflected in the United States Declaration of Independence.

Locke was born in 1632 in Wrington, Somerset, about 12 miles from Bristol, and grew up in the nearby town of Pensford. In 1647, he was sent to the prestigious Westminster School in London, and after completing studies there, he was admitted to Christ Church, Oxford in 1652. Although a capable student, Locke was irritated by the undergraduate curriculum of the time. He found the works of modern philosophers, such as René Descartes, more interesting than the classical material taught at the university. Through a friend, Locke was introduced to medicine and the experimental philosophy being pursued at other universities and in the Royal Society, of which he eventually became a member. In 1667, he moved to London to serve as a personal physician, and to resume his medical studies. He also served as Secretary of the Board of Trade and Plantations and Secretary to the Lords Proprietor of Carolina, which helped to shape his ideas on international trade and economics. Locke fled to the Netherlands in 1683, under strong suspicion of involvement in the Rye House Plot, although there is little evidence to suggest that he was directly involved in the scheme. In the Netherlands, he had time to return to his writing,
although the bulk of Locke’s publishing took place upon his return from exile in 1688. He died in 1704. Locke never married nor had children.

Locke’s theory of mind has been as influential as his political theory, and is often cited as the origin of modern conceptions of identity and the self. Locke was the first to define the self through a continuity of consciousness. He postulated that, at birth, the mind was a blank slate or tabula rasa. Contrary to Cartesian philosophy based on pre-existing concepts, he maintained that we are born without innate ideas, and that
knowledge is instead determined only by experience derived from sense perceptions.

Two Treatises of Government

Two Treatises of Government, Locke’s most important and influential work on political theory, was first published anonymously in 1689. It is divided into the First Treatise and the Second Treatise. The First Treatise is focused on the refutation of Sir Robert Filmer, in particular his Patriarcha, which argued that civil society was founded on a divinely sanctioned patriarchalism. Locke proceeds through Filmer’s arguments, contesting his proofs from Scripture and ridiculing them as senseless, until concluding that no government can be justified by an appeal to the divine right of kings. The Second Treatise outlines a theory of civil society. Locke begins by describing the state of nature, a picture much more stable than Thomas Hobbes’ state of “war of every man against every man,” and argues that all men are created equal in the state of nature by God. He goes on to explain the hypothetical rise of property and civilization, in the process explaining that the only legitimate governments are those that have the consent of the people. Therefore, any government that rules without the consent of the people can, in theory, be overthrown.

Locke’s political theory was founded on social contract theory. Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed that human nature is characterized by reason and tolerance. Similarly to Hobbes, he assumed that the sole right to defend in the state of nature was not enough, so people established a civil society to resolve conflicts in a civil way with help from government in a state of society. However, Locke never refers to Hobbes by name and may instead have been responding to other writers of the day. He also advocated governmental separation
of powers, and believed that revolution is not only a right but an obligation in some circumstances. These ideas would come to have profound influence on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. However, Locke did not demand a republic. Rather, he believed a legitimate contract could easily exist between citizens and a monarchy, an oligarchy, or in some mixed form.

Natural Rights

Locke’s conception of natural rights is captured in his best known statement that individuals have a right to protect their “life, health, liberty, or possessions” and in his belief that the natural right to property is derived from labor. He defines the state of nature as a condition, in which humans are rational and follow natural law, and in which all men are born equal with the right to life, liberty and property. However, when one citizen breaks the Law of Nature, both the transgressor and the victim enter into a state of war, from which it is virtually impossible to break free. Therefore, Locke argued that individuals enter into civil society to protect their natural rights via an “unbiased judge” or common authority, such as courts.

Constitution of Carolina and Views on Slavery

Locke’s writings have often been tied to liberalism, democracy, and the foundation of the United States as the first modern democratic republic. However, historians also note that Locke was a major investor in the English slave-trade through the Royal African Company. In addition, he participated in drafting the Fundamental
Constitutions of Carolina, which established a feudal aristocracy and gave a master absolute power over his slaves. Because of his opposition to aristocracy and slavery in his major writings, some historians accuse Locke of hypocrisy and racism, and point out that his idea of liberty is reserved to Europeans or even the European capitalist class only. The debate continues among scholars over the disparities between Locke's philosophical arguments and his personal involvement in the slave trade and slavery in North American colonies, and over whether his writings provide, in fact, justification of slavery.

Attributions

- John Locke
Montesquieu was a French political philosopher of the Enlightenment period, whose articulation of the theory of separation of powers is implemented in many constitutions throughout the world.

**Learning Objective**

Describe Montesquieu’s solution for keeping power from falling into the hands of any one individual

**Key Points**

- Montesquieu was a French lawyer, man of letters, and one of the most influential political philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment. His political theory work, particularly the idea of separation of powers, shaped the modern democratic government.
- *The Spirit of the Laws* is a treatise on political theory that was first published anonymously by Montesquieu in 1748. Montesquieu covered many
topics, including the law, social life, and the study of anthropology, and provided more than 3,000 commendations.

- In this political treatise, Montesquieu pleaded in favor of a constitutional system of government and the separation of powers, the ending of slavery, the preservation of civil liberties and the law, and the idea that political institutions should reflect the social and geographical aspects of each community.

- Montesquieu defines three main political systems: republican, monarchical, and despotic. As he defines them, republican political systems vary depending on how broadly they extend citizenship rights.

- Another major theme in The Spirit of Laws concerns political liberty and the best means of preserving it. Establishing political liberty requires two things: the separation of the powers of government, and the appropriate framing of civil and criminal laws so as to ensure personal security.

- Montesquieu argues that the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of government (the so-called tripartite system) should be assigned to different bodies, so that attempts by one branch of government to infringe on political liberty might be restrained by the other branches (checks and balances). He also argues against slavery and for the freedom of thought, speech, and assembly.
Key Terms

**The Spirit of the Laws**
A treatise on political theory first published anonymously by Montesquieu in 1748. In it, Montesquieu pleaded in favor of a constitutional system of government and the separation of powers, the ending of slavery, the preservation of civil liberties and the law, and the idea that political institutions ought to reflect the social and geographical aspects of each community.

**separation of powers**
A model for the governance of a state (or who controls the state), first proposed in ancient Greece and developed and modernized by the French political philosopher Montesquieu. Under this model, the state is divided into branches, each with separate and independent powers and areas of responsibility so that the powers of one branch are not in conflict with the powers associated with the other branches. The typical division of branches is legislature, executive, and judiciary.

**Glorious Revolution**
The overthrow of King James II of England (James VII of Scotland and James II of Ireland) by a union of English Parliamentarians with the Dutch stadtholder William III of Orange-Nassau (William of Orange). William's successful invasion of England with a Dutch fleet and army led to his ascending of the English throne as William III of England jointly with his wife
Introduction: Montesquieu

Baron de Montesquieu, usually referred to as simply Montesquieu, was a French lawyer, man of letters, and one of the most influential political philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment. He was born in France in 1689. After losing both parents at an early age, he became a ward of his uncle, the Baron de Montesquieu. He became a counselor of the Bordeaux Parliament in 1714. A year later, he married Jeanne de Lartigue, a Protestant, who bore him three children. Montesquieu's early life occurred at a time of significant governmental change. England had declared itself a constitutional monarchy in the wake of its Glorious Revolution (1688–89), and had joined with Scotland in the Union of 1707 to form the Kingdom of Great Britain. In France, the long-reigning Louis XIV died in 1715, and was succeeded by five year-old Louis XV. These national transformations had a great impact on Montesquieu, who would refer to them repeatedly in his work. Montesquieu withdrew from the practice of law to devote himself to study and writing.

Besides writing works on society and politics, Montesquieu traveled for a number of years through Europe, including Austria and Hungary, spending a year in Italy and 18 months in England,
where he became a freemason before resettling in France. He was troubled by poor eyesight and was completely blind by the time he died from a high fever in 1755.

Montesquieu is famous for his articulation of the theory of separation of powers, which is implemented in many constitutions throughout the world. He is also known for doing more than any other author to secure the place of the word “despotism” in the political lexicon.
The Spirit of Laws

*The Spirit of the Laws* is a treatise on political theory first published anonymously by Montesquieu in 1748. The book was originally published anonymously partly because Montesquieu’s works were subject to censorship, but its influence outside France grew with rapid translation into other languages. In 1750, Thomas Nugent published the first English translation. In 1751, the Catholic Church added it to its *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* (list of prohibited books). Yet Montesquieu’s political treatise had an enormous influence on the work of many others, most notably the founding fathers of the United States Constitution, and Alexis de Tocqueville, who applied Montesquieu’s methods to a study of American society in *Democracy in America*.

Montesquieu spent around 21 years researching and writing *The Spirit of the Laws*, covering many things, including the law, social life, and the study of anthropology, and providing more than 3,000 commendations. In this political treatise, Montesquieu pleaded in favor of a constitutional system of government and the separation of powers, the ending of slavery, the preservation of civil liberties and the law, and the idea that political institutions should reflect the social and geographical aspects of each community.

Montesquieu defines three main political systems: republican, monarchical, and despotic. As he defines them, republican political systems vary depending on how broadly they extend citizenship rights—those that extend citizenship relatively broadly are termed democratic republics, while those that restrict citizenship more narrowly are termed aristocratic republics. The distinction between monarchy and despotism hinges on whether or not a fixed set of laws exists that can restrain the authority of the ruler. If so, the regime counts as a monarchy. If not, it counts as despotism.

A second major theme in *The Spirit of Laws* concerns political liberty and the best means of preserving it. Montesquieu’s political liberty is what we might call today personal security, especially
insofar as this is provided for through a system of dependable and moderate laws. He distinguishes this view of liberty from two other, misleading views of political liberty. The first is the view that liberty consists in collective self-government (i.e., that liberty and democracy are the same). The second is the view that liberty consists of being able to do whatever one wants without constraint. Political liberty is not possible in a despotic political system, but it is possible, though not guaranteed, in republics and monarchies. Generally speaking, establishing political liberty requires two things: the separation of the powers of government, and the appropriate framing of civil and criminal laws so as to ensure personal security.

Separation of Powers and Appropriate Laws

Building on and revising a discussion in John Locke’s *Second Treatise of Government*, Montesquieu argues that the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of government (the so-called tripartite system) should be assigned to different bodies, so that attempts by one branch of government to infringe on political liberty might be restrained by the other branches (checks and balances). Montesquieu based this model on the Constitution of the Roman Republic and the British constitutional system. He took the view that the Roman Republic had powers separated so that no one could usurp complete power. In the British constitutional system, Montesquieu discerned a separation of powers among the monarch, Parliament, and the courts of law. He also notes that liberty cannot be secure where there is no separation of powers, even in a republic. Montesquieu also intends what modern legal scholars might call the rights to “robust procedural due process,” including the right to a fair trial, the presumption of innocence, and the proportionality in
the severity of punishment. Pursuant to this requirement to frame civil and criminal laws appropriately to ensure political liberty, Montesquieu also argues against slavery and for the freedom of thought, speech, and assembly.

Attributions

- Baron de Montesquieu
16. Voltaire

19.4.4: Voltaire

Voltaire was a French Enlightenment writer, historian, and philosopher, who attacked the Catholic Church and advocated freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and separation of church and state.

Learning Objective

Discuss Voltaire's thoughts on the masses and government

Key Points

- Voltaire was a French Enlightenment writer, historian, and philosopher famous for his wit, his attacks on the established Catholic Church, and his advocacy of freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and separation of church and state.
- Voltaire's political and philosophical views can be found in nearly all of his prose writings. Most of his prose was written as polemics, with the goal of
conveying radical political and philosophical messages.

- Voltaire’s works frequently contain the word “l’infâme” and the expression “écrasez l’infâme,” or “crush the infamous.” The phrase refers to abuses of the people by royalty and the clergy, and the superstition and intolerance that the clergy bred within the people. His two most famous works elaborating the concept are The Treatise on Tolerance and The Philosophical Dictionary.

- Voltaire had an enormous influence on the development of historiography through his demonstration of fresh new ways to look at the past. His best-known works are The Age of Louis XIV and The Essay on the Customs and the Spirit of the Nations.

- In his criticism of the French society and existing social structures, Voltaire hardly spared anyone. He perceived the French bourgeoisie to be too small and ineffective, the aristocracy to be parasitic and corrupt, the commoners as ignorant and superstitious, and the church as a static and oppressive force.

- Voltaire distrusted democracy, which he saw as propagating the idiocy of the masses. He long thought only an enlightened monarch could bring about change, and that it was in the king’s rational interest to improve the education and welfare of his subjects.
Key Terms

**Ancien Régime**
The monarchic-aristocratic, social, and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century (“early modern France”), under the late Valois and Bourbon Dynasties. The term is occasionally used to refer to the similar feudal social and political order of the time elsewhere in Europe.

**The Philosophical Dictionary**
An encyclopedic dictionary published by Voltaire in 1764. The alphabetically arranged articles often criticize the Roman Catholic Church and other institutions. It represents the culmination of Voltaire’s views on Christianity, God, morality, and other subjects.

**The Treatise on Tolerance**
A work by French philosopher Voltaire, published in 1763, in which he calls for tolerance between religions, and targets religious fanaticism, especially that of the Jesuits (under whom Voltaire received his early education), indicting all superstitions surrounding religions.

**deism**
A theological/philosophical position that combines the rejection of revelation and authority as a source of religious knowledge, with the conclusion that reason and observation of the natural world are sufficient to determine the existence of a single
creator of the universe.

Introduction: Voltaire

François-Marie Arouet, known by his literary pseudonym Voltaire, was a French Enlightenment writer, historian, and philosopher famous for his wit, his attacks on the established Catholic Church, and his advocacy of freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and separation of church and state.

He was born in Paris in 1694 and educated by the Jesuits at the Collège Louis-le-Grand (1704-1711). By the time he left school, Voltaire had decided he wanted to be a writer, against the wishes of his father, who wanted him to become a lawyer. Under his father’s pressure, he studied law but he continued to write, producing essays and historical studies. In 1713, his father obtained a job for him as a secretary to a French ambassador in the Netherlands, but Voltaire was forced to return to France after a scandalous affair. From early on, he had trouble with the authorities over his critiques of the government. These activities were to result in two imprisonments and a temporary exile to England. One satirical verse, in which Voltaire accused Philippe II, Duke of Orléans, of incest with his own daughter, led to an eleven-month imprisonment in the Bastille (after which he adopted the name Voltaire). He mainly argued for religious tolerance and freedom of thought. He campaigned to eradicate priestly and aristocratic-monarchical authority, and supported a constitutional monarchy that protects people’s rights.
Voltaire was a versatile writer, producing works in almost every literary form, including plays, poems, novels, essays, and historical and scientific works. He wrote more than 20,000 letters and more than 2,000 books and pamphlets. He was an outspoken advocate of several liberties, despite the risk this placed him in under the strict censorship laws of the time. As a satirical polemicist, he frequently made use of his works to criticize intolerance, religious dogma, and the French institutions of his day.

Political and Philosophical Views
Voltaire's political and philosophical views can be found in nearly all of his prose writings, even in what would be typically categorized as fiction. Most of his prose, including such genres as romance, drama, or satire, was written as polemics with the goal of conveying radical political and philosophical messages. His works, especially private letters, frequently contain the word “l’infâme” and the expression “écrasez l’infâme,” or “crush the infamous.” The phrase refers to abuses of the people by royalty and the clergy that Voltaire saw around him, and the superstition and intolerance that the clergy bred within the people. Voltaire's first major philosophical work in his battle against “l’infâme” was The Treatise on Tolerance (1763), in which he calls for tolerance between religions and targets religious fanaticism, especially that of the Jesuits, indicting all superstitions surrounding religions. The book was quickly banned. Only a year later, he published The Philosophical Dictionary—an encyclopedic dictionary with alphabetically arranged articles that criticize the Roman Catholic Church and other institutions. In it, Voltaire is concerned with the injustices of the Catholic Church, which he sees as intolerant and fanatical. At the same time, he espouses deism, tolerance, and freedom of the press. The Dictionary was Voltaire's lifelong project, modified and expanded with each edition. It represents the culmination of his views on Christianity, God, morality, and other subjects.

Voltaire as Historian

Voltaire had an enormous influence on the development of historiography through his demonstration of fresh new ways to look at the past. His best-known historiography works are The Age of Louis XIV (1751) and The Essay on the Customs and the Spirit of the Nations (1756). Voltaire broke from the tradition of narrating diplomatic and military events, and emphasized customs, social history, and achievements in the arts and sciences. The Essay traced
the progress of world civilization in a universal context, thereby rejecting both nationalism and the traditional Christian frame of reference. Voltaire was also the first scholar to make a serious attempt to write the history of the world, eliminating theological frameworks and emphasizing economics, culture, and political history. He treated Europe as a whole, rather than a collection of nations. He was the first to emphasize the debt of medieval culture to Middle Eastern civilization, and consistently exposed the intolerance and frauds of the church over the ages.

Views on the Society

In his criticism of the French society and existing social structures, Voltaire hardly spared anyone. He perceived the French bourgeoisie to be too small and ineffective, the aristocracy to be parasitic and corrupt, the commoners as ignorant and superstitious, and the church as a static and oppressive force useful only on occasion as a counterbalance to the rapacity of kings, although all too often, even more rapacious itself. Voltaire distrusted democracy, which he saw as propagating the idiocy of the masses. He long thought only an enlightened monarch could bring about change, given the social structures of the time and the extremely high rates of illiteracy, and that it was in the king’s rational interest to improve the education and welfare of his subjects. But his disappointments and disillusions with Frederick the Great changed his philosophy and soon gave birth to one of his most enduring works, his novella Candide, or Optimism (1759), which ends with a new conclusion: “It is up to us to cultivate our garden.”

He is remembered and honored in France as a courageous polemicist who indefatigably fought for civil rights (as the right to a fair trial and freedom of religion), and who denounced the hypocrisies and injustices of the Ancien Régime. The Ancien Régime involved an unfair balance of power and taxes between the three
Estates: clergy and nobles on one side, the commoners and middle class, who were burdened with most of the taxes, on the other.

Attributions

- Voltaire
Jean-Jacques Rousseau was a Francophone Genevan philosopher and writer, whose conceptualization of social contract, the theory of natural human, and works on education greatly influenced the political, philosophical, and social western tradition.

**Learning Objective**

Identify the components of Rousseau's philosophy, particularly the idea of the General Will

**Key Points**

- Jean-Jacques Rousseau was a Francophone Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer. His political philosophy influenced the Enlightenment in France and across Europe. It was also important to the French Revolution and the overall development of modern political and educational thought.
- In common with other philosophers of the day,
Rousseau looked to a hypothetical state of nature as a normative guide. In The Discourse on the Origins of Inequality Among Men, he maintained that the stage of human development associated with what he called “savages” was the best or optimal in human development.

- In his Discourse on the Moral Effects of the Arts and Sciences, Rousseau argued, in opposition to the dominant stand of Enlightenment thinkers, that the arts and sciences corrupt human morality.
- The Social Contract outlines the basis for a legitimate political order within a framework of classical republicanism. Published in 1762, it became one of the most influential works of political philosophy in the western tradition.
- Rousseau’s philosophy of education concerns itself with developing the students’ character and moral sense, so that they may learn to practice self-mastery and remain virtuous even in the unnatural and imperfect society in which they will have to live.
- Rousseau was a believer in the moral superiority of the patriarchal family on the antique Roman model. To him, ideal woman is educated to be governed by her husband, while ideal man is educated to be self-governing.
Key Terms

general will
A philosophical and political concept, developed and popularized in the 18th century, that denoted the will of the people as a whole. It served to designate the common interest embodied in legal tradition, as distinct from, and transcending, people's private and particular interests at any particular time.

The Social Contract
A 1762 treatise by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in which he theorized the best way to establish a political community in the face of the problems of commercial society. The work helped inspire political reforms and revolutions in Europe. It argued against the idea that monarchs were divinely empowered to legislate. Rousseau asserts that only the people, who are sovereign, have that all-powerful right.

Discourse on the Moral Effects of the Arts and Sciences
A 1750 treatise by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which argued that the arts and sciences corrupt human morality. It was Rousseau's first expression of his influential views about nature vs. society, to which he would dedicate most of his intellectual life.

state of nature
A concept used in moral and political philosophy, religion, social contract theories, and international law to denote the hypothetical conditions of what the lives of people might have been like before societies came
into existence. In some versions of social contract theory, there are no rights in the state of nature, only freedoms, and it is the contract that creates rights and obligations. In other versions the opposite occurs—the contract imposes restrictions upon individuals that curtail their natural rights.

**The Discourse on the Origins of Inequality Among Men**

A work by philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau that first exposes his conception of a human state of nature and of human perfectibility, an early idea of progress. In it, Rousseau explains how, according to him, people may have established civil society, which leads him to present private property as the original source and basis of all inequality.

**“noble savage”**

A literary stock character who embodies the concept of an idealized indigene, outsider, or “other” who has not been “corrupted” by civilization, and therefore symbolizes humanity’s innate goodness. In English, the phrase first appeared in the 17th century in John Dryden’s heroic play *The Conquest of Granada* (1672).

**Introduction: Jean-Jacques Rousseau**

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was a Francophone Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer. His political philosophy influenced the Enlightenment in France and across Europe. It was also important
to the French Revolution and the overall development of modern political and educational thought.

Rousseau was born in 1712 in Geneva, which was at the time a city-state and a Protestant associate of the Swiss Confederacy. His mother died several days after he was born, and after his father remarried a few years later, Jean-Jacques was left with his maternal uncle, who packed him away, along with his own son, to board for two years with a Calvinist minister in a hamlet outside Geneva. Here, the boys picked up the elements of mathematics and drawing. After his father and uncle had more or less disowned him, the teenage Rousseau supported himself for a time as a servant, secretary, and tutor, wandering in Italy and France. He had been an indifferent student, but during his 20s, which were marked by long bouts of hypochondria, he applied himself to the study of philosophy, mathematics, and music. Rousseau spent his adulthood holding numerous administrative positions and moving across Europe, often to escape a controversy caused by his radical writings. His relationships with various women had important impacts on his life choices (e.g., temporary conversion to Catholicism) and inspired many of his writings. His decision to place his five children (born from a long-term domestic partnership with Thérèse Levasseur) in a shelter for abandoned children was widely criticized by his contemporaries and generations to come, particularly in light of his progressive works on education. Rousseau died in 1778.
The Theory of Natural Human

In common with other philosophers of the day, Rousseau looked to a hypothetical state of nature as a normative guide. Contrary to Thomas Hobbes' views, Rousseau holds that “uncorrupted morals” prevail in the “state of nature.” In The Discourse on the Origins of Inequality Among Men (1754), Rousseau maintained that man in a state of nature had been a solitary, ape-like creature, who was not méchant (bad), as Hobbes had maintained, but (like some other
animals) had an “innate repugnance to see others of his kind suffer.” He asserted that the stage of human development associated with what he called “savages” was the best or optimal in human development, between the less-than-optimal extreme of brute animals on the one hand, and the extreme of decadent civilization on the other. Espousing the belief that all degenerates in men’s hands, Rousseau taught that men would be free, wise, and good in the state of nature, and that instinct and emotion, when not distorted by the unnatural limitations of civilization, are nature’s voices and instructions to the good life. Rousseau’s “noble savage” stands in direct opposition to the man of culture (however, while Rousseau discusses the concept, he never uses the phrase that appears in other authors’ writings of the period). In his Discourse on the Moral Effects of the Arts and Sciences (1750), Rousseau argued, in opposition to the dominant stand of Enlightenment thinkers, that the arts and sciences corrupt human morality.

The Social Contract

The Social Contract outlines the basis for a legitimate political order within a framework of classical republicanism. Published in 1762, it became one of the most influential works of political philosophy in the western tradition. Rousseau claimed that the state of nature was a primitive condition without law or morality, which human beings left for the benefits and necessity of cooperation. As society developed, division of labor and private property required the human race to adopt institutions of law. According to Rousseau, by joining together into civil society through the social contract, and abandoning their claims of natural right, individuals can both preserve themselves and remain free. This is because submission to the authority of the general will of the people as a whole guarantees individuals against being subordinated to the wills of others, and also ensures that they obey themselves because they are,
collectively, the authors of the law. The idea of general will denoted the will of the people as a whole. It served to designate the common interest embodied in legal tradition, as distinct from, and transcending, people’s private and particular interests at any particular time.

Although Rousseau argues that sovereignty (or the power to make the laws) should be in the hands of the people, he also makes a sharp distinction between the sovereign and the government. He posits that the political aspects of a society should be divided into two parts. First, there must be a sovereign consisting of the whole population, women included, that represents the general will and is the legislative power within the state. The second division is that of the government, being distinct from the sovereign. This division is necessary because the sovereign cannot deal with particular matters like applications of the law. Doing so would undermine its generality, and therefore damage its legitimacy. Thus, government must remain a separate institution from the sovereign body. When the government exceeds the boundaries set in place by the people, it is the mission of the people to abolish such government, and begin anew.

**Education Theory**

Rousseau’s philosophy of education, elaborated in his 1762 treatise *Emile, or On Education*, concerns itself with developing the students’ character and moral sense, so that they may learn to practice self-mastery and remain virtuous even in the unnatural and imperfect society in which they will have to live. The hypothetical boy, Émile, is to be raised in the countryside, which, Rousseau believes, is a more natural and healthy environment than the city, under the guardianship of a tutor, who will guide him through various learning experiences arranged by the tutor. Rousseau felt that children learn right and wrong through experiencing the
consequences of their acts, rather than through physical punishment. The tutor will make sure that no harm results to Émile through his learning experiences. Rousseau became an early advocate of developmentally appropriate education.

Although many of Rousseau's ideas foreshadowed modern ones in many ways, in one way they do not; Rousseau was a believer in the moral superiority of the patriarchal family on the antique Roman model. Sophie, the young woman Émile is destined to marry, as a representative of ideal womanhood, is educated to be governed by her husband, while Émile, as representative of the ideal man, is educated to be self-governing. This is an essential feature of Rousseau's educational and political philosophy, and particularly important to the distinction between private, personal relations and the public world of political relations. The private sphere as Rousseau imagines it depends on the subordination of women, in order for both it and the public political sphere (upon which it depends) to function as Rousseau imagines it could and should. Rousseau anticipated the modern idea of the bourgeois nuclear family, with the mother at home taking responsibility for the household, childcare, and early education.

Attributions

- Jean-Jacques Rousseau
Discourse on the Arts and Sciences. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.


Although Marquis de Condorcet’s ideas are considered to embody the ideals of the Age of Enlightenment, his support of liberal economy, free and equal public instruction, constitutionalism, and equal rights for women and people of all races distinguish him from most of his contemporaries.

**Learning Objective**

Compare and contrast the Marquis de Condorcet’s thoughts on popular rule with the other Enlightenment thinkers.

**Key Points**

- Marquis de Condorcet, was a French philosopher, mathematician, and early political scientist. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he advocated a liberal economy, free and equal public instruction, constitutionalism, and equal rights for women and people of all races.
• He launched a career as a mathematician, soon reaching international fame. However, his political ideas, particularly that of radical democracy and opposition to slavery, were criticized heavily in the English-speaking world.
• Condorcet took a leading role when the French Revolution swept France in 1789. He hoped for a rationalist reconstruction of society, and championed many liberal causes, including women’s suffrage.
• Condorcet’s *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Spirit* is perhaps the most influential formulation of the Idea of Progress ever written. It narrates the history of civilization as one of progress in the sciences, and shows the intimate connection between scientific progress and the development of human rights and justice.
• According to Condorcet, for republicanism to exist the nation needed enlightened citizens, and education needed democracy to become truly public. In order to educate citizens, he proposed a system of free public education.

**Key Terms**

**Idea of Progress**

In intellectual history, the idea that advances in technology, science, and social organization can produce an improvement in the human condition. That
is, people can become better, in terms of quality of life (social progress), through economic development (modernization), and the application of science and technology (scientific progress). The assumption is that the process will happen once people apply their reason and skills, for it is not divinely foreordained.

**Rationalism**

In epistemology, the view that regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge, or any view appealing to reason as a source of knowledge or justification. More formally, it is defined as a methodology, or a theory, in which the criterion of the truth is not a result of experience but of intellect and deduction.

---

**Marquis de Condorcet: The Radical of the Enlightenment**

Nicolas de Condorcet, known also as Marquis de Condorcet, was a French philosopher, mathematician, and early political scientist. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he advocated a liberal economy, free and equal public instruction, constitutionalism, and equal rights for women and people of all races. Although his ideas and writings are considered to embody the ideals of the Age of Enlightenment and rationalism, they were much more radical than those of most of his contemporaries, even those who were also seen as radicals.

Condorcet was born in 1743 and raised by a devoutly religious mother. He was educated at the Jesuit College in Reims and at the
Collège de Navarre in Paris, where he quickly showed his intellectual ability and gained his first public distinctions in mathematics. From 1765 to 1774, he focused on science. In 1765, he published his first work on mathematics, launching his career as a mathematician. In 1769, he was elected to the French Royal Academy of Sciences. Condorcet worked with Leonhard Euler and Benjamin Franklin. He soon became an honorary member of many foreign academies and philosophic societies, but his political ideas, particularly that of radical democracy, were criticized heavily in the English-speaking world, most notably by John Adams. In 1781, Condorcet wrote a pamphlet, Reflections on Negro Slavery, in which he denounced slavery.
Condorcet’s political views, including suffrage of women, opposition of slavery, equal rights regardless of race, or free public education, were unique even in the context of many radical ideas proposed during the Enlightenment period. He was also one of the first to systematically apply mathematics in the social sciences.

Role in the French Revolution

Condorcet took a leading role when the French Revolution swept France in 1789. He hoped for a rationalist reconstruction of society, and championed many liberal causes. In 1792, he presented a project for the reformation of the education system, aiming to create a hierarchical structure, under the authority of experts who would work as the guardians of the Enlightenment and who, independent of power, would be the guarantors of public liberties. The project was judged to be contrary to the republican and egalitarian virtues. Condorcet also advocated women’s suffrage for the new government, publishing “For the Admission to the Rights of Citizenship For Women” in 1790. This view went much further than the views of other major Enlightenment thinkers, including the champions of women’s rights. Even Mary Wollstonecraft, a British writer and philosopher who attacked gender oppression, pressed for equal educational opportunities, and demanded “justice” and “rights to humanity” for all, did not go as far as to demand equal political rights for women.

At the time of the Trial of Louis XVI, Condorcet, who opposed the death penalty but still supported the trial itself, spoke out against the execution of the King during the public vote at the Convention. He proposed to send the king to the galleys. Changing forces and shifts in power among different revolutionary groups eventually positioned largely independent Condorcet in the role of the critic of predominant ideas. His political opponents branded him a traitor, and in 1793, a warrant was issued for Condorcet’s arrest. After a
period of hiding, he was captured and in 1794 he mysteriously died in prison.

The Idea of Progress

Condorcet’s Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Spirit (1795) was perhaps the most influential formulation of the Idea of Progress ever written. It narrates the history of civilization as one of progress in the sciences, shows the intimate connection between scientific progress and the development of human rights and justice, and outlines the features of a future rational society entirely shaped by scientific knowledge. It also made the notion of progress a central concern of Enlightenment thought. Condorcet argued that expanding knowledge in the natural and social sciences would lead to an ever more just world of individual freedom, material affluence, and moral compassion. He believed that through the use of our senses and communication with others, knowledge could be compared and contrasted as a way of analyzing our systems of belief and understanding. None of Condorcet’s writings refer to a belief in a religion or a god who intervenes in human affairs. Instead, he frequently wrote of his faith in humanity itself and its ability to progress with the help of philosophers. He envisioned man as continually progressing toward a perfectly utopian society. However, he stressed that for this to be a possibility, man must unify regardless of race, religion, culture, or gender.

Education and Rights

According to Condorcet, for republicanism to exist the nation needed enlightened citizens, and education needed democracy to
become truly public. Democracy implied free citizens and ignorance was the source of servitude. Citizens had to be provided with the necessary knowledge to exercise their freedom and understand the rights and laws that guaranteed their enjoyment. Although education could not eliminate disparities in talent, all citizens, including women, had the right to free education. In opposition to those who relied on revolutionary enthusiasm to form the new citizens, Condorcet maintained that revolution was not made to last, and that revolutionary institutions were not intended to prolong the revolutionary experience but to establish political rules and legal mechanisms that would insure future changes without revolution. In a democratic city there would be no Bastille to be seized. Public education would form free and responsible citizens, not revolutionaries.

Attributions

- Marquis de Condorcet
Mary Wollstonecraft was an English writer, philosopher, and advocate of women's rights, whose focus on women's rights, and particularly women's access to education, distinguished her from most of male Enlightenment thinkers.

**Learning Objective**

Summarize the ways in which Wollstonecraft's philosophy differed from the other Enlightenment thinkers.

**Key Points**

- Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) was an English writer, philosopher, and advocate of women’s rights. She was the major female voice of the Enlightenment. Until the late 20th century, however, Wollstonecraft’s life, received more attention than her writing.
- The majority of Wollstonecraft’s early works focus on education. She advocates educating children into the emerging middle-class ethos: self-discipline,
honesty, frugality, and social contentment. She also advocates the education of women, a controversial topic at the time and one which she would return to throughout her career.

- In response to Edmund Burke’s Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790), which was a defense of constitutional monarchy, aristocracy, and the Church of England, Wollstonecraft’s A Vindication of the Rights of Men (1790) attacks aristocracy and advocates republicanism.

- A Vindication of the Rights of Woman (1792) is one of the earliest works of feminist philosophy. In it, Wollstonecraft argues that women ought to have an education commensurate with their position in society, and claims that women are essential to the nation because they educate its children and because they could be “companions” to their husbands, rather than just wives.

- Scholars of feminism still debate to what extent Wollstonecraft was, indeed, a feminist; while she does call for equality between the sexes in particular areas of life, such as morality, she does not explicitly state that men and women are equal.

- Wollstonecraft addresses her writings to the middle class, and represents a class bias by her condescending treatment of the poor.
Key Terms

A Vindication of the Rights of Woman
A 1792 work by the 18th-century British feminist Mary Wollstonecraft that is one of the earliest works of feminist philosophy. In it, Wollstonecraft argues that women should have an education commensurate with their position in society, claiming that women are essential to the nation because they educate its children and because they could be “companions” to their husbands, rather than just wives.

Reflections on the Revolution in France
A political pamphlet written by the Irish statesman Edmund Burke and published in 1790. One of the best-known intellectual attacks against the French Revolution, it is a defining tract of modern conservatism as well as an important contribution to international theory.

A Vindication of the Rights of Men
A 1790 political pamphlet written by the 18th-century British feminist Mary Wollstonecraft, which attacks aristocracy and advocates republicanism. It was the first response in a pamphlet war sparked by the publication of Edmund Burke’s Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790), a defense of constitutional monarchy, aristocracy, and the Church of England.
Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) was an English writer, philosopher, and advocate of women's rights. During her brief career, she wrote novels, treatises, a travel narrative, a history of the French Revolution, a conduct book, and a children's book. Until the late 20th century, Wollstonecraft’s life, which encompassed an illegitimate child, passionate love affairs, and suicide attempts, received more attention than her writing. After two ill-fated affairs, with Henry Fuseli and Gilbert Imlay (by whom she had a daughter, Fanny Imlay), Wollstonecraft married the philosopher William Godwin, one of the forefathers of the anarchist movement. She died at the age of 38, eleven days after giving birth to her second daughter, leaving behind several unfinished manuscripts. The second daughter, Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, became an accomplished writer herself as Mary Shelley, the author of *Frankenstein*.

After Wollstonecraft’s death, her widower published a memoir (1798) of her life, revealing her unorthodox lifestyle, which inadvertently destroyed her reputation for almost a century. However, with the emergence of the feminist movement at the turn of the twentieth century, Wollstonecraft’s advocacy of women’s equality and critiques of conventional femininity became increasingly important. Today, Wollstonecraft is regarded as one of the founding feminist philosophers, and feminists often cite both her life and work as important influences.
Despite the controversial topic, the Rights of Woman received favorable reviews and was a great success. It was almost immediately released in a second edition in 1792, several American editions appeared, and it was translated into French. It was only the later revelations of her personal life that resulted in negative views towards Wollstonecraft, which persisted for over a century.
Education Theory

The majority of Wollstonecraft’s early works focus on education. She assembled an anthology of literary extracts “for the improvement of young women” entitled The Female Reader. In both her conduct book Thoughts on the Education of Daughters (1787) and her children’s book Original Stories from Real Life (1788), Wollstonecraft advocates educating children into the emerging middle-class ethos of self-discipline, honesty, frugality, and social contentment. Both books also emphasize the importance of teaching children to reason, revealing Wollstonecraft’s intellectual debt to the important 17th-century educational philosopher John Locke. Both texts also advocate the education of women, a controversial topic at the time, and one which she would return to throughout her career. Wollstonecraft argues that well-educated women will be good wives and mothers, and ultimately contribute positively to the nation.

A Vindication of the Rights of Man

Published in response to Edmund Burke’s Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790), which was a defense of constitutional monarchy, aristocracy, and the Church of England, and an attack on Wollstonecraft’s friend, Richard Price, Wollstonecraft’s A Vindication of the Rights of Man (1790) attacks aristocracy and advocates republicanism. Wollstonecraft attacked not only monarchy and hereditary privilege, but also the gendered language that Burke used to defend and elevate it. Burke associated the beautiful with weakness and femininity, and the sublime with strength and masculinity. Wollstonecraft turns these definitions against him, arguing that his theatrical approach turn Burke’s readers—the citizens—into weak women who are swayed by show.
In her first unabashedly feminist critique, Wollstonecraft indicts Burke's defense of an unequal society founded on the passivity of women.

In her arguments for republican virtue, Wollstonecraft invokes an emerging middle-class ethos in opposition to what she views as the vice-ridden aristocratic code of manners. Influenced by Enlightenment thinkers, she believed in progress, and derides Burke for relying on tradition and custom. She argues for rationality, pointing out that Burke's system would lead to the continuation of slavery, simply because it had been an ancestral tradition.

A Vindication of the Rights of Woman

A Vindication of the Rights of Woman (1792) is one of the earliest works of feminist philosophy. In it, Wollstonecraft argues that women ought to have an education commensurate with their position in society, and then proceeds to redefine that position, claiming that women are essential to the nation because they educate its children and because they could be “companions” to their husbands rather than just wives. Instead of viewing women as ornaments to society or property to be traded in marriage, Wollstonecraft maintains that they are human beings deserving of the same fundamental rights as men. Large sections of the Rights of Woman respond vitriolically to the writers, who wanted to deny women an education.

While Wollstonecraft does call for equality between the sexes in particular areas of life, such as morality, she does not explicitly state that men and women are equal. She claims that men and women are equal in the eyes of God. However, such statements of equality stand in contrast to her statements respecting the superiority of masculine strength and valor. Her ambiguous position regarding the equality of the sexes have since made it difficult to classify Mary Wollstonecraft | 179
Wollstonecraft as a modern feminist. Her focus on the rights of women does distinguish Wollstonecraft from most of her male Enlightenment counterparts. However, some of them, most notably Marquis de Condorcet, expressed a much more explicit position on the equality of men and women. Already in 1790, Condorcet advocated women’s suffrage.

Wollstonecraft addresses her text to the middle class, which she describes as the “most natural state,” and in many ways the *Rights of Woman* is inflected by a bourgeois view of the world. It encourages modesty and industry in its readers and attacks the uselessness of the aristocracy. But Wollstonecraft is not necessarily a friend to the poor. For example, in her national plan for education, she suggests that, after the age of nine, the poor, except for those who are brilliant, should be separated from the rich and taught in another school.

**Attributions**

- Mary Wollstonecraft
  - “A Vindication of the Rights of Men.”
  - “A Vindication of the Rights of Woman.”
  - “Reflections on the Revolution in France.”
    https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
Reflections_on_the_Revolution_in_France. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

20. The Age of Enlightenment

21.1: The Age of Enlightenment

21.1.1: Enlightenment Ideals

Centered on the idea that reason is the primary source of authority and legitimacy, the Enlightenment was a philosophical movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century.

Learning Objective

Identify the core ideas that drove the Age of Enlightenment

Key Points

- The Age of Enlightenment was a philosophical movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. Centered on the idea that reason is the primary source of authority and legitimacy, this movement advocated such ideals as
liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state.

- There is little consensus on the precise beginning of the Age of Enlightenment, but the beginning of the 18th century (1701) or the middle of the 17th century (1650) are commonly identified as starting points. French historians usually place the period between 1715 and 1789. Most scholars use the last years of the century, often choosing the French Revolution of 1789 or the beginning of the Napoleonic Wars (1804–15) to date the end of the Enlightenment.

- The Enlightenment took hold in most European countries, often with a specific local emphasis. The cultural exchange during the Age of Enlightenment ran between particular European countries and also in both directions across the Atlantic.

- There were two distinct lines of Enlightenment thought. The radical Enlightenment advocated democracy, individual liberty, freedom of expression, and eradication of religious authority. A second, more moderate variety sought accommodation between reform and the traditional systems of power and faith.

- Science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and thought. The Enlightenment has long been hailed as the foundation of modern Western political and intellectual culture. It brought political modernization to the West. In religion, Enlightenment era commentary was a response to the preceding century of religious conflict in Europe.

- Historians of race, gender, and class note that
Enlightenment ideals were not originally envisioned as universal in the today’s sense of the word. Although they did eventually inspire the struggles for rights of people of color, women, or the working masses, most Enlightenment thinkers did not advocate equality for all, regardless of race, gender, or class, but rather insisted that rights and freedoms were not hereditary.

Key Terms

**reductionism**
Several related but distinct philosophical positions regarding the connections between theories, “reducing” one idea to another, more basic one. In the sciences, its methodologies attempt to explain entire systems in terms of their individual, constituent parts and interactions.

**scientific method**
A body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, or correcting and integrating previous knowledge that apply empirical or measurable evidence subject to specific principles of reasoning. It has characterized natural science since the 17th century, consisting of systematic observation, measurement, and experimentation, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses.
cogito ergo sum

A Latin philosophical proposition by René Descartes usually translated into English as “I think, therefore I am.” The phrase originally appeared in his Discourse on the Method. This proposition became a fundamental element of Western philosophy, as it purported to form a secure foundation for knowledge in the face of radical doubt. While other knowledge could be a figment of imagination, deception, or mistake, Descartes asserted that the very act of doubting one’s own existence served—at minimum—as proof of the reality of one’s own mind.

empiricism

The theory that knowledge comes primarily from sensory experience. It emphasizes evidence, especially data gathered through experimentation and use of the scientific method.

The Age of Enlightenment

The Age of Enlightenment, also known as the Enlightenment, was a philosophical movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. Centered on the idea that reason is the primary source of authority and legitimacy, this movement advocated such ideals as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state. The Enlightenment was marked by an emphasis on the scientific method.
and reductionism along with increased questioning of religious orthodoxy. The core ideas advocated by modern democracies, including the civil society, human and civil rights, and separation of powers, are the product of the Enlightenment. Furthermore, the sciences and academic disciplines (including social sciences and the humanities) as we know them today, based on empirical methods, are also rooted in the Age of Enlightenment. All these developments, which followed and partly overlapped with the European exploration and colonization of the Americas and the intensification of the European presence in Asia and Africa, make the Enlightenment a starting point of what some historians define as the European Moment in World History: the long period of often tragic European domination over the rest of the world.

There is little consensus on the precise beginning of the Age of Enlightenment, with the beginning of the 18th century (1701) or the middle of the 17th century (1650) often considered starting points. French historians usually place the period between 1715 and 1789, from the beginning of the reign of Louis XV until the French Revolution. In the mid-17th century, the Enlightenment traces its origins to Descartes’ *Discourse on Method*, published in 1637. In France, many cite the publication of Isaac Newton’s *Principia Mathematica* in 1687. Some historians and philosophers have argued that the beginning of the Enlightenment is when Descartes shifted the epistemological basis from external authority to internal certainty by his *cogito ergo sum* (1637).

As to its end, most scholars use the last years of the century, often choosing the French Revolution of 1789 or the beginning of the Napoleonic Wars (1804–15) to date the end of the Enlightenment.

**National Varieties**

The Enlightenment took hold in most European countries, often
with a specific local emphasis. For example, in France it became associated with anti-government and anti-Church radicalism, while in Germany it reached deep into the middle classes and took a spiritualistic and nationalistic tone without threatening governments or established churches. Government responses varied widely. In France, the government was hostile and Enlightenment thinkers fought against its censorship, sometimes being imprisoned or hounded into exile. The British government largely ignored the Enlightenment’s leaders in England and Scotland. The Scottish Enlightenment, with its mostly liberal Calvinist and Newtonian focus, played a major role in the further development of the transatlantic Enlightenment. In Italy, the significant reduction in the Church's power led to a period of great thought and invention, including scientific discoveries. In Russia, the government began to actively encourage the proliferation of arts and sciences in the mid-18th century. This era produced the first Russian university, library, theater, public museum, and independent press. Several Americans, especially Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, played a major role in bringing Enlightenment ideas to the New World and in influencing British and French thinkers. The cultural exchange during the Age of Enlightenment ran in both directions across the Atlantic. In their development of the ideas of natural freedom, Europeans and American thinkers drew from American Indian cultural practices and beliefs.
The prime example of reference works that systematized scientific knowledge in the Age of Enlightenment were universal encyclopedias rather than technical dictionaries. It was the goal of universal encyclopedias to record all human knowledge in a comprehensive reference work. The most well-known of these works is Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d’Alembert’s *Encyclopédie,*
ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers. The work, which began publication in 1751, was composed of thirty-five volumes and over 71,000 separate entries. A great number of the entries were dedicated to describing the sciences and crafts in detail, and provided intellectuals across Europe with a high-quality survey of human knowledge.

Major Enlightenment Ideas

In the mid-18th century, Europe witnessed an explosion of philosophic and scientific activity that challenged traditional doctrines and dogmas. The philosophic movement was led by Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who argued for a society based upon reason rather than faith and Catholic doctrine, for a new civil order based on natural law, and for science based on experiments and observation. The political philosopher Montesquieu introduced the idea of a separation of powers in a government, a concept which was enthusiastically adopted by the authors of the United States Constitution.

There were two distinct lines of Enlightenment thought. The radical enlightenment, inspired by the philosophy of Spinoza, advocated democracy, individual liberty, freedom of expression, and eradication of religious authority. A second, more moderate variety, supported by René Descartes, John Locke, Christian Wolff, Isaac Newton and others, sought accommodation between reform and the traditional systems of power and faith.

Science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and thought. Many Enlightenment writers and thinkers had backgrounds in the sciences and associated scientific advancement with the overthrow of religion and traditional authority in favor of the development of free speech and thought. Broadly speaking, Enlightenment science greatly valued empiricism and rational thought and was embedded with the Enlightenment ideal of
advancement and progress. However, as with most Enlightenment views, the benefits of science were not seen universally.

The Enlightenment has also long been hailed as the foundation of modern Western political and intellectual culture. It brought political modernization to the West in terms of focusing on democratic values and institutions and the creation of modern, liberal democracies. The fundamentals of European liberal thought, including the right of the individual, the natural equality of all men, the separation of powers, the artificial character of the political order (which led to the later distinction between civil society and the state), the view that all legitimate political power must be “representative” and based on the consent of the people, and liberal interpretation of law that leaves people free to do whatever is not explicitly forbidden, were all developed by Enlightenment thinkers.

In religion, Enlightenment-era commentary was a response to the preceding century of religious conflict in Europe. Enlightenment thinkers sought to curtail the political power of organized religion and thereby prevent another age of intolerant religious war. A number of novel ideas developed, including deism (belief in God the Creator, with no reference to the Bible or any other source) and atheism. The latter was much discussed but had few proponents. Many, like Voltaire, held that without belief in a God who punishes evil, the moral order of society was undermined.
The increased consumption of reading materials of all sorts was one of the key features of the “social” Enlightenment. The Industrial Revolution allowed consumer goods to be produced in greater quantities at lower prices, encouraging the spread of books, pamphlets, newspapers, and journals. Cave’s innovation was to create a monthly digest of news and commentary on any topic the educated public might be interested in, from commodity prices to Latin poetry.
Impact

The ideas of the Enlightenment played a major role in inspiring the French Revolution, which began in 1789 and emphasized the rights of common men as opposed to the exclusive rights of the elites. As such, they laid the foundation for modern, rational, democratic societies. However, historians of race, gender, and class note that Enlightenment ideals were not originally envisioned as universal in the today's sense of the word. Although they did eventually inspire the struggles for rights of people of color, women, or the working masses, most Enlightenment thinkers did not advocate equality for all, regardless of race, gender, or class, but rather insisted that rights and freedoms were not hereditary (the heredity of power and rights was a common pre-Enlightenment assumption). This perspective directly attacked the traditionally exclusive position of the European aristocracy but was still largely focused on expanding the rights of white males of a particular social standing.

Attributions

- Enlightenment Ideals


21. Scientific Exploration

21.1.2: Scientific Exploration

Science, based on empiricism and rational thought and embedded with the Enlightenment ideal of advancement and progress, came to play a leading role in the movement’s discourse and thought.

Learning Objective

Describe advancements made in science and social sciences during the 18th century

Key Points

- Science came to play a leading role in Enlightenment discourse and ideas. The movement greatly valued empiricism and rational thought and was embedded with the Enlightenment ideal of advancement and progress. Similar rules were applied to social sciences.
- Building on the body of work forwarded by Copernicus, Kepler and Newton, 18th-century astronomers refined telescopes, produced star
catalogs, and worked towards explaining the motions of heavenly bodies and the consequences of universal gravitation. In 1781, amateur astronomer William Herschel was responsible for arguably the most important discovery in 18th-century astronomy: a new planet later named Uranus.

- The 18th century witnessed the early modern reformulation of chemistry that culminated in the law of conservation of mass and the oxygen theory of combustion.

- David Hume and other Scottish Enlightenment thinkers developed a “science of man.” Against philosophical rationalists, Hume held that passion rather than reason governs human behavior and argued against the existence of innate ideas, positing that all human knowledge is ultimately founded solely in experience. Modern sociology largely originated from these ideas.

- Adam Smith published The Wealth of Nations, often considered the first work on modern economics, in 1776. It had an immediate impact on British economic policy that continues into the 21st century. Enlightenment-era changes in law also continue to shape legal systems today.

- The Age of Enlightenment was also when the first scientific and literary journals were established. As a source of knowledge derived from science and reason, these journals were an implicit critique of existing notions of universal truth monopolized by monarchies, parliaments, and religious authorities.
chemica1 revolution

The 18th-century reformulation of chemistry that culminated in the law of conservation of mass and the oxygen theory of combustion. During the 19th and 20th century, this transformation was credited to the work of the French chemist Antoine Lavoisier (the “father of modern chemistry”). However, recent research notes that gradual changes in chemical theory and practice emerged over two centuries.

science of man

A topic in David Hume’s 18th century experimental philosophy A Treatise of Human Nature (1739). It expanded the understanding of facets of human nature, including senses, impressions, ideas, imagination, passions, morality, justice, and society.

empiricism

The theory that knowledge comes primarily from sensory experience. It emphasizes evidence gathered through experimentation and by use of the scientific method.

While the Enlightenment cannot be pigeonholed into a specific doctrine or set of dogmas, science is a key part of the ideals of this movement. Many Enlightenment writers and thinkers had backgrounds in the sciences and associated scientific advancement with the overthrow of religion and traditional authority in favor of the development of free speech and thought. Broadly speaking,
Enlightenment science greatly valued empiricism and rational thought, embedded with the ideals of advancement and progress. Similar rules were applied to social sciences.

Astronomy

Building on the body of work forwarded by Copernicus, Kepler and Newton, 18th-century astronomers refined telescopes, produced star catalogs, and worked towards explaining the motions of heavenly bodies and the consequences of universal gravitation. In 1705, astronomer Edward Halley correctly linked historical descriptions of particularly bright comets to the reappearance of just one (later named Halley's Comet), based on his computation of the orbits of comets. James Bradley realized that the unexplained motion of stars he had early observed with Samuel Molyneux was caused by the aberration of light. He also came fairly close to the estimation of the speed of light. Observations of Venus in the 18th century became an important step in describing atmospheres, including the work of Mikhail Lomonosov, Johann Hieronymus Schröter, and Alexis Claude de Clairaut. In 1781, amateur astronomer William Herschel was responsible for arguably the most important discovery in 18th-century astronomy. He spotted a new planet that he named Georgium Sidus. The name Uranus, proposed by Johann Bode, came into widespread usage after Herschel's death. On the theoretical side of astronomy, the English natural philosopher John Michell first proposed the existence of dark stars in 1783.
Much astronomical work of the period becomes shadowed by one of the most dramatic scientific discoveries of the 18th century. On March 13, 1781, amateur astronomer William Herschel spotted a new planet with his powerful reflecting telescope. Initially identified as a comet, the celestial body later came to be accepted as a planet. Soon after, the planet was named Georgium Sidus by Herschel and was called Herschelium in France. The name Uranus, as proposed by Johann Bode, came into widespread usage after Herschel’s death.

Chemistry

The 18th century witnessed the early modern reformulation of...
chemistry that culminated in the law of conservation of mass and the oxygen theory of combustion. This period was eventually called the chemical revolution. According to an earlier theory, a substance called phlogiston was released from inflammable materials through burning. The resulting product was termed calx, which was considered a dephlogisticated substance in its true form. The first strong evidence against phlogiston theory came from Joseph Black, Joseph Priestley, and Henry Cavendish, who all identified different gases that composed air. However, it was not until Antoine Lavoisier discovered in 1772 that sulphur and phosphorus grew heavier when burned that the phlogiston theory began to unravel. Lavoisier subsequently discovered and named oxygen, as well as described its roles in animal respiration and the calcination of metals exposed to air (1774–1778). In 1783, he found that water was a compound of oxygen and hydrogen. Transition to and acceptance of Lavoisier’s findings varied in pace across Europe. Eventually, however, the oxygen-based theory of combustion drowned out the phlogiston theory and in the process created the basis of modern chemistry.

Social Sciences

David Hume and other Scottish Enlightenment thinkers developed a “science of man” that was expressed historically in works by authors including James Burnett, Adam Ferguson, John Millar, and William Robertson, all of whom merged a scientific study of how humans behaved in prehistoric and ancient cultures with a strong awareness of the determining forces of modernity. Against philosophical rationalists, Hume held that passion rather than reason governs human behavior and argued against the existence of innate ideas, positing that all human knowledge is ultimately founded solely in experience. According to Hume, genuine knowledge must either be directly traceable to objects perceived in experience or result
from abstract reasoning about relations between ideas derived from experience. Modern sociology largely originated from the science of

Adam Smith published *The Wealth of Nations*, often considered the first work on modern economics, in 1776. It had an immediate impact on British economic policy that continues into the 21st century. The book was immediately preceded and influenced by Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot and Baron de Launee drafts of *Reflections on the Formation and Distribution of Wealth* (Paris, 1766). Smith acknowledged indebtedness to this work and may have been its original English translator.

Enlightenment-era changes in law also continue to shape legal systems today. Cesare Beccaria, a jurist and one of the great Enlightenment writers, published his masterpiece *Of Crimes and Punishments* in 1764. Beccaria is recognized as one of the fathers of classical criminal theory. His treatise condemned torture and the death penalty and was a founding work in the field of penology (the study of the punishment of crime and prison management). It also promoted criminal justice. Another prominent intellectual was Francesco Mario Pagano, whose work *Saggi Politici* (Political Essays, 1783) argued against torture and capital punishment and advocated more benign penal codes.
Although less widely known to the general public than his fellow English, Scottish, or French philosophers of the era, Beccaria remains one of the greatest thinkers of the Enlightenment era. His theories have continued to play a great role in recent times. Some of the current policies impacted by his theories are truth in sentencing, swift punishment and the abolition of death penalty. While many of his theories are popular, some are still a source of heated controversy, more than two centuries after Beccaria’s death.
Scientific Publications

The Age of Enlightenment was also when the first scientific and literary journals were established. The first journal, the Parisian Journal des Scavans, appeared in 1665. However, it was not until 1682 that periodicals began to be more widely produced. French and Latin were the dominant languages of publication, but there was also a steady demand for material in German and Dutch. There was generally low demand for English publications on the Continent, which was echoed by England’s similar lack of desire for French works. Languages commanding less of an international market such as Danish, Spanish, and Portuguese found journal success more difficult and often used an international language instead. French slowly took over Latin's status as the lingua franca of learned circles. This in turn gave precedence to the publishing industry in Holland, where the vast majority of these French language periodicals were produced. As a source of knowledge derived from science and reason, the journals were an implicit critique of existing notions of universal truth monopolized by monarchies, parliaments, and religious authorities.

Attributions

- Scientific Exploration
• “Science in the Age of Enlightenment.”
• “Cesare_Beccaria_in_Dei_delitti_crop.jpg.”
22. The Popularization of Science

21.1.3: The Popularization of Science

Scientific societies and academies and the unprecedented popularization of science among an increasingly literate population dominated the Age of Enlightenment.

**Learning Objective**

Describe advancements made in the popularization of science during the 18th century

**Key Points**

- Science during the Enlightenment was dominated by scientific societies and academies, which largely replaced universities as centers of scientific research and development. Scientific academies and societies grew out of the Scientific Revolution as the creators of scientific knowledge in contrast to the scholasticism of the university.
• National scientific societies were founded throughout the Enlightenment era in the urban hotbeds of scientific development across Europe. Many regional and provincial societies followed along with some smaller private counterparts. Activities included research, experimentation, sponsoring essay contests, and collaborative projects between societies.

• Academies and societies disseminated Enlightenment science by publishing the works of their members. The publication schedules were typically irregular, with periods between volumes sometimes lasting years. While the journals of the academies primarily published scientific papers, the independent periodicals that followed were a mix of reviews, abstracts, translations of foreign texts, and sometimes derivative, reprinted materials.

• Although dictionaries and encyclopedias have existed since ancient times, during the Enlightenment they evolved from a simple list of definitions to far more detailed discussions of those words. The most well-known of the 18th century encyclopedic dictionaries is *Encyclopaedia, or a Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts*.

• During the Enlightenment, science began to appeal to an increasingly larger audience. A more literate population seeking knowledge and education in both the arts and the sciences drove the expansion of print culture and the dissemination of scientific learning in coffeehouses, at public lectures, and through popular publications.

• During the Enlightenment era, women were
excluded from scientific societies, universities, and learned professions. Despite these limitations, many women made valuable contributions to science during the 18th century.

Key Terms

Encyclopaedia, or a Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts

A general encyclopedia published in France between 1751 and 1772, with later supplements, revised editions, and translations. It had many writers, known as the Encyclopédistes, and was edited by Denis Diderot and until 1759 co-edited by Jean le Rond d'Alembert. It is most famous for representing the thought of the Enlightenment.

Scientific Revolution

The emergence of modern science during the early modern period, when developments in mathematics, physics, astronomy, biology (including human anatomy) and chemistry transformed society's views about nature. It began in Europe towards the end of the Renaissance period and continued through the late 18th century, influencing the intellectual social movement known as the Enlightenment. While its dates are disputed, the publication of Nicolaus Copernicus's De revolutionibus orbium coelestium (On
the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres) in 1543 is often cited as its beginning.

**Conversations on the Plurality of Worlds**

A popular science book by French author Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle published in 1686. It offered an explanation of the heliocentric model of the Universe, suggested by Nicolaus Copernicus in his 1543 work *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*. The book, written in French and not in Latin as most scientific works of the era, was one of the first attempts to explain scientific theories in a popular language understandable to the wide audience.

**Societies and Academies**

Science during the Enlightenment was dominated by scientific societies and academies, which largely replaced universities as centers of scientific research and development. These organizations grew out of the Scientific Revolution as the creators of scientific knowledge in contrast to the scholasticism of the university. During the Enlightenment, some societies created or retained links to universities. However, contemporary sources distinguished universities from scientific societies by claiming that the university's utility was in the transmission of knowledge, while societies functioned to create knowledge. As the role of universities in institutionalized science began to diminish, learned societies became the cornerstone of organized science. After 1700, many official academies and societies were founded in Europe, with more
than seventy official scientific societies in existence by 1789. In reference to this growth, Bernard de Fontenelle coined the term “the Age of Academies” to describe the 18th century.

National scientific societies were founded in the urban hotbeds of scientific development across Europe. In the 17th century, the Royal Society of London (1662), the Paris Académie Royale des Sciences (1666), and the Berlin Akademie der Wissenschaften (1700) came into existence. In the first half of the 18th century, the Academia Scientiarum Imperialis (1724) in St. Petersburg, and the Kungliga Vetenskapsakademien (Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences) (1739) were created. Many regional and provincial societies followed along with some smaller private counterparts. Official scientific societies were chartered by the state to provide technical expertise, which resulted in direct, close contact between the scientific community and government bodies. State sponsorship was beneficial to the societies as it brought finance and recognition along with a measure of freedom in management. Most societies were granted permission to oversee their own publications, control the election of new members, and otherwise provide administration. Membership in academies and societies was highly selective. Activities included research, experimentation, sponsoring essay contests, and collaborative projects between societies.

Scientific and Popular Publications

Academies and societies served to disseminate Enlightenment science by publishing the scientific works of their members as well as their proceedings. With the exception of the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society by the Royal Society of London, which was published on a regular, quarterly basis, publication schedules were typically irregular, with periods between volumes sometimes lasting years. These and other limitations of academic journals left considerable space for the rise of independent
periodicals, which excited scientific interest in the general public. While the journals of the academies primarily published scientific papers, independent periodicals were a mix of reviews, abstracts, translations of foreign texts, and sometimes derivative, reprinted materials. Most of these texts were published in the local vernacular, so their continental spread depended on the language of the readers. For example, in 1761, Russian scientist Mikhail Lomonosov correctly attributed the ring of light around Venus, visible during the planet’s transit, as the planet’s atmosphere. However, because few scientists understood Russian outside of Russia, his discovery was not widely credited until 1910. With a wider audience and ever-increasing publication material, specialized journals emerged, reflecting the growing division between scientific disciplines in the Enlightenment era.
The Philosophical Transactions was established in 1665 as the first journal in the world exclusively devoted to science. It is still published by the Royal Society, which also makes it the world’s longest-running scientific journal. The use of the word “Philosophical” in the title refers to “natural philosophy,” which was the equivalent of what would now be generally called science.

Although dictionaries and encyclopedias have existed since ancient
times, they evolved from simply a long list of definitions to detailed discussions of those words in 18th-century encyclopedic dictionaries. The works were part of an Enlightenment movement to systematize knowledge and provide education to a wider audience than the educated elite. As the 18th century progressed, the content of encyclopedias also changed according to readers' tastes. Volumes tended to focus more strongly on secular affairs, particularly science and technology, rather than on matters of theology. The most well-known of these works is Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert's *Encyclopaedia, or a Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts*. The work, which began publication in 1751, was composed of thirty-five volumes and more than 71,000 separate entries. Many entries describe the sciences and crafts in detail. The massive work was arranged according to a “tree of knowledge.” The tree reflected the marked division between the arts and sciences, largely a result of the rise of empiricism. Both areas of knowledge were united by philosophy, the trunk of the tree of knowledge.

Science and the Public

During Enlightenment, the discipline of science began to appeal to a consistently growing audience. An increasingly literate population seeking knowledge and education in both the arts and the sciences drove the expansion of print culture and the dissemination of scientific learning. The British coffeehouse is an early example of this phenomenon, as their establishment created a new public forum for political, philosophical, and scientific discourse. In the mid-16th century, coffeehouses cropped up around Oxford, where the academic community began to capitalize on the unregulated conversation the coffeehouse allowed. The new social space was used by some scholars as a place to discuss science and experiments outside the laboratory of the official institution. Education was a central theme, and some patrons began offering lessons to others.
As coffeehouses developed in London, customers heard lectures on scientific subjects such as astronomy and mathematics for an exceedingly low price.

Public lecture courses offered scientists unaffiliated with official organizations a forum to transmit scientific knowledge and their own ideas, leading to the opportunity to carve out a reputation and even make a living. The public, on the other hand, gained both knowledge and entertainment from demonstration lectures. Courses varied in duration from one to four weeks to a few months or even the entire academic year and were offered at virtually any time of day. The importance of the lectures was not in teaching complex scientific subjects, but rather in demonstrating the principles of scientific disciplines and encouraging discussion and debate. Barred from the universities and other institutions, women were often in attendance at demonstration lectures and constituted a significant number of auditors.

Increasing literacy rates in Europe during the Enlightenment enabled science to enter popular culture through print. More formal works included explanations of scientific theories for individuals lacking the educational background to comprehend the original scientific text. The publication of Bernard de Fontenelle's *Conversations on the Plurality of Worlds* (1686) marked the first significant work that expressed scientific theory and knowledge expressly for the laity, in the vernacular and with the entertainment of readers in mind. The book specifically addressed women with an interest in scientific writing and inspired a variety of similar works written in a discursive style. These were more accessible to the reader than complicated articles, treatises, and books published by the academies and scientists.
Science and Gender

During the Enlightenment, women were excluded from scientific societies, universities, and learned professions. They were educated, if at all, through self-study, tutors, and by the teachings of more open-minded family members and relatives. With the exception of daughters of craftsmen, who sometimes learned their fathers' professions by assisting in the workshop, learned women were primarily part of elite society. In addition, women's inability to access scientific instruments (e.g., microscope) made it difficult for them to conduct independent research.

Despite these limitations, many women made valuable contributions to science during the 18th century. Two notable women who managed to participate in formal institutions were Laura Bassi and the Russian Princess Yekaterina Dashkova. Bassi was an Italian physicist who received a PhD from the University of Bologna and began teaching there in 1732. Dashkova became the director of the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg in 1783. Her personal relationship with Empress Catherine the Great allowed her to obtain the position, which marked in history the first appointment of a woman to the directorship of a scientific academy. More commonly, however, women participated in the sciences as collaborators of their male relative or spouse. Others became illustrators or translators of scientific texts.
Women usually participated in the sciences through an association with a male relative or spouse. For example, Marie-Anne Pierette Paulze worked collaboratively with her husband, Antoine Lavoisier. Aside from assisting in Lavoisier's laboratory research, she was responsible for translating a number of English texts into French for her husband's work on the new chemistry. Paulze also illustrated many of her husband's publications, such as his *Treatise on Chemistry* (1789).
Attributions
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23. Enlightened Despotism

21.1.4: Enlightened Despotism

Enlightened despots, inspired by the ideals of the Age of Enlightenment, held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern in lieu of any other governments.

Learning Objective

Define enlightened despotism and provide examples

Key Points

- Enlightened despots held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern in lieu of any other governments. In effect, the monarchs of enlightened absolutism strengthened their authority by improving the lives of their subjects.
- An essay defending the system of enlightened despotism was penned by Frederick the Great, who
ruled Prussia from 1740 to 1786. Frederick modernized the Prussian bureaucracy and civil service and pursued religious policies throughout his realm that ranged from tolerance to segregation. Following the common interest among enlightened despots, he supported arts, philosophers that he favored, and complete freedom of the press and literature.

- Catherine II of Russia continued to modernize Russia along Western European lines, but her enlightened despotism manifested itself mostly with her commitment to arts, sciences, and the modernization of Russian education. While she introduced some administrative and economic reforms, military conscription and economy continued to depend on serfdom.

- Maria Theresa implemented significant reforms to strengthen Austria’s military and bureaucratic efficiency. She improved the economy of the state, introduced a national education system, and contributed to important reforms in medicine. However, unlike other enlightened despots, Maria Theresa found it hard to fit into the intellectual sphere of the Enlightenment and did not share fascination with Enlightenment ideals.

- Joseph was a proponent of enlightened despotism but his commitment to modernizing reforms subsequently engendered significant opposition, which eventually culminated in a failure to fully implement his programs. Among other accomplishments, he inspired a complete reform of the legal system, ended censorship of the press and theater, and continued his mother’s reforms in
education and medicine.

Key Terms

**serfdom**

The status of many peasants under feudalism, specifically relating to manorialism. It was a condition of bondage that developed primarily during the High Middle Ages in Europe and lasted in some countries until the mid-19th century.

**enlightened despotism**

Also known as enlightened absolutism or benevolent absolutism, a form of absolute monarchy or despotism inspired by the Enlightenment. The monarchs who embraced it followed the precepts of rationality. Some of them fostered education and allowed religious tolerance, freedom of speech, and the right to hold private property. They held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern in lieu of any other governments.

**Encyclopédie**

A general encyclopedia published in France between 1751 and 1772, with later supplements, revised editions, and translations. It had many writers, known as the Encyclopédistes. It is most famous for representing the thought of the Enlightenment.
Enlightened Despotism

Major thinkers of the Age of Enlightenment are credited for the development of government theories critical to the creation and evolution of the modern civil-society-driven democratic state. Enlightened despotism, also called enlightened absolutism, was among the first ideas resulting from the political ideals of the Enlightenment. The concept was formally described by the German historian Wilhelm Roscher in 1847 and remains controversial among scholars.

Enlightened despots held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern in lieu of any other governments. In effect, the monarchs of enlightened absolutism strengthened their authority by improving the lives of their subjects. This philosophy implied that the sovereign knew the interests of his or her subjects better than they themselves did. The monarch taking responsibility for the subjects precluded their political participation. The difference between a despot and an enlightened despot is based on a broad analysis of the degree to which they embraced the Age of Enlightenment. However, historians debate the actual implementation of enlightened despotism. They distinguish between the “enlightenment” of the ruler personally versus that of his or her regime.

Frederick the Great

Enlightened despotism was defended in an essay by Frederick the
Great, who ruled Prussia from 1740 to 1786. He was an enthusiast of French ideas and invited the prominent French Enlightenment philosopher Voltaire to live at his palace. With the help of French experts, Frederick organized a system of indirect taxation, which provided the state with more revenue than direct taxation. One of Frederick’s greatest achievements included the control of grain prices, whereby government storehouses would enable the civilian population to survive in needy regions, where the harvest was poor. Frederick modernized the Prussian bureaucracy and civil service and pursued religious policies throughout his realm that ranged from tolerance to segregation. He was largely non-practicing and tolerated all faiths in his realm, although Protestantism became the favored religion and Catholics were not chosen for higher state positions. While he protected and encouraged trade by Jewish citizens of the Empire, he repeatedly expressed strong anti-Semitic sentiments. He also encouraged immigrants of various nationalities and faiths to come to Prussia. Some critics, however, point out his oppressive measures against conquered Polish subjects after some Polish land fell under the control of the Prussian Empire. Following the common interest among enlightened despots, Frederick supported arts, philosophers that he favored, and complete freedom of the press and literature.

Catherine the Great

Catherine II of Russia was the most renowned and the longest-ruling female leader of Russia, reigning from 1762 until her death in 1796. An admirer of Peter the Great, she continued to modernize Russia along Western European lines but her enlightened despotism manifested itself mostly with her commitment to arts, sciences, and the modernization of Russian education. The Hermitage Museum, which now occupies the whole Winter Palace, began as Catherine’s personal collection. She wrote comedies, fiction, and memoirs,
while cultivating Voltaire, Diderot, and d'Alembert—all French encyclopedists who later cemented her reputation in their writings. The leading European economists of her day became foreign members of the Free Economic Society, established on her suggestion in Saint Petersburg in 1765. She also recruited Western European scientists. Within a few months of her accession in 1762, having heard the French government threatened to stop the publication of the famous French Encyclopédie on account of its irreligious spirit, Catherine proposed to Diderot that he should complete his great work in Russia under her protection. She believed a ‘new kind of person’ could be created by instilling Russian children with Western European education. She continued to investigate educational theory and practice of other countries and while she introduced some educational reforms, she failed to establish a national school system.

Catherine established the Smolny Institute for Noble Girls to educate females. At first, the Institute only admitted young girls of the noble elite, but eventually it began to admit girls of the petit-bourgeoisie, as well. The girls who attended the Smolny Institute, Smolyanki, were often accused of being ignorant of anything that
went on in the world outside the walls of the Smolny buildings. Within the walls of the Institute, they were taught impeccable French, musicianship, dancing, and complete awe of the Monarch.

Although Catherine refrained from putting most democratic principles into practice, she issued codes addressing some modernization trends, including dividing the country into provinces and districts, limiting the power of nobles, creating a middle estate, and a number of economic reforms. However, military conscription and economy continued to depend on serfdom, and the increasing demands of the state and private landowners led to increased levels of reliance on serfs.

Maria Theresa

Maria Theresa was the only female ruler of the Habsburg dominions and the last of the House of Habsburg. She implemented significant reforms to strengthen Austria's military and bureaucratic efficiency. She doubled the state revenue between 1754 and 1764, though her attempt to tax clergy and nobility was only partially successful. Nevertheless, her financial reforms greatly improved the economy. In 1760, Maria Theresa created the council of state, which served as a committee of expert advisors. It lacked executive or legislative authority but nevertheless showed the difference between the autocratic form of government. In medicine, her decision to have her children inoculated after the smallpox epidemic of 1767 was responsible for changing Austrian physicians' negative view of vaccination. Austria outlawed witch burning and torture in 1776. It was later reintroduced, but the progressive nature of these reforms remains noted. Education was one of the most notable reforms of Maria Theresa's rule. In a new school system based on that of Prussia, all children of both genders from the ages
were required to attend school from the ages of 6 to 12, although the law turned out to be very difficult to execute.

However, Maria Theresa found it hard to fit into the intellectual sphere of the Enlightenment. For example, she believed that religious unity was necessary for a peaceful public life and explicitly rejected the idea of religious tolerance. She regarded both the Jews and Protestants as dangerous to the state and actively tried to suppress them. As a young monarch who fought two dynastic wars, she believed that her cause should be the cause of her subjects, but in her later years she would believe that their cause must be hers.

**Joseph II of Austria**

Maria Theresa’s oldest son, Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor from 1765 to 1790 and ruler of the Habsburg lands from 1780 to 1790, was at ease with Enlightenment ideas. Joseph was a proponent of enlightened despotism, but his commitment to modernizing reforms engendered significant opposition, which eventually culminated in a failure to fully implement his programs.

Joseph inspired a complete reform of the legal system, abolished brutal punishments and the death penalty in most instances, and imposed the principle of complete equality of treatment for all offenders. He ended censorship of the press and theater. In 1781–82, he extended full legal freedom to serfs. The landlords, however, found their economic position threatened and eventually reversed the policy. To equalize the incidence of taxation, Joseph ordered an appraisal of all the lands of the empire to impose a single egalitarian tax on land. However, most of his financial reforms were repealed shortly before or after Joseph’s death in 1790. To produce a literate citizenry, elementary education was made compulsory for all boys and girls and higher education on practical lines was offered for a select few. Joseph created scholarships for talented poor students and allowed the establishment of schools for Jews and other
Joseph II was one of the first rulers in Central Europe. He attempted to abolish serfdom but his plans met with resistance from the landholders. His Imperial Patent of 1785 abolished serfdom on some territories of the Empire, but under the pressure of the landlords did not give the peasants ownership of the land or freedom from dues owed to the landowning nobles. It did give them personal freedom. The final emancipation reforms in the Habsburg Empire were introduced in 1848.

Probably the most unpopular of all his reforms was his attempted modernization of the highly traditional Catholic Church. Calling himself the guardian of Catholicism, Joseph II struck vigorously at papal power. He tried to make the Catholic Church in his empire
the tool of the state, independent of Rome. Joseph was very friendly to Freemasonry, as he found it highly compatible with his own Enlightenment philosophy, although he apparently never joined the Lodge himself. In 1789, he issued a charter of religious toleration for the Jews of Galicia, a region with a large Yiddish-speaking traditional Jewish population. The charter abolished communal autonomy whereby the Jews controlled their internal affairs. It promoted Germanization and the wearing of non-Jewish clothing.

Attributions
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24. Frederick the Great and Prussia

21.2: Frederick the Great and Prussia

21.2.1: The Hohenzollerns

The Hohenzollern family split into two branches, the Catholic Swabian branch and the Protestant Franconian branch. The latter transformed from a minor German princely family into one of the most important dynasties in Europe.

Learning Objective

Explain who the Hohenzollerns were and the progression of their relationship with and status within the Holy Roman Empire.

Key Points

- The House of Hohenzollern is a dynasty of
Hohenzollern, Brandenburg, Prussia, the German Empire, and Romania. The family arose in the area around the town of Hechingen in Swabia during the 11th century. The family split into two branches, the Catholic Swabian branch and the Protestant Franconian branch, which later became the Brandenburg-Prussian branch.

- The Margraviate of Brandenburg was a major principality of the Holy Roman Empire from 1157 to 1806. It played a pivotal role in the history of Germany and Central Europe. The House of Hohenzollern came to the throne of Brandenburg in 1415. Frederick VI of Nuremberg was officially recognized as Margrave and Prince-elector Frederick I of Brandenburg at the Council of Constance in 1415.

- When Duke of Prussia Albert Frederick died in 1618 without having had a son, his son-in-law John Sigismund, at the time the prince-elector of the Margraviate of Brandenburg, inherited the Duchy of Prussia. He then ruled both territories in a personal union that came to be known as Brandenburg-Prussia. Prussia lay outside the Holy Roman Empire and the electors of Brandenburg held it as a fief of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to which the electors paid homage.

- The electors of Brandenburg spent the next two centuries attempting to gain lands to unite their separate territories and form one geographically contiguous domain. In the second half of the 17th century, Frederick William, the “Great Elector,” developed Brandenburg-Prussia into a major power. The electors succeeded in acquiring full sovereignty.
over Prussia in 1657.

- In return for aiding Emperor Leopold I during the War of the Spanish Succession, Frederick William’s son, Frederick III, was allowed to elevate Prussia to the status of a kingdom. In 1701, Frederick crowned himself Frederick I, King of Prussia. Prussia, unlike Brandenburg, lay outside the Holy Roman Empire. Legally, Brandenburg was still part of the Holy Roman Empire so the Hohenzollerns continued to use the additional title of Elector of Brandenburg for the remainder of the empire’s run.

- The feudal designation of the Margraviate of Brandenburg ended with the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, which made the Hohenzollerns de jure as well as de facto sovereigns over it. It became part of the German Empire in 1871 during the Prussian-led unification of Germany.

---

Key Terms

**personal union**

The combination of two or more states that have the same monarch while their boundaries, laws, and interests remain distinct. It differs from a federation in that each constituent state has an independent government, whereas a unitary state is united by a central government. Its ruler does not need to be a hereditary monarch.
fief

The central element of feudalism, consisting of heritable property or rights granted by an overlord to a vassal who held it in fealty (or “in fee”) in return for a form of feudal allegiance and service, usually given by the personal ceremonies of homage and fealty. The fees were often lands or revenue-producing real property held in feudal land tenure.

The House of Hohenzollern

A dynasty of Hohenzollern, Brandenburg, Prussia, the German Empire, and Romania. The family arose in the area around the town of Hechingen in Swabia during the 11th century and took their name from the Hohenzollern Castle. The family split into two branches, the Catholic Swabian branch and the Protestant Franconian branch, which later became the Brandenburg-Prussian branch.

The Margraviate of Brandenburg

A major principality of the Holy Roman Empire from 1157 to 1806. Also known as the March of Brandenburg, it played a pivotal role in the history of Germany and Central Europe. Its ruling margraves were established as prestigious prince-electors in the Golden Bull of 1356, allowing them to vote in the election of the Holy Roman Emperor.

the Golden Bull of 1356

A decree issued by the Imperial Diet at Nuremberg and Metz headed by the Emperor Charles IV, which fixed, for a period of more than four hundred years, important aspects of the constitutional structure
The House of Hohenzollern is a dynasty of Hohenzollern, Brandenburg, Prussia, the German Empire, and Romania. The family arose in the area around the town of Hechingen in Swabia during the 11th century and took their name from the Hohenzollern Castle. The first ancestor of the Hohenzollerns was mentioned in 1061, but the family split into two branches, the Catholic Swabian branch and the Protestant Franconian branch, which later became the Brandenburg-Prussian branch. The Swabian branch ruled the principalities of Hohenzollern-Hechingen and Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen (both fiefs of the Holy Roman Empire) until 1849 and ruled Romania from 1866 to 1947. The cadet Franconian branch of the House of Hohenzollern was founded by Conrad I, Burgrave of Nuremberg (1186-1261). Beginning in the 16th century, this branch of the family became Protestant and decided on expansion through marriage and the purchase of surrounding lands. The family supported the Hohenstaufen and Habsburg rulers of the Holy Roman Empire during the 12th to 15th centuries and was rewarded with several territorial grants. In the first phase, the family gradually added to their lands, at first with many small acquisitions in the Franconian region of Germany (Ansbach in 1331 and Kulmbach in 1340). In the second phase, the family expanded further with large acquisitions in the Brandenburg and Prussian regions of Germany and current Poland (Margraviate of Brandenburg in 1417 and Duchy of Prussia in 1618). These acquisitions eventually transformed the
Hohenzollerns from a minor German princely family into one of the most important dynasties in Europe.

Margraviate of Brandenburg

The Margraviate of Brandenburg was a major principality of the Holy Roman Empire from 1157 to 1806. Also known as the March of Brandenburg, it played a pivotal role in the history of Germany and Central Europe. Its ruling margraves were established as prestigious prince-electors in the Golden Bull of 1356, allowing them to vote in the election of the Holy Roman Emperor. The state thus became additionally known as Electoral Brandenburg or the Electorate of Brandenburg. The House of Hohenzollern came to the throne of Brandenburg in 1415. Frederick VI of Nuremberg was officially recognized as Margrave and Prince-elector Frederick I of Brandenburg at the Council of Constance in 1415.
Frederick made Berlin his residence, although he retired to his Franconian possessions in 1425. He granted governance of Brandenburg to his eldest son John the Alchemist while retaining the electoral dignity for himself. The next elector, Frederick II, forced the submission of Berlin and Cölln, setting an example for the other towns of Brandenburg. He reacquired the Neumark from the Teutonic Knights and began its rebuilding. Brandenburg accepted the Protestant Reformation in 1539. The population has remained largely Lutheran since, although some later electors converted to Calvinism. At the end of the Thirty Years’ War in 1648, Brandenburg
was recognized as the possessor of territories, which were more than 100 kilometers from the borders of Brandenburg and formed the nucleus of the later Prussian Rhineland.

**Brandenburg-Prussia**

When Duke of Prussia Albert Frederick died in 1618 without having had a son, his son-in-law John Sigismund, at the time the prince-elector of the Margraviate of Brandenburg, inherited the Duchy of Prussia. He then ruled both territories in a personal union that came to be known as Brandenburg-Prussia. Prussia lay outside the Holy Roman Empire and the electors of Brandenburg held it as a fief of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth to which the electors paid homage.

The electors of Brandenburg spent the next two centuries attempting to gain lands to unite their separate territories (the Mark Brandenburg, the territories in the Rhineland and Westphalia, and Ducal Prussia) and form one geographically contiguous domain. In the Peace of Westphalia ending the Thirty Years’ War in 1648, Brandenburg-Prussia acquired Farther Pomerania and made it the Province of Pomerania. In the second half of the 17th century, Frederick William, the “Great Elector,” developed Brandenburg-Prussia into a major power. The electors succeeded in acquiring full sovereignty over Prussia in 1657.

**Kingdom of Prussia**

In return for aiding Emperor Leopold I during the War of the Spanish Succession, Frederick William’s son, Frederick III, was allowed to elevate Prussia to the status of a kingdom. In 1701,
Frederick crowned himself Frederick I, King of Prussia. Prussia, unlike Brandenburg, lay outside the Holy Roman Empire, within which only the emperor and the ruler of Bohemia could call themselves king. As king was a more prestigious title than prince-elector, the territories of the Hohenzollerns became known as the Kingdom of Prussia, although their power base remained in Brandenburg. Legally, Brandenburg was still part of the Holy Roman Empire, ruled by the Hohenzollerns in personal union with the Prussian kingdom over which they were fully sovereign. For this reason, the Hohenzollerns continued to use the additional title of Elector of Brandenburg for the remainder of the empire's run. However, by this time the emperor's authority over the empire had become merely nominal. The various territories of the empire acted more or less as de facto sovereign states and only acknowledged the emperor's overlordship over them in a formal way. For this reason, Brandenburg soon came to be treated as de facto part of the Prussian kingdom rather than a separate entity.

From 1701 to 1946, Brandenburg's history was largely that of the state of Prussia, which established itself as a major power in Europe during the 18th century. King Frederick William I of Prussia, the “Soldier-King,” modernized the Prussian Army, while his son Frederick the Great achieved glory and infamy with the Silesian Wars and Partitions of Poland. The feudal designation of the Margraviate of Brandenburg ended with the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, which made the Hohenzollerns de jure as well as de facto sovereigns over it. It was replaced with the Province of Brandenburg in 1815 following the Napoleonic Wars. Brandenburg, along with the rest of Prussia, became part of the German Empire in 1871 during the Prussian-led unification of Germany.
Attributions

- The Hohenzollerns
25. Frederick the Great

21.2.2: Frederick the Great

In his youth, Frederick the Great was a sensitive man with great appreciation for intellectual development, arts, and education. Despite his father's fears, this did not prevent him from becoming a brilliant military strategist during his later reign as King of Prussia.

Learning Objective

Describe elements of Frederick II’s upbringing and his transformation into a Prussian leader

Key Points

- Frederick, the son of Frederick William I and his wife Sophia Dorothea of Hanover, was born in Berlin in 1712. He was brought up by Huguenot governesses and tutors and learned French and German simultaneously. In spite of his father’s desire that his education be entirely religious and pragmatic, the young Frederick preferred music, literature, and French culture, which clashed with his father’s
militarism.

- Frederick found an ally in his sister, Wilhelmine, with whom he remained close for life. At age 16, he formed an attachment to the king’s 13-year-old page, Peter Karl Christoph Keith. Margaret Goldsmith, a biographer of Frederick’s, suggests the attachment was of a sexual nature and as a result Keith was sent away and Frederick temporarily relocated.

- When he was 18, Frederick plotted to flee to England with his close friend Hans Hermann von Katte and other junior army officers. Frederick and Katte were subsequently arrested and imprisoned in Küstrin. Because they were army officers who had tried to flee Prussia for Great Britain, Frederick William leveled an accusation of treason against the pair. The king forced Frederick to watch the decapitation of Katte.

- Frederick married Elisabeth Christine of Brunswick-Bevern, a Protestant relative of the Austrian Habsburgs, in 1733. He had little in common with his bride and resented the political marriage. Once Frederick secured the throne in 1740 after his father’s death, he immediately separated from his wife.

- Prince Frederick was 28 years old when he acceded to the throne of Prussia. His goal was to modernize and unite his vulnerably disconnected lands, which he largely succeeded at through aggressive military and foreign policies. Contrary to his father’s fears, Frederick proved himself a courageous soldier and an extremely skillful strategist.
Key Terms

The Prince
A 16th-century political treatise by the Italian diplomat and political theorist Niccolò Machiavelli. Machiavelli’s ideas on how to accrue honor and power as a leader had a profound impact on political leaders throughout the modern West. Although the work advises princes how to tyrannize, Machiavelli is generally thought to have preferred some form of free republic.

Anti-Machiavel
A 1740 essay by Frederick the Great consisting of a chapter-by-chapter rebuttal of The Prince, the 16th-century book by Niccolò Machiavelli, and Machiavellianism in general. Frederick’s argument is essentially moral in nature. His own views reflect a largely Enlightenment ideal of rational and benevolent statesmanship: the king, Frederick contends, is charged with maintaining the health and prosperity of his subjects.

effective absolutism
Also known as enlightened despotism or benevolent absolutism, a form of absolute monarchy or despotism inspired by the Enlightenment. The monarchs who embraced it followed the participles of rationality. Some of them fostered education and allowed religious tolerance, freedom of speech, and the right to hold private property. They held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social
contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern in lieu of any other governments.

Frederick the Great: Early Childhood

Frederick, the son of Frederick William I and his wife, Sophia Dorothea of Hanover, was born in Berlin in 1712. His birth was particularly welcomed by his grandfather, Frederick I, as his two previous grandsons both died in infancy. With the death of Frederick I in 1713, Frederick William became King of Prussia, thus making young Frederick the crown prince.

The new king wished for his sons and daughters to be educated not as royalty but as simple folk. He had been educated by a Frenchwoman, Madame de Montbail, who later became Madame de Rocoule, and wanted her to educate his children. Frederick was brought up by Huguenot governesses and tutors and learned French and German simultaneously. In spite of his father’s desire that his education be entirely religious and pragmatic, the young Frederick, with the help of his tutor Jacques Duhan, secretly procured a 3,000-volume library of poetry, Greek and Roman classics, and French philosophy to supplement his official lessons. Frederick William I, popularly dubbed the Soldier-King, possessed a violent temper and ruled Brandenburg-Prussia with absolute authority. As Frederick grew, his preference for music, literature, and French culture clashed with his father’s militarism, resulting in frequent beatings and humiliation from his father.
Crown Prince

Frederick found an ally in his sister Wilhelmine, with whom he remained close for life. At age 16, he formed an attachment to the king’s 13-year-old page, Peter Karl Christoph Keith. Margaret Goldsmith, a biographer of Frederick’s, suggests the attachment was of a sexual nature. As a result, Keith was sent away to an unpopular regiment near the Dutch frontier, while Frederick was temporarily sent to his father’s hunting lodge in order “to repent of his sin.” Around the same time, he became close friends with Hans Hermann von Katte.

When he was 18, Frederick plotted to flee to England with Katte and other junior army officers. Frederick and Katte were subsequently arrested and imprisoned in Küstrin. Because they were army officers who had tried to flee Prussia for Great Britain, Frederick William leveled an accusation of treason against the pair. The king briefly threatened the crown prince with the death penalty, then considered forcing Frederick to renounce the succession in favor of his brother, Augustus William, although either option would have been difficult to justify to the Imperial Diet (general assembly) of the Holy Roman Empire. The king forced Frederick to watch the decapitation of Katte at Küstrin, leaving the crown prince to faint right before the fatal blow was struck.

Frederick was granted a royal pardon and released from his cell, although he remained stripped of his military rank. Instead of returning to Berlin, he was forced to remain in Küstrin and began rigorous schooling in statecraft and administration. Tensions eased slightly when Frederick William visited Küstrin a year later and Frederick was allowed to visit Berlin on the occasion of his sister Wilhelmine’s marriage to Margrave Frederick of Bayreuth in 1731. The crown prince returned to Berlin after finally being released from his tutelage at Küstrin a year later.

A number of royal family members were considered candidates for marriage, but Frederick eventually married Elisabeth Christine
of Brunswick-Bevern, a Protestant relative of the Austrian Habsburgs, in 1733. He had little in common with his bride and resented the political marriage as an example of the Austrian interference that had plagued Prussia since 1701. Once Frederick secured the throne in 1740 after his father's death, he immediately separated from his wife and prevented Elisabeth from visiting his court in Potsdam, granting her instead Schönhausen Palace and apartments at the Berliner Stadtschloss. In later years, Frederick would pay his wife formal visits only once a year. Recent major biographers are unequivocal that Frederick was homosexual and that his sexuality was central to his life and character.
inheritance: an army of 80,000 men. By 1770, after two decades of punishing war alternating with intervals of peace, Frederick doubled the size of the huge army, which during his reign would consume 86% of the state budget.

Becoming the Leader

Frederick was restored to the Prussian Army as colonel. When Prussia provided a contingent of troops to aid Austria during the War of the Polish Succession, Frederick studied under Prince Eugene of Savoy during the campaign against France on the Rhine. Frederick William, weakened by gout brought about by the campaign and seeking to reconcile with his heir, granted Frederick Schloss Rheinsberg in Rheinsberg, north of Neuruppin. In Rheinsberg, Frederick assembled a small number of musicians, actors, and other artists. He spent his time reading, watching dramatic plays, and making and listening to music, and regarded this time as one of the happiest of his life.

The works of Niccolò Machiavelli, such as The Prince, were considered a guideline for the behavior of a king in Frederick's age. In 1739, Frederick finished his Anti-Machiavel, an idealistic refutation of Machiavelli. Instead of promoting more democratic principles of the Enlightenment, Frederick was a proponent of enlightened absolutism. It was written in French and published anonymously in 1740, but Voltaire distributed it in Amsterdam to great popularity.

Frederick’s years dedicated to the arts instead of politics ended upon the 1740 death of Frederick William and his inheritance of the Kingdom of Prussia.

Prince Frederick was 28 years old when he acceded to the throne of Prussia. His goal was to modernize and unite his vulnerably disconnected lands, and he largely succeeded through aggressive military and foreign policies. Contrary to his father's fears, Frederick proved himself a courageous soldier and an extremely skillful
strategist. In fact, Napoleon Bonaparte viewed the Prussian king as the greatest tactical genius of all time. After the Seven Years' War, the Prussian military acquired a formidable reputation across Europe. Esteemed for their efficiency and success in battle, Frederick's army became a model emulated by other European powers, most notably Russia and France. Frederick was also an influential military theorist whose analysis emerged from his extensive personal battlefield experience and covered issues of strategy, tactics, mobility and logistics. Even the later military reputation of Prussia under Bismarck and Moltke rested on the weight of mid-eighteenth century military developments and the territorial expansion of Frederick the Great. Despite his dazzling success as a military commander, however, Frederick was not a fan of protracted warfare.

Attributions

- Frederick the Great
Frederick the Great significantly modernized Prussian economy, administration, judicial system, education, finance, and agriculture, but never attempted to change the social order based on the dominance of the landed nobility.

Learning Objective

Analyze Frederick the Great’s domestic reforms and his relationship with the Junker class

Key Points

- Frederick the Great helped transform Prussia from a European backwater to an economically strong and politically reformed state. During his reign, the effects of the Seven Years’ War and the gaining of Silesia greatly changed the economy.
- Frederick organized a system of indirect taxation,
which provided the state with more revenue than direct taxation. He also followed Johann Ernst Gotzkowsky’s recommendations in the field of toll levies and import restrictions and protected Prussian industries with high tariffs and minimal restrictions on domestic trade.

- Frederick gave his state a modern bureaucracy, reformed the judicial system, and made it possible for men not of noble stock to become judges and senior bureaucrats. He also allowed freedom of speech, the press, and literature, and abolished most uses of judicial torture. He also reformed the currency system and thus stabilized prices. However, he did not reform the existing social order.

- At the time, Prussia’s education system was seen as one of the best in Europe. Frederick laid the basic foundations of what would eventually become a Prussian primary education system. In 1763, he issued a decree for the first Prussian general school law based on the principles developed by Johann Julius Hecker.

- Frederick was keenly interested in land use, especially draining swamps and opening new farmland for colonizers who would increase the kingdom’s food supply. The resulting program created 60,000 hectares (150,000 acres) of new farmland, but also eliminated vast swaths of natural habitat.

- While Frederick was largely non-practicing and tolerated all faiths in his realm, Protestantism became the favored religion and Catholics were not chosen for higher state positions. His attitudes towards Catholics and Jews were very selective and thus in
some cases oppressive, while in others relatively tolerant.

**Key Terms**

**Freemason**

A member of fraternal organizations that trace their origins to the local fraternities of stonemasons, which from the end of the 14th century regulated the qualifications of stonemasons and their interactions with authorities and clients. There is no clear mechanism by which these local trade organizations became the fraternal organizations gathering members of similar ideological and intellectual interests, but the rituals and passwords known from operative lodges around the turn of the 17th–18th centuries show continuity with the rituals developed in the later 18th century by members who did not practice the physical craft.

**Seven Years’ War**

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents, and affected Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one
side and France on the other. For the first time, aiming to curtail Britain and Prussia’s ever-growing might, France formed a grand coalition of its own, which ended with failure as Britain rose as the world’s predominant power, altering the European balance of power.

**Junkers**

The members of the landed nobility in Prussia. They owned great estates that were maintained and worked by peasants with few rights. They were an important factor in Prussian and, after 1871, German military, political, and diplomatic leadership.

---

**Frederick the Great and the Modernization of Prussia**

As King of Prussia from 1740 until 1786, Frederick the Great helped transform Prussia from a European backwater to an economically strong and politically reformed state. During his reign, the effects of the Seven Years’ War and the gaining of Silesia greatly changed the economy. The conquest of Silesia gave Prussia’s fledgling industries access to raw materials and fertile agricultural lands. With the help of French experts, he organized a system of indirect taxation, which provided the state with more revenue than direct taxation. He also commissioned Johann Ernst Gotzkowsky, a Prussian merchant with a successful trade in trinkets, silk, taft, and porcelain, to promote the trade and open a silk factory that employed 1,500 people.
Frederick followed Gotzovsky's recommendations in the fields of toll levies and import restrictions. He also protected Prussian industries with high tariffs and minimal restrictions on domestic trade. In 1763, when Gotzkowsky went bankrupt during a financial crisis, Frederick took over his porcelain factory. The factory was eventually turned into the Royal Porcelain Factory in Berlin (Königliche Porzellan-Manufaktur, or KPM), which still operates today. In 1781, Frederick decided to make coffee a royal monopoly. Disabled soldiers were employed to spy on citizens sniffing in search of illegally roasted coffee, much to the annoyance of general population.

Frederick also gave his state a modern bureaucracy whose mainstay until 1760 was the able War and Finance Minister Adam Ludwig von Blumenthal, succeeded in 1764 by his nephew Joachim, who ran the ministry to the end of the reign and beyond. He reformed the judicial system and made it possible for men not of noble stock to become judges and senior bureaucrats. He also allowed freedom of speech, the press and literature, and abolished most uses of judicial torture, except the flogging of soldiers as punishment for desertion. The death penalty could only be carried out with a warrant signed by the King himself, and Frederick signed a handful of these warrants per year.

At the time, Prussia's education system was seen as one of the best in Europe. Frederick laid the basic foundations of what would eventually become a Prussian primary education system. In 1763, he issued a decree for the first Prussian general school law based on the principles developed by Johann Julius Hecker. In 1748, Hecker had founded the first teacher's seminary in Prussia. The decree expanded the existing schooling system significantly and required that all young citizens, both girls and boys, be educated by mainly municipality-funded schools from the age of 5 to 13 or 14. Prussia was among the first countries in the world to introduce tax-funded and generally compulsory primary education, although it took several decades before universal education was successfully enacted.
The circulation of depreciated money kept prices high. To revalue the thaler, the Mint Edict of May 1763 was proposed. This stabilized the rates of depreciated coins that would not be accepted and provided for payment of taxes in currency of pre-Seven Years’ War value. Prussia used a thaler containing 1/14th of a Cologne mark of silver. Many other rulers soon followed the steps of Frederick in reforming their own currencies, which resulted in a shortage of ready money, thus lowering prices.

An important aspect of Frederick's efforts is the absence of social order reform. In his modernization of military and administration, he relied on the class of Junkers, the Prussian land-owning nobility. Under his rule, they continued to hold their privileges, including the right to hold serfs. Frederick's attempts to protect the peasantry from cruel treatment and oppression by landlords and lower their labor obligations never really succeeded because of the economic, political, and military influence the Junkers exercised. As the bulwark of the ruling House of Hohenzollern, the Junkers controlled the Prussian army, leading in political influence and social status, and owned immense estates, especially in the north-eastern half of Germany.

Agriculture

Frederick was keenly interested in land use, especially draining swamps and opening new farmland for colonizers who would increase the kingdom's food supply. He called it “peopling Prussia.” About a thousand new villages were founded in his reign that attracted 300,000 immigrants from outside Prussia. Using improved technology enabled him to create new farmland through a massive drainage program in the country's Oderbruch marshland. This strategy created roughly 150,000 acres of new farmland, but also eliminated vast swaths of natural habitat, destroyed the region's biodiversity, and displaced numerous native plant and animal
communities. Frederick saw this project as the “taming” and “conquering” of nature, which, in its wild form, he regarded as “useless” and “barbarous” (an attitude that reflected his Enlightenment-era, rationalist sensibilities). He presided over the construction of canals for bringing crops to market and introduced new crops, especially potato and turnip, to the country. Control of grain prices was of Frederick’s greatest achievements in that it allowed populations to survive in areas where harvests were poor. Frederick also loved animals and founded the first veterinary school in Germany. Unusual for his time and aristocratic background, he criticized hunting as cruel, rough, and uneducated.

Frederick the Great inspects the potato harvest outside Neustettin (now Szczecinek, Poland), Eastern Pomerania. He introduced new crops, especially the potato and the turnip, to the country, and because of it he was sometimes called Der Kartoffelkönig (the Potato King).

**Religious Policies**

While Frederick was largely non-practicing (in contrast to his
devoutly Calvinist father) and tolerated all faiths in his realm, Protestantism became the favored religion and Catholics were not chosen for higher state positions. Frederick was known to be more tolerant of Jews and Catholics than many neighboring German states, although he expressed strong anti-Semitic sentiments and, in territories taken over from Poland, persecuted Polish Roman Catholic churches by confiscating goods and property, exercising strict control of churches, and interfering in church administration. Like many leading figures in the Age of Enlightenment, Frederick was a Freemason and his membership legitimized the group and protected it against charges of subversion.

Frederick retained Jesuits as teachers in Silesia, Warmia, and the Netze District after their suppression by Pope Clement XIV. Just like Catherine II, he recognized the educational skills the Jesuits had as an asset for the nation and was interested in attracting a diversity of skills to his country, whether from Jesuit teachers, Huguenot citizens, or Jewish merchants and bankers.

As Frederick made more wasteland arable, Prussia looked for new colonists to settle the land. To encourage immigration, he repeatedly emphasized that nationality and religion were of no concern to him. This policy allowed Prussia’s population to recover very quickly from the considerable losses it suffered during Frederick’s wars.
Additionally to reforming efforts, Frederick was a patron of music as well as a gifted musician who played the transverse flute. He composed more than 100 sonatas for the flute as well as four symphonies. His court musicians included C. P. E. Bach, Johann Joachim Quantz, Carl Heinrich Graun and Franz Benda. A meeting with Johann Sebastian Bach in 1747 in Potsdam led to Bach’s writing The Musical Offering.

Attributions

• Prussia Under Frederick the Great
  ◦ “Johann Ernst Gotzkowsky.” https://en.wikipedia.org/
27. The War of Austrian Succession

21.2.4: The War of Austrian Succession

Frederick the Great’s 1740 invasion of resource-rich and strategically located Silesia, marked the onset of the War of Austrian Succession and aimed to unify the disconnected lands under Frederick's rule.

Learning Objective

Evaluate Frederick the Great’s actual goals against his stated rationale for the War of Austrian Succession

Key Points

- In 1713, Charles VI of the Habsburg dynasty issued an edict known as the Pragmatic Sanction, which aimed to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. The Pragmatic Sanction did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial crown was
elective, not hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.

- In 1740, Charles VI died and his daughter Maria Theresa succeeded him, but not as Holy Roman Emperor. The plan was for her to succeed to the hereditary domains and her husband, Francis Stephen, to be elected Holy Roman Emperor.
- Hoping to unify his disconnected lands and thus desiring the prosperous, resource-rich, and strategically located Austrian province of Silesia, Frederick declined to endorse the Pragmatic Sanction. He disputed the succession of Maria Theresa to the Habsburg lands while simultaneously making his own claim on Silesia. Accordingly, the War of Austrian Succession began on December 16, 1740, when Frederick invaded and quickly occupied the province. Politically, he used the 1537 Treaty of Brieg as a pretext for the invasion.
- The War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748) escalated and eventually involved most of the powers of Europe. Austria was supported by Great Britain and the Dutch Republic, the traditional enemies of France, as well as the Kingdom of Sardinia and the Electorate of Saxony. France and Prussia were allied with the Electorate of Bavaria.
- The Prussian army proved to be a powerful force and ultimately Prussia claimed victory in the First Silesian War (1740–1742). Peace terms of the 1742 Treaty of Breslau gave Prussia all of Silesia and Glatz County with the Austrians retaining only a portion of Upper Silesia called “Austrian or Czech Silesia.”
Frederick renewed his alliance with the French and preemptively invaded Bohemia in 1744, thus beginning the Second Silesian War (1744–1745). Frederick’s victories on the battlefields of Bohemia and Silesia again forced his enemies to seek peace terms. Under the terms of the 1745 Treaty of Dresden, Austria was forced to adhere to the terms of the Treaty of Breslau, but Frederick recognized the election of Maria Theresa’s husband, Francis I, as the Holy Roman Emperor.

**Key Terms**

**Pragmatic Sanction**

An edict issued by Charles VI in 1713 to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. The Head of the House of Habsburg ruled the Archduchy of Austria, the Kingdom of Hungary, the Kingdom of Croatia, the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Italian territories awarded to Austria by the Treaty of Utrecht, and the Austrian Netherlands. The edict did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial crown was elective, not hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.

**War of Austrian Succession**

A war (1740–1748) that involved most of the powers of
Europe over the question of Maria Theresa’s succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The war included King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins’ Ear (which formally began in October 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the First and Second Silesian Wars.

**personal union**

The combination of two or more states with the same monarch but distinct boundaries, laws, and interests. It differs from a federation in that each constituent state has an independent government, whereas a unitary state is united by a central government. The ruler does not need to be a hereditary monarch.

**Background**

In 1713, Charles VI of the Habsburg dynasty issued an edict known as the Pragmatic Sanction. It aimed to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. The Head of the House of Habsburg ruled the Archduchy of Austria, the Kingdom of Hungary, the Kingdom of Croatia, the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Italian territories awarded to Austria by the Treaty of Utrecht (Duchy of Milan, Kingdom of Naples and Kingdom of Sicily), and the Austrian Netherlands. However, the Pragmatic Sanction did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial
crown was elective, not hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.

In 1740, Charles VI died and his daughter Maria Theresa succeeded him as Queen of Hungary, Croatia and Bohemia, Archduchess of Austria, and Duchess of Parma. She was not, however, a candidate for the title of Holy Roman Emperor, which had never been held by a woman. The plan was for her to succeed to the hereditary domains and her husband, Francis Stephen, to be elected Holy Roman Emperor.

Also in 1740, Frederick the Great of the Hohenzollern dynasty took the title of King of Prussia upon his father's death. As such, Frederick was also Elector of Brandenburg because the two remained in personal union since the early 17th century. Legally, Brandenburg was still part of the Holy Roman Empire but the Hohenzollerns were fully sovereign rulers of the Prussian Kingdom. Theoretically, this positioned Frederick as a sovereign king of Prussia but under the authority of the Holy Roman Emperor as the ruler of Brandenburg. In reality, by the 18th century Emperor's authority over the Empire had become merely nominal. The various territories of the Empire acted more or less as *de facto* sovereign states and only acknowledged the Emperor's overlordship over them in a formal way. For this reason, Brandenburg soon came to be treated as *de facto* part of the Prussian kingdom rather than a separate entity.

**Frederick the Great and Silesia**

Hoping to unify his disconnected lands and thus desiring the prosperous, resource-rich, and strategically located Austrian province of Silesia, Frederick declined to endorse the Pragmatic Sanction. He disputed the succession of Maria Theresa to the Habsburg lands while simultaneously making his own claim on Silesia. Accordingly, the War of Austrian Succession began on December 16, 1740, when Frederick invaded and quickly occupied
the province. He was worried that if he did not move to occupy the region, Augustus III, King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, would seek to connect his own disparate lands through Silesia. Politically, Frederick used the 1537 Treaty of Brieg as a pretext for the invasion. Under the treaty, the Hohenzollerns of Brandenburg were to inherit the Duchy of Brieg, an autonomous region of Silesia. However, the 1537 agreement had been rejected by the Bohemian king Ferdinand I of Habsburg soon after it was reached and never came into effect.

Since their marriage in 1708, Charles and his wife Elizabeth Christine had not had children, and since 1711 Charles had been the sole surviving male member of the House of Habsburg. Charles's elder brother Joseph I had died without male issue, making accession of a female a very plausible contingency. Charles VI needed to take extraordinary measures to avoid a succession dispute. He was, indeed, ultimately succeeded by his elder daughter Maria Theresa (born 1717). Her accession in 1740 still resulted in the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession.

The War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748) escalated and eventually involved most of the powers of Europe. It included King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins' Ear (formally...
began in 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the war over Silesia (First and Second Silesian Wars). Austria was supported by Great Britain and the Dutch Republic, the traditional enemies of France, as well as the Kingdom of Sardinia and the Electorate of Saxony. France and Prussia were allied with the Electorate of Bavaria.

Silesian Wars

Frederick occupied Silesia except for three fortresses at Glogau, Brieg and Breslau. The first real battle he faced in Silesia was the Battle of Mollwitz in April 1741, which was the first time Frederick would command an army and later saw as his “school.” In early September 1741, the French entered the war against Austria and together with their allies, the Electorate of Bavaria, marched on Prague. With Prague under threat, the Austrians pulled their army out of Silesia to defend Bohemia. When Frederick pursued them into Bohemia and blocked their path to Prague, the Austrians attacked him in May 1742. The Prussian Cavalry proved to be a powerful force and ultimately Prussia claimed victory. Frederick forced the Austrians to seek peace with him in the First Silesian War (1740–1742). Peace terms of the Treaty of Breslau between the Austrians and the Prussians negotiated in 1742 gave Prussia all of Silesia and Glatz County with the Austrians retaining only a portion of Upper Silesia called “Austrian or Czech Silesia.” Prussian possession of Silesia gave the kingdom control over the navigable Oder River.
On June 4, 1745, Frederick trapped a joint force of Saxons and Austrians that had crossed the mountains to invade Silesia. After allowing them to cross the mountains, Frederick then pinned the enemy force down and defeated them at the Battle of Hohenfriedberg. The battle was one of Prussia's great victories during the Second Silesian War.

Frederick strongly suspected that the Austrians (who had subdued Bavaria but were still at war with France) would resume war with Prussia in an attempt to recover Silesia. Accordingly, he renewed his alliance with the French and preemptively invaded Bohemia in 1744. Thus the Second Silesian War (1744–1745) began. Frederick's stunning victories on the battlefields of Bohemia and Silesia again forced his enemies to seek peace terms. Under the terms of the Treaty of Dresden, signed in December 1745, Austria was forced to adhere to the terms of the Treaty of Breslau giving Silesia to Prussia. Frederick, on the other hand, recognized the election of Maria Theresa's husband/consort—Francis I—as the Holy Roman Emperor.

Attributions

- The War of Austrian Succession


21.3: The Holy Roman Empire

21.3.1: The Structure of the Holy Roman Empire

Although the Habsburgs held the title of Holy Roman Emperor for nearly four centuries, the title was not hereditary and their power over the decentralized empire was limited and separate from their reign over the territories under the Habsburg rule.

Learning Objective

Describe the structure of the Holy Roman Empire, focusing on its relation to the Habsburg dynasty and the lands under their rule

Key Points

- The Holy Roman Empire was a multi-ethnic complex of territories in central Europe that developed during the Early Middle Ages and
continued until its dissolution in 1806. The German prince-electors, the highest-ranking noblemen of the empire, usually elected one of their peers to be the emperor. The empire evolved into a decentralized, limited elective monarchy composed of hundreds of sub-units, and the power of the emperor was limited.

• The Habsburgs held the title of Holy Roman Emperor between 1438 and 1740 and again from 1745 to 1806. Although one family held onto the title for centuries, the Holy Roman Emperor was elected and the position never became hereditary. This contrasted with the power that the Habsburgs held over territories under their rule, which did not overlap with the Holy Roman Empire.

• The various Habsburg possessions never really formed a single country—each province was governed according to its own particular customs. Serious attempts at centralization began under Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II, but many of these were abandoned. The Holy Roman Empire was also not a centralized state but its fragmentation was much more dramatic.

• The division between the positions of the Holy Roman Emperor and the Emperor of the Austrian Monarchy is best illustrated by the circumstances around the War of the Austrian Succession. At its end, Maria Theresa was recognized as the head of the Austrian Monarchy, but it was her husband, Francis I who was eventually granted the title of Holy Roman Emperor.

• At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Holy Roman Empire saw significant
administrative changes. In 1804, the Holy Roman Emperor Francis II, who was also ruler of the lands of the Habsburg Monarchy, founded the Empire of Austria. In doing so, he created a formal overarching structure for the Habsburg Monarchy as he foresaw either the end of the Holy Roman Empire or the eventual accession as Holy Roman Emperor of Napoleon.

• In 1805, the leaders of some imperial territories proclaimed their independence and signed a treaty with France. Eventually, Francis II agreed to the Treaty of Pressburg (1805), which in practice meant the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire. In 1806, the Confederation of the Rhine was established, putting an end to the Holy Roman Empire.

Key Terms

Confederation of the Rhine

A confederation of client states of the First French Empire formed initially from 16 German states by Napoleon after he defeated Austria and Russia in the Battle of Austerlitz. The Treaty of Pressburg, in effect led to its creation. It lasted from 1806 to 1813 and its members were German princes from the Holy Roman Empire.
**Imperial Recess**

A resolution passed by the *Reichstag* (Imperial Diet) of the Holy Roman Empire in 1803 and ratified by the Emperor Francis II. It proved to be the last significant law enacted by the Empire before its dissolution in 1806. The law secularized over 70 ecclesiastical states and abolished 45 imperial cities.

**War of the Austrian Succession**

A 1740–1748 war that involved most of the powers of Europe over the question of Maria Theresa’s succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The war included King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins’ Ear (which formally began in 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the First and Second Silesian Wars.

**Treaty of Pressburg**

An 1805 treaty between Napoleon and Holy Roman Emperor Francis II as a consequence of the French victories over the Austrians at Ulm and Austerlitz. It was signed in Pressburg (now Bratislava), at that time in Hungary, by Johann I Josef, Prince of Liechtenstein and the Hungarian Count Ignaz Gyulai for Austria and Charles Maurice de Talleyrand for France.
The Holy Roman Empire

The Holy Roman Empire was a multi-ethnic complex of territories in central Europe that developed during the Early Middle Ages and continued until its dissolution in 1806. The term Holy Roman Empire was not used until the 13th century and the office of Holy Roman Emperor was traditionally elective, although frequently controlled by dynasties. The German prince-electors, the highest-ranking noblemen of the empire, usually elected one of their peers to be the emperor and he would later be crowned by the Pope (the tradition of papal coronations was discontinued in the 16th century). In time, the empire evolved into a decentralized, limited elective monarchy composed of hundreds of sub-units, principalities, duchies, counties, free imperial cities, and other domains. The power of the emperor was limited and while the various princes, lords, bishops and cities of the empire were vassals who owed the emperor their allegiance, they also possessed an extent of privileges that gave them de facto independence within their territories.

The Habsburg Dynasty and the Holy Roman Empire

The Habsburgs held the title of Holy Roman Emperor between 1438 and 1740 and again from 1745 to 1806. Although one family held the title for centuries, the Holy Roman Emperor was elected and the position never became hereditary. This contrasted with the power that the Habsburgs held over territories under their rule, which did not overlap with the Holy Roman Empire. From the 16th century until the formal establishment of the Austrian Empire in 1804, those lands were unofficially called the Habsburg or Austrian
Monarchy. They changed over the centuries, but the core always consisted of the Hereditary Lands (most of the modern states of Austria and Slovenia, as well as territories in northeastern Italy and southwestern Germany); the Lands of the Bohemian Crown; and the Kingdom of Hungary. Many other lands were also under Habsburg rule at one time or another.

The various Habsburg possessions never really formed a single country—each province was governed according to its own particular customs. Until the mid 17th century, not all of the provinces were even necessarily ruled by the same person—junior members of the family often ruled portions of the Hereditary Lands as private apanages. Serious attempts at centralization began under Maria Theresa and especially her son Joseph II in the mid to late 18th century, but many of these were abandoned following large-scale resistance to Joseph's more radical reform attempts.

The Holy Roman Empire was also a decentralized state; in fact, its fragmentation was much more dramatic than that of the Habsburg Monarchy. It was divided into dozens—eventually hundreds—of individual entities governed by kings, dukes, counts, bishops, abbots and other rulers, collectively known as princes. There were also some areas ruled directly by the Emperor. At no time could the Emperor simply issue decrees and govern autonomously over the Empire. His power was severely restricted by the various local leaders. The Emperors were unable to gain much control over the lands that they formally owned. Instead, to secure their own position from the threat of being deposed, they were forced to grant more and more autonomy to local rulers.

The division between the positions of the Holy Roman Emperor and the Emperor of the Austrian Monarchy is best illustrated by the circumstances around the War of the Austrian Succession. The war began under the pretext that Maria Theresa was ineligible to succeed to the Habsburg thrones of her father, Charles VI, because the existing law precluded royal inheritance by a woman. At the end, Maria Theresa was recognized as the head of the Austrian Monarchy while her husband, Francis I, was eventually granted the
title of Holy Roman Emperor. When Francis died in 1765, Maria Theresa continued to rule the Habsburg lands, but her son, Joseph II, secured the title of the Holy Roman Emperor. However, he gained the rule over the hereditary territories of the Habsburgs only after his mother's death fifteen years later.

The End of the Holy Roman Empire and the Austrian Empire

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Holy Roman Empire underwent significant changes. In 1803, the Imperial Recess was declared, which reduced the number of ecclesiastical states from 81 to only 3 and the free imperial cities from 51 to 6. In 1804, the Holy Roman Emperor Francis II, who was also ruler of the lands of the Habsburg Monarchy, founded the Empire of Austria comprising all his lands. In doing so, he created a formal overarching structure for the Habsburg Monarchy as he foresaw either the end of the Holy Roman Empire or the eventual accession as Holy Roman Emperor of Napoleon, who had earlier that year adopted the title of an Emperor of the French. In 1805, the leaders of some imperial territories proclaimed their independence and signed a treaty with France, becoming French allies. Eventually, Francis II agreed to the humiliating Treaty of Pressburg (1805), which in practice meant the dissolution of the long-lived Holy Roman Empire and a reorganization under a Napoleonic imprint of the German territories lost in the process into a precursor state of what became modern Germany. In 1806, the Confederation of the Rhine was established, comprising 16 sovereigns and countries. This confederation, under French influence, put an end to the Holy Roman Empire.
The Austrian Empire was a multinational empire and one of Europe’s great powers. Geographically it was the second largest country in Europe after the Russian Empire. It was also the third most populous after Russia and France, as well as the largest and strongest country in the German Confederation.
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- The Structure of the Holy Roman Empire
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29. The Pragmatic Sanction

21.3.2: The Pragmatic Sanction

The Pragmatic Sanction of 1713 was an edict issued by Charles VI to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter, but it was contested after Charles’ death in 1740, resulting in the War of Austrian Succession.

Learning Objective

Explain the contents of the Pragmatic Sanction and its intended purpose

Key Points

- The Pragmatic Sanction was an edict issued by Charles VI on April 19, 1713, to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. It did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial crown was elective, not hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.
In 1703, Charles and Joseph, the sons of Leopold, signed the Mutual Pact of Succession, granting succession rights to the daughters of Joseph and Charles in case of complete extinction of the male line, but favoring Joseph’s daughters over Charles’s because Joseph was older.

Charles soon expressed a wish to amend this pact to give his own future daughters precedence over his nieces. Securing the right to succeed for his own daughters, who were not even born yet, became Charles's obsession. The Pragmatic Sanction of 1713 was the first such document to be publicly announced and as such required formal acceptance by the estates of the realms it concerned.

For 10 years, Charles VI labored with the support of his closest advisor Johann Christoph von Bartenstein to have his sanction accepted by the courts of Europe and by Habsburg's hereditary territories. All the major empires and states agreed to recognize the sanction, but some Habsburg territories, including Hungary and Bohemia, did not initially accept it.

After Charles VI died, Prussia and Bavaria contested the claims of Maria Theresa on his Austrian lands. The refusal to accept the Sanction of 1713 resulted in the War of the Austrian Succession.

Maria Theresa's husband was elected Holy Roman Emperor as Francis I in 1745. The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 finally recognized Maria Theresa's rule over the Habsburg hereditary lands. In accordance with tradition, Maria Theresa held the title of the Holy Roman Empress as wife of the Emperor.
Key Terms

the Mutual Pact of Succession

A succession device secretly signed by Archdukes Joseph and Charles of Austria, the future Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, in 1703. It stipulated that the claim to the Spanish realms was to be assumed by Charles, while the right of succession to the rest of the Habsburg dominions would rest with his elder brother Joseph. The pact also specified they would both be succeeded by their respective heirs male. Should one of them fail to have a son, the other would succeed him in all his realms. However, should both brothers die leaving no sons, the daughters of the elder brother (Joseph) would have absolute precedence over the daughters of the younger brother (Charles), and the eldest daughter of Joseph would ascend all the Habsburg thrones.

The Pragmatic Sanction

An edict issued by Charles VI in 1713 to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. The Head of the House of Habsburg ruled the Archduchy of Austria, the Kingdom of Hungary, the Kingdom of Croatia, the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Italian territories awarded to Austria by the Treaty of Utrecht, and the Austrian Netherlands. The edict did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial crown was elective, not hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.
**Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle**

A 1748 treaty, sometimes called the Treaty of Aachen, that ended the War of the Austrian Succession. It was signed 1748 by Great Britain, France, and the Dutch Republic. Two implementation treaties were signed at Nice in 1748 and 1749 by Austria, Spain, Sardinia, Modena, and Genoa.

**War of the Austrian Succession**

A war (1740–1748) that involved most of the powers of Europe over the question of Maria Theresa's succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The war included King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins' Ear (which formally began in October 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the First and Second Silesian Wars.

**The Pragmatic Sanction of 1713**

The Pragmatic Sanction was an edict issued by Charles VI on April 19, 1713, to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. The Head of the House of Habsburg ruled the Archduchy of Austria, the Kingdom of Hungary, the Kingdom of Croatia, the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Italian territories awarded to Austria by the Treaty of Utrecht (Duchy of Milan, Kingdom of Naples and Kingdom of Sicily), and the Austrian Netherlands. The Pragmatic Sanction did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial crown was elective, not
hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.

Because Charles VI had no male heirs and earlier arrangements favored his brother’s daughters, he needed to take extraordinary measures to avoid a succession dispute. Charles was ultimately succeeded by his elder daughter Maria Theresa (born 1717). Despite the promulgation of the Pragmatic Sanction, however, her accession in 1740 resulted in the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession.

The Mutual Pact of Succession

In 1700, the senior (oldest, first-in-line) branch of the House of Habsburg became extinct with the death of Charles II of Spain. The War of the Spanish Succession ensued, with Louis XIV of France claiming the crowns of Spain for his grandson Philip and Leopold I (Holy Roman Emperor) claiming them for his son Charles. In 1703, Charles and Joseph, the sons of Leopold, signed the Mutual Pact of
Succession, granting succession rights to the daughters of Joseph and Charles in case of complete extinction of the male line, but favoring Joseph's daughters over Charles's because Joseph was older.

In 1705, Leopold I died and was succeeded by his elder son, Joseph I. Six years later, Joseph I died leaving behind two daughters, Archduchesses Maria Josepha and Maria Amalia. Charles succeeded Joseph according to the Pact, and Maria Josepha became his heir presumptive. However, Charles soon expressed a wish to amend the Pact to give his own future daughters precedence over his nieces. Securing the right to succeed for his own daughters, who were not even born yet, became Charles's obsession. The previous succession laws had also forbidden the partition of the Habsburg dominions and provided for succession by females, but they had been mostly hypothetical. On April 19, 1713, the Emperor announced the changes in a secret session of the council. The Pragmatic Sanction was the first such document to be publicly announced and as such required formal acceptance by the estates of the realms it concerned.

Recognition and Failure

For 10 years, Charles VI labored with the support of his closest advisor Johann Christoph von Bartenstein to have his sanction accepted by the courts of Europe and by Habsburg's hereditary territories. All the major empires and states agreed to recognize the sanction. Hungary, which had an elective kingship, had accepted the house of Habsburg as hereditary kings in the male line. It was agreed that if the Habsburg male line became extinct, Hungary would once again have an elective monarchy. This was also the rule in the Kingdom of Bohemia. Maria Theresa, Charles' daughter who succeeded her father following his death in 1740, still gained the throne of Hungary (the Hungarian Parliament voted its own
Pragmatic Sanction in 1723). Croatia was one of the crown lands that supported the Sanction of 1713, which eventually resulted in Maria Theresa making significant contributions to Croatian matters.

After Charles VI died, Prussia and Bavaria contested the claims of Maria Theresa on his Austrian lands. The refusal to accept the Sanction of 1713 resulted in the War of the Austrian Succession, in which Austria lost resource-rich and strategically located Silesia to Prussia as well as the Duchy of Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla. The elective office of Holy Roman Emperor was filled by Joseph I's son-in-law Charles Albert of Bavaria, marking the first time in several hundred years that the position was not held by a Habsburg. As Emperor Charles VII, he lost his own country, Bavaria, to the Austrian army of his wife's cousin Maria Theresa and soon died. His son, Maximilian III Joseph, Elector of Bavaria, renounced claims on Austria in exchange for the return of his paternal duchy of Bavaria. Maria Theresa's husband was elected Holy Roman Emperor as Francis I in 1745. The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 finally recognized Maria Theresa's rule over the Habsburg hereditary lands. In accordance with the tradition, Maria Theresa held the title of the Holy Roman Empress as wife of the Emperor. She lost the title with her husband's death in 1765, although she remained the ruler of the Habsburg lands until her death fifteen years later.

Attributions

- The Pragmatic Sanction
  - “Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748).”
The Pragmatic Sanction
Maria Theresa introduced reforms that improved her empire’s economy, military, education, public health, and administration but left the feudal social order intact.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze Empress Maria-Theresa’s reforms and policies

**Key Points**

- Maria Theresa (1717 – 1780) was the only female ruler of the Habsburg dominions and the last of the House of Habsburg. She was the sovereign of Austria, Hungary, Croatia, Bohemia, Transylvania, Mantua, Milan, Lodomeria and Galicia, the Austrian Netherlands, and Parma. By marriage, she was Duchess of Lorraine, Grand Duchess of Tuscany, and Holy Roman Empress.
- Maria Theresa was a devout Roman Catholic and believed that religious unity was necessary for a
peaceful public life. Consequently, she explicitly rejected the idea of religious tolerance.

• Maria Theresa implemented significant reforms to strengthen Austria’s military, financial, and bureaucratic efficiency. However, she did not manage to change her lands’ deeply feudal social order based on privileged landlords and oppressive forced labor of the peasantry.

• Maria Theresa invested in reforms that advanced what today would be defined as public health. Her initiatives included the study of infant mortality, countering wasteful and unhygienic burial customs, and inoculation of children.

• Wishing to improve Austria's bureaucracy, Maria Theresa reformed education in 1775. In a new school system based on the Prussian one, all children of both genders had to attend school from the ages of 6 to 12. Education reform was not immediately effective.

**Key Terms**

**Jansenist**

An advocate of a Catholic theological movement, primarily in France, that emphasized original sin, human depravity, the necessity of divine grace, and predestination. The movement originated from the posthumously published work of the Dutch theologian Cornelius Jansen, who died in 1638. Through the 17th
and into the 18th centuries, it was a distinct movement within the Catholic Church and was opposed by many in the Catholic hierarchy, especially the Jesuits.

**the Pragmatic Sanction of 1713**

An edict issued by Charles VI in 1713 to ensure that the Habsburg hereditary possessions could be inherited by a daughter. The Head of the House of Habsburg ruled the Archduchy of Austria, the Kingdom of Hungary, the Kingdom of Croatia, the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Italian territories awarded to Austria by the Treaty of Utrecht, and the Austrian Netherlands. The edict did not affect the office of Holy Roman Emperor because the Imperial crown was elective, not hereditary, although successive elected Habsburg rulers headed the Holy Roman Empire since 1438.

**the War of Austrian Succession**

A war (1740–1748) that involved most of the powers of Europe over the question of Maria Theresa’s succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The war included King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins' Ear (which formally began in October 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the First and Second Silesian Wars.
Maria Theresa

Maria Theresa (1717 – 1780) was the only female ruler of the Habsburg dominions and the last of the House of Habsburg. She was the sovereign of Austria, Hungary, Croatia, Bohemia, Transylvania, Mantua, Milan, Lodomeria and Galicia, the Austrian Netherlands and Parma. By marriage, she was Duchess of Lorraine, Grand Duchess of Tuscany and Holy Roman Empress. Although her father Charles VI ensured that his daughter, the first woman in the dynasty, would succeed him as the ruler of the Habsburg lands (the Pragmatic Sanction of 1713), the title of Holy Roman Emperor was neither hereditary nor ever held by a woman. The refusal of Prussia and Bavaria to accept Maria Theresa’s rule in 1740 after her father’s death resulted in the War of Austrian Succession (1740-48). In its aftermath, Maria Theresa was recognized as the ruler of the Habsburg lands. However, her title of Holy Roman Empress meant that she was in fact the wife of the Emperor, Francis I, who secured the title as one of Austria’s gains in the same war.

Although Maria Theresa was an absolutist conservative, this was tempered by pragmatism and she implemented a number of overdue reforms, which were responses to the challenges to her lands but not ideologically framed in the Age of Enlightenment.
After several diplomatic failures and military defeats in the 1730s, Austria seemed to be declining or even on the verge of collapse. After her forty-year reign, Maria Theresa left a revitalized empire that influenced the rest of Europe through the 19th century.
Religion

Maria Theresa was a devout Roman Catholic and believed that religious unity was necessary for a peaceful public life. Consequently, she explicitly rejected the idea of religious toleration but never allowed the Church to interfere with what she considered to be prerogatives of a monarch and kept Rome at arm’s length. She controlled the selection of archbishops, bishops, and abbots. Her approach to religious piety differed from that of her predecessors, as she was influenced by Jansenist ideas. The empress actively supported conversion to Roman Catholicism by securing pensions to the converts. She tolerated Greek Catholics and emphasized their equal status with Roman Catholics. Convinced by her advisors that the Jesuits posed a danger to her monarchical authority, she hesitantly issued a decree that removed them from all the institutions of the monarchy. Though she eventually gave up trying to convert her non-Catholic subjects to Roman Catholicism, Maria Theresa regarded both the Jews and Protestants as dangerous to the state and actively tried to suppress them. The empress was arguably the most anti-Semitic monarch of her time yet like many of her contemporaries, she supported Jewish commercial and industrial activity.

Administrative and State Reforms

Maria Theresa implemented significant reforms to strengthen Austria’s military and bureaucratic efficiency. She employed Count Friedrich Wilhelm von Haugwitz, who modernized the empire by creating a standing army of 108,000 men paid for with 14 million gulden extracted from each crown-land. The central government was responsible for the army, although Haugwitz instituted taxation
of the nobility for the first time. Under Haugwitz, she centralized administration, a task previously left to the nobility and church, along Prussian models with permanent civil service. She also oversaw the unification of the Austrian and Bohemian chancellories in May 1749 and doubled the state revenue between 1754 and 1764, though her attempt to tax clergy and nobility was only partially successful. However, these financial reforms greatly improved the economy.

In 1760, Maria Theresa created the council of state, which served as a committee of experienced people who advised her. The council lacked executive or legislative authority, but nevertheless was distinguishable from the form of government employed by Frederick II of Prussia. Unlike the latter, Maria Theresa was not an autocrat who acted as her own minister. Prussia would adopt this form of government only after 1807. In 1776, Austria outlawed witch burning and torture. It was later reintroduced, but the progressive nature of these reforms remains noted. Despite all these reformist efforts, Maria Theresa did not change her lands' deeply feudal social order based on privileged landlords and oppressive forced labor of the peasantry.

Public Health

Maria Theresa invested in reforms that advanced what today would be defined as public health. She recruited Gerard van Swieten, who founded the Vienna General Hospital, revamped Austria’s educational system, and served as the Empress's personal physician. After calling in van Swieten, Maria Theresa asked him to study the problem of infant mortality in Austria. Following his recommendation, she made a decree that autopsies would be mandatory for all hospital deaths in Graz, Austria’s second largest city. This law – still in effect today – combined with the relatively
stable population of Graz, resulted in one of the most important and complete autopsy records in the world. Maria Theresa banned the creation of new burial grounds without prior government permission, thus countering wasteful and unhygienic burial customs. Her decision to have her children inoculated after the smallpox epidemic of 1767 was responsible for changing Austrian physicians' negative view of inoculation.

Education

Aware of the inadequacy of bureaucracy in Austria and wishing to improve it, Maria Theresa reformed education in 1775. In a new school system based on the Prussian one, all children of both genders had to attend school between ages 6 and 12. Education reform was met with much hostility. Maria Theresa crushed the dissent by ordering the arrest of those who opposed. The reforms, however, were not as successful as expected since no funding was offered from the state, education in most schools remained substandard, and in many parts of the empire forcing parents to send their children to school was ineffective (particularly in the countryside, children were seen as valuable labor force and schooling as a way to take them away from work). The empress permitted non-Catholics to attend university and allowed the introduction of secular subjects such as law, which influenced the decline of theology as the main foundation of university education. Educational reform also included that of Vienna University by Swieten from 1749, the founding of the Theresianum (1746) as a civil service academy, and other new military and foreign service academies.
Maria Theresa as a widow in 1773, by Anton von Maron
Maria Theresa was devastated by her husband’s (Francis I) death. Their eldest son, Joseph, became Holy Roman Emperor. Maria Theresa abandoned all ornamentation, had her hair cut short, painted her rooms black, and dressed in mourning for the rest of her life. She completely withdrew from court life, public events, and theater. She described her state of mind shortly after Francis’s death: “I hardly know myself now, for I have become like an animal with no true life or reasoning power.”

Attributions

- Empress Maria-Theresa
21.3.4: Joseph II and Domestic Reform

As a proponent of enlightened absolutism, Joseph II introduced a series of reforms that affected nearly every realm of life in his empire, but his commitment to modernization engendered significant opposition, which eventually led to a failure to fully implement his programs.

Learning Objective

Contrast Joseph’s domestic reforms with those of his mother

Key Points

- Joseph II became the absolute ruler over the most extensive realm of Central Europe in 1780. Deeply interested in the ideals of the Enlightenment, he was always positive that the rule of reason would produce the best possible results in the shortest time. He
issued edicts, 6,000 in all, plus 11,000 new laws designed to regulate and reorder every aspect of the empire. He intended to improve his subjects' lives but strictly in accordance with his own criteria.

- Josephinism is notable for the very wide range of reforms designed to modernize the creaky empire in an era when France and Prussia were rapidly advancing. However, it elicited grudging compliance at best and more often vehement opposition from all sectors in every part of his empire.

- In 1781, Joseph issued the Serfdom Patent, which aimed to abolish aspects of the traditional serfdom system of the Habsburg lands through the establishment of basic civil liberties for the serfs. It was enforced differently in all the various Habsburg lands but serfdom was abolished in the Empire only in 1848.

- Joseph continued education and public health reforms initiated by his mother. Elementary education was made compulsory and higher education was offered for a select few. Joseph created scholarships for talented poor students and allowed the establishment of schools for Jews and other religious minorities. In 1784, he ordered that the country change its language of instruction from Latin to German, a highly controversial step in a multilingual empire. He also attempted to centralize medical care in Vienna.

- Probably the most unpopular of all his reforms was his attempt to modernize the highly traditional Catholic Church and make the Catholic Church in his empire the tool of the state, independent of Rome.
Joseph's enlightened despotism included also the Patent of Toleration, enacted in 1781, and the Edict of Tolerance in 1782. The Patent granted religious freedom to the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Serbian Orthodox and the Edict extended religious freedom to the Jewish population.

**Key Terms**

**the Patent of Toleration**

An edict issued in 1781 by the Holy Roman Emperor, Joseph II of Austria. It extended religious freedom to non-Catholic Christians living in Habsburg lands, including Lutherans, Calvinists, and the Eastern Orthodox. Specifically, these members of minority faiths were now legally permitted to hold “private religious exercises” in clandestine churches.

**Josephinism**

The collective domestic policies of Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor (1765–1790). During the ten years in which Joseph was the sole ruler of the Habsburg Monarchy (1780–1790), he attempted to legislate a series of drastic reforms to remodel Austria in the form of the ideal Enlightened state. This provoked severe resistance from powerful forces within and outside of his empire.
the Edict of Tolerance

An edict issued in 1782 by Joseph II of Austria that extended religious freedom and some civil rights to the Jewish population in the Habsburg empire. It allowed Jewish children to attend schools and universities and adults to engage in certain professions as well as eliminated previous restrictions, including forcing the Jewish population to wear gold stars.

enlightened despotism

Also known as enlightened absolutism or benevolent absolutism: a form of absolute monarchy or despotism inspired by the Enlightenment. The monarchs who embraced it followed the partícipes of rationality. Some of them fostered education, allowed religious tolerance, freedom of speech, and the right to hold private property. They held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern in lieu of any other governments.

the Serfdom Paten

A 1781 decree that aimed to abolish aspects of the traditional serfdom system of the Habsburg lands through the establishment of basic civil liberties for the serfs. Issued by the enlightened absolutist emperor Joseph II, it diminished the long-established mastery of the landlord, allowing the serf to independently choose marriage partners, pursue career choices, and move between estates.
Joseph II

Joseph II was Holy Roman Emperor from 1765 to 1790 and ruler of the Habsburg lands from 1780 to 1790. He was the eldest son of Maria Theresa and her husband, Francis I and thus the first ruler in the Austrian dominions of the House of Lorraine, styled Habsburg-Lorraine. As women were never elected to be Holy Roman Emperor, Joseph took the title after his father’s death in 1765 yet it was his mother who remained the ruler of the Habsburg lands. However, Maria Theresa, devastated after her husband’s death and always relying on the help of advisors, declared Joseph to be her new co-ruler the same year. From then on, mother and son had frequent ideological disagreements. Joseph often threatened to resign as co-regent and emperor. When Maria Theresa died in 1780, Joseph became the absolute ruler over the most extensive realm of Central Europe. There was no parliament to deal with and Joseph, deeply interested in the ideals of the Enlightenment, was always positive that the rule of reason would produce the best possible results in the shortest time. He issued edicts, 6,000 in all, plus 11,000 new laws designed to regulate and reorder every aspect of the empire. He intended to improve his subjects’ lives but strictly in accordance with his own criteria. This made him one of the most committed enlightened despots.

Josephinism

Josephinism (or Josephism), as his policies were called, is notable for the very wide range of reforms designed to modernize the creaky empire in an era when France and Prussia were rapidly advancing. However, it elicited grudging compliance at best and more often vehement opposition from all sectors in every part of his empire.
Joseph set about building a rational, centralized, and uniform government for his diverse lands but with himself as supreme autocrat. He expected government servants to all be dedicated agents of Josephinism and selected them without favor for class or ethnic origins. Promotion was solely by merit. To impose uniformity, he made German the compulsory language of official business throughout the Empire. Joseph's enlightened despotism and his resulting commitment to modernizing reforms subsequently engendered significant opposition, which eventually culminated in an ultimate failure to fully implement his programs.

Tax, Land, and Legal Reform

To equalize the incidence of taxation, Joseph ordered a fresh appraisal of the value of all properties in the empire. His goal was to impose a single and egalitarian tax on land and thus modernize the relationship of dependence between the landowners and peasantry, relieve some of the tax burden on the peasantry, and increase state revenues. Joseph looked on the tax and land reforms as being interconnected and strove to implement them at the same time. The various commissions he established to formulate and carry out the reforms met resistance among the nobility, the peasantry, and some officials.

In 1781, Joseph issued the Serfdom Patent, which aimed to abolish aspects of the traditional serfdom system of the Habsburg lands through the establishment of basic civil liberties for the serfs. It was enforced differently in all the various Habsburg lands. The nobility in Bohemia refused to enact its provisions, while the Transylvanian nobles simply refused to notify the peasants in their region about this emancipation document. The Hungarian estates claimed that their peasants were not serfs, but “tenants in fee simple, who were fully informed as to their rights and duties by
precise contracts” and continued to restrict these “tenants.” In contrast, the peasants of the German-speaking provinces were actually aided by the Patent. The Patent granted the serfs some legal rights in the Habsburg monarchy, but it did not affect the financial dues and the physical corvée (unpaid labor) that the serfs legally owed to their landlords, which it practice meant that it did not abolish serfdom but rather expanded selected rights of serfs. Joseph II recognized the importance of further reforms, continually attempting to destroy the economic subjugation through related laws, such as his Tax Decree of 1789. This new law would have finally realized Emperor Joseph II’s ambition to modernize Habsburg society, allowing for the end of corvée and the beginning of lesser tax obligations. Joseph’s latter reforms were withdrawn upon his death and the final emancipation reforms in the Empire were introduced only in 1848.

Despite the attempts to improve the fate of the peasantry, Joseph’s land reforms met with the resistance of the landed nobility and serfdom was not abolished in the Empire until 1848.

Joseph inspired a complete reform of the legal system, abolished brutal punishments and the death penalty in most instances, and imposed the principle of complete equality of treatment for all
offenders. He ended censorship of the press and theater.

**Education and Public Health**

Joseph continued education and public health reforms initiated by his mother. To produce a literate citizenry, elementary education was made compulsory for all boys and girls and higher education on practical lines was offered for a select few. Joseph created scholarships for talented poor students and allowed the establishment of schools for Jews and other religious minorities. In 1784, he ordered that the country change its language of instruction from Latin to German, a highly controversial step in a multilingual empire.

By the 18th century, centralization was the trend in medicine because more and better educated doctors were requesting improved facilities. Cities lacked the budgets to fund local hospitals and the monarchy wanted to end costly epidemics and quarantines. Joseph attempted to centralize medical care in Vienna through the construction of a single, large hospital, the famous Allgemeines Krankenhaus, which opened in 1784. Centralization, however, worsened sanitation problems causing epidemics and a 20% death rate in the new hospital, but the city became preeminent in the medical field in the next century.

**Religion**

Probably the most unpopular of all his reforms was his attempt
to modernize the highly traditional Catholic Church and make the Catholic Church in his empire the tool of the state, independent of Rome. Clergymen were deprived of the tithe and ordered to study in seminaries under government supervision, while bishops had to take a formal oath of loyalty to the crown. As a man of the Enlightenment, he ridiculed the contemplative monastic orders, which he considered unproductive. Accordingly, he suppressed a third of the monasteries (over 700 were closed) and reduced the number of monks and nuns from 65,000 to 27,000. Marriage was defined as a civil contract outside the jurisdiction of the Church. Joseph also sharply cut the number of holy days to be observed in the Empire and forcibly simplified the manner in which the Mass (the central Catholic act of worship) was celebrated. Opponents of the reforms blamed them for revealing Protestant tendencies, with the rise of Enlightenment rationalism and the emergence of a liberal class of bourgeois officials.

Joseph's enlightened despotism included also the Patent of Toleration, enacted in 1781, and the Edict of Tolerance in 1782. The Patent granted religious freedom to the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Serbian Orthodox, but it wasn't until the 1782 Edict of Tolerance that Joseph II extended religious freedom to the Jewish population. Providing the Jewish subjects of the Empire with the right to practice their religion came with the assumption that the freedom would gradually force Jewish men and women into the mainstream German culture. While it allowed Jewish children to attend schools and universities, adults to engage in jobs from which there had been excluded, and all Jewish men and women not to wear gold stars that marked their identity, it also stipulated that the Jewish languages, the written language Hebrew and the spoken language Yiddish, were to be replaced by the national language of the country. Official documents and school textbooks could not be printed in Hebrew.
Josephinism made many enemies inside the empire—from disaffected ecclesiastical authorities to noblemen. By the later years of his reign, disaffection with his sometimes radical policies was at a high, especially in the Austrian Netherlands and Hungary. Popular revolts and protests—led by nobles, seminary students, writers, and agents of Prussian King Frederick William—stirred throughout the Empire, prompting Joseph to tighten censorship of the press.
Attributions

- Joseph II and Domestic Reform
32. The Seven Years' War

21.4: The Seven Years’ War

21.4.1: The Diplomatic Revolution

The diplomatic revolution of 1756 was the reversal of longstanding alliances in Europe between the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War, when Austria went from an ally of Britain to an ally of France and Prussia became an ally of Britain.

Learning Objective

Recall the parties involved in the Diplomatic Revolution and what changed between them as a result of this event

Key Points

• The War of the Austrian Succession had seen belligerence align on a time-honored basis. France's traditional enemies, Great Britain and Austria, had coalesced. Prussia, the leading anti-Austrian state in
Germany, had been supported by France. Neither group, however, found much reason to be satisfied with its partnership.

- The collapse of that system and the aligning of France with Austria and of Great Britain with Prussia constituted what is known as the “diplomatic revolution” or the “reversal of alliances.” This change in European alliances was a prelude to the Seven Years’ War, triggered by a separation of interests between Austria, Britain, and France.

- The War of Austrian Succession made it clear that Britain no longer viewed Austria as powerful enough to check French power but was content to build up other states like Prussia. Therefore Britain and Prussia, in the Westminster Convention of 1756, agreed that Britain would not aid Austria in a renewed conflict for Silesia if Prussia agreed to protect Hanover from France.

- In response to the Westminster Convention, Louis XV’s ministers and Count Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz of Austria concluded the First Treaty of Versailles (1756). Both sides agreed to remain neutral and provide 24,000 troops if either got into conflict with a third party.

- Austria’s actions alerted Frederick, who decided to strike first by invading Saxony, commencing the Seven Years’ War (1756–1763). By invading Saxony, Frederick inflamed his enemies. France and Austria signed a new offensive alliance, the Second Treaty of Versailles (1757).

- In 1758, the Anglo-Prussian Convention between Great Britain and the Kingdom of Prussia formalized
the alliance between the two powers. However, the alliance proved to be short-lived.

Key Terms

the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle
A 1748 treaty sometimes called the Treaty of Aachen that ended the War of the Austrian Succession. It was signed in 1748 by Great Britain, France, and the Dutch Republic. Two implementation treaties were signed at Nice in 1748 and 1749 by Austria, Spain, Sardinia, Modena, and Genoa.

the Westminster Convention of 1756
A 1756 military alliance between Great Britain and Prussia in which the two state agreed that Britain would not aid Austria in a renewed conflict for Silesia if Prussia agreed to protect Hanover from France.

the Seven Years’ War
A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.
**diplomatic revolution**

The reversal of longstanding alliances in Europe between the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years’ War. Austria went from an ally of Britain to an ally of France. Prussia became an ally of Britain. The most influential diplomat involved was Prince Kaunitz of Austria.

**personal union**

The combination of two or more states that have the same monarch while their boundaries, laws, and interests remain distinct. It differs from a federation in that each constituent state has an independent government, whereas a unitary state is united by a central government. The ruler does not need to be a hereditary monarch.

**War of Austrian Succession**

A war (1740–1748) that involved most of the powers of Europe over the question of Maria Theresa's succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The war included King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins’ Ear (which formally began in October 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the First and Second Silesian Wars.
The Diplomatic Revolution

In the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748), Frederick the Great of Prussia seized the prosperous province of Silesia from Austria. Maria Theresa of Austria signed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 in order to gain time to rebuild her military forces and forge new alliances. The War of the Austrian Succession had seen the belligerence align on a time-honored basis. France's traditional enemies, Great Britain and Austria, had coalesced. Prussia, the leading anti-Austrian state in Germany, had been supported by France. Neither group, however, found much reason to be satisfied with its partnership: British subsidies to Austria produced nothing of much help to the British, while the British military effort had not saved Silesia for Austria. Prussia, having secured Silesia, came to terms with Austria in disregard of French interests. Even so, France concluded a defensive alliance with Prussia in 1747 and the maintenance of the Anglo-Austrian alignment after 1748 was deemed essential by some British politicians.

The collapse of that system and the aligning of France with Austria and of Great Britain with Prussia constituted what is known as the “diplomatic revolution” or the “reversal of alliances.” This change in European alliances was a prelude to the Seven Years’ War.

Background

The diplomatic change was triggered by a separation of interests between Austria, Britain, and France. The 1748 Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, after the War of the Austrian Succession, left Austria aware of the high price it paid for having Britain as an ally. Maria Theresa of Austria defended her claim to the Habsburg throne and
had her husband, Francis Stephen, crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1745. However, she had been forced to relinquish valuable territories in the process. Under British diplomatic pressure, Maria Theresa ceded Parma to Spain and, more importantly, the valuable state of Silesia to Prussia. The acquisition of Silesia further advanced Prussia as a great European power, which now posed an increasing threat to Austria’s German lands and to Central Europe as a whole. The growth of Prussia, dangerous to Austria, was welcomed by the British, who saw it as a means of balancing French power.

**British-Prussian Alliance vs. Austrian-French Alliance**

The results of the War of Austrian Succession made it clear that Britain no longer viewed Austria as powerful enough to check French power but was content to build up other states like Prussia. Therefore Britain and Prussia, in the Westminster Convention of 1756, agreed that Britain would not aid Austria in a renewed conflict for Silesia if Prussia agreed to protect Hanover (which remained in personal union with Britain) from France. Britain felt that with Prussia’s growing strength, it would be more apt to defend Hanover than Austria. Meanwhile, Austria was determined to reclaim Silesia, so the two allies found themselves with conflicting interests. Maria Theresa, recognizing the futility of renewed alliance with Britain, knew that without a powerful ally (such as France), she could never hope to reclaim Silesia from Frederick the Great.

Maria Theresa sent her foreign policy minister, Count Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz, to France to secure an alliance to enable Austria to reclaim Silesia. Louis XV proved reluctant to agree to any treaty presented by Kaunitz. Only with renewed aggression between France and Britain was Louis convinced to align with Austria. Furthermore, Austria no longer surrounded France, so France no
longer saw Austria as an immediate threat. Consequently, it entered into a defensive alliance with Austria. In response to the Westminster Convention, Louis XV's ministers and Kaunitz concluded the First Treaty of Versailles (1756). Both sides agreed to remain neutral and provide 24,000 troops if either got into conflict with a third party.

Maria Theresa's diplomats, after securing French neutrality, actively began to establish an anti-Prussian coalition. Austria's actions alerted Frederick, who decided to strike first by invading Saxony, commencing the Seven Years' War (1756–1763). Frederick's actions were meant to scare Russia out of supporting Austria (the two countries had previously entered into a defensive alliance in 1746). However, by invading Saxony, Frederick had inflamed his enemies. Russia, under the direction of Empress Elizabeth, sent an additional 80,000 troops to Austria. A year after the signing of the First Treaty of Versailles, France and Austria signed a new offensive alliance, the Second Treaty of Versailles (1757).

In 1758, the Anglo-Prussian Convention between Great Britain and the Kingdom of Prussia formalized the alliance between the two powers. However, the alliance proved to be short-lived largely because Britain withdrew financial and military support for Prussia in 1762. The dissolution of the alliance and the pre-eminent rise of Britain left it with no allies by the time the American Revolutionary War broke out.

Attributions

• The Diplomatic Revolution
  ◦ “Anglo-Prussian alliance (1756).” https://en.wikipedia.org/

33. Events of the Seven Years' War

21.4.2: Events of the Seven Years’ War

The Seven Years’ War was fought between 1756 and 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanned five continents, and affected Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines.

Learning Objective

Outline the progression of the Seven Years’ War

Key Points

- The Seven Years’ War was a world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines.
• Realizing that war was imminent, Prussia preemptively struck Saxony in 1756 and quickly overran it. The result caused uproar across Europe. Because of Prussia’s alliance with Britain, Austria formed an alliance with France. Reluctantly, most of the states of the empire joined Austria’s cause. The Anglo-Prussian alliance was joined by smaller German states (especially Hanover, which remained in a personal union with Britain).

• After a series of victories and failures on both sides, by 1763, forces were depleted and the war in central Europe was essentially a stalemate. Frederick the Great had retaken most of Silesia and Saxony but not the latter’s capital, Dresden; Catherine the Great ended Russia’s alliance with Prussia and withdrew from the war; and Austria was facing a severe financial crisis. A peace settlement was reached at the Treaty of Hubertusburg, ending the war in central Europe.

• In North America, the French and Indian War (1754–1763) pitted the colonies of British America against those of New France, with both sides supported by military units from their parent countries of Great Britain and France as well as by American Indian allies.

• In the Fantastic War (1762–63) in South America, Spanish forces conquered the Portuguese territories of Colonia do Sacramento and Rio Grande de São Pedro and forced the Portuguese to surrender and retreat. In India, the British eventually eliminated French power. In West Africa, the British captured Senegal, the island of Gorée, and the French trading
post on the Gambia. The loss of these valuable colonies further weakened the French economy.

- Over the course of the war in colonies, Great Britain gained enormous areas of land and influence. They captured the French sugar colonies of Guadeloupe in 1759 and Martinique in 1762 as well as the cities of Havana in Cuba and Manila in the Philippines, both prominent Spanish colonial cities.

---

**Key Terms**

**Treaty of Paris**

A 1763 treaty signed by the kingdoms of Great Britain, France, and Spain with Portugal in agreement after Great Britain’s victory over France and Spain during the Seven Years’ War. The signing of the treaty formally ended the Seven Years’ War, known as the French and Indian War in the North American theater, and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe. Great Britain and France each returned much of the territory that they had captured during the war, but Great Britain gained much of France’s possessions in North America. Additionally, Great Britain agreed to protect Roman Catholicism in the New World. The treaty did not involve Prussia and Austria as they signed a separate agreement, the Treaty of Hubertusburg.
The Seven Years’ War

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

Fantastic War

The Spanish–Portuguese War between 1762 and 1763 fought as part of the Seven Years’ War. The name refers to the fact that no major battles were fought, even though there were numerous movements of troops and huge losses among the invaders—utterly defeated in the end.

Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg

Events that led to Russia’s sudden change of alliance during the Seven Years’ War: in January 1762, the Empress Elizabeth of Russia died. Her nephew Peter, a strong admirer of Frederick the Great of Prussia, succeeded her and reversed Elizabeth’s anti-Prussian policy. He negotiated peace with Prussia and signed both an armistice and a treaty of peace and friendship.

French and Indian War

A 1754–1763 war that comprised the North American theater of the worldwide Seven Years’ War of 1756–1763. The war pitted the colonies of British America against those of New France, with both sides supported by military units from their parent countries of Great
Britain and France as well as by American Indian allies.

**Treaty of Hubertusburg**

A 1763 treaty signed by Prussia, Austria, and Saxony. Together with the Treaty of Paris, it marked the end of the Seven Years’ War. The treaty ended the continental conflict with no significant changes in prewar borders. Silesia remained Prussian and Prussia clearly stood among the ranks of the great powers.

**diplomatic revolution**

The reversal of longstanding alliances in Europe between the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years’ War. Austria went from an ally of Britain to an ally of France. Prussia became an ally of Britain. It was part of efforts to preserve or upset the European balance of power and a prelude to the Seven Years’ War.

---

**Seven Years’ War**

The Seven Years’ War was fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other. For the first time, aiming to curtail Britain and Prussia’s ever-growing might, France formed a grand coalition of its own, which ended as Britain rose as the world’s predominant power, altering the European balance of power. Conflict between Great Britain and France broke out in 1754–1756 when the British attacked
disputed French positions in North America and seized hundreds of French merchant ships. Meanwhile, rising power Prussia was struggling with Austria for dominance within and outside the Holy Roman Empire in Central Europe. In 1756, the major powers shifted their alliances and Prussia allied with Britain while France allied with Austria, a change known as the diplomatic revolution.

In the historiography of some countries, the war is named after combatants in its respective theaters, e.g. the French and Indian War in the United States. In French-speaking Canada, it is known as the War of the Conquest, while it is called the Seven Years’ War in English-speaking Canada (North America, 1754–1763), Pomeranian War (with Sweden and Prussia, 1757–1762), Third Carnatic War (on the Indian subcontinent, 1757–1763), and Third Silesian War (with Prussia and Austria, 1756–1763).

The Seven Years’ War is sometimes considered the first true world war. It restructured not only the European political order, but also affected events all around the world, paving the way for the beginning of later British world supremacy in the 19th century, the rise of Prussia in Germany, the beginning of tensions in British North America, as well as a clear sign of France’s eventual turmoil.
Europe

Realizing that war was imminent, Prussia preemptively struck Saxony in 1756 and quickly overran it. The result caused uproar across Europe. Because of Prussia's alliance with Britain, Austria formed an alliance with France, seeing an opportunity to recapture Silesia (lost in the War of the Austrian Succession). Reluctantly, by following the imperial diet, most of the states of the empire joined Austria's cause. The Anglo-Prussian alliance was joined by smaller German states (especially Hanover, which remained in a personal union with Britain). Sweden, fearing Prussia's expansionist tendencies, went to war in 1757 to protect its Baltic dominions. Spain intervened on behalf of France and together they launched an unsuccessful invasion of Portugal in 1762. The Russian Empire was originally aligned with Austria, fearing Prussia's ambition on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but switched sides upon the succession of Tsar Peter III in 1762.

Despite the huge disparity in numbers, 1756 was successful for the Prussian-led forces on the continent. In 1757, Frederick the Great marched into the Kingdom of Bohemia. Although he won the bloody Battle of Prague and laid siege to the city, he lost the Battle of Kolin, which forced him to lift the siege and withdraw from Bohemia altogether. Things were looking grim for Prussia now, with the Austrians mobilizing to attack Prussian-controlled soil and a combined French and Reichsarmee (German states) army approaching from the west. However, at the end of 1757, the whole situation in Germany was reversed. After winning the battles of Rossbach and Leuthen, Frederick once again established himself as Europe's premier general, but the Prussians were now facing the prospect of four major powers attacking on four fronts (France from the west, Austria from the south, Russia from the east, and Sweden from the north).

In 1758, following a failed invasion of Moravia, Frederick ceased his attempts to launch a major invasion of Austrian territory. The
Russians invaded East Prussia, where they would remain until 1762. The years 1759 and 1760 saw several Prussian defeats, partly because of the Prussian misjudgment of the Russians and partly as a result of good cooperation between the Russian and Austrian forces. The French planned to invade the British Isles during 1759 but were prevented by two sea defeats. By 1761, forces on both sides were seriously depleted. In 1762, the Russian Empress Elizabeth died and her successor, Peter III, recalled Russian armies from Berlin and mediated Frederick’s truce with Sweden. He also placed a corps of his own troops under Frederick’s command. This turn of events has become known as “the Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg.” Frederick was then able to muster a larger army and concentrate it against Austria.

1762 brought two new countries into the war. Britain declared war against Spain and Portugal then joined the conflict on Britain's side. Spain, aided by the French, launched an invasion of Portugal and succeeded in capturing Almeida. Eventually the Anglo-Portuguese army chased the greatly reduced Franco-Spanish army back to Spain, recovering almost all the lost towns. By 1763, the war in central Europe was essentially a stalemate. Frederick had retaken most of Silesia and Saxony but not the latter’s capital, Dresden. The Russian emperor was overthrown by his wife, Catherine, who ended Russia’s alliance with Prussia and withdrew from the war. Austria was facing a severe financial crisis and had to decrease the size of its army, which greatly affected its offensive power. In 1763, a peace settlement was reached at the Treaty of Hubertusburg, ending the war in central Europe.
Frederick the Great routed a vastly superior Austrian force at the Battle of Leuthen on December 5, 1757. Frederick always called Leuthen his greatest victory, an assessment shared by many as the Austrian Army was considered a highly professional force.

**The French and Indian War**

In North America, the French and Indian War (1754–1763) pitted the colonies of British America against those of New France, with both sides supported by military units from their parent countries of Great Britain and France as well as by American Indian allies. Fighting took place primarily along the frontiers between New France and the British colonies, from Virginia in the south to Newfoundland in the north. British operations in 1755, 1756 and 1757 in the frontier areas of Pennsylvania and New York all failed, due to a combination of poor management, internal divisions, effective Canadian scouts, French regular forces, and Indian warrior allies. In 1755, the British captured Fort Beauséjour on the border separating Nova Scotia from Acadia. The Acadians were expelled and American Indians driven off their land to make way for settlers from New England. Between 1758 and 1760, the British military launched a
campaign to capture the Colony of Canada. They succeeded in capturing territory in surrounding colonies and ultimately the city of Quebec (1759). Though the British later lost the Battle of Sainte-Foy west of Quebec (1760), the French ceded Canada in accordance with the Treaty of Paris (1763).

**Other Colonies**

In the Fantastic War (1762–63) in South America, Spanish forces conquered the Portuguese territories of Colonia do Sacramento and Rio Grande de São Pedro and forced the Portuguese to surrender and retreat. Under the Treaty of Paris (1763), Spain had to return the colony of Sacramento to Portugal, while the vast and rich territory of the so-called “Continent of S. Peter” (the present-day Brazilian state of Rio Grande do Sul) would be retaken from the Spanish army during the undeclared Hispano-Portuguese war of 1763–1777.

In India, the outbreak of the war in Europe renewed the long-running conflict between the French and the British trading companies for influence. The war spread beyond Southern India and into Bengal and eventually eliminated French power in India.

In West Africa in 1758, the British captured Senegal and brought home large amounts of captured goods. This success convinced the British to launch two further expeditions to take the island of Gorée and the French trading post on the Gambia. The loss of these valuable colonies further weakened the French economy.

Over the course of the war in colonies, Great Britain gained enormous areas of land and influence. They lost Minorca in the Mediterranean to the French in 1756 but captured, additionally to territories in Africa and North America, the French sugar colonies of Guadeloupe in 1759 and Martinique in 1762 as well as the Spanish cities of Havana in Cuba and Manila in the Philippines, both prominent Spanish colonial cities. However, expansion into the hinterlands of both cities met with stiff resistance. In the
Philippines, the British were confined to Manila until their agreed-upon withdrawal at the war's end.

Attributions

- Events of the Seven Years' War
  - “SevenYearsWar.png.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_Years%27_War#/media/File:SevenYearsWar.png. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
Although the question of whether the Seven Years’ War was the first world war remains ambiguous, it marked a shift in the European balance of power that shaped the world far beyond Europe.

Learning Objective

Assess the claim that the Seven Years’ War was the first world war

Key Points

- Because of its span and global impact, some historians have argued that the Seven Years’ War was the first world war, almost 160 years before World War I. However, this label has also been given to various earlier and later conflicts. Regardless, the war restructured not only the European political order, but also events all around the world.
- Although Frederick the Great’s preemptive invasion of Saxony in 1756 marks the conventional beginning of
the Seven Years’ War, key developments in the colonial rivalry between Britain and France in North America preceded the outbreak of the war in Europe.

- The war preceded by events in North America and formally started in Europe soon turned into a war for colonies outside of North America: the British-French conflict over trading influences reignited in India and in West Africa and the British captured several French colonies. The triple Franco-Spanish invasion of Portugal in Europe was followed by a Spanish invasion of Portuguese territories in South America. Over the course of the war in colonies, Great Britain gained enormous areas of land and influence.

- While the question of whether the Seven Years’ War was indeed the first world war remains ambiguous, the conflict certainly had global impact and marked a shift in the European balance of power. And as European empires continued their efforts to colonize territories on other continents, the impact reached far beyond Europe.

- Although the war did not result in major territorial changes in Europe, a new political order emerged. With Britain becoming the main colonial power, Prussia confirming its position as a military, economic, and political European power, and Austria and Russia proving their growing military potential, France lost its influence in Europe.

- The war also ended the old system of alliances in Europe. In the years after the war, European states now saw Britain as a greater threat than France and thus did not rejoin old alliances.
**Key Terms**

**diplomatic revolution**

The reversal of longstanding alliances in Europe between the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years’ War. Austria went from an ally of Britain to an ally of France. Prussia became an ally of Britain. It was part of efforts to preserve or upset the European balance of power and a prelude to the Seven Years’ War.

**Second Hundred Years’ War**

A periodization or historical era term used by some historians to describe the series of military conflicts between Great Britain and France that occurred from about 1689 (or some say 1714) to 1815. It is named after the Hundred Years’ War when the England-France rivalry began in the 14th century. The term appears to have been coined by J. R. Seeley in his influential work *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (1883).

**The Seven Years’ War**

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.
Treaty of Hubertusburg

A 1763 treaty signed by Prussia, Austria, and Saxony. Together with the Treaty of Paris, it marked the end of the Seven Years’ War. The treaty ended the continental conflict with no significant changes in prewar borders. Silesia remained Prussian and Prussia clearly stood among the ranks of the great powers.

Seven Years’ War: The First World War?

The Seven Years’ War was fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other. For the first time, aiming to curtail Britain and Prussia's ever-growing might, France formed a grand coalition of its own, which ended in failure as Britain rose as the world's predominant power, altering the European balance of alliances.

Because of its span and global impact, some historians have argued that the Seven Years’ War was the first world war (almost 160 years before World War I). However, this label has also been given to various earlier conflicts, including the Eighty Years’ War, the Thirty Years’ War, the War of the Spanish Succession and the War of the Austrian Succession, and to later conflicts including the Napoleonic Wars. The term “Second Hundred Years’ War” has been used in order to describe the almost continuous level of worldwide
conflict during the entire 18th century, reminiscent of the more famous and compact struggle of the 14th century. The Seven Years' War influenced many major events around the globe. The war restructured not only the European political order, but also paved the way for the beginning of later British world supremacy in the 19th century, the rise of Prussia in Germany, the beginning of tensions in British North America, and France's eventual turmoil.

A Global War

Although Frederick the Great's preemptive invasion of Saxony in 1756 marks the conventional beginning of the Seven Years' War, key developments in North America preceded the outbreak of the conflict in Europe. The boundary between British and French possessions in North America was largely undefined in the 1750s. France had long claimed the entire Mississippi River basin, which was disputed by Britain. In the early 1750s, the French began constructing a chain of forts in the Ohio River Valley to assert their claim and shield the American Indian population from increasing British influence. The most important French fort planned was intended to occupy a position at "the Forks" where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers meet to form the Ohio River (present day Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania). British colonial militia from Virginia were sent to drive them out. Led by George Washington, they ambushed a small French force at Jumonville Glen in 1754. The French retaliated by attacking Washington's army at Fort Necessity, forcing them to surrender.

News of these events arrived in Europe, where Britain and France unsuccessfully attempted to negotiate a solution. The two nations eventually dispatched regular troops to North America to enforce their claims and engaged in military actions in 1755. Defeated France prepared to attack Hanover, whose prince-elector was also the King.
of Great Britain and Minorca. Britain concluded a treaty whereby Prussia agreed to protect Hanover. In response, France concluded an alliance with its long-time enemy Austria, an event known as the diplomatic revolution.

The war preceded by events in North America and formally started in Europe soon also turned into a war for colonies outside of North America. In 1757, the British-French conflict over trading influences reignited in India. By 1761, the British effectively eliminated French power in India. In 1758 in West Africa, the British captured Senegal and brought home large amounts of captured goods. This success convinced them to launch two further expeditions to take the island of Gorée and the French trading post on the Gambia. The loss of these valuable colonies further weakened the French economy.

When the Seven Years’ War between France and Great Britain started in 1756, Spain and Portugal remained neutral, but everything changed when Ferdinand VI died in 1759 and was succeeded by his younger half-brother Charles III of Spain. One of the main objects of Charles’s policy was the survival of Spain as a colonial power and thus as a power to be reckoned with in Europe. The triple Franco-Spanish invasion of Portugal in Europe (main theater of the war, which absorbed the lion’s share of the Spanish war effort) in 1762 was followed by a Spanish invasion of Portuguese territories in South America (a secondary theater of the war). While the first ended in humiliating defeat, the second represented a stalemate: Portuguese victory in Northern and Western Brazil, Spanish victory in Southern Brazil and Uruguay.

Over the course of the war in colonies, Great Britain gained enormous areas of land and influence. They lost Minorca in the Mediterranean to the French in 1756 but captured territories in West Africa and North America, the French sugar colonies of Guadeloupe in 1759 and Martinique in 1762 as well as Havana in Cuba and Manila in the Philippines, both prominent Spanish colonial cities.
Many middle and small states in Europe, unlike in previous wars, tried to steer clear away from the escalating conflict, even though they had interests in the conflict or with the belligerents, like Denmark-Norway. The Dutch Republic, a long-time British ally, kept its neutrality intact. Naples, Sicily, and Savoy sided with the Franco-Spanish alliance. Like Sweden, Russia concluded a separate peace with Prussia before the war formally ended.

Global Impact

While the question of whether the Seven Years’ War was indeed the first world war remains ambiguous, the war had certainly global impact and marked a shift in the European balance of power. And as European empires continued their efforts to colonize territories on other continents, the impact reached far beyond Europe. Faced with the choice of retrieving either New France or its Caribbean island colonies of Guadeloupe and Martinique, France chose the latter to retain these lucrative sources of sugar. France also returned
Minorca to the British. Spain lost control of Florida to Great Britain, but it received from the French the Île d’Orléans and all of the former French holdings west of the Mississippi River. In India, the British retained the Northern Circars, but returned all the French trading ports.

When later France went to war with Great Britain during the American Revolution, the British found no support among the European powers. Furthermore, France’s defeat in the Seven Years' War caused the French to embark upon major military reforms with particular attention being paid to the artillery. The origins of the famed French artillery that played a prominent role in the wars of the French Revolutionary wars and beyond can be traced to military reforms that started in 1763.

The Treaty of Hubertusburg between Austria, Prussia, and Saxony simply restored the status quo of 1748, with Silesia and Glatz reverting to Frederick and Saxony to its own elector. The only concession that Prussia made to Austria was to consent to the election of Archduke Joseph as Holy Roman Emperor. However, Austria’s military performance restored its prestige and the empire secured its position as a major player in the European system. Prussia emerged from the war as a great power whose importance could no longer be challenged. Frederick the Great’s personal reputation was enormously enhanced and after the Seven Years’ War, Prussia became one of the most imitated powers in Europe.

Russia, on the other hand, made one great invisible gain from the war: the elimination of French influence in Poland. Although the war ended in a draw, the performance of the Imperial Russian Army against Prussia improved Russia’s reputation as a factor in European politics, as many had not expected the Russians to hold their own against the Prussians in campaigns fought on Prussian soil.

The war also ended the old system of alliances in Europe. In the years after the war, European states such as Austria, The Dutch Republic, Sweden, Denmark-Norway, Ottoman Empire, and Russia now saw Britain as a greater threat than France and did not revert to previous alliances, while the Prussians were angered by what
they considered a British betrayal in 1762. Consequently, when the American War of Independence turned into a global war between 1778–83, Britain found itself opposed by a strong coalition of European powers and lacking any substantial ally.

AttrIBUTIONS

• A Global War
  ◦ “SevenYearsWar.png.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_Years%27_War#/media/File:SevenYearsWar.png. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
The Treaty of Paris of 1763 between Great Britain, France, and Spain, with Portugal in agreement, formally ended the Seven Years’ War and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe.

Learning Objective

Identify the provisions of the Treaty of Paris (1763)

Key Points

- The Treaty of Paris of 1763 between Great Britain, France, and Spain, with Portugal in agreement, formally ended the Seven Years’ War and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe.
- During the war, Great Britain conquered a number of French colonies in North America and the Caribbean, French trading posts in India, and French-controlled territories in West Africa. It also captured the Spanish
colonies of Manila and Havana. France captured Minorca and British trading posts in Sumatra, while Spain captured the border fortress of Almeida in Portugal and Colonia del Sacramento in South America.

- In the treaty, most of these territories were restored to their original owners, although Britain made considerable gains.
- The Treaty of Paris is sometimes noted as the point at which France gave Louisiana to Spain. The transfer, however, occurred with the Treaty of Fontainebleau (1762) but was not publicly announced until 1764. The Treaty of Paris gave Britain the east side of the Mississippi, with New Orleans remaining in French hands.
- The Treaty of Hubertusburg was signed five days later by Prussia, Austria, and Saxony. Together with the Treaty of Paris, it marked the end of the Seven Years’ War. The treaty ended the continental conflict with no significant changes in prewar borders.

**Key Terms**

**Treaty of Fontainebleau**
A secret agreement of 1762 in which France ceded Louisiana to Spain. The treaty followed the last battle in the French and Indian War in North America, the Battle of Signal Hill in September 1762. Having lost Canada,
King Louis XV of France proposed to King Charles III of Spain that France should give Spain “the country known as Louisiana, as well as New Orleans and the island in which the city is situated.” Charles accepted in November 1762.

**Treaty of Hubertusburg**
A 1763 treaty signed by Prussia, Austria and Saxony. Together with the Treaty of Paris, it marked the end of the Seven Years’ War. The treaty ended the continental conflict with no significant changes in prewar borders. Silesia remained Prussian and Prussia clearly stood among the ranks of the great powers.

**The Treaty of Paris**
Also known as the Treaty of 1763, signed by the kingdoms of Great Britain, France, and Spain with Portugal in agreement after Great Britain’s victory over France and Spain during the Seven Years’ War. The signing of the treaty formally ended the Seven Years’ War and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe.

---

**The Treaty of Paris**

The Treaty of Paris, also known as the Treaty of 1763, was signed on February 10, 1763 by the kingdoms of Great Britain, France, and Spain with Portugal in agreement after Great Britain’s victory over France and Spain during the Seven Years’ War. The signing of the
treaty formally ended the Seven Years' War, known as the French and Indian War in the North American theater, and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe. The treaty did not involve Prussia and Austria as they signed a separate agreement, the Treaty of Hubertusburg, five days later.

Exchange of Territories

During the war, Great Britain conquered the French colonies of Canada, Guadeloupe, Saint Lucia, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tobago, the French trading posts in India, the slave-trading station at Gorée, the Sénégal River and its settlements, and the Spanish colonies of Manila in the Philippines and Havana in Cuba. France captured Minorca and British trading posts in Sumatra, while Spain captured the border fortress of Almeida in Portugal and Colonia del Sacramento in South America.

In the treaty, most of these territories were restored to their original owners, although Britain made considerable gains. France and Spain restored all their conquests to Britain and Portugal. Britain restored Manila and Havana to Spain, and Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Lucia, Gorée, and the Indian trading posts to France. In return, France ceded Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tobago to Britain. France also ceded the eastern half of French Louisiana to Britain (the area from the Mississippi River to the Appalachian Mountains). In addition, while France regained its trading posts in India, France recognized British clients as the rulers of key Indian native states and pledged not to send troops to Bengal. Britain agreed to demolish its fortifications in British Honduras (now Belize), but retained a logwood-cutting colony there. Although the Protestant British feared Roman Catholics, Great Britain did not want to antagonize France through expulsion or forced conversion. Also, it did not want French settlers to leave Canada to strengthen other French
settlements in North America. Consequently, Great Britain decided to protect Roman Catholics living in Canada.

The Treaty of Paris is sometimes noted as the point at which France gave Louisiana to Spain. The transfer, however, occurred with the Treaty of Fontainebleau (1762) but was not publicly announced until 1764. The Treaty of Paris was to give Britain the east side of the Mississippi (including Baton Rouge, Louisiana, which was to be part of the British territory of West Florida) – except for the Île d’Orléans (historic name for the New Orleans area), which was granted to Spain, along with the territory to the west – the larger portion of Louisiana. The Mississippi River corridor in modern-day Louisiana was to be reunited following the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the Adams–Onís Treaty in 1819.

“A new map of North America,” produced following the Treaty of Paris (1763).

The Anglo-French hostilities ended in 1763 with Treaty of Paris, which involved a complex series of land exchanges, the most important being France’s cession to Spain of Louisiana, and to Great Britain the rest of New France except for the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. Faced with the choice of retrieving either New France or its Caribbean island colonies of Guadeloupe and Martinique, France chose the latter to retain these lucrative sources of sugar, writing off New France as an unproductive, costly territory.
The Treaty of Hubertusburg

The Treaty of Hubertusburg was signed on February 15, 1763 by Prussia, Austria, and Saxony. Together with the Treaty of Paris, it marked the end of the Seven Years’ War. The treaty ended the continental conflict with no significant changes in prewar borders. Most notably, Silesia remained Prussian. The Treaty, although it restored the prewar status quo, marked the ascendancy of Prussia as a leading European power. Through the Treaty of Paris, Great Britain emerged as the world’s chief colonial empire, which was its primary goal in the war, and France lost most of its overseas possessions. The phrase “Hubertsburg Peace” is sometimes used as a description for any Treaty which restores the situation that existed before conflict broke out.


21.5.1: The Triumphs of Tsarina Elizabeth I

Elizabeth’s reign was marked by domestic reforms that continued the efforts of her father, Peter the Great, strengthening Russia’s position as a major participant in the European imperial rivalry.

**Learning Objective**

Characterize Elizabeth I’s two decades in power

**Key Points**

- Elizabeth (1709 – 1762), the daughter of Peter the Great and his second wife, Catherine I, was the Empress of Russia from 1741 until her death in 1762. She came to power as a result of a daring coup that, amazingly, succeeded without bloodshed.
- Elizabeth aimed to continue changes made by Peter the Great. She reconstituted the senate as it had been under his reign, with the chiefs of the departments of state attending. Her first task after this was to address the war with Sweden. In 1743, the Treaty of
Åbo was signed, with Sweden ceding to Russia all of southern Finland east of the Kymmene River.

- The triumphs of Elizabeth’s foreign policy were credited to the diplomatic ability of Aleksey Bestuzhev-Ryumin, the head of foreign affairs. Bestuzhev reconciled the Empress with the courts of Vienna and London; enabled Russia to assert itself in Poland, Turkey, and Sweden; and isolated the King of Prussia by forcing him into hostile alliances. All this would have been impossible without the steady support of Elizabeth.

- The critical event of Elizabeth’s later years was the Seven Years’ War (1756–1763). Elizabeth regarded the 1756 alliance between Great Britain and Prussia as utterly subversive of the previous conventions between Great Britain and Russia and sided against Prussia over a personal dislike of Frederick the Great. She therefore entered into an alliance with France and Austria against Prussia.

- A year before the Seven Years’ War formally ended, Elizabeth died. Her Prussophile successor, Peter III, at once recalled Russian armies from Berlin and mediated Frederick's truce with Sweden. This turn of events has become known as “the Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg.”

- Elizabeth was renowned throughout and beyond Russia for her fierce commitment to the arts, particularly music, theater, and architecture.
the Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg

Events that led to Russia’s sudden change of alliance during the Seven Years’ War: in January 1762, the Empress Elizabeth of Russia died. Her nephew Peter, a strong admirer of Frederick the Great of Prussia, succeeded her and reversed Elizabeth’s anti-Prussian policy. He negotiated peace with Prussia and signed both an armistice and a treaty of peace and friendship.

the Seven Years’ War

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

the Winter Palace

From 1732 to 1917, the official residence of the Russian monarchs in Saint Petersburg.

Elizabeth of Russia

Elizabeth Petrovna (1709 – 1762), the daughter of Peter the Great and his second wife, Catherine I, was the Empress of Russia from 1741 until her death in 1762. After Peter died in 1725, his wife succeeded
him as the Empress of Russia but died only two years later. Elizabeth's half-nephew Peter II (the son of her half-brother from her father's first marriage) succeeded her mother. After his death in 1730, Elizabeth's first cousin, Empress Anna (ruled 1730–40), daughter of Peter the Great's elder brother Ivan V, ruled Russia. During the reign of her cousin, Elizabeth was gathering support in the background but after the death of Empress Anna, the regency of Anna Leopoldovna (Empress Anna's niece) for the infant Ivan VI was marked by high taxes and economic problems. As the daughter of Peter the Great, Elizabeth enjoyed much support from the Russian guards regiments. She often visited them, marking special events with the officers and acting as godmother to their children. The guards repaid her kindness when on the night of November 25, 1741, Elizabeth seized power with the help of the Preobrazhensky Regiment. The regiment marched to the Winter Palace and arrested the infant Emperor, his parents, and their own lieutenant-colonel, Count von Munnich. It was a daring coup and, amazingly, succeeded without bloodshed.
Elizabeth remains one of the most popular Russian monarchs due to her strong opposition to Prussian policies and her decision not to execute a single person during her reign, an unprecedented one at the time.

**Domestic and Foreign Policies**

The substantial changes made by Peter the Great had not exercised a formative influence on the intellectual attitudes of the ruling
classes as a whole, and Elizabeth aimed to change that. Her
domestic policies allowed the nobles to gain dominance in local
government while shortening their terms of service to the state. She
encouraged Mikhail Lomonosov’s establishment of the University of
Moscow and Ivan Shuvalov’s foundation of the Imperial Academy of
Arts in Saint Petersburg. She abolished the cabinet council system
used under Anna and reconstituted the senate as it had been under
Peter the Great, with the chiefs of the departments of state
attending. Her first task after this was to address the war with
Sweden. In 1743, the Treaty of Åbo, by which Sweden ceded to Russia
all of southern Finland east of the Kymmene River, was signed.

This triumph was credited to the diplomatic ability of the new
vice chancellor, Aleksey Bestuzhev-Ryumin, the head of foreign
affairs. He represented the anti-Franco-Prussian portion of
Elizabeth’s council and his object was to bring about an Anglo-
Austro-Russian alliance. By sheer tenacity of purpose, Bestuzhev
not only extricated his country from the Swedish imbroglio but
also reconciled the Empress with the courts of Vienna and London;
enabled Russia to assert itself in Poland, Turkey, and Sweden; and
isolated the King of Prussia by forcing him into hostile alliances.
All this would have been impossible without the steady support of
Elizabeth, who trusted him completely in spite of the Chancellor’s
many enemies, most of whom were her personal friends. However,
in 1758, Chancellor Bestuzhev was removed from office, most likely
because he attempted to sow discord between the Empress and her
heir and his consort.

Seven Years’ War

The critical event of Elizabeth’s later years was the Seven Years’
War (1756–1763). Elizabeth regarded the 1756 alliance between Great
Britain and Prussia as utterly subversive of the previous conventions
between Great Britain and Russia and sided against Prussia over a
personal dislike of Frederick the Great. She therefore entered into an alliance with France and Austria against Prussia, insisting that the King of Prussia must be rendered harmless to his neighbors for the future by reducing him to the rank of Prince-Elector. During the first six years of the war, Elizabeth focused on diplomatic (both covert and overt) and military efforts that aimed to deprive Frederick the Great and Prussia of their position as a major European ruler and power. However, Elizabeth died in 1762, a year before the war formally ended. Her Prussophile successor, Peter III, at once recalled Russian armies from Berlin and mediated Frederick’s truce with Sweden. He also placed a corps of his own troops under Frederick’s command. This turn of events has become known as “the Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg.”

Arts and Culture

Elizabeth was renowned throughout and beyond Russia for her fierce commitment to the arts, particularly music, theater, and architecture. The Empress had a longstanding love of theater and had a stage erected in the palace to enjoy the countless performances she sanctioned. Although many domestic and foreign works were shown, the French plays quickly became the most popular. Music also gained importance in Russia under Elizabeth. Many attribute its popularity to Elizabeth’s relationship with Alexei Razumovsky, a Ukrainian Cossack and the supposed husband of the Empress, who reportedly relished music. Elizabeth turned her court into “the country’s leading musical center.” She spared no expense, importing leading musical talents from Germany, France, and Italy. The Empress also spent exorbitant sums of money on the grandiose baroque projects of her favorite architect, Bartolomeo Rastrelli. The Winter Palace and the Smolny Convent in Saint Petersburg are among the chief monuments of her reign. Although the original construction of the Palace started
under Peter the Great, Elizabeth commissioned an entirely new scheme (of the current structure) and oversaw the construction but died before its completion. The Convent, built when Elizabeth considered becoming a nun, was one of the many religious buildings erected at her behest, using the nation’s funds rather than those of the church. The Convent was one of many buildings erected for religious purposes under Elizabeth’s rule.

During the reign of Elizabeth, Rastrelli, still working to his original plan, devised an entirely new scheme in 1753 on a colossal scale—the present Winter Palace. The expedited completion of the palace became a matter of honor to the Empress, who regarded the palace as a symbol of national prestige. Work on the building continued throughout the year, even in the severest months of the winter. The deprivation to both the Russian people and the army caused by the ongoing Seven Years’ War were not permitted to hinder the progress.

Attributions

- The Triumphs of Tsarina Elizabeth I

- “Miracle of the House of Brandenburg.”
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The Brief Reign of Peter III

21.5.2: The Brief Reign of Peter III

Peter III's decision to turn Russia from an enemy to an ally of Prussia and his domestic reforms did not convince the Russian nobility to support the unpopular emperor.

**Learning Objective**

Recall the events of Peter III’s time as tsar

**Key Points**

- Peter III was emperor of Russia for six months in 1762. It was his aunt, Empress Elizabeth, that chose him as her successor. Elizabeth invited her young nephew to Saint Petersburg, where he was received into the Orthodox Church and proclaimed heir in 1742.
- Empress Elizabeth arranged for Peter to marry his second cousin, Sophia Augusta Frederica (later
Catherine the Great). They married in 1745 but the union was unhappy. The traditionally held view of Peter as a person of weak character and many vices is mainly drawn from the memoirs of his wife and successor.

- After Peter succeeded to the Russian throne, the pro-Prussian emperor withdrew Russian forces from the Seven Years’ War and concluded a peace treaty with Prussia. Russia thus switched from an enemy of Prussia to an ally. The decision proved to be extremely unpopular in his own court and greatly contributed to Peter’s quick demise.

- One of Peter’s most widely debated reforms was a manifesto that exempted the nobility from obligatory state and military service (established by Peter the Great) and gave them freedom to travel abroad. Although the exemption from the obligatory service was welcomed by the Russian elites, the overall reform did not convince them to support their emperor, who was generally considered as taking little interest in Russia and its matters.

- Catherine staged a coup and had her husband arrested, forcing him to sign a document of abdication and leaving no one to dispute her accession to the throne. On July 17, eight days after the coup and just six months after his accession to the throne, Peter III died at the hands of Alexei Orlov.
Key Terms

the Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg
Events that led to Russia’s sudden change of alliance during the Seven Years’ War: in January 1762, the Empress Elizabeth of Russia died. Her nephew Peter, a strong admirer of Frederick the Great of Prussia, succeeded her and reversed Elizabeth’s anti-Prussian policy. He negotiated peace with Prussia and signed both an armistice and a treaty of peace and friendship.

the Seven Years’ War
A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

casus belli
A Latin expression meaning “an act or event that provokes or is used to justify war” (literally, “a case of war”).
Peter III

Peter III (1728 – 1762) was emperor of Russia for six months in 1762, chosen by his unmarried, childless aunt, Empress Elizabeth, as her successor. Young Peter of Holstein-Gottorp lost his mother, Elizabeth’s sister Anna, at three months old and his father at the age of 11. Elizabeth invited her young nephew to Saint Petersburg, where he was received into the Orthodox Church and proclaimed heir in 1742. Empress Elizabeth arranged for Peter to marry his second cousin, Sophia Augusta Frederica (later Catherine the Great). The young princess formally converted to Russian Orthodoxy and took the name Ekaterina Alexeievna (Catherine). They married in 1745 but the union was unhappy. The traditionally held view of Peter as a person of weak character with many vices is mainly drawn from the memoirs of his wife and successor. She described him in extremely negative terms and this image of Peter has dominated in historical works, although some recent biographers painted a more positive picture of Peter’s character and rule.
Peter III's temperament became quite unbearable for those who resided in the palace. He would announce trying drills in the morning to male servants, who later joined Catherine in her room to sing and dance until late hours. Catherine became pregnant with her second child, Anna, who only lived to four months, in 1759. Due to various rumors of Catherine's promiscuity, Peter was led to believe he was not the child's biological father, but Catherine angrily dismissed his accusation. She spent much of this time alone in her own private boudoir to hide away from Peter's abrasive personality.
Reign

After Peter succeeded to the Russian throne, the pro-Prussian emperor withdrew Russian forces from the Seven Years' War and concluded a peace treaty with Prussia, an event known as the Second Miracle of the House of Brandenburg. It’s sometimes simply called the Miracle of the House of Brandenburg, which also refers to a surprising development during the Seven Years' War, when Russia and Austria failed to follow up their victory over Frederick the Great at the Battle of Kunersdorf in 1759. He gave up Russian conquests in Prussia and offered 12,000 troops to make an alliance with Frederick the Great (1762). Russia thus switched from an enemy of Prussia to an ally — Russian troops withdrew from Berlin and marched against the Austrians. This dramatically shifted the balance of power in Europe. Frederick recaptured southern Silesia and subsequently forced Austria to the negotiating table. The decision proved to be extremely unpopular in his own court and greatly contributed to Peter’s quick demise.

As Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, Peter planned war against Denmark to restore parts of Schleswig to his Duchy. He focused on making alliances with Sweden and England to ensure that they would not interfere on Denmark's behalf, while Russian forces gathered at Kolberg in Russian-occupied Pomerania. Alarmed at the Russian troops concentrating near their borders, unable to find any allies to resist Russian aggression, and short of money to fund a war, the government of Denmark threatened in late June to invade the free city of Hamburg in northern Germany to force a loan from it. Peter considered this a casus belli and prepared for open warfare against Denmark, but lost his throne before starting the war.

One of Peter's most widely debated reforms was a manifesto that exempted the nobility from obligatory state and military service (established by Peter the Great) and gave them freedom to travel abroad. The manifesto obliged nobles to educate their children and ostracized the nobility considered lazy and unproductive. Although
the exemption from the obligatory service was welcomed by the Russian elites, the overall reform did not convince them to support their emperor, who was generally considered as taking little interest in Russia and its matters. A case of Peter's religious policies serves as a demonstrative example of how the pro-Prussian emperor was perceived in Russia. His pro-Lutheran stand has been interpreted by some recent biographers as the introduction of religious freedom, while Peter's contemporaries (and many historians) saw it as an anti-Orthodox attitude proving Peter's lack of understanding of his own empire.

**Overthrow**

In July 1762, barely six months after becoming emperor, Peter took a holiday with his Holstein-born courtiers and relatives to Oranienbaum, leaving his wife in Saint Petersburg. On the night of July 8, Catherine the Great received the news that one of her co-conspirators had been arrested by her estranged husband and that all they had been planning had to take place at once. She left the palace and departed for the Ismailovsky regiment, where Catherine delivered a speech asking the soldiers to protect her from her husband. Catherine left with the regiment to go to the Semenovsky Barracks where the clergy was waiting to ordain her as the sole occupant of the Russian throne. She had her husband arrested and forced him to sign a document of abdication, leaving no one to dispute her accession to the throne. On July 17, eight days after the coup and just six months after his accession to the throne, Peter III died at the hands of Alexei Orlov. Historians find no evidence for Catherine's complicity in the supposed assassination.
Attributions

• The Brief Reign of Peter III
From German Princess to Russian Tsarina

21.5.3: From German Princess to Russian Tsarina

Born to the family of impoverished German aristocracy, Catherine the Great's fate was decided when she was chosen to become wife of her second cousin, the prospective tsar Peter III, whom she eventually overthrew to become the Empress of Russia in 1762.

Learning Objective

Detail Catherine the Great's journey from German Princess to sole ruler of Russia

Key Points

- Catherine II of Russia reigned Russia from 1762 until her death in 1796. Born Sophia Augusta Fredericka to Christian August, Prince of Anhalt-Zerbst, and Princess Johanna Elisabeth of Holstein-Gottorp in Stettin, Pomerania, her fate was decided after she was chosen to become wife of her second cousin, the
prospective tsar Peter of Holstein-Gottorp (as Peter III).

• Catherine spared no effort to ingratiate herself not only with the Empress, but also with her husband and with the Russian people. She applied herself to learning the language and wrote that when she came to Russia she decided to do whatever was required of her to become qualified to wear the crown.

• Although Sophia’s father, a devout German Lutheran, opposed his daughter’s conversion to Eastern Orthodoxy, in 1744 the Russian Orthodox Church received Princess Sophia as a member with the new name Catherine and the (artificial) patronymic Alekseyevna (daughter of Aleksey). On the following day, the formal betrothal took place in Saint Petersburg.

• Count Andrei Shuvalov, chamberlain to Catherine, is credited as the source of rumors regarding the monarch’s intimate affairs. These rumor led many, including Peter, to believe that her two children were not fathered by her husband.

• After the death of Empress Elizabeth in 1762, Peter succeeded to the throne as Emperor Peter III and Catherine became empress consort. The tsar’s eccentricities and policies, including a great admiration for Frederick the Great of Prussia, alienated the same groups that Catherine cultivated.

• Catherine staged a coup and had her husband arrested, then forced him to sign a document of abdication, leaving no one to dispute her accession to the throne. Eight days after the coup and just six months after his accession to the throne, Peter III
died at the hands of Alexei Orlov. Historians find no evidence for Catherine’s complicity in the supposed assassination.

**Key Terms**

**enlightened despotism**

Also known as enlightened absolutism or benevolent absolutism: a form of absolute monarchy or despotism inspired by the Enlightenment. The monarchs who embraced it followed the precepts of rationality. Some of them fostered education, and allowed religious tolerance, freedom of speech, and the right to hold private property. They held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern through a social contract in lieu of any other governments.

**the Seven Years’ War**

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every great European power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.
Early Life

Catherine II of Russia (1729 – 1796) was the longest-ruling female leader of Russia, reigning from 1762 until her death in 1796 at the age of 67. Born Sophia Augusta Fredericka to Christian August, Prince of Anhalt-Zerbst, and Princess Johanna Elisabeth of Holstein-Gottorp in Stettin, Pomerania, she received education chiefly from a French governess and from tutors. Although Sophia was born a princess, her family had very little money. She came to power based on her mother’s relations to wealthy members of royalty.

The choice of Sophia as wife of her second cousin, the prospective tsar Peter of Holstein-Gottorp (as Peter III), was a result of diplomatic arrangements, most notably by Peter's aunt, Empress Elizabeth. Catherine first met Peter at the age of 10. Based on her writings, she found him detestable when they met, which did not change after the two got married. Empress Elizabeth appreciated and liked Sophia, who upon her arrival in Russia in 1744 spared no effort to ingratiate herself not only with the Empress, but also with her husband and with the Russian people. She applied herself to learning the language with such zeal that she rose at night and walked about her bedroom barefoot, repeating her lessons (she mastered the language but she retained a foreign accent). This led to a severe attack of pneumonia in March 1744. In her memoirs, she wrote that when she came to Russia she decided to do whatever was required of her to become qualified to wear the crown.
The choice of Sophia as wife of her second cousin, the prospective tsar Peter of Holstein-Gottorp, resulted from diplomatic management in which Count Lestocq, Peter's aunt (the ruling Russian Empress Elizabeth), and Frederick the Great of Prussia took part. Lestocq and Frederick wanted to strengthen the friendship between Prussia and Russia to weaken Austria's influence and ruin the Russian chancellor Bestuzhev, on whom Empress Elizabeth relied and who acted as a known partisan of Russo-Austrian co-operation.
Conversion and Marriage

Although Sophia’s father, a devout German Lutheran, opposed his daughter’s conversion to Eastern Orthodoxy, in 1744 the Russian Orthodox Church received Princess Sophia as a member with the new name Catherine and the (artificial) patronymic Alekseyevna (daughter of Aleksey). On the following day, the formal betrothal took place in Saint Petersburg. Sophia was 16 and her father did not travel to Russia for the wedding. The newlyweds settled in the palace of Oranienbaum, which remained the residence of the “young court” for many years to come.

Count Andrei Shuvalov, chamberlain to Catherine, is credited as the source of information rumors regarding the monarchs’ intimate affairs. Peter was believed to have taken a mistress (Elizabeth Vorontsova), while Catherine carried on liaisons with Sergei Saltykov, Grigory Grigoryevich Orlov, Alexander Vasilchikov, Grigory Potemkin, Stanisław August Poniatowski, Alexander Vasilchikov, and others. Some of these men eventually became her trusted political or military advisors. She also became friends with Princess Ekaterina Vorontsova-Dashkova, the sister of her husband’s mistress, who introduced her to several powerful political groups that opposed her husband.

Peter III’s temperament became quite unbearable for those who resided in the palace. He would announce trying drills in the morning to male servants, who later joined Catherine in her room to sing and dance until late hours. In 1754, Catherine and Peter welcomed a son, the future tsar Paul I. There is considerable speculation as to the actual paternity of Paul. It is suggested that his mother had engaged in an affair—to which Empress Elizabeth consented—with a young officer named Serge Saltykov and that he was Paul’s father. However, Peter never gave any indication that he believed Paul was not his son. He also did not take any interest in parenthood, but Empress Elizabeth, certainly did. She removed young Paul from his mother by ordering the midwife to take the
baby and follow her. Catherine was not to see her child for another
month and then only briefly during the churching ceremony. Six
months later Elizabeth let Catherine see the child again. Paul had
in effect become a ward of the state and in a larger sense, the
property of the state, to be brought up by Elizabeth as she believed
he should be — as a true heir and great-grandson of her father,
Peter the Great. Catherine became pregnant with her second child,
Anna, who died as an infant in 1757. Due to the rumors of Catherine’s
promiscuity, Peter was led to believe he was not the child’s
biological father.

The Coup

After the death of Empress Elizabeth in 1762, Peter succeeded to the
throne as Emperor Peter III and Catherine became empress consort.
The imperial couple moved into the new Winter Palace in Saint
Petersburg. The tsar’s eccentricities and policies, including a great
admiration for Frederick the Great of Prussia, alienated the same
groups that Catherine cultivated. Furthermore, Peter intervened in
a dispute between his Duchy of Holstein and Denmark over the
province of Schleswig, which many at his court saw as a step
towards unnecessary war. Peter’s shift in the official position of
Russia from the enemy to the ally of Prussia during the Seven Years’
War eroded much of his support among the nobility. Domestic
reforms, including a manifesto that exempted the nobility from
obligatory state and military service (established by Peter the
Great), did not convince the Russian elites to support their emperor.

In July 1762, barely six months after becoming emperor, Peter
took a holiday with his Holstein-born courtiers and relatives in
Oranienbaum, leaving his wife in Saint Petersburg. On the night of
July 8, Catherine received the news that one of her co-conspirators
had been arrested by her estranged husband and that all they had
been planning had to take place at once. She left the palace and departed for the Ismailovsky regiment, where Catherine delivered a speech asking the soldiers to protect her from her husband. She left with the regiment to go to the Semenovsky Barracks where the clergy was waiting to ordain her as the sole occupant of the Russian throne. She had her husband arrested and forced him to sign a document of abdication, leaving no one to dispute her accession to the throne. On July 17—eight days after the coup and just six months after his accession to the throne—Peter III died at the hands of Alexei Orlov. Historians find no evidence for Catherine's complicity in the supposed assassination.

Catherine, though not descended from any previous Russian emperor of the Romanov Dynasty (she descended from the Rurik Dynasty, which preceded the Romanovs), succeeded her husband as empress regnant. She followed the precedent established when Catherine I (born in the lower classes in the Swedish East Baltic territories) succeeded her husband Peter the Great in 1725. Historians debate Catherine's technical status, some seeing her as a regent or as a usurper, tolerable only during the minority of her son, Grand Duke Paul. In the 1770s, a group of nobles connected with Paul considered a new coup to depose Catherine and transfer the crown to Paul, whose power they envisaged restricting in a kind of constitutional monarchy. However, the plan failed and Catherine reigned until her death.

The period of Catherine's rule, the Catherinian Era, is often considered the Golden Age of the Russian Empire and Russian nobility. She enthusiastically supported the ideals of the Enlightenment, thus earning the status of an enlightened despot. As such, she believed that strengthening her authority had to occur by improving the lives of her subjects. This philosophy of enlightened despotism implied that the sovereign knew the interests of his or her subjects better than they themselves did. The monarch taking responsibility for the subjects precluded their political participation. Catherine presided over the age of the Russian Enlightenment and sought contact with and inspiration from the
major philosophers of the era. In one of her letters to Dennis Diderot, she referred to how she saw her responsibility as the empress:

You philosophers are lucky men. You write on paper and paper is patient. Unfortunate Empress that I am, I write on the susceptible skins of living beings.

As a patron of the arts and an advocate of Enlightenment ideals, she presided over the age of the Russian Enlightenment. In this painting, she is visiting Mikhail Lomonosov, a Russian polymath, scientist and writer, who made important contributions to literature, education, and science. Among his discoveries was the atmosphere of
Venus and the Law of Mass Conservation in chemical reactions. He was also a poet and influenced the formation of the modern Russian literary language.

Attributions

• From German Princess to Russian Tsarina
Catherine the Great enthusiastically supported the ideals of the Enlightenment, thus earning the status of an enlightened despot, although her reforms benefited a small number of her subjects and did not change the oppressive system of Russian serfdom.

**Learning Objective**

Evaluate Catherine the Great’s domestic policies and to what extent she can be considered an enlightened despot

**Key Points**

- The period of Catherine’s rule (1762-1796), the Catherinian Era, is often considered the Golden Age of the Russian Empire and Russian nobility. She enthusiastically supported the ideals of the Enlightenment, thus earning the status of an enlightened despot.
• An admirer of Peter the Great, Catherine continued to modernize Russia along Western European lines. However, military conscription and economy continued to depend on serfdom, and the increasing demands of the state and private landowners led to increased levels of reliance on serfs. Consequently, the unrest intensified and more than fifty peasant revolts occurred between 1762 and 1769. These culminated in Pugachev’s Rebellion, the largest peasant revolt in Russia’s history.

• Catherine believed a “new kind of person” could be created by inculcating Russian children with European education. However, despite the experts’ recommendations to establish a general system of education for all Russian Orthodox subjects from the age of 5 to 18, excluding serfs, only modest action was taken. An estimated 62,000 pupils were educated in some 549 state institutions near the end of Catherine’s reign, a minuscule number of people compared to the size of the Russian population.

• Catherine converted to the Russian Orthodoxy as part of her immersion in the Russian matters but personally remained largely indifferent to religion. Her religious policies aimed to control populations and religious institutions in the multi-religious empire and were not an expression of religious freedom.

• Catherine did not advocate democratic reforms but addressed some modernization trends, including dividing the country into provinces and districts, further increasing the power of the landed oligarchs, and issuing the Charter of the Towns, which
distributed all people into six groups as a way to limit the power of nobles and create a middle estate.

- Catherine had a reputation as a patron of the arts, literature, and education. She cultivated and corresponded with French encyclopedists but did not support a free-thinking spirit among her own subjects as much as among famous French philosophers.

**Key Terms**

**enlightened despotism**

Also known as enlightened absolutism or benevolent absolutism, a form of absolute monarchy or despotism inspired by the Enlightenment. The monarchs who embraced it followed the participles of rationality. Some of them fostered education and allowed religious tolerance, freedom of speech, and the right to hold private property. They held that royal power emanated not from divine right but from a social contract whereby a despot was entrusted with the power to govern through a social contract in lieu of any other governments.

**Pugachev’s Rebellion**

A 1773-75 revolt in a series of popular rebellions that took place in Russia after Catherine II seized power in 1762. It began as an organized insurrection of
Cossacks against a background of profound peasant unrest and war with the Ottoman Empire. It was the largest peasant revolt in Russia's history.

**Hermitage Museum**

A museum of art and culture in Saint Petersburg, Russia. One of the largest and oldest museums in the world, it was founded in 1764 by Catherine the Great and has been open to the public since 1852. Its collections, of which only a small part is on permanent display, comprise over three million items.

**Cossacks**

A group of predominantly East Slavic-speaking people who became known as members of democratic, self-governing, semi-military communities, predominantly located in Ukraine and in Russia. They inhabited sparsely populated areas and islands in the lower Dnieper, Don, Terek, and Ural river basins and played an important role in the historical and cultural development of both Russia and Ukraine.

**the Smolny Institute**

Russia's first educational establishment for women, established under Catherine the Great's rule, that continued to function under the personal patronage of the Russian Empress until just before the 1917 revolution.
Catherine II: Enlightened Despot

The period of Catherine’s rule (1762-1796), the Catherinian Era, is often considered the Golden Age of the Russian Empire and the Russian nobility. She enthusiastically supported the ideals of the Enlightenment, thus earning the status of an enlightened despot. As such, she believed that strengthening her authority had to occur by improving the lives of her subjects. This philosophy of enlightened despotism implied that the sovereign knew the interests of his or her subjects better than they themselves did. The monarch taking responsibility for the subjects precluded their political participation.
Portrait of Empress Catherine the Great by Russian painter Fyodor Rokotov, 1763. Catherine reformed the administration of Russian guberniyas and many new cities and towns were founded on her orders. An admirer of Peter the Great, she continued to modernize Russia along Western European lines although her reforms did not benefit the masses and military conscription and economy continued to depend on serfdom.

Serfdom

An admirer of Peter the Great, Catherine continued to modernize...
Russia along Western European lines. However, military conscription and economy continued to depend on serfdom, and the increasing demands of the state and private landowners led to increased levels of reliance on serfs. Catherine confirmed the authority of the nobles over the serfs in return for the nobles' political cooperation. This was one of the chief reasons behind ongoing rebellions. The unrest intensified as the 18th century wore on, with more than fifty peasant revolts occurring between 1762 and 1769. These culminated in Pugachev's Rebellion, when, between 1773 and 1775, Yemelyan Pugachev rallied the peasants and Cossacks and promised the serfs land of their own and freedom from their lords.

In the 18th century, the peasantry in Russia were no longer bound to the land, but tied to their owners, which made Russian serfdom more similar to slavery than any other system of forced labor that existed at the time in Europe. A landowner could punish his serfs at his discretion and under Catherine the Great gained the ability to sentence his serfs to hard labor in Siberia, a punishment normally reserved for convicted criminals. The only thing a noble could not do to his serfs was to kill them. The life of a serf belonged to the state. Historically, when the serfs faced problems they could not solve (such as abusive masters), they appealed to the autocrat. They continued doing so during Catherine's reign though she signed legislation prohibiting the practice. While she eliminated some ways for people to become serfs, culminating in a 1775 manifesto that prohibited a serf who had once been freed from becoming a serf again, she also restricted the freedoms of many peasants. During her reign, Catherine gave away many state-owned peasants to become private serfs (owned by a landowner).

Pugachev launched the rebellion in mid-September 1773. He had a substantial force composed of Cossacks, Russian peasants, factory serfs, and non-Russians. Despite some victories, by late 1774 the tide was turning, and the Russian army's victory at Tsaritsyn left 9,000 to 10,000 rebels dead. By early September, the rebellion was crushed. Pugachev was betrayed by his own Cossacks when he tried to flee and he was beheaded and dismembered in 1775 in Moscow.
Education

Catherine believed a “new kind of person” could be created by inculcating Russian children with European education. However, despite the experts’ recommendations to establish a general system of education for all Russian Orthodox subjects from the age of 5 to 18, excluding serfs, only modest action was taken. The Moscow Foundling Home (Moscow Orphanage), charged with admitting destitute and extramarital children, was created to experiment with new educational theories. However, due to extremely high mortality rates, it failed to serve that purpose. Shortly after the Moscow Foundling Home, Catherine established the Smolny Institute for Noble Girls to educate females. The girls who attended the Smolny Institute, Smolyanki, were often accused of being ignorant of anything that went on outside the walls of the Smolny buildings. Within the walls of the Institute, they were taught impeccable French, musicianship, dancing, and complete awe of the Monarch.

The building was commissioned from Giacomo Quarenghi by the Society for Education of Noble Maidens and constructed in 1806–08 to house the Smolny Institute for Noble Maidens, established at the
urging of Ivan Betskoy and in accordance with a decree of Catherine in 1764. The establishment of the institute was a significant step in making education available for females in Russia.

Catherine introduced some educational reforms despite the lack of a national school system. The remodelling of the Cadet Corps in 1766 initiated many educational reforms. The Corps began to take children from a very young age and educate them until the age of 21, and the curriculum was broadened from the professional military curriculum to include the sciences, philosophy, ethics, history, and international law. In 1786, the Russian Statute of National Education was promulgated. The statute established a two-tier network of high schools and primary schools in guberniya capitals that were free of charge, open to all of the free classes (not serfs), and co-educational. Two years after the implementation of Catherine's program, a member of the National Commission inspected the institutions established. Throughout Russia, the inspectors encountered a patchy system. While the nobility put up appreciable amounts of money for these institutions, they preferred to send their children to private, more prestigious institutions. Also, the townspeople tended to turn against the junior schools and their pedagogical methods. An estimated 62,000 pupils were educated in some 549 state institutions near the end of Catherine's reign, a minuscule number of people compared to the size of the Russian population.

**Religion**

Catherine converted to the Russian Orthodoxy as part of her immersion in the Russian matters but personally remained largely indifferent to religion. Her religious policies largely aimed to control populations and religious institutions in the multi-religious empire. She nationalized all of the church lands to help pay for her wars, largely emptied the monasteries, and forced most of the remaining
clergymen to survive as farmers or from fees for services. However, in her anti-Ottoman policy, she promoted the protection and fostering of Christians under Turkish rule. Although she placed strictures on Roman Catholics in the Polish parts of her empire, Russia also provided an asylum to the Jesuits following their suppression in most of Europe in 1773.

Catherine took many approaches to Islam during her reign but her pro-Islam policies were all an attempt to control Muslim populations in the empire. After the Toleration of All Faiths Edict of 1773, Muslims were permitted to build mosques and practice freely. In 1785, Catherine approved the subsidization of new mosques and new town settlements for Muslims. By building new settlements with mosques placed in them, Catherine attempted to ground many of the nomadic people who wandered through southern Russia. In 1786, she assimilated the Islamic schools into the Russian public school system to be regulated by the government. The plan was another attempt to force nomadic people to settle.

Russia often treated Judaism as a separate entity and Jews were under a separate legal and bureaucratic system. After the annexation of Polish territories, the Jewish population in the empire grew significantly. Catherine levied additional taxes on the followers of Judaism, but if a family converted to the Orthodox faith that additional tax was lifted. In 1785, she declared Jewish populations to be officially foreigners, with foreigners’ rights. Catherine's decree also denied them the rights of Orthodox or naturalized citizens of Russia. Taxes doubled again for those of Jewish descent in 1794 and Catherine officially declared that Jews bore no relation to Russians.

Administration and Intellectual Life

Catherine did not advocate democratic reforms but addressed some of the modernization trends. In 1775, she decreed a Statute for
the Administration of the Provinces of the Russian Empire. The statute sought to efficiently govern Russia by increasing population and dividing the country into provinces and districts. In 1785, she conferred on the nobility the Charter to the Nobility, increasing further the power of the landed oligarchs. Nobles in each district elected a Marshal of the Nobility, who spoke on their behalf to the monarch on issues of concern to them, mainly economic ones. In the same year, Catherine issued the Charter of the Towns, which distributed all people into six groups as a way to limit the power of nobles and create a middle estate.

Catherine had a reputation as a patron of the arts, literature, and education. The Hermitage Museum, which now occupies the whole Winter Palace, began as Catherine's personal collection. Within a few months of her accession in 1762, having heard the French government threatened to stop the publication of the famous French Encyclopédie on account of its irreligious spirit, Catherine proposed to Diderot that he should complete his great work in Russia under her protection. She wrote comedies, fiction, and memoirs while cultivating the French encyclopedists, who later cemented her reputation in their writings. Catherine enlisted Voltaire to her cause, and corresponded with him for 15 years, from her accession to his death in 1778. During Catherine's reign, Russians imported and studied the classical and European influences that inspired the Russian Enlightenment. She also became a great patron of Russian opera. However, she did not support a free-thinking spirit among her own subjects as much as among the famous French philosophers. When Alexander Radishchev published his Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow in 1790 (one year after the start of the French Revolution) and warned of uprisings because of the deplorable social conditions of the peasants held as serfs, Catherine exiled him to Siberia.
Catherine’s Domestic Policies

40. Catherine the Great's Foreign Policies

Catherine’s Foreign Policy Goals

During Catherine the Great’s reign, Russia significantly extended its borders by absorbing new territories, most notably from the Ottoman Empires and the Commonwealth of Poland-Lithuania, as well as attempted to serve as an international mediator in disputes that could, or did, lead to war.

Learning Objective

Describe Catherine the Great’s foreign policy efforts and to what extent she achieved her goals

Key Points

• During her reign, Catherine extended the borders of the Russian Empire southward and westward to absorb New Russia, Crimea, Northern Caucasus, Right-bank Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, and Courland at the expense, mainly, of two powers – the Ottoman
Empire and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. Under her rule, some 200,000 square miles (520,000 km$^2$) were added to Russian territory.

- Catherine made Russia the dominant power in south-eastern Europe after her first Russo-Turkish War against the Ottoman Empire (1768–74), which saw some of the heaviest defeats in Ottoman history. In 1786, Catherine conducted a triumphal procession in the Crimea, which helped provoke the next Russo-Turkish War. This war, catastrophic for the Ottomans, legitimized the Russian claim to the Crimea.

- Catherine’s triumph in Crimea is linked to a concept of Potemkin villages. In politics and economics, Potemkin villages refer to any construction (literal or figurative) built solely to deceive others into thinking that a situation is better than it really is.

- Although the idea of partitioning the Commonwealth of Poland–Lithuania came from Frederick the Great of Prussia, Catherine took a leading role in carrying it out (in three separate partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795). Russia completed the partitioning of Poland–Lithuania with Prussia and Austria and the Commonwealth ceased to exist as an independent state.

- Catherine longed for recognition as an enlightened sovereign. She pioneered for Russia the role that Britain later played through most of the 19th and early 20th centuries as an international mediator in disputes that could, or did, lead to war.

- In 1780, she established a League of Armed
Neutrality, designed to defend neutral shipping from
the British Royal Navy during the American
Revolution. After establishing a league of neutral
parties, Catherine the Great attempted to act as a
mediator between the United States and Britain by
submitting a ceasefire plan.

Key Terms

Potemkin villages
In politics and economics, a term referring to any
construction (literal or figurative) built solely to
deceive others into thinking that a situation is better
than it really is. The term comes from stories of a fake
portable village, supposedly built only to impress
Empress Catherine II during her journey to Crimea in
1787.

the Confederation of Bar
An association of Polish nobles formed at the fortress
of Bar in Podolia in 1768 to defend the internal and
external independence of the Polish–Lithuanian
Commonwealth against Russian influence and against
King Stanislaw II Augustus with Polish reformers, who
were attempting to limit the power of the
Commonwealth's wealthy magnates. Its creation led to
a civil war and contributed to the First Partition of the
Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth.
League of Armed Neutrality

An alliance of European naval powers between 1780 and 1783, which was intended to protect neutral shipping against the Royal Navy's wartime policy of unlimited search of neutral shipping for French contraband. Empress Catherine the Great of Russia began the first League with her declaration of Russian armed neutrality in 1780, during the War of American Independence. She endorsed the right of neutral countries to trade by sea with nationals of belligerent countries without hindrance, except in weapons and military supplies.

Treaty of Jassy

A 1792 peace treaty signed at Jassy in Moldavia (presently in Romania) by the Russian and Ottoman Empires that ended the Russo-Turkish War of 1787–92 and confirmed Russia's increasing dominance in the Black Sea. The treaty formally recognized the Russian Empire's annexation of the Crimean Khanate via the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca of 1783 and transferred Yedisan (the territory between Dniester and Bug rivers) to Russia making the Dniester the Russo-Turkish frontier in Europe and leaving the Asiatic frontier (Kuban River) unchanged.

Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca

A 1774 peace treaty signed in Küçük Kaynarca (today Kaynardzha, Bulgaria) between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire. Following the recent Ottoman defeat at the Battle of Kozludzha, the document ended the Russo-Turkish War of 1768–74 and marked a defeat of the Ottomans in their struggle against Russia.
the Targowica Confederation

A confederation established by Polish and Lithuanian magnates in 1792 in Saint Petersburg, with the backing of the Russian Empress Catherine the Great. The confederation opposed the progressive Polish Constitution of May 3rd, 1791, especially the provisions limiting the privileges of the nobility. Four days later after the proclamation of the confederation, two Russian armies invaded the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth without a formal declaration of war.

Catherine’s Foreign Policy

During her reign, Catherine extended the borders of the Russian Empire southward and westward to absorb New Russia (a region north of the Black Sea; presently part of Ukraine), Crimea, Northern Caucasus, Right-bank Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, and Courland at the expense, mainly, of two powers – the Ottoman Empire and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. Under her rule, some 200,000 square miles (520,000 km²) were added to Russian territory. Catherine’s foreign minister, Nikita Panin (in office 1763–81), exercised considerable influence from the beginning of her reign but eventually Catherine had him replaced with Ivan Osterman (in office 1781–97).

Wars with the Ottoman Empire

While Peter the Great had succeeded only in gaining a toehold in the
south on the edge of the Black Sea in the Azov campaigns, Catherine completed the conquest of the south. Catherine made Russia the dominant power in south-eastern Europe after her first Russo-Turkish War against the Ottoman Empire (1768–74), which saw some of the heaviest defeats in Ottoman history, including the 1770 Battles of Chesma and Kagul. The Russian victories allowed Catherine's government to obtain access to the Black Sea and to incorporate present-day southern Ukraine, where the Russians founded several new cities. The Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (1774) gave the Russians territories at Azov, Kerch, Yenikale, Kinburn, and the small strip of Black Sea coast between the rivers Dnieper and Bug. The treaty also removed restrictions on Russian naval or commercial traffic in the Azov Sea, granted to Russia the position of protector of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, and made the Crimea a protectorate of Russia.

Catherine annexed the Crimea in 1783, nine years after the Crimean Khanate had gained nominal independence—which had been guaranteed by Russia—from the Ottoman Empire as a result of her first war against the Turks. The palace of the Crimean khans passed into the hands of the Russians. In 1786, Catherine conducted a triumphal procession in the Crimea, which helped provoke the next Russo-Turkish War. The Ottomans restarted hostilities in the second Russo-Turkish War (1787–92). This war, catastrophic for the Ottomans, ended with the Treaty of Jassy (1792), which legitimized the Russian claim to the Crimea and granted the Yedisan region to Russia.

Catherine's triumph in Crimea is linked to a concept of Potemkin villages. In politics and economics, Potemkin villages refer to any construction (literal or figurative) built solely to deceive others into thinking that a situation is better than it really is. The term comes from stories of a fake portable village, built only to impress Empress Catherine II during her journey to Crimea in 1787. The purpose of the trip was to impress Russia's allies. To help accomplish this in a region devastated by war, Grigory Potemkin (Catherine's lover and trusted advisor) set up “mobile villages” on the banks of the Dnieper.
River. As soon as the barge carrying the Empress and ambassadors arrived, Potemkin’s men, dressed as peasants, would populate the village. Once the barge left, the village was disassembled, then rebuilt downstream overnight. Some modern historians, however, claim accounts of this portable village are exaggerated and the story is most likely a myth.

Partitions of Poland

In 1764, Catherine placed Stanisław Poniatowski, her former lover, on the Polish throne. Although the idea of partitioning Poland came from Frederick the Great of Prussia, Catherine took a leading role in carrying it out (in three separate partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795). In 1768, she formally became protector of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, which provoked an anti-Russian uprising in Poland, the Confederation of Bar (1768–72). After the uprising broke down due to internal politics in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, she established a system of government fully controlled by the Russian Empire through a Permanent Council, under the supervision of her ambassadors and envoys.

After the French Revolution of 1789, Catherine rejected many principles of the Enlightenment she had once viewed favorably. Afraid the progressive May 3rd Constitution of Poland (1791) might lead to a resurgence in the power of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and the growing democratic movements inside the Commonwealth might become a threat to the European monarchies, Catherine decided to intervene in Poland. She provided support to a Polish anti-reform group known as the Targowica Confederation. After defeating Polish loyalist forces in the Polish–Russian War of 1792 and in the Kościuszko Uprising (1794), Russia completed the partitioning of Poland, dividing all of the remaining Commonwealth territory with Prussia and Austria (1795).
Partitions of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1772, 1793 and 1795: The Partitions of Poland were a series of three partitions of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth that took place towards the end of the 18th century and ended the existence of the state, resulting in the elimination of the sovereign Crown of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania for 123 years. The partitions were conducted by the Russian Empire, the Kingdom of Prussia and Habsburg Austria, which divided up the Commonwealth lands among
Relations with Western Europe

Catherine agreed to a commercial treaty with Great Britain in 1766, but stopped short of a full military alliance. Although she could see the benefits of Britain's friendship, she was wary of Britain's increased power following its victory in the Seven Years War, which threatened the European balance of power.

Catherine longed for recognition as an enlightened sovereign. She pioneered for Russia the role that Britain later played through most of the 19th and early 20th centuries as an international mediator in disputes that could, or did, lead to war. She acted as mediator in the War of the Bavarian Succession (1778–79) between the German states of Prussia and Austria. In 1780, she established a League of Armed Neutrality, designed to defend neutral shipping from the British Royal Navy during the American Revolution. After establishing a league of neutral parties, Catherine the Great attempted to act as a mediator between the United States and Britain by submitting a ceasefire plan.
A 1791 British caricature of an attempted mediation between Catherine (on the right, supported by Austria and France) and Turkey, by James Gillray, Library of Congress. Cartoon shows Catherine II, faint and shying away from William Pitt (British prime minister). Seated behind Pitt are the King of Prussia and a figure representing Holland as Sancho Panza. Selim III kneels to kiss the horse’s tail. A gaunt figure representing the old order in France and Leopold II (Holy Roman Emperor) render assistance to Catherine by preventing her from falling to the ground.
From 1788 to 1790, Russia fought a war against Sweden, a conflict instigated by Catherine’s cousin, King Gustav III of Sweden, who expected to simply overtake the Russian armies still engaged in war against the Ottoman Turks, and hoped to strike Saint Petersburg directly. But Russia’s Baltic Fleet checked the Royal Swedish navy in a tied battle of Hogland (1788), and the Swedish army failed to advance. Denmark declared war on Sweden in 1788 (the Theater War). After the decisive defeat of the Russian fleet at the Battle of Svensksund in 1790, the parties signed the Treaty of Värälä (1790), returning all conquered territories to their respective owners.

Attributions

- **Catherine’s Foreign Policy Goals**
Catherine the Great’s Foreign Policies

PART III

CH. 22 THE FRENCH REVOLUTION
Although Louis XV's upbringing turned him into a great patron of arts and sciences, his reign was marked by diplomatic, military, and political failures that removed France from the position of one of the most powerful and admired states in Europe.

**Learning Objective**

Detail Louis XV's upbringing and his personality as king

**Key Points**

- Louis XV (1710 – 1774) was a monarch of the House of Bourbon who ruled as King of France from 1715 until his death. Until he reached maturity in 1723, his kingdom was ruled by Philippe d'Orléans, Duke of Orléans as Regent of France, and Cardinal Fleury was his chief minister from 1726 until 1743.
- Although Louis XIV was not born as the Dauphin, the death of his great-grandfather Louis XV, his father, and his older brother made him the heir to the
throne of France at the age of five.

- The young king received an excellent education that later resulted in his patronage of arts and sciences. At the age of 15, he was married to Marie Leszczyńska, daughter of Stanisław I, the deposed king of Poland. In 1729 his wife gave birth to a male child, an heir to the throne. The birth of a long-awaited heir, which ensured the survival of the dynasty for the first time since 1712, was welcomed with tremendous joy and Louis XV became extremely popular.

- In 1723, the king’s majority was declared by the Parlement of Paris, which ended the regency. Louis XV appointed Louis Henri, Duke of Bourbon, in charge of state affairs. The Duke pursued policies that resulted in serious economic and social problems in France, so the king dismissed him in 1726 and selected Cardinal Fleury to replace him. From 1726 until his death in 1743, Cardinal Fleury ruled France with the king’s assent. It was the most peaceful and prosperous period of the reign of Louis XV, despite some unrest.

- Historians agree that in terms of culture and art, France reached a high point under Louis XV. However, he was blamed for the many diplomatic, military, and economic reverses. His reign was marked by ministerial instability and his reputation destroyed by military losses that largely deprived France of its colonial possessions.

- Louis’s XV’s reign sharply contrasts with Louis XIV’s reign. Historians emphasize Louis XIV’s military and diplomatic successes. Despite the fact that Louis
XIV’s considerable foreign, military, and domestic expenditure also impoverished and bankrupted France, in comparison to his great predecessor, Louis XV is commonly seen as one of the least effective rulers of the House of Bourbon.

### Key Term

**Dauphin**

The title given to the heir apparent to the throne of France from 1350 to 1791 and 1824 to 1830. The word is French for dolphin, as a reference to the depiction of the animal on their coat of arms.

Louis XV (1710 – 1774), known as Louis the Beloved, was a monarch of the House of Bourbon who ruled as King of France from 1715 until his death. He succeeded his great-grandfather Louis XIV at the age of five. Until he reached maturity in 1723, his kingdom was ruled by Philippe d’Orléans, Duke of Orléans as Regent of France (his maternal great-uncle and cousin twice removed patrilineally). Cardinal Fleury was his chief minister from 1726 until the Cardinal's death in 1743, at which time the young king took sole control of the kingdom.
Early Life

Louis XV was born during the reign of his great-grandfather Louis XIV. His grandfather and Louis XIV’s son, Louis Le Grand Dauphin (Dauphin being the title given to the heir apparent to the throne of France), had three sons with his wife Marie Anne Victoire of Bavaria: Louis, Duke of Burgundy; Philippe, Duke of Anjou (who became King of Spain); and Charles, Duke of Berry. Louis XV was the third son of the Duke of Burgundy and his wife Marie Adélaïde of Savoy. At birth, Louis XV received a customary title for younger sons of the French royal family: Duke of Anjou. In April 1711, Louis Le Grand Dauphin suddenly died, making Louis XV’s father, the Duke of Burgundy, the new Dauphin. At that time, Burgundy had two living sons, Louis, Duke of Brittany, and his youngest son, the future Louis XV.

A year later, Marie Adélaïde contracted smallpox or measles and died. Her husband, said to be heartbroken by her death, died from the disease the same week. Within a week of his death, it was clear that the couple’s two children had also been infected. Fearing that the Dauphin (the older son) would die, the Court had both the Dauphin and the Duke of Anjou baptized. The Dauphin died the same day. The Duke of Anjou, and now after his brother’s death the Dauphin, survived the smallpox.
In September 1715, Louis XIV died of gangrene after a 72-year reign. In August 1714, he made a will stipulating that the nation was to be governed by a Regency Council made up of fourteen members until the new king reached the age of majority. Philippe, Duke of Orléans, nephew of Louis XIV, was named president of the council, but all decisions were to be made by majority vote.

By French royal tradition, princes were put in the care of men when they reached their seventh birthdays. Louis was taken from his governess, Madame de Ventadour, in 1717 and placed in the care of Francois de Villeroy, who had been designated as his governor in
Louis XIV’s will. De Villeroy served under the formal authority of the Duke of Maine, who was charged with overseeing the king’s education. He was aided by André-Hercule de Fleury (later to become Cardinal Fleury), who served as the king’s tutor. Fleury gave the king an excellent education, including lessons from renowned professors (e.g., Guillaume Delisle, a cartographer known for his accurate maps of Europe and the newly explored Americas). Louis XV had an inquisitive and open-minded nature. An avid reader, he developed eclectic tastes. Later in life he advocated the creation of departments in physics (1769) and mechanics (1773) at the Collège de France.

In 1721, 11-year-old Louis XV was betrothed to his first cousin, the Infanta Maria Anna Victoria of Spain. The eleven-year-old king was not interested in the arrival of his future wife, the three-year-old Spanish Infanta. The king was quite frail as a boy and several medical emergencies led to concern for his life. Many also assumed that the Spanish Infanta, eight years younger than the king, was too young to bear an heir in a timely way. To remedy this situation, the Duke of Bourbon set about choosing a European princess old enough to produce an heir. Eventually, 21-year-old Marie (Maria) Leszczyńska, daughter of Stanisław I, the deposed king of Poland, was chosen to marry the king. The marriage was celebrated in 1725 when the king was 15, and the couple soon produced many children. In September 1729, in her third pregnancy, the queen finally gave birth to a male child, an heir to the throne, the Dauphin Louis (1729–1765). The birth of a long-awaited heir, which ensured the survival of the dynasty for the first time since 1712, was welcomed with tremendous joy and celebration in all spheres of French society and the young king became extremely popular.
Marie was on a list of 99 eligible European princesses to marry the young king, but she was far from the first choice on the list. She had been placed there initially because she was a Catholic princess and therefore fulfilled the minimum criteria, but was removed because she was poor when the list was reduced from 99 to 17. However, when the list of 17 was further reduced to four, the preferred choices presented numerous problems and Marie emerged as the best compromise. Queen Marie maintained the role and reputation of a simple and dignified Catholic queen. She functioned as an example
of Catholic piety and was famed for her generosity to the poor and needy through her philanthropy, which made her very popular among the public her entire life as queen.

Towards the Personal Reign

In 1723, the king's majority was declared by the Parlement of Paris, which ended the regency. Initially, Louis XV left the Duke of Orléans in charge of state affairs. The Duke of Orléans was appointed first minister upon the death of Cardinal Dubois in August 1723, but died in December of the same year. Following the advice of Fleury, Louis XV appointed his cousin Louis Henri, Duke of Bourbon, to replace the late Duke of Orléans. The ministry of the Duke of Bourbon pursued policies that resulted in serious economic and social problems in France. These included the persecution of Protestants; monetary manipulations; the creation of new taxes; and high grain prices. As a result of Bourbon's rising unpopularity, the king dismissed him in 1726 and selected Cardinal Fleury, his former tutor, as a replacement.

From 1726 until his death in 1743, Cardinal Fleury ruled France with the king's assent. It was the most peaceful and prosperous period of the reign of Louis XV, despite some unrest. After the financial and social disruptions suffered at the end of the reign of Louis XIV, the rule of Fleury is seen by historians as a period of recovery. The king's role in the decisions of the Fleury government is unclear, but he did support Fleury against the intrigues of the court and the conspiracies of the courtiers.
Louis XV, The King

Starting in 1743 with the death of Fleury, the king ruled alone without a first minister. He had read many times the instructions of Louis XIV: “Listen to the people, seek advice from your Council, but decide alone.” His political correspondence reveals his deep knowledge of public affairs as well as the soundness of his judgement. Most government work was conducted in committees of ministers that met without the king. The king reviewed policy only in the High Council, which was composed of the king, the Dauphin, the chancellor, the finance minister, and the foreign minister. Created by Louis XIV, the council was in charge of state policy regarding religion, diplomacy, and war. There, he let various political factions oppose each other and vie for influence and power.

Historians agree that in terms of culture and art, France reached a high point under Louis XV. However, he was blamed for the many diplomatic, military, and economic reverses. His reign was marked by ministerial instability and his reputation destroyed by military losses that largely deprived France of its colonial possessions. Historians have also noted that the king left the country in the hands of his advisors while he engaged in his favorite hobbies, including hunting and womanizing. This sharply contrasts Louis XV’s reign from that of his great-grandfather and predecessor Louis XIV. Historians emphasize Louis XIV’s military and diplomatic successes, particularly placing a French prince on the Spanish throne, which ended the threat of an aggressive Spain that historically interfered in French domestic politics. They also note the effect of Louis’s wars in expanding France’s boundaries and creating more defensible frontiers that preserved France from invasion until the Revolution. Under Louis XIV, Europe came to admire France for its military and cultural successes, power, and sophistication. Europeans began to emulate French manners, values, goods, and deportment. French became the universal language of the European elite. Despite the fact that Louis XIV’s
considerable foreign, military, and domestic expenditure also impoverished and bankrupted France, in comparison to his great predecessor, Louis XV is commonly seen as one of the least effective rulers of the House of Bourbon.

Attributions

- Louis XV
  - “MariaLeszczynska02.jpg.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marie_Leszczy%C5%84ska#/media/File:MariaLeszczynska02.jpg. Wikipedia Public domain.
22.1.3: The Ancien Regime

The Ancien Régime was the social and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties. It was based on the rigid division of the society into three disproportionate and unequally treated classes.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the structure of the Ancien Régime and the societal rules at play

**Key Points**

- The Ancien Régime (Old Regime or Former Regime) was the social and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties.
- The estates of the realm were the broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christian Europe from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different
systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best-known system is the three-estate system of the French Ancien Régime.

- The First Estate comprised the entire clergy, traditionally divided into “higher” (nobility) and “lower” (non-noble) clergy. In 1789, it numbered around 130,000 (about 0.5% of the population).

- The Second Estate was the French nobility and (technically, although not in common use) royalty, other than the monarch himself, who stood outside of the system of estates. It is traditionally divided into “nobility of the sword” and “nobility of the robe,” the magisterial class that administered royal justice and civil government. The Second Estate constituted approximately 1.5% of France’s population.

- The Third Estate comprised all of those who were not members of the above and can be divided into two groups, urban and rural, together making up 98% of France’s population. The urban included the bourgeoisie and wage-laborers. The rural included peasants.

- The French estates of the realm system was based on massive social injustices that were one of the key factors leading up to the French Revolution.
Key Terms

the gabelle
A very unpopular tax on salt in France that was established during the mid-14th century and lasted, with brief lapses and revisions, until 1946. Because all French citizens needed salt (for use in cooking, for preserving food, for making cheese, and for raising livestock), the tax propagated extreme regional disparities in salt prices and stood as one of the most hated and grossly unequal forms of revenue generation in the country’s history.

estates of the realm
The broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christendom (Christian Europe) from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best-known system is a three-estate system of the French Ancien Régime used until the French Revolution (1789–1799). This system was made up of clergy (the First Estate), nobility (the Second Estate), and commoners (the Third Estate).

the taille
A direct land tax on the French peasantry and non-nobles in Ancien Régime France. The tax was imposed on each household based on how much land it held.

Ancien Régime
The social and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th
century until the latter part of the 18th century under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties. The term is occasionally used to refer to the similar feudal social and political order of the time elsewhere in Europe.

Ancien Régime

The Ancien Régime (Old Regime or Former Regime) was the social and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties. The term is occasionally used to refer to the similar feudal social and political order of the time elsewhere in Europe. The administrative and social structures of the Ancien Régime were the result of years of state-building, legislative acts, internal conflicts, and civil wars, but they remained a patchwork of local privilege and historic differences until the French Revolution ended the system. Despite the notion of absolute monarchy and the efforts by the kings to create a centralized state, Ancien Régime France remained a country of systemic irregularities. Administrative (including taxation), legal, judicial, and ecclesiastic divisions and prerogatives frequently overlapped (for example, French bishoprics and dioceses rarely coincided with administrative divisions).
Estates of the Realm

The estates of the realm were the broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christendom (Christian Europe) from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best-known system is the three-estate system of the French Ancien Régime used until the French Revolution (1789–1799). This system was made up of clergy (the First Estate), nobility (the Second Estate), and commoners (the Third Estate).

The First Estate comprised the entire clergy, traditionally divided into “higher” and “lower” clergy. Although there was no formal demarcation between the two categories, the upper clergy were effectively clerical nobility from the families of the Second Estate. In the time of Louis XVI, every bishop in France was a nobleman, a situation that had not existed before the 18th century. At the other extreme, the “lower clergy” (about equally divided between parish priests and monks and nuns) constituted about 90 percent of the First Estate, which in 1789 numbered around 130,000 (about 0.5% of the population).

The Second Estate was the French nobility and (technically, although not in common use) royalty, other than the monarch himself, who stood outside of the system of estates. It is traditionally divided into “nobility of the sword” and “nobility of the robe,” the magisterial class that administered royal justice and civil government. The Second Estate constituted approximately 1.5% of France’s population and were exempt from the corvée royale (forced labor on the roads) and from most other forms of taxation such as the gabelle (salt tax) and most important, the taille (the oldest form of direct taxation). This exemption from paying taxes led to their reluctance to reform.

The Third Estate comprised all who were not members of the above and can be divided into two groups, urban and rural, together making up 98% of France’s population. The urban included the
bourgeoisie and wage-laborers. The rural included peasants who owned their own land (and could be prosperous) and peasants who worked on nobles’ or wealthier peasants’ land. The peasants paid disproportionately high taxes compared to the other Estates and simultaneously had very limited rights. In addition, the First and Second Estates relied on the labor of the Third, which made the latter’s unequal status all the more unjust.

The Third Estate men and women shared the hard life of physical labor and food shortages. Most were born within this group and died as part of it. It was extremely rare for individuals of this status to advance to another estate. Those who crossed the class lines did so as a result of either being recognized for their extraordinary bravery in a battle or entering religious life. Some commoners were able to marry into the Second Estate, although that was very rare.
France under the *Ancien Régime* (before the French Revolution) divided society into three estates: the First Estate (clergy); the Second Estate (nobility); and the Third Estate (commoners). The king was considered part of no estate.

### Social Injustice

The population of France in the decade prior to the French Revolution was about 26 million, of whom 21 million lived in agriculture. Few of these owned enough land to support a family and most were forced to take on extra work as poorly paid laborers on larger farms. Despite regional differences and French peasants’ generally better economic status than that of their Eastern European counterparts, hunger was a daily problem and the condition of most French peasants was poor.

The fundamental issue of poverty was aggravated by social inequality as all peasants were liable to pay taxes from which the nobility could claim immunity, and feudal dues payable to a local lord. Similarly, the tithes (a form of obligatory tax, at the time often paid in kind), which the peasants were obliged to pay to their local churches, were a cause of grievance as the majority of parish priests were poor and the contribution was being paid to an aristocratic and usually absentee abbot. The clergy numbered about 100,000 and yet owned 10% of the land. The Catholic Church maintained a rigid hierarchy as abbots and bishops were all members of the nobility and canons were all members of wealthy bourgeois families. As an institution, it was both rich and powerful. It paid no taxes and merely contributed a grant to the state every five years, the amount of which was self-determined. The upper echelons of the clergy also had considerable influence over government policy.

Successive French kings and their ministers tried to suppress the power of the nobles but did so with very limited success.
Attributions
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43. The Rise of the Nobility

22.1.4: The Rise of the Nobility

Despite attempts to weaken the position of the nobility, Louis XV met with avid resistance and largely failed to reform the system that privileged the aristocracy.

Learning Objective

Explain how the nobility continued to gain power throughout the reign of Louis XV.

Key Points

• Louis XIV believed in the divine right of kings, which assert that a monarch is above everyone except God. He continued his predecessors’ work of creating a centralized state governed from Paris, sought to eliminate remnants of feudalism in France, and subjugated and weakened the aristocracy.

• Louis XIV eventually failed to reform the unjust tax system that greatly favored the nobility, but instituted reforms in military administration and compelled
many members of the nobility, especially the noble elite, to inhabit Versailles. This created an effective system of control as the king manipulated the nobility with an elaborate system of pensions and privileges, minimizing their influence and increasing his own power.

- Although Louis XV attempted to continue his predecessor's efforts to weaken the aristocracy, he failed to establish himself as an absolute monarch of Louis XIV's stature. He supported the policy of fiscal justice, which created a tax on the twentieth of all revenues that affected the privileged classes as well as commoners. This breach in the privileged status of the aristocracy and the clergy was another attempt to impose taxes on the privileged, but the new tax was received with violent protest from the upper classes.

- Pressed and eventually won over by his entourage at court, the king gave in and exempted the clergy from the twentieth in 1751. Eventually, the twentieth became a mere increase in the already existing taille, the most important direct tax of the monarchy from which privileged classes were exempted.

- During the reign of Louis XV, the parlements repeatedly challenged the crown for control over policy, especially regarding taxes and religion, which strengthened the position of the nobility and weakened the authority of the king.

- Chancellor René Nicolas de Maupeou sought to reassert royal power by suppressing the parlements in 1770. A furious battle resulted and after King Louis XV died, the parlements were restored.
Key Terms

**Ancien Régime**

The social and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties. The term is occasionally used to refer to the similar feudal social and political order of the time elsewhere in Europe.

**lit de justice**

A particular formal session of the Parlement of Paris, under the presidency of the king, for the compulsory registration of the royal edicts.

**parlements**

Provincial appellate courts in the France of the Ancien Régime, i.e. before the French Revolution. They were not legislative bodies but rather the court of final appeal of the judicial system. They typically wielded much power over a wide range of subject matter, particularly taxation. Laws and edicts issued by the Crown were not official in their respective jurisdictions until assent was given by publishing them. The members were aristocrats who had bought or inherited their offices and were independent of the King.

**letters patent**

A type of legal instrument in the form of a published written order issued by a monarch, president, or other head of state, generally granting an office, right, monopoly, title, or status to a person or corporation.
A direct land tax on the French peasantry and non-nobles in Ancien Régime France. The tax was imposed on each household based on how much land it held.

Background: The Nobility under Louis XIV

Louis XIV believed in the divine right of kings, which assert that a monarch is above everyone except God and therefore not answerable to the will of his people, the aristocracy, or the Church. Louis continued his predecessors’ work of creating a centralized state governed from Paris, sought to eliminate remnants of feudalism in France, and subjugated and weakened the aristocracy.

The reign of Louis XIV marked the rise of France of as a military, diplomatic, and cultural power in Europe. However, the ongoing wars, the panoply of Versailles, and the growing civil administration required a great deal of money, and finance was always the weak spot in the French monarchy. Tax-collecting methods were costly and inefficient and the state always received far less than what the taxpayers paid. But the main weakness arose from an old bargain between the French crown and nobility: the king reigned with limited or no opposition from the nobles if only he refrained from taxing them. Only the commoners paid direct taxes and that meant the peasants because many bourgeois obtained exemptions. The system was outrageously unjust in throwing a heavy tax burden on the poor and helpless.

Later after 1700, the French ministers supported by Madame De Maintenon (Louis XIV’s second wife) were able to convince the King
to change his fiscal policy. Louis was willing enough to tax the nobles but unwilling to fall under their control. Only towards the close of his reign under extreme stress of war was he able, for the first time in French history, to impose direct taxes on the aristocracy. This was a step toward equality before the law and toward sound public finance, but so many concessions and exemptions were won by nobles and bourgeois that the reform lost much of its value.

Louis XIV also instituted reforms in military administration through Michel le Tellier and his son François-Michel le Tellier, Marquis de Louvois. They helped to curb the independent spirit of the nobility, imposing order on them at court and in the army. Gone were the days when generals protracted war at the frontiers while bickering over precedence and ignoring orders from the capital and the larger politico-diplomatic picture. The old military aristocracy (“the nobility of the sword”) ceased to have a monopoly over senior military positions and rank.

Over time, Louis XIV also compelled many members of the nobility, especially the noble elite, to inhabit Versailles. Provincial nobles who refused to join the Versailles system were locked out of important positions in the military or state offices. Lacking royal subsides and thus unable to keep up a noble lifestyle, these rural nobles often went into debt. This created an effective system of control as the king manipulated the nobility with an elaborate system of pensions and privileges, minimizing their influence and increasing his own power.
In the political system of pre-Revolutionary France, the nobility made up the Second Estate (with the Catholic clergy comprising the First Estate and the bourgeoisie and peasants in the Third Estate). Although membership in the noble class was mainly inherited, it was not a closed order. New individuals were appointed to the nobility by the monarchy, or could purchase rights and titles or join by marriage. Sources differ about the actual number of nobles in France, but proportionally it was among the smallest noble classes in Europe.

**Louis XV: Attempts to Reform**

Although Louis XV attempted to continue his predecessor’s efforts to weaken the aristocracy, he failed to establish himself as an absolute monarch of Louis XIV’s stature. Following the advice of his mistress, Marquise de Pompadour, Louis XV supported the policy of fiscal justice designed by Machault d’Arnouville. In order to finance the budget deficit, which amounted to 100 million livres in 1745, Machault d’Arnouville created a tax on the twentieth of all revenues that affected the privileged classes as well as commoners. This
breach in the privileged status of the aristocracy and the clergy, normally exempt from taxes, was another attempt to impose taxes on the privileged. However, the new tax was received with violent protest from the privileged classes in the estates of the few provinces that retained the right to decide taxation (most provinces had long lost their provincial estates and the right to decide taxation). The new tax was also opposed by the clergy and by the parlements (provincial appellate court staffed by aristocrats). Members of these courts bought their positions from the king, together with the right to transfer their positions hereditarily through payment of an annual fee. Membership in such courts and appointment to other public positions often led to elevation to nobility (the so-called nobles of the robe, as distinguished from the nobility of ancestral military origin, the nobles of the sword.) While these two categories of nobles were often at odds, both sought to retain their privileges.

The Role of Parlements

Pressed and eventually won over by his entourage at court, the king gave in and exempted the clergy from the twentieth in 1751. Eventually, the twentieth became a mere increase in the already existing taille, the most important direct tax of the monarchy from which privileged classes were exempted. It was another defeat in the taxation war waged against the privileged classes. As a result of these attempts at reform, the Parlement of Paris, using the quarrel between the clergy and the Jansenists as a pretext, addressed remonstrances to the king in April 1753. In these remonstrances, the Parlement, made up of privileged aristocrats and ennobled commoners, proclaimed itself the “natural defender of the fundamental laws of the kingdom” against the arbitrariness of the monarchy.
During the reign of Louis XV, the parlements repeatedly challenged the crown for control over policy, especially regarding taxes and religion. The parlements had the duty to record all royal edicts and laws. Some, especially the Parlement of Paris, gradually acquired the habit of refusing to register legislation with which they disagreed until the king held a lit de justice or sent letters patent to force them to act. Furthermore, the parlements could pass certain regulations, which were laws that applied within their jurisdiction. In the years immediately before the start of the French Revolution in 1789, their extreme concern to preserve Ancien Régime institutions of noble privilege prevented France from carrying out many simple reforms, especially in the area of taxation, even when those reforms had the support of the king. Chancellor René Nicolas de Maupeou sought to reassert royal power by suppressing the parlements in 1770. A furious battle resulted and after King Louis XV died, the parlements were restored.
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44. France's Fiscal Woes

22.1.5: France’s Fiscal Woes

Under Louis XIV, France witnessed successful reforms and growth as a global power, but financial strain imposed by multiple wars left the state bankrupt. Under Louis XV, lost wars and limited reforms reversed the gains of the initial years of economic recovery.

**Learning Objective**

Examine the excessive spending of Louis XIV and Louis XV and the consequences of their actions for the French government.

**Key Points**

- Louis XIV began his personal reign with effective fiscal reforms. He chose Jean-Baptiste Colbert as Controller-General of Finances in 1665, and Colbert reduced the national debt through more efficient taxation. However, the gains were insufficient to support Louis's policies. During his reign, France fought three major wars and two lesser conflicts. In
order to weaken the power of the nobility, Louis attached nobles to his court at Versailles. These strategies to hold centralized power, although effective, were very costly.

- To support the reorganized and enlarged army, the panoply of Versailles, and the growing civil administration, the king needed more money. Only towards the close of his reign under extreme stress of war was he able to impose direct taxes on the aristocratic population. However, so many concessions and exemptions were won by nobles and bourgeois that the reform lost much of its value.
- Louis encouraged industry, fostered trade and commerce, and sponsored the founding of an overseas empire, but the powerful position of Louis XIV’s France came at a financial cost that could not be balanced by his reforms. The considerable foreign, military, and domestic expenditure impoverished and bankrupted France.
- Cardinal Fleury was Louis XV’s chief minister and his rule was the most peaceful and prosperous period of the reign of Louis XV. After the financial and social disruptions suffered at the end of the reign of Louis XIV, the rule of Fleury is seen by historians as a period of “recovery.” Following Fleury’s death, Louis failed to continue his policies.
- Louis XV attempted fiscal reforms that included the taxation of the nobility but his foreign policy failures weakened France and further strained its finances. As a result of lost wars, Louis was forced to cede many territories, including lucrative overseas colonies.
- Lost wars and subsequent financial strains,
ineffective reforms, and religious feuds, combined with XV’s reputation as a man interested more in women and hunting than in ruling France, weakened the monarchy that was left in a state of economic crisis.

Key Terms

parlements

Provincial appellate courts in the France of the Ancien Régime, i.e. before the French Revolution. They were not legislative bodies but rather the court of final appeal of the judicial system. They typically wielded much power over a wide range of subject matter, particularly taxation. Laws and edicts issued by the Crown were not official in their respective jurisdictions until assent was given by publishing them. The members were aristocrats who had bought or inherited their offices and were independent of the King.

Seven Years’ War

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split
Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other. For the first time, aiming to curtail Britain and Prussia's ever-growing might, France formed a grand coalition of its own, which ended with failure as Britain rose as the world's predominant force, altering the European balance of power.

**Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle of 1748**

A treaty, sometimes called the Treaty of Aachen, that ended the War of the Austrian Succession following a congress assembled in 1748 at the Free Imperial City of Aachen and signed by Great Britain, France, and the Dutch Republic.

**taille**

A direct land tax on the French peasantry and non-nobles in Ancien Régime France. The tax was imposed on each household based on how much land it held.

---

**Louis XIV: Finance Reform vs. High Spending**

Louis XIV, known as the “Sun King,” reigned over France from 1643 until 1715. He began his personal reign with effective fiscal reforms. In 1661, the treasury verged on bankruptcy. To rectify the situation, Louis chose Jean-Baptiste Colbert as Controller-General of Finances in 1665. Colbert reduced the national debt through more efficient taxation. Although his tax reform proved difficult, excellent
results were achieved and the deficit of 1661 turned into a surplus in 1666. In 1667, the net receipts had risen to 20 million pounds sterling while expenditure had fallen to 11 million, leaving a surplus of 9 million pounds.

However, the gains were insufficient to support Louis’s policies. During his reign, France fought three major wars: the Franco-Dutch War, the War of the League of Augsburg, and the War of the Spanish Succession. There were also two lesser conflicts: the War of Devolution and the War of the Reunions. Warfare defined the foreign policies of Louis XIV, seen by the king as the ideal way to enhance his glory. Even in peacetime, he concentrated on preparing for the next war, including reforms that enlarged and modernized the French military.

Furthermore, in order to centralize his power, Louis recognized that he had to weaken the power of the nobility, which he achieved partly by attaching nobles to his court at Versailles and thus virtually controlling their daily lives. Apartments were built to house those willing to pay court to the king, but the pensions and privileges necessary to live in a style appropriate to their rank were only possible by waiting constantly on Louis. This strategy, although effective, turned out to be very costly, particularly given the king’s extravagant choices and lavish lifestyle.

To support the reorganized and enlarged army, the panoply of Versailles, and the growing civil administration, the king needed more money. Methods of collecting taxes were costly and inefficient. Direct taxes passed through the hands of many intermediate officials; indirect taxes were collected by private individuals called tax farmers who made a substantial profit. The state always received far less than what the taxpayers actually paid. Yet the main weakness arose from an old bargain between the French crown and nobility: the king could rule without much opposition from the nobility if only he refrained from taxing them. Only the lowest classes paid direct taxes and that meant mostly peasants since many bourgeois obtained exemptions. Later after 1700, the French ministers who were supported by Madame De
Maintenon (the king's second wife) were able to convince the King to change his fiscal policy. Louis was willing to tax the nobles but unwilling to fall under their control, and only towards the close of his reign under extreme stress of war was he able, for the first time in French history, to impose direct taxes on the aristocratic elements of the population. This was a step toward equality before the law and sound public finance, but so many concessions and exemptions were won by nobles and bourgeois that the reform lost much of its value.

In addition to successful finance reforms, Louis encouraged industry, fostered trade and commerce, and sponsored the founding of an overseas empire. His political and military victories as well as numerous cultural achievements helped raise France to a preeminent position in Europe. Historians note, however, that the powerful position of Louis XIV's France came at a financial cost that could not be balanced by his reforms. The considerable foreign, military, and domestic expenditure impoverished and bankrupted France.
Voltaire’s history, *The Age of Louis XIV*, named Louis’s reign as not only one of the four great ages in which reason and culture flourished, but the greatest ever. The success, however, came at the financial cost that bankrupted France.

**Louis XV: The Disintegration of the Empire**

Louis XV succeeded his great-grandfather Louis XIV at the age of five. Until he reached maturity in 1723, his kingdom was ruled by Philippe d’Orléans, Duke of Orléans as Regent of France. Cardinal
Fleury was his chief minister from 1726 until the Cardinal's death in 1743, at which time the young king took sole control of the kingdom. Fleury's rule was the most peaceful and prosperous period of the reign of Louis XV. After the financial and social disruptions suffered at the end of the reign of Louis XIV, the rule of Fleury is seen by historians as a period of “recovery.” Fleury stabilized the French currency and balanced the budget in 1738. Economic expansion was a major goal of the government. Communications were improved with the completion of the Saint-Quentin canal in 1738 and the systematic building of a national road network. By the middle of the 18th century, France had the most modern and extensive road network in the world. Modern highways, which stretched from Paris to the most distant borders of France, helped to advance trade. In foreign relations, Fleury sought peace by trying to maintain alliance with England and pursuing reconciliation with Spain.

After Fleury's death, Louis failed to continue his policies. Following the advice of his mistress, Marquise de Pompadour, he supported the policy of fiscal justice designed by Machault d'Arnouville. In order to finance the budget deficit, Machault d'Arnouville created a tax on the twentieth of all revenues that affected the privileged classes as well as commoners. This breach in the privileged status of the aristocracy and the clergy, normally exempt from taxes, was another attempt to impose taxes on the privileged, but the new tax was received with violent protest from the privileged classes. It was opposed by the clergy and by the parlements (provincial appellate court staffed by aristocrats). Pressed and eventually won over by his entourage at court, the king gave in and exempted the clergy from the twentieth in 1751. Eventually, the twentieth became a mere increase in the already existing taille, the most important direct tax of the monarchy from which privileged classes were exempted. It was another defeat in the taxation war waged against the privileged classes.

Louis's greatest failure was perhaps his foreign policy. As a result of lost wars, Louis was forced to return the Austrian Netherlands (modern-day Belgium) territory won at the Battle of Fontenoy of
1745 but returned to Austria by the terms of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle of 1748. He also ceded New France in North America to Spain and Great Britain at the conclusion of the Seven Years’ War in 1763. Although he incorporated the territories of Lorraine and Corsica into the kingdom of France, the loss of colonies in North America, the Caribbean, and West Africa as well as the weakening of influence in India demonstrated that France was no longer a colonial European power with access to lucrative overseas opportunities (although France did maintain control over Guadeloupe and Martinique, sources of profitable sugar).

Most historians argue that Louis XV’s decisions damaged the power of France, weakened the treasury, discredited the absolute monarchy, and made it more vulnerable to distrust and destruction. Lost wars and financial strains that they imposed, ineffective reforms, and religious feuds, combined with the king’s reputation as a man interested more in women and hunting than in ruling France, weakened the monarchy that was left in a state of economic crisis.
Under Louis XV, financial strain imposed by wars, particularly by the disastrous for France Seven Years’ War and by the excesses of the royal court, contributed to fiscal problems and the national unrest that in the end culminated in the French Revolution of 1789.

Attributions
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Taxes and the Three Estates

22.1.6: Taxes and the Three Estates

The taxation system under the Ancien Régime largely excluded the nobles and the clergy from taxation while the commoners, particularly the peasantry, paid disproportionately high direct taxes.

Learning Objective

Distinguish between the three Estates and their burdens of taxation.

Key Points

• France under the Ancien Régime was divided society into three estates: the First Estate (clergy); the Second Estate (nobility); and the Third Estate (commoners). One critical difference between the estates of the realm was the burden of taxation. The nobles and the clergy were largely excluded from taxation while the commoners paid
disproportionately high direct taxes.

- The desire for more efficient tax collection was one of the major causes for French administrative and royal centralization. The taille became a major source of royal income. Exempted from the taille were clergy and nobles (with few exceptions). Different kinds of provinces had different taxation obligations and some among the nobility and the clergy paid modest taxes, but the majority of taxes was always paid by the poorest. Moreover, the church separately taxed the commoners and the nobles.

- As the French state continuously struggled with the budget deficit, some attempts to reform the skewed system took place under both Louis XIV and Louis XV. The greatest challenge to introduce any changes was an old bargain between the French crown and the nobility: the king could rule without much opposition from the nobility if only he refrained from taxing them.

- New taxes introduced under Louis XIV were a step toward equality before the law and sound public finance, but so many concessions and exemptions were won by nobles and bourgeois that the reform lost much of its value.

- Although Louis XV also attempted to impose new taxes on the First and Second Estates, with all the exemptions and reductions won by the privileged classes the burden of the new tax once again fell on the poorest citizens.

- Historians consider the unjust taxation system, continued under Louis XVI, to be one of the causes of the French Revolution.
Key Terms

the estates of the realm
The broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christendom (Christian Europe) from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best known system is a three-estate system of the French Ancien Régime used until the French Revolution (1789–1799). This system was made up of clergy (the First Estate), nobility (the Second Estate), and commoners (the Third Estate).

parlements
Provincial appellate courts in the France of the Ancien Régime, i.e. before the French Revolution. They were not legislative bodies but rather the court of final appeal of the judicial system. They typically wielded much power over a wide range of subject matter, particularly taxation. Laws and edicts issued by the Crown were not official in their respective jurisdictions until assent was given by publishing them. The members were aristocrats who had bought or inherited their offices and were independent of the King.

Ancien Régime
The social and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties. The term is occasionally used to refer to the similar feudal social
and political order of the time elsewhere in Europe.

**taille**

A direct land tax on the French peasantry and non-nobles in Ancien Régime France. The tax was imposed on each household and was based on how much land it held.

**tithe**

A one-tenth part of something, paid as a contribution to a religious organization or compulsory tax to government. Today, the fee is voluntary and paid in cash, checks, or stocks, whereas historically it was required and paid in kind, such as with agricultural products.

---

### Estates of the Realm and Taxation

France under the *Ancien Régime* (before the French Revolution) divided society into three estates: the First Estate (clergy); the Second Estate (nobility); and the Third Estate (commoners). The king was not considered part of any estate. One critical difference between the estates of the realm was the burden of taxation. The nobles and the clergy were largely excluded from taxation (with the exception of a modest quit-rent, an *ad valorem* tax on land) while the commoners paid disproportionately high direct taxes. In practice, this meant mostly the peasants because many bourgeois obtained exemptions. The system was outrageously unjust in throwing a heavy tax burden on the poor and powerless.
Taxation Structure

The desire for more efficient tax collection was one of the major causes for French administrative and royal centralization. The taille, a direct land tax on the peasantry and non-nobles, became a major source of royal income. Exempted from the taille were clergy and nobles (except for non-noble lands they held in “pays d'état;” see below), officers of the crown, military personnel, magistrates, university professors and students, and certain cities (“villes franches”) such as Paris. Peasants and nobles alike were required to pay one-tenth of their income or produce to the church (the tithe). Although exempted from the taille, the church was required to pay the crown a tax called the “free gift,” which it collected from its office holders at roughly 1/20 the price of the office.

There were three kinds of provinces: the “pays d'élection,” the “pays d'état,” and the “pays d'imposition.” In the “pays d'élection” (the longest held possessions of the French crown) the assessment and collection of taxes were originally trusted to elected officials, but later these positions were bought. The tax was generally “personal,” which meant it was attached to non-noble individuals. In the “pays d'état” (provinces with provincial estates), tax assessment was established by local councils and the tax was generally “real,” which meant that it was attached to non-noble lands (nobles possessing such lands were required to pay taxes on them). “Pays d'imposition” were recently conquered lands that had their own local historical institutions, although taxation was overseen by the royal administrator.

In the decades leading to the French Revolution, peasants paid a land tax to the state (the taille) and a 5% property tax (the vingtième; see below). All paid a tax on the number of people in the family (capitation), depending on the status of the taxpayer (from poor
to prince). Further royal and seigneurial obligations might be paid in several ways: in labor, in kind, or rarely, in coin. Peasants were also obligated to their landlords for rent in cash, a payment related to their amount of annual production, and taxes on the use of the nobles' mills, wine-presses, and bakeries.

The tax system in pre-revolutionary France largely exempted the nobles and the clergy from taxes. The tax burden therefore devolved to the peasants, wage-earners, and the professional and business classes, also known as the Third Estate. Further, people from less-privileged walks of life were blocked from acquiring even petty positions of power in the regime, which caused further resentment.
Attempts at Reform

As the French state continuously struggled with the budget deficit, attempts to reform the skewed system took place under both Louis XIV and Louis XV. The greatest challenge to systemic change was an old bargain between the French crown and the nobility: the king could rule without much opposition from the nobility if only he refrained from taxing them. Consequently, attempts to impose taxes on the privileged — both the nobility and the clergy — were a great source of tension between the monarchy and the First and the Second Estates.

Already in 1648, when Louis XIV was still a minor and his mother Queen Anne acted as a regent and Cardinal Mazarin as her chief minister, the two attempted to tax members of the Parlement de Paris. The members not only refused to comply, but also ordered all of Mazarin’s earlier financial edicts burned. The later wars of Louis XIV, although successful politically and militarily, exhausted the state’s budget, which eventually led the King to accept reform proposals. Only towards the end of Louis’s reign did the French ministers supported by Madame De Maintenon (the King’s second wife) convince the King to change his fiscal policy. Louis was willing to tax the nobles but unwilling to fall under their control, and only under extreme stress of war was he able, for the first time in French history, to impose direct taxes on the aristocracy. Several additional tax systems were created, including the “capitation” (begun in 1695), which touched every person including nobles and the clergy (although exemption could be bought for a large one-time sum) and the “dixième” (1710–17, restarted in 1733), enacted to support the military, which was a true tax on income and property value. This was a step toward equality before the law and sound public finance,
but so many concessions and exemptions were won by nobles and bourgeois that the reform lost much of its value.

Louis XV continued the tax reform initiated by his predecessor. Following the advice of his mistress, Marquise de Pompadour, he supported the policy of fiscal justice designed by Machault d'Arnouville. In order to finance the budget deficit, in 1749 Machault d'Arnouville created a tax on the twentieth of all revenues that affected the privileged classes as well as commoners. Known as the “vingtième” (or “one-twentieth”), it was enacted to reduce the royal deficit. This tax continued throughout the Ancien Régime. It was based solely on revenues, requiring 5% of net earnings from land, property, commerce, industry, and official offices. It was meant to touch all citizens regardless of status. However, the clergy, the regions with “pays d’état,” and the parlements protested. Consequently, the clergy won exemption, the “pays d’état” won reduced rates, and the parlements halted new income statements, effectively making the “vingtième” a far less efficient tax than it was designed to be. The financial needs of the Seven Years’ War led to a second (1756–1780) and then a third (1760–1763) “vingtième” being created. With all the exemptions and reductions won by the privileged classes, however, the burden of the new tax once again fell on the poorest.

Historians consider the unjust taxation system continued under Louis XVI to be one of the causes of the French Revolution.

Attributions

• Taxes and the Three Estates
46. Territorial Losses

22.1.7: Territorial Losses

Louis XV’s controversial decision following the War of the Austrian Succession and his loss in the Seven Years’ War weakened the international position of France and lost most of its colonial holdings.

Learning Objective

Describe the land lost under Louis XV

Key Points

- Louis XV inherited a country with a reputation of a military, political, colonial, and cultural power. By the end of his reign, however, the international opinion of France changed dramatically, largely because of Louis’s controversial foreign policy.
- Louis XV entered the War of the Austrian Succession in 1741 on the side of Prussia in hopes of pursuing its own anti-Austrian foreign policy goals. In Germany, the French were forced back to the Rhine.
and their Bavarian allies were decisively defeated. In the Netherlands, France experienced much military success. By 1748, France occupied the entire Austrian Netherlands (modern-day Belgium) as well as some parts of the northern Netherlands, then the wealthiest area of Europe.

- Despite his victory, Louis XV, who wanted to appear as an arbiter and not as a conqueror, agreed to restore all his conquests back to the defeated enemies with chivalry at the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748. The attitude was internationally hailed, but at home the king became unpopular.

- In what is known as diplomatic revolution, the king overruled his ministers and signed the Treaty of Versailles with Austria in 1756. The new Franco-Austrian alliance would last intermittently for the next thirty-five years. In 1756, Frederick the Great invaded Saxony without a declaration of war, initiating the Seven Years’ War, and Britain declared war on France.

- The French military successes of the War of the Austrian Succession were not repeated in the Seven Years’ War, except for a few temporary victories.

- The Treaty of Paris forced France to cede Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tobago to Britain. France also ceded the eastern half of French Louisiana to Britain. In addition, while France regained its trading posts in India, it recognized British clients as the rulers of key Indian native states and pledged not to send troops to Bengal.
Key Terms

French and Indian War
A 1754–1763 conflict that comprised the North American theater of the worldwide Seven Years’ War of 1756–1763. The war pitted the colonies of British America against those of New France, with both sides supported by military units from their parent countries of Great Britain and France as well as by American Indian allies.

Treaty of Paris of 1763
A 1763 treaty signed by the kingdoms of Great Britain, France, and Spain with Portugal in agreement, after Great Britain’s victory over France and Spain during the Seven Years’ War. The signing of the treaty formally ended the Seven Years’ War and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe. Great Britain and France each returned much of the territory they had captured during the war, but Great Britain gained much of France’s possession in North America. Additionally, Great Britain agreed to protect Roman Catholicism in the New World. The treaty did not involve Prussia and Austria as they signed a separate agreement, the Treaty of Hubertusburg.

War of the Austrian Succession
A war (1740–1748) that involved most of the powers of Europe over the question of Maria Theresa’s succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The war included King George’s War in North America, the War of Jenkins’ Ear, the First Carnatic War in India, the
Jacobite rising of 1745 in Scotland, and the First and Second Silesian Wars. It began under the pretext that Maria Theresa was ineligible to succeed to the Habsburg thrones of her father, Charles VI.

**Seven Years’ War**

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

**Treaty of Aix-la-Chape**

A 1748 treaty, sometimes called the Treaty of Aachen, that ended the War of the Austrian Succession following a congress assembled at the Free Imperial City of Aachen. The treaty was signed by Great Britain, France, and the Dutch Republic. Two implementation treaties were signed at Nice in 1748 and 1749 by Austria, Spain, Sardinia, Modena, and Genoa.

**diplomatic revolution**

The reversal of longstanding alliances in Europe between the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years’ War. Austria went from an ally of Britain to an ally of France. Prussia became an ally of Britain. It was part of efforts to preserve or upset the European balance of power.
Background

The reign of Louis XIV left the French state financially troubled but politically triumphant. Louis’s political and military victories as well as numerous cultural achievements helped raise France to a preeminent position in Europe. Europe came to admire France for its military and cultural successes, power, and sophistication. Europeans generally began to emulate French manners, values, and goods, and French became the universal language of the European elite. Louis XIV’s successor and great-grandson, Louis XV, inherited a country with a reputation of a military, political, colonial, and cultural power. By the end of his reign, however, the international opinion of France changed dramatically, largely because of Louis’s controversial foreign policy.

The War of the Austrian Succession

In 1740, the death of Emperor Charles VI and his succession by his daughter Maria Theresa started the War of the Austrian Succession. Sensing the vulnerability of Maria Theresa’s position, King Frederick the Great of Prussia invaded the Austrian province of Silesia in hopes of annexing it permanently. The elderly Cardinal Fleury had little energy left to oppose the war, which was strongly supported by the anti-Austrian party at court. Renewing the cycle of conflicts typical of Louis XIV’s reign, the king entered the war in 1741 on the side of Prussia in hopes of pursuing its own anti-Austrian foreign policy goals. The war would last seven years and Fleury did not live to see its end. After Fleury’s death in 1743, the king followed his predecessor’s example of ruling without a first minister. In Germany, the French were forced back to the Rhine and their Bavarian allies were decisively defeated. At one point Austria even
considered launching an offensive against Alsace, before being compelled to retreat due to a Prussian offensive. In north Italy, the war stalled and did not produce significant results.

These fronts were of lesser importance than the front in the Netherlands. Here, France experienced much military success despite the king's loss of his trusted advisor. Against an army composed of British, Dutch, and Austrian forces, the French were able to savor a series of major victories at the Battles of Fontenoy (1745), Rocoux (1746), and Lauffeld (1747). In 1746, French forces besieged and occupied Brussels, which Louis entered in triumph. By 1748, France occupied the entire Austrian Netherlands (modern-day Belgium) as well as some parts of the northern Netherlands, then the wealthiest area of Europe.

Despite his victories, Louis XV, who wanted to appear as an arbiter and not as a conqueror, agreed to restore all his conquests back to the defeated enemies with chivalry at the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, arguing that he was “king of France, not a shopkeeper.” He thought it better to cultivate the existing borders of France rather than trying to expand them. The attitude was internationally hailed and he became known as the “arbiter of Europe.” At home, however, this decision, largely misunderstood by his generals and by the French people, made the king unpopular. The news that the king had restored the Southern Netherlands to Austria was met with disbelief and bitterness. Louis's popularity was also threatened by public exposure of his marital infidelities, which likely could have been kept concealed had France not entered the War of the Austrian Succession (when taking personal command of his armies, the king brought along one of his mistresses). The military successes of the War of the Austrian Succession inclined the French public to overlook Louis's adulteries, but after 1748, in the wake of the anger over the terms of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, pamphlets against the king's mistresses became increasingly widely published and read.
In the aftermath of the War of Austrian Succession in France, there was a general resentment at what was seen as a foolish throwing away of advantages (particularly in the Austrian Netherlands, which had largely been conquered by the brilliant strategy of Marshal Saxe), and the phrases Bête comme la paix (“Stupid as the peace”) and La guerre pour le roi de Prusse (“The war for the king of Prussia”) became popular in Paris.

Seven Years’ War

By 1755, a new European conflict was brewing. The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle turned out to be only a short-lived truce in the conflict between Austria and Prussia over the province of Silesia, while France and Britain were in conflict over colonial possessions. Indeed, the French and British were fighting without a declaration of war in the French and Indian War of 1754-1763. In 1755, the British seized 300 French merchant ships in violation of international law. A few months later, Great Britain and Prussia, enemies in the War of the Austrian Succession, signed a 1756 treaty of “neutrality.”
Frederick the Great had abandoned his French ally during the War of Austrian Succession by signing a separate peace treaty with Austria in 1745. At the same time, French officials realized that the Habsburg Empire of Maria Theresa of Austria was no longer the formidable challenge it had been when they controlled Spain and much of the rest of Europe. The new dangerous power looming on the horizon was Prussia. In what is known as diplomatic revolution, the king overruled his ministers and signed the Treaty of Versailles with Austria in 1756, putting an end to more than 200 years of conflict with the Habsburgs. The new Franco-Austrian alliance would last intermittently for the next thirty-five years. In 1756, Frederick the Great invaded Saxony without a declaration of war, initiating the Seven Years' War, and Britain declared war on France.

The French military successes of the War of the Austrian Succession were not repeated in the Seven Years' War, except for a few temporary victories. A French invasion of Hanover in 1757 resulted in a counter-attack that saw them driven out of the electorate. Plans for an invasion of Britain in 1759 were never carried out due to catastrophic naval defeats. French forces suffered disaster after disaster against the British in North America, the Caribbean, India, and Africa.
In the aftermath of the lost Seven Years' War, France lost most of its colonial holdings in North America and some, although not all, of its colonies in the Caribbean.

**Treaty of Paris**

During the war, Great Britain conquered the French colonies of Canada, Guadeloupe, Saint Lucia, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tobago, the French trading posts in India, the slave-trading station at Gorée, the Sénégal River and its settlements, and the Spanish colonies of Manila in the Philippines and Havana in Cuba. France captured Minorca and British trading
posts in Sumatra while Spain captured the border fortress of Almeida in Portugal and Colonia del Sacramento in South America.

In the Treaty of Paris of 1763, which ended the Seven Years’ War, most of these territories were restored to their original owners, although Britain made considerable gains. France and Spain restored all their conquests to Britain and Portugal. Britain restored Manila and Havana to Spain, and Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Lucia, Gorée, and the Indian trading posts to France. In return, France ceded Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Tobago to Britain. France also ceded the eastern half of French Louisiana to Britain. In addition, while France regained its trading posts in India, it recognized British clients as the rulers of key Indian native states and pledged not to send troops to Bengal. The Treaty is sometimes noted as the point at which France gave Louisiana to Spain. The transfer, however, occurred with the Treaty of Fontainebleau (1762) but was not publicly announced until 1764. The Treaty of Paris was to give Britain the east side of the Mississippi. New Orleans on the east side remained in French hands (albeit temporarily). The Mississippi River corridor in what is modern day Louisiana was to be reunited following the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the Adams-Onís Treaty in 1819.

**Territorial Gains**

Although Louis XV failed to expand the French frontier, the large acquisition of Lorraine through diplomacy in 1766 contributed to his legacy. Furthermore, after a short period of Corsican sovereignty, France conquered the island but it was not incorporated into the French state until 1789.
Attributions

- Territorial Losses
47. The American Revolution

22.1.8: The American Revolution

France supported the rebellious colonies (eventually the United States) during the American Revolution because it perceived the revolt as the embodiment of Enlightenment ideals and as an opportunity to curb British ambitions.

**Learning Objective**

Connect the American Revolution and French politics

**Key Points**

- The origins of the French involvement in the American Revolution go back to the British victory in the French and Indian War. France's loss in that war weakened its international position at the time when Britain was becoming the most powerful European empire. The outbreak of the American Revolution was thus seen in France as an opportunity to curb British ambitions.
- From the spring of 1776, France (together with
Spain) was informally involved in the American Revolutionary War by providing supplies, ammunition, and guns. The 1777 capture of a British army at Saratoga encouraged the French to formally enter the war in support of Congress.

- Benjamin Franklin negotiated a permanent military alliance in early 1778 and thus France became the first country to officially recognize the Declaration of Independence. In 1778, the Treaty of Amity and Commerce and the Treaty of Alliance were signed between the United States and France.

- France supported the United States in North America but as the enemy of Britain, it was also involved in the Caribbean and Indian theaters of the American Revolution.

- France's material gains in the aftermath of the American Revolution were minimal, but its financial losses huge. The treaty with France was mostly about exchanges of captured territory (France's only net gains were the islands of Tobago and Senegal in Africa). Historians link the disastrous post-war financial state of the French state to the subsequent French Revolution.

- The American Revolution also serves as an example of the transatlantic flow of ideas. At its ideological roots were the ideals of the Enlightenment, many of which emerged in France and were developed by French philosophers. Conversely, the American Revolution became the first in a series of upheavals in the Atlantic that embodied the ideals of the Enlightenment and thus inspired others to follow the revolutionary spirit, including the French during their
1789 Revolution.

Key Terms

**Enlightenment**
An intellectual movement which dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. It included a range of ideas centered on reason as the primary source of authority and legitimacy, and came to advance ideals such as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state.

**French and Indian War**
A 1754-1763 conflict that comprised the North American theater of the worldwide Seven Years’ War of 1756-1763. The war pitted the colonies of British America against those of New France, with both sides supported by military units from their parent countries of Great Britain and France as well as by American Indian allies.

**Treaty of Paris of 1763**
A 1763 treaty signed by the kingdoms of Great Britain, France and Spain with Portugal in agreement, after Great Britain’s victory over France and Spain during the Seven Years’ War. The signing of the treaty formally ended the Seven Years’ War and marked the beginning of an era of British dominance outside Europe. Great
Britain and France each returned much of the territory that they had captured during the war, but Great Britain gained much of France's possession in North America. Additionally, Great Britain agreed to protect Roman Catholicism in the New World. The treaty did not involve Prussia and Austria as they signed a separate agreement, the Treaty of Hubertusburg.

**Second Anglo-Mysore War**

A 1780-1784 conflict between the Kingdom of Mysore and the British East India Company. At the time, Mysore was a key French ally in India, and the Franco-British war sparked Anglo-Mysorean hostilities in India. The great majority of soldiers on the company side were raised, trained, paid, and commanded by the company, not the British government.

**New France**

The area colonized by France in North America during a period beginning with the exploration of the Saint Lawrence River by Jacques Cartier in 1534 and ending with the cession to Spain and Great Britain in 1763. At its peak in 1712, the territory extended from Newfoundland to the Rocky Mountains and from Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, including all the Great Lakes of North America.

---

France and the American Revolution: Background

The origins of the French involvement in the American Revolution
go back to the British victory in the French and Indian War (1754–1763; the American theater in the Seven Years' War). The war pitted the colonies of British America against those of New France, with both sides supported by military units from their parent countries as well as by American Indians. As a result of the war, France ceded most of the territories of New France, except the islands of Saint Pierre and Miquelon, to Great Britain and Spain at the Treaty of Paris of 1763. Britain received Canada, Acadia, and the parts of French Louisiana which lay east of the Mississippi River – except for New Orleans, which was granted to Spain, along with the territory to the west – the larger portion of Louisiana. Consequently, France lost its position as a major player in North American affairs.

France's loss in the war weakened its international position at the time when Britain began turning into the most powerful European empire. The outbreak of the American Revolution was thus seen in France as an opportunity to curb British ambitions. Furthermore, both the French general population and the elites supported the revolutionary spirit that many perceived as the incarnation of the Enlightenment ideals against the “English tyranny.” In political terms, the Revolution was seen in France as an opportunity to strip Britain of its North American possessions in retaliation for France’s loss a decade before.

French Involvement

From the spring of 1776, France and Spain were informally involved in the American Revolutionary War, with French admiral Latouche Tréville leading the process of providing supplies, ammunition, and guns from France. In 1777, the British sent an invasion force from Canada to seal off New England as part of a grand strategy to end the war. The British army in New York City went to Philadelphia, capturing it from Washington. The invasion army under John
Burgoyne waited in vain for reinforcements from New York and became trapped in northern New York state. It surrendered after the Battle of Saratoga in October 1777.

A British army was captured at the Battle of Saratoga in late 1777 and in its aftermath, the French openly entered the war as allies of the United States. Estimates place the percentage of French-supplied arms to the Americans in the Saratoga campaign at up to 90%.

The capture of a British army at Saratoga encouraged the French to formally enter the war in support of Congress. Benjamin Franklin negotiated a permanent military alliance in early 1778, making France the first country to officially recognize the Declaration of Independence. In 1778, the Treaty of Amity and Commerce and the Treaty of Alliance were signed between the United States and France. William Pitt, former British prime minister and Britain’s political leader during the Seven Years’ War, spoke out in parliament urging Britain to make peace in America and unite with America against France, while other British politicians who previously sympathized with colonial grievances now turned against the Americans for allying with Britain’s international rival and enemy. Later, Spain (in 1779) and the Dutch (1780) became allies of the
French, leaving the British Empire to fight a global war without major international support.

The American theater became only one front in Britain’s war. The British were forced to withdraw troops from continental America to reinforce the valuable sugar-producing Caribbean colonies, which were considered more important. British commander Sir Henry Clinton evacuated Philadelphia to reinforce New York City because of the alliance with France and the deteriorating military situation. General Washington attempted to intercept the retreating column, resulting in the Battle of Monmouth Court House, the last major battle fought in the north. After an inconclusive engagement, the British successfully retreated to New York City. The northern war subsequently became a stalemate, as the focus of attention shifted to the smaller southern theater.

The northern, southern, and naval theaters of the war converged in 1781 at Yorktown, Virginia. The British army under Cornwallis marched to Yorktown, where they expected to be rescued by a British fleet. The fleet was there but so was a larger French fleet. The British returned to New York for reinforcements after the Battle of the Chesapeake, leaving Cornwallis trapped. In October 1781, the British surrendered their second invading army of the war under a siege by the combined French and Continental armies under Washington.
In 1781, British forces moved through Virginia and settled at Yorktown, but their escape was blocked by a French naval victory in September. A combined Franco-American army launched a siege at Yorktown and captured more than 8,000 British troops in October. The defeat at Yorktown finally turned the British Parliament against the war and in early 1782 they voted to end offensive operations in North America.

France was also involved in the Caribbean and Indian theaters of the American Revolutionary War. Although France lost St. Lucia early in the war, its navy dominated the Caribbean, capturing Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent, Montserrat, Tobago, St. Kitts, and Turks and Caicos between 1778 and 1782. Dutch possessions in the Caribbean and South America were captured by Britain but later recaptured by France and restored to the Dutch Republic. When word reached India in 1778 that France had entered the war, the British East India Company moved quickly to capture French trading outposts there. The capture of the French-controlled port of Mahé on India's west coast motivated Mysore's ruler, Hyder Ali, to start the Second Anglo-Mysore War in 1780. The French support was weak, however, and the status quo ante bellum (“the state existing before the war”) 1784 Treaty of Mangalore ended the war. France's trading posts in India were returned after the war.

**Aftermath of the American Revolution for France**

France's material gains in the aftermath of the American Revolution were minimal but its financial losses huge. The treaty with France was mostly about exchanges of captured territory (France's only net gains were the islands of Tobago and Senegal in Africa), but it also reinforced earlier treaties, guaranteeing fishing rights off
Newfoundland. France, already in financial trouble, was economically exhausted by borrowing to pay for the war and using up all its credit. Its participation in the war created the financial disasters that marked the 1780s. Historians link those disasters to the coming of the French Revolution. Ironically, while the peace in 1783 left France on the verge of an economic crisis, the British economy boomed thanks to the return of American business.

The American Revolution also serves as an example of the transatlantic flow of ideas. At its ideological roots were the ideals of the Enlightenment, many of which emerged in France and were developed by French philosophers. Conversely, the American Revolution became the first in a series of upheavals in the Atlantic that embodied the ideals of the Enlightenment and thus inspired others to follow the revolutionary spirit, including the French during their 1789 Revolution. The American Revolution was a powerful example of overthrowing an old regime for many Europeans who were active during the era of the French Revolution, and the American Declaration of Independence influenced the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen of 1789.

Attributions

- The American Revolution
3.0.

Louis XVI, although highly educated and intellectually gifted, was seen by his contemporaries and is largely remembered as an individual of unimaginative and indecisive personality.

**Learning Objective**

Recall Louis XVI’s childhood and describe his character

**Key Points**

- Louis XVI (1754 – 1793), born Louis-Auguste, was King of France from 1774 until his deposition in 1792, although his formal title after 1791 was King of the French. During his childhood, Louis-Auguste was neglected by his parents who favored his older brother, Louis, duc de Bourgogne. Considered
brighter and more handsome than his little brother, Louis, duc de Bourgogne died at the age of nine in 1761.

- A strong and healthy but very shy Louis-Auguste was an intellectually curious and gifted student. Upon the death of his father, he became the new Dauphin. The strict and conservative education he received from the Duc de La Vauguyon, however, did not prepare him for the throne that he was to inherit in 1774.

- In 1770, at age 15, Louis-Auguste married 14-year-old Habsburg Archduchess Maria Antonia, the youngest daughter of the Holy Roman Emperor Francis I and his wife Empress Maria Theresa of the Habsburg dynasty. The French public was hostile towards the marriage that confirmed the Franco-Austrian alliance.

- Over time the couple became closer, although their marriage was not consummated until 1777. The created a strain upon their marriage and the failure to produce children alerted the French public.

- When Louis XVI succeeded to the throne in 1774, he had an enormous responsibility as the government was deeply in debt and resentment of “despotic” monarchy was on the rise. While none doubted Louis’s intellectual ability to rule France, it was quite clear that, although raised as the Dauphin since 1765, he lacked firmness and decisiveness.

- Historians note the king had a rather dull personality. In addition to the extreme lack of decisiveness demonstrated by his decisions regarding both domestic and foreign policies, he has been
described as quiet and shy but also conventional and unimaginative.

**Key Terms**

**parlements**
Provincial appellate courts in the France of the Ancien Régime, i.e. before the French Revolution. They were not legislative bodies but rather the court of final appeal of the judicial system. They typically wielded much power over a wide range of subject matter, particularly taxation. Laws and edicts issued by the Crown were not official in their respective jurisdictions until assent was given by publication. The members were aristocrats who had bought or inherited their offices and were independent of the King.

**Seven Years’ War**
A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

**Dauphin**
The title given to the heir apparent to the throne of
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Louis XVI: Childhood

Louis XVI (1754 – 1793), born Louis-Auguste, was King of France from 1774 until his deposition in 1792, although his formal title after 1791 was King of the French. Out of seven children, he was the second son of Louis, the Dauphin of France, and thus the grandson of Louis XV and Maria Leszczyńska. His mother was Marie-Josèphe of Saxony, the daughter of Frederick Augustus II of Saxony, Prince-Elector of Saxony and King of Poland. During his childhood, Louis-Auguste was neglected by his parents who favored his older brother, Louis, duc de Bourgogne. Considered brighter and more handsome than his little brother, the eldest son died at the age of nine in 1761.

A strong and healthy but very shy Louis-Auguste excelled at Latin, history, geography, and astronomy, and became fluent in Italian and English. Upon the death of his father, who died of tuberculosis in 1765, the eleven-year-old Louis-Auguste became the new Dauphin. His mother never recovered from the loss of her husband and died in 1767, also from tuberculosis. The strict and conservative education he received from the Duc de La Vauguyon, “gouverneur des Enfants de France” (governor of the Children of France), from 1760 until his marriage in 1770, did not prepare him for the throne that he was to inherit in 1774 after the death of his grandfather, Louis XV.
Marriage

In 1770 at age 15, Louis-Auguste married 14-year-old Habsburg Archduchess Maria Antonia (better known by the French form of her name, Marie Antoinette), the youngest daughter of the Holy Roman Emperor Francis I and his wife, Empress Maria Theresa of the Habsburg dynasty. The French public was hostile towards the marriage. France's alliance with Austria pulled the country into the disastrous Seven Years' War, in which it was defeated by the British both in Europe and in North America. By the time Louis-Auguste and Marie Antoinette were married, the French people were generally critical of the Franco-Austrian alliance and Marie-Antoinette was seen as an unwelcome foreigner.

For the young couple, the marriage was initially amiable but distant. Over time, the couple became closer, although their marriage was not consummated until 1777. The royal couple thus failed to produce children for several years after their wedding, which created a strain upon their marriage. The contemporary French public fervently debated why the royal couple failed to produce an heir for so long, and historians have tried to identify the cause of why they failed to consummate their marriage for years. Eventually, in spite of their earlier difficulties, the royal couple became the parents of four children.
Louis XVI at the age of 20, by Joseph Duplessis, ca. 1775. Louis’s indecisiveness and conservatism led some to view him as a symbol of the perceived tyranny of the Ancien Régime and his popularity deteriorated progressively, despite the king’s many decisions triggered by his desire to be loved by the public.

Louis XVI’s Personality

When Louis XVI succeeded to the throne in 1774, he was 19 years old. He had an enormous responsibility as the government was deeply in debt and resentment of “despotic” monarchy was on the rise. He felt woefully unqualified to resolve the situation. As king, Louis focused primarily on religious freedom and foreign policy. While
none doubted Louis's intellectual ability to rule France, it was quite clear that although raised as the Dauphin since 1765, he lacked firmness and decisiveness. His desire to be loved by his people is evident in the prefaces of many of his edicts, which often explained that his actions were intended to benefit the population. He aimed to earn the love of his people by reinstating the parlements. When questioned about his decision, he said, “It may be considered politically unwise, but it seems to me to be the general wish and I want to be loved.” Louis XVI believed that to be a good king, he had to, in his own words, “always consult public opinion; it is never wrong.”

Historians note the king had a rather dull personality. In addition to the extreme lack of decisiveness demonstrated by king's decisions regarding both domestic and foreign policies, he has been described as quiet and shy but also conventional and unimaginative. His interest in locksmithing and carpentry as well as commitment to deepening his education (he had an impressive library) were seen as hobbies that he was more passionate about than about ruling France. Even the long period when the royal couple did not produce children was interpreted in light of Louis's unimpressive personality. Contemporary pamphlets mocked the king's perceived infertility and inability to satisfy his wife, who in turn was accused of extramarital affairs.

Attributions

- Louis XVI
• “Seven Years’ War.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_Years%27_War. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
49. Marriage to Marie-Antoinette

22.2.2: Marriage to Marie-Antoinette

Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette’s marriage confirmed and strengthened the Franco-Austrian alliance, which had many opponents among French elites and commoners.

**Learning Objective**

Explain the political reasons for the marriage of Marie-Antoinette and Louis XVI

**Key Points**

- Maria Antonia (1755 – 1793), commonly known as Marie Antoinette, was born in Vienna as the youngest daughter of Empress Maria Theresa, ruler of the Habsburg Empire, and her husband Francis I, Holy Roman Emperor. Her family connections made her the primary candidate for the wife of the Dauphin of France at the time of the Franco-Austrian alliance.
Following the Seven Years' War and the Diplomatic Revolution of 1756, Maria Theresa and Louis XV's common desire to destroy the ambitions of Prussia and Great Britain and help secure a definitive peace between them led them to seal their alliance with a marriage: in 1770, Louis XV formally asked the hand of Maria Antonia for his eldest surviving grandson, future Louis XVI.

The French public was hostile towards the marriage. France's alliance with Austria had pulled the country into the disastrous Seven Years' War, in which it was defeated by the British, both in Europe and in North America. By the time that Louis and Marie Antoinette were married, the French were generally critical of the Austrian alliance, and many saw Marie Antoinette as an unwelcome foreigner.

At the outset of the reign of Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette had limited political influence with her husband although she played an important role in introducing French meditation in the process of ending the War of Bavarian Succession.

Later, the queen's political impact rose significantly. She played a key role in supporting the American Revolution and influenced nominations for critical state positions.

Maria Theresa died in 1780 and Marie Antoinette feared that the death of her mother would jeopardize the Franco-Austrian alliance (as well as, ultimately, herself), but her brother, Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor, assured her that he had no intention of breaking the alliance.
**Seven Years’ War**

A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

**Diplomatic Revolution of 1756**

The reversal of longstanding alliances in Europe between the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years’ War. Austria went from an ally of Britain to an ally of France. Prussia became an ally of Britain. It was part of efforts to preserve or upset the European balance of power.

**War of the Bavarian Succession**

A 1778 – 1779 conflict between a Saxon-Prussian alliance and Austria to prevent the Habsburgs from acquiring the Electorate of Bavaria. Although the war consisted of only a few minor skirmishes, thousands of soldiers died from disease and starvation, earning the conflict the name Kartoffelkrieg (Potato War) in Prussia and Saxony.

**Dauphin**

The title given to the heir apparent to the throne of France from 1350 to 1791 and 1824 to 1830.
Maria Antonia: Childhood

Maria Antonia (1755 – 1793), commonly known as Marie Antoinette, was born in Vienna as the youngest daughter of Empress Maria Theresa, ruler of the Habsburg Empire, and her husband Francis I, Holy Roman Emperor. Shortly after her birth, she was placed under the care of the Governess of the Imperial children, Countess von Brandeis. Despite the private tutoring she received, results of her schooling were less than satisfactory. At the age of ten, she could not write correctly in German or in any language commonly used at court, such as French and Italian. Conversations with her were stilted although she became a good musician. She played the harp, the harpsichord, and the flute, had a beautiful singing voice, and excelled at dancing.

Political Marriage

Following the Seven Years' War and the Diplomatic Revolution of 1756, Empress Maria Theresa decided to end hostilities with her longtime enemy, King Louis XV of France. Their common desire to destroy the ambitions of Prussia and Great Britain and help secure a definitive peace between them led them to seal their alliance with a marriage: in 1770, Louis XV formally asked the hand of Maria Antonia for his eldest surviving grandson, future Louis XVI. Maria Antonia formally renounced all her rights to the Habsburg domains and was married to the Dauphin of France the same year. Upon her arrival in France, she adopted the French version of her name: Marie Antoinette.
The couple's failure to produce children for several years placed a strain upon their marriage, exacerbated by the publication of obscene pamphlets mocking their infertility. The reasons behind the couple's initial failure to have children were debated at that time and have been since. The marriage was reportedly consummated in 1773 but historians have concluded it did not take place until 1777. Eventually, in spite of their early difficulties, the royal couple became the parents of four children.

The French public was hostile towards the marriage. France's alliance with Austria pulled the country into the disastrous Seven Years' War, in which it was defeated by the British both in Europe and in North America. By the time that Louis and Marie Antoinette were married, the French were generally critical of the Austrian alliance and many saw Marie Antoinette as an unwelcome foreigner. Simultaneously, the Dauphine was beautiful, personable, and well-liked by the common people. Her first official appearance in Paris in 1773 was a resounding success.

In 1770, Madame du Barry, Louis XV's mistress with considerable political influence, was instrumental in ousting Étienne François, duc de Choiseul, who had helped orchestrate the Franco-Austrian alliance and Marie Antoinette's marriage, and exiling his sister the duchesse de Gramont, one of Marie Antoinette's ladies-in-waiting. Marie Antoinette was persuaded by her husband's aunts to refuse to even acknowledge du Barry, but some saw this as a political blunder that jeopardized Austria's interests at the French court. However, Marie Antoinette's mother and the Austrian ambassador to France who was sending the Empress secret reports on Marie-Antoinette's behavior, put Marie Antoinette under pressure and she grudgingly agreed to speak to Madame du Barry. Two days after the death of Louis XV in 1774, Louis XVI exiled Madame du Barry, pleasing his wife and aunts.
The queen spent heavily on fashion, luxuries, and gambling, although the country was facing a grave financial crisis. For her, Rose Bertin created dresses, hair styles such as poufs up to three feet high and the *panache* (bundle of feathers). She and her court also adopted the English fashion of dresses made of indienne (a material banned in France from 1686 until 1759), percale, and muslin. By the time of the Flour War of 1775, a series of riots against the high price of flour and bread, her reputation among the general public was damaged.
Political Influence

Upon the death of Louis XV in 1774, the Dauphin ascended the throne as King Louis XVI of France and Navarre, and Marie Antoinette became Queen of France and Navarre. At the outset, the new queen had limited political influence with her husband. Marie Antoinette's first child, Marie-Thérèse Charlotte, was born in 1778, but in the middle of the queen's pregnancy her brother made claims on the throne of Bavaria (the War of the Bavarian Succession). Marie Antoinette pleaded with her husband for the French to intercede on behalf of Austria. The Peace of Teschen (1779) ended the brief conflict, with the queen imposing French mediation on the demand of her mother and Austria's gaining a territory of at least 100,000 inhabitants, a strong retreat from the early French position of hostility toward Austria with the impression, partially justified, that the queen sided with Austria against France.

The queen played a very important role in supporting the American Revolution by securing Austrian and Russian support for France, which resulted in the establishment of a neutral league that stopped Great Britain's attack and by weighing in decisively for the nomination of Philippe Henri, marquis de Ségur, as Minister of War and Charles Eugène Gabriel de La Croix, marquis de Castries, Secretary of the Navy in 1780. The two helped George Washington in defeating the British in the American Revolutionary War, which ended in 1783.

In 1783, the queen also played a decisive role in the nomination of Charles Alexandre de Calonne as Controller-General of Finances, and of the baron de Breteuil as the Minister for the Maison du Roi (Minister of the Royal Household), making him perhaps the strongest and most conservative minister of the reign. As a result of these nominations, Marie Antoinette's influence became paramount in government, and the new ministers rejected any major change to the structure of the old regime. More than that, the decree by de Ségur requiring four quarterings of nobility as a condition for
the appointment of officers blocked the access of commoners to important positions in the armed forces.

Empress Maria Theresa died in 1780 and Marie Antoinette feared the death of her mother would jeopardize the Franco-Austrian alliance, but her brother, Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor, assured her that he had no intention of breaking the alliance. Joseph II visited his sister in 1781 to reaffirm the Franco-Austrian alliance, but his visit was tainted with rumors that Marie Antoinette was sending money from the French treasury to Austria. In the same year, Marie Antoinette gave birth to her second child, Louis Joseph Xavier François, Dauphin of France. Despite the general celebration over the birth of the Dauphin, Marie Antoinette’s political influence, such as it was, did greatly benefit Austria. This together with the queen’s extravagant and expensive lifestyle contributed to her growing unpopularity.

Attributions

- Marriage to Marie-Antoinette
  - “Seven Years’ War.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
Seven_Years%27_War. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

Despite the initial sympathy of the commoners, Marie Antoinette quickly lost the approval of the French as her lavish lifestyle and pro-Austrian stance combined with Louis XVI’s failed reforms turned both the elites and the masses hostile towards the royals.

Learning Objective

Characterize the relationship between the royals and the French people at the beginning of Louis XVI’s reign

Key Points

- Although nearly all royal marriages in Europe were traditionally arranged around the political interests of involved families, the marriage of Louis-Auguste and Maria Antonia provoked very strong and ambiguous reactions in France. It aimed to strengthen the union between France and Austria, but the French public
was highly critical of the political alliance.

- Despite the common skepticism towards the Franco-Austrian alliance, Marie Antoinette’s arrival in Paris provoked excitement. She was beautiful, personable, and well-liked by the common people. Her first official appearance in Paris in 1773 was a resounding success. However, the popularity of the queen did not last long.

- The queen’s extravagant lifestyle soon discouraged many, particularly in light of the country’s financial crisis and mass poverty. She spent heavily on fashion, luxuries, and gambling. By the time of the Flour War of 1775, a series of riots against the high price of flour and bread, her reputation among the general public was damaged.

- Similarly, the queen’s role in French politics contributed to the loss of initial popularity as Marie Antoinette was consistently accused of influencing her husband’s decisions to disproportionately benefit Austria.

- The wealth and lavish lifestyle that the royal couple provided for their favorites outraged most aristocratic families, who resented the influence of the selected few, and also fueled the increasing popular disapprobation toward Marie Antoinette, mostly in Paris.

- The queen’s lifestyle continued to fuel her increasingly negative public image. Her husband’s seeming approval of Marie Antoinette’s choices, combined with his failed reforms and declining mental health, only worsened the already hostile attitude of both the elites and masses.
Key Terms

Seven Years' War
A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

War of the Bavarian Succession
A 1778 – 1779 conflict between a Saxon-Prussian alliance and Austria to prevent the Habsburgs from acquiring the Electorate of Bavaria. Although the war consisted of only a few minor skirmishes, thousands of soldiers died from disease and starvation, earning the conflict the name Kartoffelkrieg (Potato War) in Prussia and Saxony.

Kettle War
A military confrontation between the troops of the Holy Roman Empire and the Republic of the Seven Netherlands on October 8, 1784. Its name relates to the fact that the only shot fired hit a soup kettle.

the Flour War
A wave of riots arising from April to May 1775 in France that followed an increase in grain prices and subsequently bread prices. The riots started after the police withheld grain from the royal stores but were
also triggered by poor harvests in the summers of 1773 and 1774.

**Dauphin**
The title given to the heir apparent to the throne of France from 1350 to 1791 and 1824 to 1830.

---

The French Public and the Political Marriage

Although nearly all royal marriages in Europe were traditionally arranged around the political interests of involved families, the marriage of fifteen-year-old Louis-Auguste and fourteen-year-old Maria Antonia (better known by the French form of her name Marie Antoinette) provoked very strong and ambiguous reactions in France. As a daughter of the Holy Roman Emperor Francis I and Empress Maria Theresa, the head of the Habsburg Empire, Maria Antonia belonged to one of the most powerful royal families in Europe. Her marriage to the heir to the French throne aimed to strengthen the ongoing if still rather recent union between two empires that were at the time seen as the weaker players in the European balance of power. Louis XV and Maria Theresa's common desire to destroy the ambitions of Prussia and Great Britain and help secure a definitive peace between the two old enemies were at the foundation of the marriage, but many among the French public were skeptical about the union. The alliance with Austria pulled France into the disastrous Seven Years'
War, in which it was defeated by the British both in Europe and in North America. By the time Louis-Auguste and Maria Antonia were married, the French people were generally critical of the Franco-Austrian alliance.

The Loss of Popularity

Despite the common skepticism towards the Franco-Austrian alliance, Marie Antoinette's arrival in Paris provoked excitement. She was beautiful, personable, and well-liked by the common people. Her first official appearance in Paris in 1773 was a resounding success. However, the popularity of the queen did not last long. Her extravagant lifestyle soon discouraged many, particularly in light of the country's financial crisis and poverty of the masses. She spent heavily on fashion, luxuries, and gambling, including custom dresses, hair styles such as poufs up to three feet high, and the panache (bundle of feathers), all made by Rose Bertin. She and her court also adopted the English fashion of dresses made of indienne (a material banned in France from 1686 until 1759), percale, and muslin. By the time of the Flour War of 1775, a series of riots against the high price of flour and bread, her reputation among the general public was damaged.

Similarly, the queen's role in French politics contributed to the loss of initial popularity as Marie Antoinette was consistently accused of influencing her husband's decisions to disproportionately benefit Austria. In 1778, her brother and the Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II made claims on the throne of Bavaria (the War of the Bavarian Succession). Marie Antoinette pleaded with her husband for the French to intercede on behalf of Austria. The Peace of Teschen (1779) ended the brief conflict, with the queen imposing French mediation on the demand of her mother, and Austria gaining a territory of at least 100,000 inhabitants — a strong retreat from
the early French position of hostility toward Austria with the impression, partially justified, that the queen sided with Austria against France.

Empress Maria Theresa died in 1780 and Marie Antoinette feared that the death of her mother would jeopardize the Franco-Austrian alliance, but her brother assured her that he had no intention of breaking the alliance. Joseph II visited his sister in 1781 to reaffirm the Franco-Austrian alliance, but his visit was tainted with rumors that Marie Antoinette was sending money from the French treasury to Austria. In the same year, Marie Antoinette gave birth to her second child, Louis Joseph Xavier François, Dauphin of France. Despite the general celebration over the birth of the Dauphin, Marie Antoinette's political influence continued to benefit Austria, which contributed to her growing unpopularity. During the Kettle War, in which her brother Joseph attempted to open the Scheldt River for naval passage, Marie Antoinette succeeded in obtaining a huge financial compensation to Austria. The queen was also able to get her brother's support against Great Britain in the American Revolution and neutralized French hostility to his alliance with Russia.
France's financial problems were the result of a combination of factors: expensive wars; a large royal family whose expenditures were paid for by the state; and the unwillingness of the privileged classes to help defray the costs of the government out of their own pockets by relinquishing some of their financial privileges. Yet the public perception was that Marie Antoinette had ruined the national finances. She was even given the nickname of “Madame Déficit.” While sole fault for the financial crisis did not lie with her, Marie Antoinette played a decisive role in the failure of radical reforms.

In 1782, after the governess of the royal children, the princesse de
Guéméné, went bankrupt and resigned, Marie Antoinette appointed her favorite, the duchesse de Polignac, to the position. The decision met with disapproval from the court as the duchess was considered to be of too modest birth to occupy such an exalted position. On the other hand, both the king and the queen trusted de Polignac completely and gave her a thirteen-room apartment in Versailles and a generous salary. The entire Polignac family benefited greatly from the royal favor in titles and positions, but its sudden wealth and lavish lifestyle outraged most aristocratic families (who resented the Polignacs' dominance at court) and fueled the increasing popular disapprobation toward Marie Antoinette, mostly in Paris.

The queen's lifestyle continued to fuel her increasingly negative public image. Her husband's seeming approval of Marie Antoinette's choices, combined with his failed reforms and declining mental health, only worsened the already hostile attitude of both the elites and the masses. The aristocracy was angered by the king's failed attempts to impose taxes on them while the masses, already in poverty, continued to carry the unjust burden of taxation. In 1783, the queen began to create her “hamlet,” a rustic retreat built by her favored architect Richard Mique. Its creation caused another uproar when the cost became widely known. A year later, Louis XVI bought the Château de Saint-Cloud from the duc d'Orléans in the name of his wife. The decision was unpopular, particularly with some factions of the nobility who disliked the queen but also with a growing percentage of the population who disapproved the idea of the queen owning a private residence independent of the king. The purchase of Saint-Cloud damaged the queen's image even further. In the eyes of public opinion, the lavish spending of the royal family could not be disconnected from France's disastrous financial condition.
The portrait of Marie Antoinette and her three surviving children: Marie Thérèse, Louis Charles (on her lap), and Louis Joseph holding up the drape of an empty bassinet signifying the recent death of Marie’s fourth child, Louise Élisabeth Vigée-Lebrun (1787).

The queen attempted to fight back her critics with propaganda portraying her as a caring mother, most notably in the painting by Élisabeth Vigée Le Brun exhibited at the Royal Académie Salon de Paris in August 1787.

Attributions

- The New Royals and Their People

- “Marie_Antoinette_and_her_Children_by_Élisabeth_Vigée-Lebrun.jpg.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marie_Antoinette#/media/File:Marie_Antoinette_and_her_Children_by_%C3%A9l%C3%A9abeth_Vig%C3%A9e-Lebrun.jpg. Wikipedia Public domain.
22.2.4: Efforts at Financial Reform

Facing severe financial crisis, Louis XVI appointed three ministers who tried progressive reforms but failed under the pressure of opposition from the privileged classes of the society.

Learning Objective

Compare the efforts made by French finance ministers under Louis XVI to revitalize the French treasury

Key Points

• While the later years of Louis XV’s reign saw serious economic setbacks, it was not until 1775 that the French economy began to enter a true crisis. With the government deeply in debt, Louis XVI was forced to permit radical reforms. He felt unqualified to resolve the situation and surrounded himself with experienced finance ministers.
• Anne Robert Jacques Turgot was appointed Controller-General of Finances in 1774. His radical reforms met with fierce opposition although they were praised by intellectuals. His attacks on privilege won him the hatred of the nobles and the parlements; his attempted reforms in the royal household, that of the court; his free trade legislation, that of the financiers; and his views on religious tolerance that of the clergy.
• Marie Antoinette disliked Turgot for opposing the granting of favors to her proteges, which played a key role in the end of his career.
• In 1777, Jacques Necker was made director-general of the finances. His greatest financial measures were the use of loans to help fund the French debt and increasing interest rather than taxes. In 1781, he gave the first-ever public record of royal finances, but the statistics were completely false. In light of the opposition to reforms, Louis forced Necker to resign. Although he was recalled twice, he failed to introduce effective reforms.
• In 1783, Louis replaced Necker with Charles Alexandre de Calonne, who increased public spending to buy the country way out of debt. Knowing the Parlement of Paris would veto a single land tax payable by all landowners, Calonne persuaded Louis XVI to call the Assembly of Notables to vote on his referendum.
• Calonne’s eventual reform package consisted of five major points: cut government spending; create a revival of free trade methods; authorize the sale of Church property; equalize salt and tobacco taxes; and
establish a universal land value tax. All the proposed measures failed because of the powerlessness of the crown to impose them. Under the pressure of the opposition, Louis XVI dismissed Calonne in 1787.

**Examples**

**Key Terms**

**Assembly of Notables**
A group of high-ranking nobles, ecclesiastics, and state functionaries convened by the King of France on extraordinary occasions to consult on matters of state.

**estates of the realm**
The broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christendom (Christian Europe) from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best-known system is the French Ancien Régime (Old Regime), a three-estate system used until the French Revolution (1789–1799). It was made up of clergy (the First Estate), nobility (the Second Estate), and commoners (the Third Estate).

**Seven Years’ War**
A world war fought between 1754 and 1763, the main
conflict occurring in the seven-year period from 1756 to 1763. It involved every European great power of the time except the Ottoman Empire, spanning five continents and affecting Europe, the Americas, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. The conflict split Europe into two coalitions, led by Great Britain on one side and France on the other.

parlements

Provincial appellate courts in the France of the Ancien Régime, i.e. before the French Revolution. They were not legislative bodies but rather the court of final appeal of the judicial system. They typically wielded much power over a wide range of subject matter, particularly taxation. Laws and edicts issued by the Crown were not official in their respective jurisdictions until they gave assent by publication. The members were aristocrats who had bought or inherited their offices and were independent of the King.

Flour War

A wave of riots arising from April to May 1775 in France that followed an increase in grain prices and subsequently bread prices. The riots started after the police withheld grain from the royal stores but were also triggered by poor harvests in the summers of 1773 and 1774.

Estates-General

A general assembly representing the French estates of the realm: the clergy (First Estate), the nobles (Second Estate), and the common people (Third Estate).
Financial Crisis under Louis XVI

When Louis XVI succeeded to the throne in 1774, he was 19 years old. At the time, the government was deeply in debt and resentment of monarchy was on the rise. While the later years of Louis XV's reign saw serious economic setbacks and the Seven Years' War (1756–1763) led to an increase in the royal debt and the loss of nearly all of France's North American possessions, it was not until 1775 that the French economy began enter a true state of crisis. An extended reduction in agricultural prices over the previous twelve years, with dramatic crashes in 1777 and 1786, and climatic events such as the disastrous winters of 1785-1789, contributed to the problem. With the government deeply in debt, Louis XVI was forced to permit radical reforms. He felt unqualified to resolve the situation and surrounded himself with experienced finance ministers.

Turgot: Radical Reform Approach

Anne Robert Jacques Turgot was appointed Controller-General of Finances in 1774. His first act was to submit to the king a statement of his guiding principles: “No bankruptcy, no increase of taxation, no borrowing.” Turgot's policy, in face of the desperate financial position, was to enforce the most rigid economy in all departments. All departmental expenses were to be submitted for the approval of the controller-general, while Turgot appealed personally to the king against the lavish giving of places and pensions. He also imposed certain conditions on leases as they were renewed or annulled, including those for the manufacture of gunpowder and the administration of the royal mails.

Turgot's measures succeeded in considerably reducing the deficit and raised the national credit to such an extent that in 1776, just
before his fall, he was able to negotiate a loan with Dutch bankers at 4% interest. Nonetheless, the deficit was still so large that it prevented him from substituting for indirect taxation a single tax on land. He suppressed, however, a number of octrois (a local tax collected on various articles brought into a district for consumption) and minor duties, and opposed on grounds of economy, the participation of France in the American Revolutionary War, although without success. Turgot also set to work to establish free trade in grain, but his edict (1774) met with strong opposition although it won the praise of intellectuals. Turgot was hated by those who were interested in speculations in grain, but his worst enemy was the poor harvest of 1774, which led to a rise in the price of bread in the winter and early spring of 1774–1775. The so-called Flour War of 1775, a series of riots against the high price of flour and bread, followed. Turgot showed great firmness in repressing the riots and the king loyally supported his decisions.
Turgot, originally considered a physiocrat, is today best remembered as an early advocate for economic liberalism.

All this time Turgot had been preparing his famous Six Edicts, which were finally presented in 1776. Two of them met with violent opposition: the edict suppressing forced unpaid labor and the edict suppressing certain rules by which the craft guilds maintained their privileges. In the preamble to the former, Turgot boldly announced the abolition of privilege and the subjection of all three estates to taxation (although the clergy were afterwards excepted). Soon nearly everybody was against Turgot. His attacks on privilege won him the hatred of the nobles and the parlements; his attempted reforms in the royal household, that of the court; his free trade legislation, that of the financiers; and his views on tolerance and his agitation for the suppression of the phrase that was offensive to Protestants in the king’s coronation oath, that of the clergy. The queen disliked him for opposing the grant of favors to her proteges, which played a key role in the end of his career. With all his enemies, Turgot’s fall was certain. In 1776, he was ordered to resign.

Necker: Loans and Debt

In 1777, Jacques Necker was made director-general of the finances since he could not be controller because of his Protestant faith. He gained popularity by regulating the finances through modest tax and loan reforms. His greatest financial measures were his use of loans to help fund the French debt and raising interest rates rather than taxes. He also advocated loans to finance French involvement in the American Revolution. From 1777 to 1781, Necker was essentially in control of all of France’s wealth. In 1781, he published a work (Compte rendu), in which he summarized governmental income and expenditures, giving the first-ever public record of royal finances.
It was meant to create a well-informed, interested populace. However, the statistics presented by Necker were completely false and misleading. He wanted to show France in a strong financial position when the reality was actually bleak. France was suffering financially and Necker was blamed for the high debt accrued from the American Revolution. While at court, Necker made many enemies because of his reforming policies. Marie Antoinette was his most formidable enemy and following his wife’s pressure, Louis would become a factor in Necker’s resignation. The king would not reform taxation to bring in more money to cover debts, nor would he allow Necker to be a special adviser because this was strongly opposed by the ministers.

Yet in 1788, the country had been struck by both economic and financial crises, and Necker was called back to the office to stop the deficit and save France from financial ruin. He was seen as the savior of France while the country stood on the brink of ruin, but his actions could not stop the French Revolution. He put a stop to the rebellion in the Dauphiné by legalizing its assembly and then set to work to arrange for the summons of the Estates-General of 1789. He advocated doubling the representation of the Third Estate to satisfy the people. But he failed to address the matter of voting – rather than voting by head count, which is what the people wanted, voting remained as one vote for each estate. Necker was dismissed on July 11, 1789, three days before the storming of the Bastille. The king recalled him on July 19 and Necker stayed in office until 1790, but his efforts to keep the financial situation afloat were ineffective. His popularity vanished and he resigned with a broken reputation.
When Necker was criticized by his enemies for the *Compte rendu*, he made public his “Financial Summary for the King,” which appeared to show that France had fought the war in America, paid no new taxes, and still had a massive credit of 10 million livres of revenue.

**Callone: Reform Package**

In 1783, Louis replaced Necker with Charles Alexandre de Calonne,
who increased public spending to buy the country's way out of debt. He took office when France was 110 million livres in debt, partly because of its involvement in the American Revolution, and had no means of paying it. At first he attempted to obtain credit and support the government through loans to maintain public confidence in its solvency. In 1785, he reissued the gold coinage and developed reductions to a basic price of goods or services. Knowing the Parlement of Paris would veto a single land tax payable by all landowners, Calonne persuaded Louis XVI to call the Assembly of Notables to vote on his referendum. Calonne's eventual reform package consisted of five major points: cut government spending; create a revival of free trade methods; authorize the sale of Church property; equalize salt and tobacco taxes; and establish a universal land value tax. While Turgot and Necker had attempted similar reforms, Calonne attributed their failure to the opposition of the parlements. Therefore, he called the Assembly of Notables in 1787, to which he presented his plan and the deficit in the treasury. Composed of the old regime's social and political elite, the Assembly balked at the deficit presented to them and despite Calonne's plan for reform and his backing from the king, they accused the controller-general of being responsible for the enormous financial strains. All the proposed measures failed because of the powerlessness of the crown to impose them. As a last resort, Calonne proposed to the king the suppression of internal customs duties and argued in favor of the taxation of the property of nobles and clergy. Under the pressure of the opposition, Louis XVI dismissed Calonne in 1787 and exiled him to Lorraine.
Louis XVI dismissed Calonne in 1787 and exiled him to Lorraine. The joy was general in Paris where Calonne, accused of wishing to raise taxes, was known as Monsieur Déficit. Calonne soon afterwards left for Great Britain, and during his residence there kept up a polemical correspondence with Necker. After his dismissal, Calonne stated, “The King, who assured me a hundred times that he would support me with unshakable firmness, abandoned me, and I succumbed.”

Attributions
• “Seven Years' War.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_Years%27_War. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
• “800px-Charles-Alexandre_de_Calonne_-_Vigée-Lebrun_1784.jpg.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Alexandre_de_Calonne#/media/File:Charles-
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Alexandre_de_Calonne_-_Vig%C3%A9-Lebrun_1784.jpg. Wikipedia Public domain.

“Necker_Jacques_-_Duplessis.jpg.”
52. The Beginning of Revolution

22.3: The Beginning of Revolution

22.3.1: Calling the Estates-General

The Estates-General of 1789 was a general assembly representing the French estates of the realm summoned by Louis XVI to propose solutions to France's financial problems. It ended when the Third Estate formed into a National Assembly, signaling the outbreak of the French Revolution.

Learning Objective

Analyze the reasons why Louis XVI called the Estates-General.

Key Points

- The Estates-General of 1789 was the first meeting
since 1614 of the French Estates-General, a general assembly representing the French estates of the realm. Summoned by King Louis XVI to propose solutions to his government's financial problems, the Estates-General convened for several weeks in May and June 1789.

- In 1787, pressured by France's desperate financial situation, the King convened an Assembly of Notables. France's finance minister, Charles Alexandre de Calonne, hoped that if the Assembly supported proposed finance reforms, parlements would be forced to register them. The plan failed but the Assembly insisted that the proposed reforms should be presented to the Estates-General.

- Louis XVI convoked the Estates-General for May 1789. The King agreed to retain many of the divisive customs which had been the norm in 1614 but were intolerable to the Third Estate. The most controversial and significant decision remained the nature of voting.

- On May 5, 1789, the Estates-General convened. The following day, the Third Estate discovered that the royal decree granting double representation also upheld traditional voting by orders. By trying to avoid the issue of representation and focus solely on taxes, the King and his ministers gravely misjudged the situation.

- On June 17, with the failure of efforts to reconcile the three estates, the Third Estate declared themselves redefined as the National Assembly, an assembly not of the estates but of the people. They invited the other orders to join them, but made it
clear that they intended to conduct the nation’s affairs with or without them.

- The King tried to resist but after failed attempts to sabotage the Assembly and keep the three estates separate, the Estates-General ceased to exist, becoming the National Assembly.

**Key Terms**

**Tennis Court Oath**

An oath taken on June 20, 1789, by the members of the French Estates-General for the Third Estate who had begun to call themselves the National Assembly, vowing “not to separate, and to reassemble wherever circumstances require, until the constitution of the kingdom is established.” It was a pivotal event in the early days of the French Revolution.

**parlements**

Provincial appellate courts in the France of the Ancien Régime, i.e. before the French Revolution. They were not legislative bodies but rather the court of final appeal of the judicial system. They typically wielded much power over a wide range of subject matter, particularly taxation. Laws and edicts issued by the Crown were not official in their respective jurisdictions until assent was given by publication. The members were aristocrats who had bought or inherited
their offices and were independent of the King.

**Estates of the Realm**

The broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christendom (Christian Europe) from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best-known system is the French Ancien Régime (Old Regime), a three-estate system used until the French Revolution (1789–1799). It was made up of clergy (the First Estate), nobility (the Second Estate), and commoners (the Third Estate).

**Estates-General**

A general assembly representing the French estates of the realm: the clergy (First Estate), the nobles (Second Estate), and the common people (Third Estate).

**Assembly of Notables**

A group of high-ranking nobles, ecclesiastics, and state functionaries convened by the King of France on extraordinary occasions to consult on matters of state.

The Estates-General (or States-General) of 1789 was the first meeting since 1614 of the general assembly representing the French estates of the realm: the clergy (First Estate), the nobles (Second Estate), and the common people (Third Estate). Summoned by King Louis XVI to propose solutions to his government’s financial problems, the Estates-General sat for several weeks in May and June 1789.
Assembly of Notables of 1787

An Assembly of Notables was a group of high-ranking nobles, ecclesiastics, and state functionaries convened by the King of France on extraordinary occasions to consult on matters of state. Throughout the history of modern France, such an assembly was convened only several times, serving a consultative purpose. Unlike the States-General, whose members were elected by the subjects of the realm, the assemblymen were selected by the king and were prominent men, usually of the aristocracy. In 1787, pressured by France’s desperate financial situation, the King convened an assembly. Repeated attempts to implement tax reform failed due to lack of the Parlement of Paris support, as parlement judges felt that any increase in tax would have a direct negative effect on their own income. In response to this opposition, the finance minister Charles Alexandre deCalonne suggested that Louis XVI call an Assembly of Notables. While the Assembly had no legislative power in its own right, Calonne hoped that if it supported the proposed reforms, parlement would be forced to register them. Most historians argue that the plan failed because the assemblymen, whose privileges the plan aimed to curb, refused to bear the burden of increased taxation, although some have noted that the nobles were quite open to changes but rejected the specifics of Calonne’s proposal. In addition, the Assembly insisted that the proposed reforms should actually be presented to a representative body such as the Estates-General.

Estates-General of 1789

Louis XVI convened the Estates-General in 1788, setting the date of its opening for May 1, 1789. Because it had been so long since
the Estates-General had been brought together, there was a debate as to which procedures should be followed. The King agreed to retain many of the divisive customs which were the norm in 1614 but intolerable to the Third Estate at a time when the concept of equality was central to public debate. The most controversial and significant decision remained that of the nature of voting. If the estates voted by order, the nobles and the clergy could together outvote the commons by 2 to 1. If, on the other hand, each delegate was to have one vote, the majority would prevail.

The number of delegates elected was about 1,200, half of whom formed the Third Estate. The First and Second Estates had 300 each. But French society had changed since 1614, and these Estates-General were not like those of 1614. Members of the nobility were not required to stand for election to the Second Estate and many were elected to the Third Estate. The total number of nobles in the three Estates was about 400. Noble representatives of the Third Estate were among the most passionate revolutionaries, including Jean Joseph Mounier and the comte de Mirabeau.

On May 5, 1789, the Estates-General convened. The following day, the Third Estate discovered that the royal decree granting double representation also upheld the traditional voting by orders. The apparent intent of the King and his advisers was for everyone to get directly to the matter of taxes, but by trying to avoid the issue of representation they had gravely misjudged the situation. The Third Estate wanted the estates to meet as one body and for each delegate to have one vote. The other two estates, while having their own grievances against royal absolutism, believed – correctly, as history would prove – that they would lose more power to the Third Estate than they stood to gain from the King. Necker sympathized with the Third Estate in this matter but lacked astuteness as a politician. He decided to let the impasse play out to the point of stalemate before he would enter the fray. As a result, by the time the King yielded to the demand of the Third Estate, it seemed to be a concession wrung from the monarchy rather than a gift that would have convinced the populace of the King's goodwill.
The suggestion to summon the Estates General came from the Assembly of Notables installed by the King in February 1787. It had not met since 1614. The usual business of registering the King’s edicts as law was performed by the Parlement of Paris. In 1787, it refused to cooperate with Charles Alexandre de Calonne’s program of badly needed financial reform, due to the special interests of its noble members.

On June 17, with the failure of efforts to reconcile the three estates, the Communes – or the Commons, as the Third Estate called itself now – declared themselves redefined as the National Assembly, an assembly not of the estates but of the people. They invited the other orders to join them but made it clear that they intended to conduct the nation’s affairs with or without them. The King tried to resist. On June 20, he ordered to close the hall where the National Assembly met, but deliberations moved to a nearby tennis court, where they proceeded to swear the Tennis Court Oath by which they agreed not to separate until they had settled the constitution of France. Two days later, removed from the tennis court as well, the Assembly met in the Church of Saint Louis, where the majority of the representatives of the clergy joined them. After a failed attempt to keep the three estates separate, that part of the deputies of the nobles who still stood apart joined the National Assembly at the
request of the King. The Estates-General ceased to exist, becoming the National Assembly.

Attributions

- Calling the Estates-General
22.3.2: Establishment of the National Assembly

Following the storming of the Bastille on July 14, the National Assembly became the effective government and constitution drafter that ruled until passing the 1791 Constitution, which turned France into a constitutional monarchy.

Learning Objective

Critique the National Assembly, its establishment, and its goals

Key Points

- After the Third Estate discovered that the royal decree granting double representation upheld the traditional voting by orders, its representatives refused to accept the imposed rules and proceeded to meet separately. On June 17, with the failure of efforts to reconcile the three estates, the Third Estate
declared themselves redefined as the National Assembly, an assembly not of the estate but of the people.

- After Louis XVI's failed attempts to sabotage the Assembly and to keep the three estates separate, the Estates-General ceased to exist, becoming the National Assembly. It renamed itself the National Constituent Assembly on July 9 and began to function as a governing body and constitution-drafter. Following the storming of the Bastille on July 14, the National Assembly became the effective government of France.

- The leading forces of the Assembly at this time were the conservative foes of the revolution (“The Right”); the Monarchiens inclined toward arranging France along lines similar to the British constitution model; and “the Left,” a group still relatively united in support of revolution and democracy. A critical figure in the Assembly was Abbé Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, who authored a pamphlet called “What Is the Third Estate?”

- In August 1789, the National Constituent Assembly abolished feudalism and published the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, but the financial crisis continued largely unaddressed and the deficit only increased.

- In November, the Assembly suspended the old judicial system and declared the property of the Church to be “at the disposal of the nation.” In 1790, religious orders were dissolved and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which turned the remaining clergy into employees of the state, was
In the turmoil of the revolution, the Assembly members gathered the various constitutional laws they had passed into a single constitution and submitted it to recently restored Louis XVI, who accepted it. Under the Constitution of 1791, France would function as a constitutional monarchy.

Key Terms

What Is the Third Estate?
A political pamphlet written in January 1789, shortly before the outbreak of the French Revolution, by French thinker and clergyman Abbé Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès. The pamphlet was Sieyès' response to finance minister Jacques Necker's invitation for writers to state how they thought the Estates-General should be organized.

Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen
A fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human and civil rights, passed by France’s National Constituent Assembly in August 1789. It was influenced by the doctrine of natural right, stating that the rights of man are held to be universal. It became the basis for a nation of free individuals protected equally by law.
Tennis Court Oath

An oath taken on June 20, 1789, by the members of the French Estates-General for the Third Estate, who had begun to call themselves the National Assembly, vowing “not to separate, and to reassemble wherever circumstances require, until the constitution of the kingdom is established.” It was a pivotal event in the early days of the French Revolution.

Estates of the Realm

The broad orders of social hierarchy used in Christendom (Christian Europe) from the medieval period to early modern Europe. Different systems for dividing society members into estates evolved over time. The best-known system is the French Ancien Régime (Old Regime), a three-estate system used until the French Revolution (1789–1799). It was made up of clergy (the First Estate), nobility (the Second Estate), and commoners (the Third Estate).

Estates-General

A general assembly representing the French estates of the realm: the clergy (First Estate), the nobles (Second Estate), and the common people (Third Estate).

From Estates General to National Assembly

The Estates-General, convened by Louis XVI to deal with France’s financial crisis, assembled on May 5, 1789. Its members were elected
to represent the estates of the realm: the First Estate (the clergy), the Second Estate (the nobility), and the Third Estate (the commoners) but the Third Estate had been granted “double representation” (twice as many delegates as each of the other estates). However, the following day, the Third Estate discovered that the royal decree granting double representation also upheld the traditional voting by orders. That meant that the nobles and the clergy could together outvote the commoners by 2 to 1. If, on the other hand, each delegate was to have one vote, the majority would prevail. As a result, double representation was meaningless in terms of power. The Third Estate refused to accept the imposed rules and proceeded to meet separately, calling themselves the Communes (“Commons”).

On June 17, with the failure of efforts to reconcile the three estates, the Third Estate declared themselves redefined as the National Assembly, an assembly not of the estates but of the people. They invited the other orders to join them, but made it clear that they intended to conduct the nation's affairs with or without them. The King tried to resist. On June 20, he ordered to close the hall where the National Assembly met, but the deliberations were moved to a nearby tennis court, where they proceeded to swear the Tennis Court Oath by which they agreed not to separate until they had settled the constitution of France. After Louis XVI's failed attempts to sabotage the Assembly and keep the three estates separate, the Estates-General ceased to exist, becoming the National Assembly.
The oath was both a revolutionary act and an assertion that political authority derived from the people and their representatives rather than from the monarch himself. Their solidarity forced Louis XVI to order the clergy and the nobility to join with the Third Estate in the National Assembly to give the illusion that he controlled the National Assembly. The Oath signified for the first time that French citizens formally stood in opposition to Louis XVI, and the National Assembly’s refusal to back down forced the king to make concessions.

**National Constituent Assembly**

The Assembly renamed itself the National Constituent Assembly on July 9 and began to function as a governing body and a constitution-drafter. Following the storming of the Bastille on July 14, the National Assembly (sometimes called the Constituent Assembly) became the effective government of France. The number of
delegates increased significantly during the election period, but many deputies took their time arriving, some of them reaching Paris as late as 1791. The majority of the Second Estate had a military background and the Third Estate was dominated by men of legal professions. This suggests that while the Third Estate was referred to as the commoners, its delegates belonged largely to the bourgeoisie and not the most-oppressed lower classes.

The leading forces of the Assembly were the conservative foes of the revolution (later known as “The Right”); the Monarchiens (“Monarchists,” also called “Democratic Royalists”) allied with Jacques Necker and inclined toward arranging France along lines similar to the British constitution model; and “the Left” (also called “National Party”), a group still relatively united in support of revolution and democracy, representing mainly the interests of the middle classes but strongly sympathetic to the broader range of the common people.

A critical figure in the Assembly and eventually for the French Revolution was Abbé Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, who for a time managed to bridge the differences between those who wanted a constitutional monarchy and those who wished to move in more democratic (or even republican) directions. In January 1789, Sieyès authored a pamphlet What Is the Third Estate?, a response to finance minister Jacques Necker’s invitation for writers to state how they thought the Estates-General should be organized. In it he argues that the Third Estate – the common people of France – constituted a complete nation within itself and had no need for the “dead weight” of the two other orders, the clergy and aristocracy. Sieyès stated that the people wanted genuine representatives in the Estates-General, equal representation to the other two orders taken together, and votes taken by heads and not by orders. These ideas had an immense influence on the course of the French Revolution.
Work of the Assembly

On August 4, 1789, the National Constituent Assembly abolished feudalism (action triggered by numerous peasant revolts), sweeping away both the seigneurial rights of the Second Estate and the tithes (a 10% tax for the Church) collected by the First Estate. During the course of a few hours, nobles, clergy, towns, provinces, companies, and cities lost their special privileges. Originally the peasants were supposed to pay for the release of seigneurial dues, but the majority refused to pay and in 1793 the obligation was cancelled.

On August 26, 1789, the Assembly published the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, which comprised a statement of principles rather than a constitution with legal effect. Influenced by the doctrine of natural right, it stated that the rights of man were held to be universal, becoming the basis for a nation of free individuals protected equally by law. Simultaneously, the Assembly continued to draft a new constitution. Amid the Assembly’s preoccupation with constitutional affairs (many competing ideas were debated), the financial crisis continued largely unaddressed and the deficit only increased. The Assembly gave Necker complete financial dictatorship.

The old judicial system, based on the 13 regional parliaments, was suspended in November 1789 and officially abolished in September 1790.

In an attempt to address the financial crisis, the Assembly declared, on November 2, 1789, that the property of the Church was “at the disposal of the nation.” Thus the nation had now also taken on the responsibility of the Church, which included paying the clergy and caring for the poor, the sick, and the orphaned. In December, the Assembly began to sell the lands to the highest bidder to raise revenue. Monastic vows were abolished, and in February 1790 all religious orders were dissolved. Monks and nuns were encouraged to return to private life. The Civil Constitution of
the Clergy, passed in July 1790, turned the remaining clergy into employees of the state.

In the turmoil of the revolution, the Assembly members gathered the various constitutional laws they had passed into a single constitution and submitted it to recently restored Louis XVI, who accepted it, writing “I engage to maintain it at home, to defend it from all attacks from abroad, and to cause its execution by all the means it places at my disposal.” The King addressed the Assembly and received enthusiastic applause from members and spectators. With this capstone, the National Constituent Assembly adjourned in a final session on September 30, 1791. Under the Constitution of 1791, France would function as a constitutional monarchy.

Attractions

• Establishment of the National Assembly

“National Constituent Assembly.”
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22.3.3: The Storming of the Bastille

The medieval fortress, armory, and political prison in Paris known as the Bastille became a symbol of the abuse of the monarchy. Its fall on July 14, 1789 was the flashpoint of the French Revolution.

Learning Objective

Explain the swell of popular emotion that led to the storming of the Bastille

Key Points

• During the reign of Louis XVI, France faced a major economic crisis, exacerbated by a regressive system of taxation. On May 5, 1789, the Estates-General convened to deal with this issue, but were held back by archaic protocols that disadvantaged the Third Estate (the commoners). On June 17, 1789, the Third Estate reconstituted themselves as the National
Assembly, a body whose purpose was the creation of a French constitution.

- Paris, close to insurrection, showed wide support for the Assembly. The press published the Assembly's debates while political discussions spread into the public squares and halls of the capital. The Palais-Royal and its grounds became the site of an ongoing meeting. The crowd, on the authority of the meeting at the Palais-Royal, broke open the prisons of the Abbaye to release some grenadiers of the French guards, reportedly imprisoned for refusing to fire on the people.

- On July 11, 1789, with troops distributed across the Paris area, Louis XVI dismissed and banished his finance minister, Jacques Necker, who had been sympathetic to the Third Estate. News of Necker's dismissal reached Paris on July 12. Crowds gathered throughout Paris, including more than ten thousand at the Palais-Royal.

- Among the troops under the royal authority, there were foreign mercenaries, most notably Swiss and German regiments, that were seen as less likely to be sympathetic to the popular cause than ordinary French soldiers. By early July, approximately half of the 25,000 regular troops in Paris and Versailles were drawn from these foreign regiments.

- On the morning of July 14, 1789, the city of Paris was in a state of alarm. At this point, the Bastille was nearly empty, housing only seven prisoners. Amid the tensions of July 1789, the building remained as a symbol of royal tyranny.

- The crowd gathered outside around mid-morning,
calling for the surrender of the prison, the removal of the cannon, and the release of the arms and gunpowder. Following failed mediation efforts, gunfire began, apparently spontaneously, turning the crowd into a mob. Governor de Launay opened the gates to the inner courtyard, and the conquerors swept in to liberate the fortress at 5:30.

Key Terms

**National Assembly**

A revolutionary assembly formed by the representatives of the Third Estate (the common people) of the Estates-General that existed from June 13 to July 9, 1789. After July 9, it was known as the National Constituent Assembly although popularly the shorter form persisted.

**Estates-General**

A general assembly representing the French estates of the realm: the clergy (First Estate), the nobles (Second Estate), and the common people (Third Estate).
Storming of the Bastille: Background

During the reign of Louis XVI, France faced a major economic crisis, partially initiated by the cost of intervening in the American Revolution and exacerbated by a regressive system of taxation. On May 5, 1789, the Estates-General convened to deal with this issue, but were held back by archaic protocols that disadvantaged the Third Estate (the commoners). On June 17, 1789, the Third Estate reconstituted themselves as the National Assembly, a body whose purpose was the creation of a French constitution. The king initially opposed this development, but was forced to acknowledge the authority of the assembly, which subsequently renamed itself the National Constituent Assembly on July 9.

Paris, close to insurrection, showed wide support for the Assembly. The press published the Assembly’s debates while political discussions spread into the public squares and halls of the capital. The Palais-Royal and its grounds became the site of an ongoing meeting. The crowd, on the authority of the meeting at the Palais-Royal, broke open the prisons of the Abbaye to release some grenadiers of the French guards, reportedly imprisoned for refusing to fire on the people. The Assembly recommended the imprisoned guardsmen to the clemency of the king, They returned to prison and received pardon. The rank and file of the regiment now leaned toward the popular cause.

Social Unrest

On July 11, 1789, with troops distributed across the Paris area, Louis XVI, acting under the influence of the conservative nobles of his privy council, dismissed and banished his finance minister, Jacques Necker, who had been sympathetic to the Third Estate. News of
Necker's dismissal reached Paris on July 12. The Parisians generally presumed that the dismissal marked the start of a coup by conservative elements. Liberal Parisians were further enraged by the fear that royal troops would attempt to shut down the National Constituent Assembly, which was meeting in Versailles. Crowds gathered throughout Paris, including more than ten thousand at the Palais-Royal. Among the troops under the royal authority were foreign mercenaries, most notably Swiss and German regiments, that were seen as less likely to be sympathetic to the popular cause than ordinary French soldiers. By early July, approximately half of the 25,000 regular troops in Paris and Versailles were drawn from these foreign regiments.

During the public demonstrations that started on July 12, the multitude displayed busts of Necker and Louis Philippe II, Duke of Orléans (of the House of Bourbon, the ruling dynasty of France, who actively supported the French Revolution). The crowd clashed with royal troops and unrest grew. The people of Paris expressed their hostility against state authorities by attacking customs posts blamed for causing increased food and wine prices, and started to plunder any place where food, guns, and supplies could be hoarded. That night, rumors spread that supplies were being hoarded at Saint-Lazare, a huge property of the clergy, which functioned as convent, hospital, school, and even a jail. An angry crowd broke in and plundered the property, seizing 52 wagons of wheat which were taken to the public market. That same day, multitudes of people plundered many other places, including weapon arsenals. The royal troops did nothing to stop the spreading of social chaos in Paris during those days.

Storming of the Bastille

On the morning of July 14, 1789, the city of Paris was in a state
of alarm. The partisans of the Third Estate in France, now under the control of the Bourgeois Militia of Paris (soon to become Revolutionary France's National Guard), earlier stormed the Hôtel des Invalides without significant opposition with the intention of gathering weapons held there. The commandant at the Invalides had in the previous few days taken the precaution of transferring 250 barrels of gunpowder to the Bastille for safer storage.

At this point, the Bastille was nearly empty, housing only seven prisoners. The cost of maintaining a garrisoned medieval fortress for so limited a purpose led to a decision, made shortly before the disturbances began, to replace it with an open public space. Amid the tensions of July 1789, the building remained as a symbol of royal tyranny.

The crowd gathered outside around mid-morning, calling for the surrender of the prison, the removal of the cannon, and the release of the arms and gunpowder. Two representatives of the crowd outside were invited into the fortress and negotiations began. Another was admitted around noon with definite demands. The negotiations dragged on while the crowd grew and became impatient. Around 1:30 p.m., the crowd surged into the undefended outer courtyard. A small party climbed onto the roof of a building next to the gate to the inner courtyard and broke the chains on the drawbridge. Soldiers of the garrison called to the people to withdraw but in the noise and confusion these shouts were misinterpreted as encouragement to enter. Gunfire began, apparently spontaneously, turning the crowd into a mob.
A 2013 analysis of the Bastille dimensions showed that it did not tower over the neighborhood as was depicted in the paintings but was a comparable height.

The firing continued and a substantial force of Royal Army troops encamped on the Champs de Mars did not intervene. With the possibility of mutual carnage suddenly apparent, Governor de Launay ordered a cease-fire at 5 p.m.. A letter offering his terms was handed out to the besiegers through a gap in the inner gate. His demands were refused, but de Launay nonetheless capitulated as he realized that with limited food stocks and no water supply his troops could not hold out much longer. He accordingly opened the gates to the inner courtyard, and the conquerors swept in to liberate the fortress at 5:30 p.m. The king first learned of the storming only the next morning through the Duke of La Rochefoucauld. “Is it a revolt?” asked Louis XVI. The duke replied: “No sire, it’s not a revolt; it’s a revolution.”
The Storming of the Bastille

- “National Assembly (French Revolution).”
55. The Declaration of the Rights of Man

22.3.4: The Declaration of the Rights of Man

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, passed by France’s National Constituent Assembly in August 1789, is a fundamental document of the French Revolution that granted civil rights to some commoners, although it excluded a significant segment of the French population.

**Learning Objective**

Identify the main points in the Declaration of the Rights of Man

**Key Points**

- The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1791) is a fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human and civil rights. The inspiration and content of the document emerged largely from the ideals of the
American Revolution. The key drafts were prepared by General Lafayette, working at times with his close friend Thomas Jefferson.

- The concepts in the Declaration come from the tenets of the Enlightenment, including individualism, the social contract as theorized by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and the separation of powers espoused by Montesquieu. The spirit of secular natural law rests at the foundations of the Declaration.

- At the time of writing, the rights contained in the declaration were only awarded to men. Furthermore, the declaration was a statement of vision rather than reality as it was not deeply rooted in the practice of the West or even France at the time. It embodied ideals toward which France pledged to aspire in the future.

- While the French Revolution provided rights to a larger portion of the population, there remained a distinction between those who obtained the political rights in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen and those who did not. Those who were deemed to hold these rights were called active citizens, a designation granted to men who were French, at least 25 years old, paid taxes equal to three days of work, and could not be defined as servants.

- Tensions arose between active and passive citizens throughout the Revolution and the question of women's rights emerged as particularly prominent. The Declaration did not recognize women as active citizens. The absence of women's rights prompted Olympe de Gouges to publish the Declaration of the
Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen in September 1791.

- The Declaration did not revoke the institution of slavery, as lobbied for by Jacques-Pierre Brissot’s Les Amis des Noirs and defended by the group of colonial planters called the Club Massiac. However, it played an important rhetorical role in the Haitian Revolution.

**Key Terms**

**social contract**

A theory or model that originated during the Age of Enlightenment that typically addresses the questions of the origin of society and the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual. Its arguments typically posit that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority) in exchange for protection of their remaining rights. The question of the relation between natural and legal rights, therefore, is often an aspect of this theory. The term comes from a 1762 book by Jean-Jacques Rousseau which discussed this concept.

**separation of powers**

A model for the governance of a state (or who controls the state) first developed in ancient Greece.
Under this model, the state is divided into branches, each with separate and independent powers and areas of responsibility so that the powers of one branch are not in conflict with the powers associated with the other branches. The typical division of branches is legislative, executive, and judiciary.

natural law

A philosophy that certain rights or values are inherent by virtue of human nature and can be universally understood through human reason. Historically, natural law refers to the use of reason to analyze both social and personal human nature to deduce binding rules of moral behavior. Although it is often conflated with common law, the two are distinct. Common law is not based on inherent rights, but is the legal tradition whereby certain rights or values are legally recognized by virtue of already having judicial recognition or articulation.

March on Versailles

A march began during the French Revolution among women in the marketplaces of Paris who, on the morning of October 5, 1789, were near rioting over the high price and scarcity of bread. Their demonstrations quickly became intertwined with the activities of revolutionaries, who were seeking liberal political reforms and a constitutional monarchy for France. The market women and their various allies grew into a crowd of thousands. Encouraged by revolutionary agitators, they ransacked the city armory for weapons and marched to the Palace of Versailles.
The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen

A fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human and civil rights passed by France’s National Constituent Assembly in August 1789. It was influenced by the doctrine of natural right, stating that the rights of man are held to be universal. It became the basis for a nation of free individuals protected equally by law.

Intellectual Context The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (August 1791) is a fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human and civil rights. The inspiration and content of the document emerged largely from the ideals of the American Revolution. The key drafts were prepared by General Lafayette, working at times with his close friend Thomas Jefferson, who drew heavily upon The Virginia Declaration of Rights drafted in May 1776 by George Mason (which was based in part on the English Bill of Rights 1689), as well as Jefferson’s own drafts for the American Declaration of Independence. In August 1789, Honoré Mirabeau played a central role in conceptualizing and drafting the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. The Declaration emerged from the tenets of
the Enlightenment, including individualism, the social contract as theorized by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and the separation of powers espoused by Montesquieu. The spirit of secular natural law rests at the foundations of the Declaration. Unlike traditional natural law theory, secular natural law does not draw from religious doctrine or authority. The document defines a single set of individual and collective rights for all men. Influenced by the doctrine of natural rights, these rights are held to be universal and valid in all times and places. Correspondingly, the role of government, carried on by elected representatives, is to recognize and secure these rights. Thomas Jefferson — the primary author of the U.S. Declaration of Independence — was in France as a U.S. diplomat and worked closely with Lafayette on designing a bill of rights for France. In the ratification by the states of the U.S. Constitution in 1788, critics demanded a written Bill of Rights. In response, James Madison’s proposal for a U.S. Bill of Rights was introduced in New York in June 1789, 11 weeks before the French declaration. Considering the 6 to 8 weeks it took news to cross the Atlantic, it is possible that the French knew of the American text, which emerged from the same shared intellectual heritage. The same
people took part in shaping both documents: Lafayette admired Jefferson, and Jefferson, in turn, found Lafayette an important political and intellectual partner. Natural Rights At the time of writing, the rights contained in the declaration were only awarded to men. Furthermore, the declaration was a statement of vision rather than reality as it was not deeply rooted in the practice of the West or even France at the time. It embodied ideals toward which France aspired to struggle in the future. In the second article, “the natural and imprescriptible rights of man” are defined as “liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression.” It demanded the destruction of aristocratic privileges by proclaiming an end to feudalism and exemptions from taxation. It also called for freedom and equal rights for all human beings (referred to as “Men”) and access to public office based on talent. The monarchy was restricted and all citizens had the right to take part in the legislative process. Freedom of speech and press were declared and arbitrary arrests outlawed. The Declaration also asserted the principles of popular sovereignty, in contrast to the divine right of kings that characterized the French monarchy, and social equality among citizens, eliminating the special rights of the nobility and
clergy.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789 by Jean-Jacques-François Le Barbier. The Declaration is included in the preamble of the constitutions of both the Fourth French Republic (1946) and Fifth Republic (1958) and is still current. Inspired by the American Revolution and also by the Enlightenment philosophers, the Declaration was a core
statement of the values of the French Revolution and had a major impact on the development of freedom and democracy in Europe and worldwide. Limitations While the French Revolution provided rights to a larger portion of the population, there remained a distinction between those who obtained the political rights in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen and those who did not. Those who were deemed to hold these political rights were called active citizens, a designation granted to men who were French, at least 25 years old, paid taxes equal to three days of work, and could not be defined as servants. This meant that at the time of the Declaration only male property owners held these rights. The category of passive citizens was created to encompass those populations that the Declaration excluded from political rights. In the end, the vote was granted to approximately 4.3 out of 29 million Frenchmen. Women, slaves, youth, and foreigners were excluded. Tensions arose between active and passive citizens throughout the Revolution and the question of women’s rights emerged as particularly prominent. The Declaration did not recognize women as active citizens despite the fact that after the March on Versailles on October 5, 1789, women presented the Women’s Petition to the
National Assembly, in which they proposed a decree giving women equal rights. In 1790, Nicolas de Condorcet and Etta Palm d’Aelders unsuccessfully called on the National Assembly to extend civil and political rights to women. The absence of women’s rights prompted Olympe de Gouges to publish the Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen in September 1791. Modeled on the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, it exposes the failure of the French Revolution, which had been devoted to equality. The Declaration did not revoke the institution of slavery, as lobbied for by Jacques-Pierre Brissot’s Les Amis des Noirs and defended by the group of colonial planters called the Club Massiac. Thousands of slaves in Saint-Domingue, the most profitable slave colony in the world, engaged in uprisings (with critical attempts beginning also in August 1791) that would be known as the first successful slave revolt in the New World. Slavery in the French colonies was abolished by the Convention dominated by the Jacobins in 1794. However, Napoleon reinstated it in 1802. In 1804, the colony of Saint-Domingue became an independent state, the Republic of Haiti. Legacy The Declaration, together with the American Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and
Bill of Rights, inspired in large part the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It has also influenced and inspired rights-based liberal democracy throughout the world. It was translated as soon as 1793–1794 by Colombian Antonio Nariño, who published it despite the Inquisition and was sentenced to be imprisoned for ten years for doing so. In 2003, the document was listed on UNESCO’s Memory of the World register.

Attributions

The Declaration of the Rights of Man “Separation of powers.”
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56. The March on Versailles

22.3.5: The March on Versailles

Concerned over the high price and scarcity of bread, women from the marketplaces of Paris led the March on Versailles on October 5, 1789. This became one of the most significant events of the French Revolution, eventually forcing the royals to return to Paris.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the March on Versailles

**Key Points**

- The Women’s March on Versailles was one of the earliest and most significant events of the French Revolution. On the morning of October 5, 1789, women were near rioting in the Paris marketplace over the high price and scarcity of bread. Their demonstrations quickly became intertwined with the activities of revolutionaries, who were seeking liberal political reforms and a constitutional monarchy for France.
• At the end of the Ancien Régime, the fear of famine became an ever-present dread for the lower strata of the Third Estate. Rumors swirled that foods, especially grain, were purposely withheld from the poor for the benefit of the privileged. While the march turned into a more general revolutionary upsurge, this fear remained at its roots.

• Despite its post-revolutionary mythology, the march was not a spontaneous event. Speakers at the Palais-Royal mentioned it regularly, but the final trigger was a royal banquet on October 1 at which the officers at Versailles welcomed the officers of new troops, a customary practice when a unit changed its garrison. The lavish banquet was reported in newspapers as nothing short of a gluttonous orgy, which outraged the commoners.

• On the morning of October 5, a young woman struck a marching drum at the edge of a group of market women who were infuriated by the chronic shortage and high price of bread. As more and more women and men arrived, the crowd grew to more than 7,000 individuals. One of the men was Stanislas-Marie Maillard, a prominent conqueror of the Bastille who by unofficial acclamation was given a leadership role.

• Although the fighting ceased quickly and the royal troops had cleared the palace attacked by the revolutionaries, the crowd was still everywhere outside. Lafayette convinced the king and later the queen to address the crowd, which calmed the participants of the march. However, the revolutionaries forced the royals to return to Paris.
As a result of the march, the monarchist faction in the Assembly effectively lost its significance. Robespierre raised his public profile considerably, Lafayette found himself tied too closely to the king; Maillard returned to Paris with his status as a local hero made permanent. For the women of Paris, the march became the climax of revolutionary hagiography. The royals were effectively trapped in Paris.

**Key Terms**

**Pacte de Famine**
A conspiracy theory adopted by many in France during the 18th century. The theory held that foods, especially grain, were purposely withheld for the benefit of privileged interest groups. During this period, French citizens obtained much of their nourishment from grain.

**flight to Varennes**
An attempted escape from Paris during the night of June 20–21, 1791 by King Louis XVI of France, his queen Marie Antoinette, and their immediate family in order to initiate a counter-revolution at the head of loyal troops under royalist officers concentrated at Montmédy near the frontier.
Great Fear
A general panic that took place between July 17 and August 3, 1789, at the start of the French Revolution. Rural unrest had been present in France since the worsening grain shortage of the spring. Fueled by rumors of an aristocratic “famine plot” to starve or burn out the population, both peasants and townspeople mobilized in many regions.

March on Versailles
Taking place on October 5, 1789, one of the earliest and most significant events of the French Revolution. Women in the marketplaces of Paris were near rioting over the high price and scarcity of bread. Their demonstrations quickly became intertwined with the activities of revolutionaries, who were seeking liberal political reforms and a constitutional monarchy for France.

National Assembly
A revolutionary assembly that existed from June 13 to July 9, 1789, and was formed by the representatives of the Third Estate (the common people) of the Estates-General.

March on Versailles: Background
The Women’s March on Versailles, also known as The October March, The October Days, or simply The March on Versailles, was
one of the earliest and most significant events of the French Revolution. On the morning of October 5, 1789, women in the marketplaces of Paris were near rioting over the high price and scarcity of bread. Their demonstrations quickly became intertwined with the activities of revolutionaries seeking liberal political reforms and a constitutional monarchy for France.

At the end of the Ancien Régime, the fear of famine became an ever-present dread for the lower strata of the Third Estate. Rampant rumors of a conspiracy theory held that foods, especially grain, were purposely withheld from the poor for the benefit of the privileged (the Pacte de Famine). Stories of a plot to destroy wheat crops in order to starve the population provoked the so-called Great Fear in the summer of 1789.

Despite its post-revolutionary mythology, the march was not a spontaneous event. Speakers at the Palais-Royal mentioned it regularly and the idea of a march on Versailles had been widespread. The final trigger came from a royal banquet held on October 1 at which the officers at Versailles welcomed the officers of new troops, a customary practice when a unit changed its garrison. The royal family briefly attended the affair. The lavish banquet was reported in newspapers as nothing short of a gluttonous orgy. Worst of all, the papers dwelt scornfully on the reputed desecration of the tricolor cockade; drunken officers were said to have stamped upon this symbol of the nation and professed their allegiance solely to the white cockade of the House of Bourbon. This embellished tale of the royal banquet became the source of intense public outrage.

The Day of the March

On the morning of October 5, a young woman struck a marching drum at the edge of a group of market women who were infuriated by the chronic shortage and high price of bread. From their starting
point in the markets of the eastern section of Paris, the angry women forced a nearby church to toll its bells. More women from other nearby marketplaces joined in, many bearing kitchen blades and other makeshift weapons. As more women and men arrived, the crowd outside the city hall reached between 6,000 and 7,000 and perhaps as high as 10,000. One of the men was Stanislas-Marie Maillard, a prominent conqueror of the Bastille, who by unofficial acclamation was given a leadership role.

When the crowd finally reached Versailles, members of the National Assembly greeted the marchers and invited Maillard into their hall. As he spoke, the restless Parisians came pouring into the Assembly and sank exhausted on the deputies’ benches. Hungry, fatigued, and bedraggled from the rain, they seemed to confirm that the siege was mostly a demand for food. With few other options available, the President of the Assembly, Jean Joseph Mounier, accompanied a deputation of market-women into the palace to see the king. A group of six women were escorted into the king's apartment, where they told him of the crowd's privations. The king responded sympathetically and after this brief but pleasant meeting, arrangements were made to disburse some food from the royal stores with more promised. Some in the crowd felt that their goals had been satisfactorily met.

However, at about 6 a.m., some of the protesters discovered a small gate to the palace was unguarded. Making their way inside, they searched for the queen's bedchamber. The royal guards fired their guns at the intruders, killing a young member of the crowd. Infuriated, the rest surged towards the breach and streamed inside.

Although the fighting ceased quickly and the royal troops cleared the palace, the crowd was still everywhere outside. Lafayette (commander-in-chief of the National Guard), who had earned the court's indebtedness, convinced the king to address the crowd. When the two men stepped out on a balcony an unexpected cry went up: “Vive le Roi!” The relieved king briefly conveyed his willingness to return to Paris. After the king withdrew, the exultant crowd would not be denied the same accord from the queen and her
presence was demanded loudly. Lafayette brought her to the same balcony, accompanied by her young son and daughter. However pleased it may have been by the royal displays, the crowd insisted that the king come back with them to Paris. At about 1 p.m. on October 6, the vast throng escorted the royal family and a complement of 100 deputies back to the capital, this time with the armed National Guards leading the way.

The march symbolized a new balance of power that displaced the ancient privileged orders of the French nobility and favored the nation’s common people, collectively termed the Third Estate. Bringing together people representing sources of the Revolution in their largest numbers yet, the march on Versailles proved to be a defining moment of that Revolution.

Consequences of the March

The rest of the National Constituent Assembly followed the king within two weeks to new quarters in Paris, excepting 56 pro-monarchy deputies. Thus, the march effectively deprived the monarchist faction of significant representation in the Assembly as
most of these deputies retreated from the political scene. Conversely, Robespierre’s impassioned defense of the march raised his public profile considerably. Lafayette, though initially acclaimed, found he had tied himself too closely to the king. As the Revolution progressed, he was hounded into exile by the radical leadership. Maillard returned to Paris with his status as a local hero made permanent. For the women of Paris, the march became the source of apotheosis in revolutionary hagiography. The “Mothers of the Nation” were highly celebrated upon their return and would be praised and solicited by successive Parisian governments for years to come.

Louis attempted to work within the framework of his limited powers after the women’s march but won little support, and he and the royal family remained virtual prisoners in the Tuileries. Desperate, he made his abortive flight to Varennes in June 1791. Attempting to escape and join with royalist armies, the king was once again captured by a mixture of citizens and national guardsmen who hauled him back to Paris.

Attributions

- The March on Versailles
57. Constitutional Monarchy

22.4: Constitutional Monarchy

22.4.1: The Constitution of 1791

The Constitution of 1791, the first written constitution of France, turned the country into a constitutional monarchy following the collapse of the absolute monarchy of the Ancien Régime.

Learning Objective

Deconstruct the government established by the Constitution of 1791

Key Points

- One of the stated goals of the National Assembly formed by the Third Estate on June 13, 1789, was to write a constitution. A twelve-member Constitutional Committee was convened on July 14, 1789, to draft most of the articles of the constitution. Many
proposals for redefining the French state were floated.

- The main early controversies surrounded the level of power to be granted to the king of France and the form the legislature would take. Another critical question was whether every subject of the French Crown would be given equal rights as the Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen theoretically promised.

- A second body, the Committee of Revisions, was created in September 1790. Because the National Assembly was both a legislature and a constitutional convention, this committee was formed to sort out whether its decrees were constitutional articles or mere statutes. The committee became very important in the days after the Champs de Mars Massacre, when one of its members used his position to preserve a number of powers of the Crown.

- A new constitution was reluctantly accepted by Louis XVI in September 1791. It abolished many institutions defined as “injurious to liberty and equality of rights.” The National Assembly was the legislative body, the king and royal ministers made up the executive branch, and the judiciary was independent of the other two branches. On a local level, previous feudal geographic divisions were formally abolished and the territory of the French state was divided into several administrative units with the principle of centralism. The king was allowed a suspensive veto to balance out the interests of the people.

- The constitution was not egalitarian by today’s standards. It distinguished between the active
citizens (male property owners of certain age) and the passive citizens. All women were deprived of rights and liberties, including the right to education and freedom to speak, write, print, and worship.

- Following the onset of French Revolutionary Wars and the August 10 Insurrection, a National Convention declared France a republic on September 22, 1792, which meant that France needed a new constitution a year after agreeing on the 1791 Constitution.

**Key Terms**

**National Assembly**

A revolutionary assembly formed by the representatives of the Third Estate (the common people) of the Estates-General that existed from June 13 to July 9, 1789. After July 9, it was known as the National Constituent Assembly although popularly the shorter form persisted.

**French Revolutionary Wars**

A series of sweeping military conflicts from 1792 until 1802, resulting from the French Revolution. They pitted the French First Republic against Britain, Austria and several other monarchies. They are divided into two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802). Initially
confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

**August 10 Insurrection**

One of the defining events in the history of the French Revolution, the storming of the Tuileries Palace by the National Guard of the insurrectional Paris Commune and revolutionary fédérés from Marseilles and Brittany resulted in the fall of the French monarchy. King Louis XVI and the royal family took shelter with the Legislative Assembly, which was suspended. The formal end of the monarchy that occurred six weeks later was one of the first acts of the new National Convention.

**Champs de Mars Massacre**

A massacre that took place on July 17, 1791, in Paris in the midst of the French Revolution. Two days before, the National Constituent Assembly issued a decree that Louis XVI would remain king under a constitutional monarchy. This decision came after Louis XVI and his family unsuccessfully tried to flee France in the Flight to Varennes the month before. Later that day, leaders of the republicans in France rallied against this decision, eventually leading royalist Lafayette to order the massacre.

**Paris Commune**

During the French Revolution, the government of Paris from 1789 until 1795. Established in the Hôtel de Ville just after the storming of the Bastille, it consisted of 144 delegates elected by the 48 divisions of the city. It became insurrectionary in the summer of 1792,
essentially refusing to take orders from the central French government. It took charge of routine civic functions but is best known for mobilizing extreme views. It lost much of its power in 1794 and was replaced in 1795.

**Feuillants**

A political group that emerged during the French Revolution and consisted of monarchists and reactionaries who sat on the right of the Legislative Assembly of 1791. It came into existence when the left-wing Jacobins split between moderates who sought to preserve the position of the king and supported the proposed plan of the National Assembly for a constitutional monarchy and radicals (Jacobins) who wished to press for a continuation of direct democratic action to overthrow Louis XVI.

**March on Versailles**

A march that started on the morning of October 5, 1789, among women in the marketplaces of Paris who were near rioting over the high price and scarcity of bread. Their demonstrations quickly became intertwined with the activities of revolutionaries, who were seeking liberal political reforms and a constitutional monarchy for France. The market women and their various allies grew into a crowd of thousands. Encouraged by revolutionary agitators, they ransacked the city armory for weapons and marched to the Palace of Versailles.

**Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen**

A fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human and civil rights
passed by France's National Constituent Assembly in August 1789. It was influenced by the doctrine of natural right, stating that the rights of man are held to be universal. It became the basis for a nation of free individuals protected equally by law.

**Constitution of 1791: Drafting Process**

One of the stated goals of the National Assembly formed by the Third Estate on June 13, 1789, was to write a constitution. A 12-member Constitutional Committee was convened on July 14, 1789 (coincidentally the day of the Storming of the Bastille) to draft most of the articles of the constitution. It originally included two members from the First Estate, two from the Second, and four from the Third. Many proposals for redefining the French state were floated, particularly in the days after the remarkable sessions of August 4 and 5 when feudalism was abolished. For instance, the Marquis de Lafayette proposed a combination of the American and British systems, a bicameral parliament with the king having the suspensive veto power over the legislature modeled on the authority then recently vested in the President of the United States.

The main early controversies surrounded the level of power that should be granted to the king of France and the form the legislature would take (i.e.: unicameral or bicameral). The Constitutional Committee proposed a bicameral legislature, but the motion was defeated in favor of one house. They also proposed an absolute veto, but were again defeated in favor of a suspensive veto, which could be overridden by three consecutive legislatures.
A second Constitutional Committee quickly replaced the first one. It included three members from the original group as well as five new members, all of the Third Estate. The greatest controversy faced by the new committee surrounded citizenship. The critical question was whether every subject of the French Crown would be given equal rights, or would there be some restrictions? The March on Versailles (October 5-6), led by women from marketplaces around Paris, rendered the question even more complicated. In the end, a distinction between active citizens who held political rights (males over the age of 25 who paid direct taxes equal to three days' labor) and passive citizens, who had only civil rights, was drawn. Some radical deputies, such as Maximilien Robespierre, could not accept the distinction.

A second body, the Committee of Revisions, was created in September 1790. Because the National Assembly was both a legislature and a constitutional convention, the Committee of Revisions was required to sort out whether its decrees were constitutional articles or mere statutes. It was the task of the Committee of Revisions to sort it out. The committee became very important in the days after the Champs de Mars Massacre (July 17, 1791), when a wave of opposition against popular movements swept France and resulted in a renewed effort to preserve powers of the Crown. The result was the rise of the Feuillants, a new political faction led by Antoine Barnave, one of the Committee's members who used his position to preserve a number of powers of the Crown, including the nomination of ambassadors, military leaders, and ministers.

Acceptance and Administration

After very long negotiations, a new constitution was reluctantly accepted by Louis XVI in September 1791. Redefining the
organization of the French government, citizenship, and the limits to the powers of government, the National Assembly set out to represent the interests of the public. It abolished many institutions defined as “injurious to liberty and equality of rights.” The National Assembly asserted its legal presence as part of the French government by establishing its permanence in the Constitution and forming a system of recurring elections. The National Assembly was the legislative body, the king and royal ministers made up the executive branch, and the judiciary was independent of the other two branches. On a local level, previous feudal geographic divisions were formally abolished and the territory of the French state was divided into several administrative units (Départements), but with the principle of centralism.

As framers of the constitution, the Assembly was concerned that if only representatives governed France, they were likely to be motivated by their own self-interests. Therefore, the king was allowed a suspensive veto to balance out the interests of the people. By the same token, representative democracy weakened the king’s executive authority. However, the constitution was not egalitarian by today’s standards. It distinguished between the active citizens (male property owners of certain age) and the passive citizens. All women were deprived of rights and liberties, including the right to education, freedom to speak, write, print, and worship.
The short-lived French Constitution of 1791 was the first written constitution in France, created after the collapse of the absolute monarchy of the Ancien Régime. One of the basic precepts of the revolution was adopting constitutionality and establishing popular sovereignty.
Effectiveness

With the onset of French Revolutionary Wars and the involvement of foreign powers in the conflict, radical Jacobin and ultimately republican conceptions grew enormously in popularity, increasing the influence of Robespierre, Danton, Marat and the Paris Commune. When the King used his veto powers to protect non-juring priests and refused to raise militias in defense of the revolutionary government, the constitutional monarchy proved unacceptable to radical revolutionaries and was effectively ended by the August 10 Insurrection. A National Convention was called, electing Robespierre as its first deputy. It was the first assembly in France elected by universal male suffrage. The convention declared France a republic on September 22, 1792, which meant that France needed a new constitution.
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58. Politics within the Revolutionaries

22.4.2: Politics within the Revolutionaries

Over the course of the Revolution, the original revolutionary movement known as the Jacobins split into more and less radical factions, the most important of which were the Feuillants (moderate; pro-royal), the Montagnards (radical) and the Girondins (moderate; pro-republic).

Learning Objective

Distinguish between the different blocs within the new government

Key Points

- The Legislative Assembly consisted of 745 members, mostly from the middle class. The rightists within the assembly consisted of about 260 Feuillants, who were staunch constitutional monarchists firm in their defense of the King against the popular
agitation. The leftists were about 136 Jacobins and Cordeliers. They favored the idea to spread the new ideals of liberty and equality and to put the king’s loyalty to the test. The remainder of the House, 345 deputies, belonged to no definite party. They were committed to the ideals of the Revolution and thus inclined to side with the left but would also occasionally back proposals from the right.

• The Feuillants came into existence when the Jacobins split between moderates, who sought to preserve the position of the king and supported the proposed plan of the National Assembly for a constitutional monarchy, and radicals (Jacobins). Labelled by their opponents as royalists, they were targeted after the fall of the monarchy.

• The National Convention was a single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, that succeeded the Legislative Assembly. It fractured into even more extreme factions than its predecessor. A result of the increasing divide within the Jacobins was the split between the more radical Montagnards and the Girondins.

• The Jacobin Club was distinguished by its left-wing revolutionary politics. They were thus closely allied to the sans-culottes, a popular force of working-class Parisians that played a pivotal role in the development of the revolution. The Jacobins were dubbed “the Mountain” (French: la montagne) for their seats in the uppermost part of the chamber and aimed for a more repressive form of government.

• The two most significant factors in the
consequential split between the Montagnards and the Giron
dins were the September Massacres and the trial of Louis XVI, both in 1792.

- The terms “left” and “right” used to refer to political parties is one of the lasting legacies of the French Revolution. Members of the National Assembly divided into supporters of the king to the president’s right and supporters of the revolution to his left.

**Key Terms**

**Feuillants**

A political group that emerged during the French Revolution and consisted of monarchists and reactionaries who sat on the right of the Legislative Assembly of 1791. It came into existence when the left-wing Jacobins split between moderates, who sought to preserve the position of the king and supported the proposed plan of the National Assembly for a constitutional monarchy, and radicals (Jacobins), who wished to press for a continuation of direct democratic action to overthrow Louis XVI.

**Jacobins**

Members of a revolutionary political movement that was the most famous political club during the French Revolution, distinguished by its left-wing, revolutionary politics. Unlike other sects like the Girondins, they
were closely allied to the sans-culottes, a popular force of working-class Parisians that played a pivotal role in the development of the revolution. They had a significant presence in the National Convention and were dubbed “the Mountain” for their seats in the uppermost part of the chamber.

**National Convention**

A single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the insurrection of August 10, 1792. It was the first French assembly elected by universal male suffrage, without distinctions of class.

**Girondins**

A political group operating in France from 1791 to 1795 during the French Revolution, active within the Legislative Assembly and the National Convention. They emerged from the Jacobin movement and campaigned for the end of the monarchy, but resisted the spiraling momentum of the Revolution. They came into conflict with The Mountain (Montagnards), a radical faction within the Jacobin Club.

**sans-culottes**

The common people of the lower classes in late 18th century France, a great many of whom became radical and militant partisans of the French Revolution in response to their poor quality of life under the Ancien Régime.
Montagnards

A political group during the French Revolution who sat on the highest benches in the Assembly. They were the most radical group and opposed the Girondists. The term, first used during a session of the Legislative Assembly, came into general use in 1793. Led by Maximilien Robespierre, they unleashed the Reign of Terror in 1794.

Legislative Assembly

The legislature of France from October 1, 1791, to September 20, 1792, during the years of the French Revolution. It provided the focus of political debate and revolutionary law-making between the periods of the National Constituent Assembly and National Convention.

Factions at the Legislative Assembly

The National Constituent Assembly dissolved itself on September 30, 1791. Upon Robespierre’s motion, it decreed that none of its members would be eligible to the next legislature. Its successor body, the Legislative Assembly operating under the Constitution of 1791, lasted until September 20, 1792. The Legislative Assembly first met on October 1, 1791, and consisted of 745 members, mostly from the middle class. The members were generally young, and since none had sat in the previous Assembly, they largely lacked national
political experience. They tended to be people with successful careers in local politics.

The rightists within the assembly consisted of about 260 Feuillants, whose chief leaders, Gilbert du Motier de La Fayette and Antoine Barnave, remained outside the House because of their ineligibility for re-election. They were staunch constitutional monarchists, firm in their defense of the King against the popular agitation. The leftists were of 136 Jacobins (still including the party later known as the Girondins or Girondists) and Cordeliers (a populist group, whose many members would later become the radical Montagnards).

The left drew its inspiration from the more radical tendency of the Enlightenment, regarded the émigré nobles as traitors, and espoused anticlericalism. They were suspicious of Louis XVI, some favoring a general European war, both to spread the new ideals of liberty and equality and to put the king's loyalty to the test.

The remainder of the House, 345 deputies, belonged to no definite party. They were called “the Marsh” (Le Marais) or “the Plain” (La Plaine). They were committed to the ideals of the Revolution, generally inclined to side with the left but would also occasionally back proposals from the right. Some historians dispute these numbers and estimate that the Legislative Assembly consisted of about 165 Feuillants (the right), about 330 Jacobins (including Girondins; the left), and about 350 deputies, who did not belong to any definite party but voted most often with the left. The differences emerge from how historians approach data in primary sources, where numbers reported by the clubs do not overlap with analyses of club membership conducted independently by name.
The Jacobins in 1791, author unknown. The Jacobins were known for creating a strong government that could deal with the needs of war, economic chaos, and internal rebellion. They supported the rights of property and favored free trade and a liberal economy much like the Girondins, but their relationship to the people made them more willing to adapt interventionist economic policies.

The illustration depicts a session at the Jacobin Club. Alexandre de Lameth presides while Mirabeau gives a speech.

The Feuillants came into existence when the Jacobins split between moderates (Feuillants), who sought to preserve the position of the king and supported the proposed plan of the National Assembly for a constitutional monarchy, and radicals (Jacobins), who wished to
press for a continuation of direct democratic action to overthrow Louis XVI. Labelled by their opponents as royalists, they were targeted after the fall of the monarchy. In August 1792, a list of 841 members was published and all were arrested and tried for treason. The name survived for a few months as an insulting label for moderates, royalists, and aristocrats.

Factions at the National Convention

The National Convention was a single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, succeeding the Legislative Assembly. It was fractured into factions even more extreme than those of the Legislative Assembly. The Jacobin Club, gathering members with republican beliefs and aspiring to establish a French democratic republic, experienced political tensions beginning in 1791. There were conflicting viewpoints in response to several revolutionary events and how to best achieve a democratic republic. A result of the increasing divide within the Jacobins was the split between the more radical Montagnards and the Girondins.

The Jacobin Club was one of several organizations that grew out of the French Revolution, distinguished by its left-wing, revolutionary politics. Because of this, the Jacobins, unlike other sects like the Girondins, were closely allied to the sans-culottes, a popular force of working-class Parisians that played a pivotal role in the development of the revolution. The Jacobins had a significant presence in the National Convention and were dubbed “the Mountain” (French: la montagne) for their seats in the uppermost part of the chamber. In addition to siding with sans-culottes, the Montagnards aimed for a more repressive form of government that would institute a price maximum on essential consumer goods and punish all traitors and enemies of the Republic. The Montagnards also believed war and other political differences required
emergency solutions. They had 302 members in 1793 and 1794, including committee members and deputies who voted with the faction. Most members of the club came from the middle class and tended to represent the Parisian population. Its leaders included Maximilien Robespierre, Jean-Paul Marat, and Georges Danton. This faction eventually gained overwhelming power in the Convention and governed France during the Reign of Terror.

Possibly the two most significant factors in the consequential split between the Montagnards and the Girondins were the September Massacres and the trial of Louis XVI, both in 1792. The official fall of the monarchy came on August 10, 1792, after Louis XVI refused to rescind his veto of the National Assembly’s constitution. The Montagnards argued for immediate execution of the king by military court-martial, insisting that he was undermining the Revolution. Because a trial would require the “presumption of innocence,” such a proceeding would contradict the mission of the National Convention. The Girondins, in contrast, agreed that the king was guilty of treason but argued for his clemency and favored the option of exile or popular referendum as his sentence. However, the trial progressed and Louis XVI was executed by guillotine in January 1793.

The second key factor in the split between the Montagnards and the Girondins was the September Massacres of 1792. Radical Parisians and members of the National Guard were angry with the poor progress in the war against Austria and Prussia and the forced enlistment of 30,000 volunteers. On August 10, radicals went on a killing spree, slaughtering roughly 1,300 inmates in various Paris prisons, many of whom were simply common criminals, not the treasonous counter-revolutionaries condemned by the Montagnards. The Girondins did not tolerate the massacres, but neither the Montagnards of the Legislative Assembly nor the Paris Commune took any action to stop or condemn the killings. Members of the Girondins later accused Marat, Robespierre, and Danton of inciting the massacres to further their dictatorial power.
The conflict between the Montagnards and the Girondins eventually led to the fall of the Girondins and their mass execution.

The Girondins campaigned for the end of the monarchy but then resisted the spiraling momentum of the Revolution. They came into conflict with The Mountain (Montagnards), a radical faction within the Jacobin Club. The Girondins comprised a group of loosely affiliated individuals rather than an organized political party.
The terms “left” and “right” to refer to political parties is one of the lasting legacies of the French Revolution. Members of the National Assembly divided into supporters of the king to the president’s right and supporters of the revolution to his left. One deputy, the Baron de Gauville, explained, “We began to recognize each other: those who were loyal to religion and the king took up positions to the right of the chair so as to avoid the shouts, oaths, and indecencies that enjoyed free rein in the opposing camp.” However, the right opposed the seating arrangement because they believed that deputies should support private or general interests but not form factions or political parties. The contemporary press occasionally used the terms “left” and “right” to refer to the opposing sides.

When the National Assembly was replaced in 1791 by the Legislative Assembly comprising entirely new members, the divisions continued. “Innovators” sat on the left, “moderates” gathered in the center, and the “conscientious defenders of the constitution” found themselves sitting on the right, where the defenders of the Ancien Régime had previously gathered. When the succeeding National Convention met in 1792, the seating arrangement continued, but following the arrest of the Girondins, the right side of the assembly was deserted, and any remaining members who had sat there moved to the center.

Attributions

• Politics within the Revolutionaries
Politics within the Revolutionaries

Several Europeans monarchies, notably Austria, Prussia, and Great Britain, engaged in military conflicts with revolutionary France to take advantage of the political chaos and stop the spread of the revolutionary, anti-royal spirit across the globe.

**Learning Objective**

State the reasons why other European states got involved in France's political turmoil

**Key Points**

- During the French Revolution, European monarchs watched the developments in France and considered whether they should intervene in support of Louis XVI or to take advantage of the chaos in France. The Holy Roman Emperor Leopold II, brother to the French Queen Marie Antoinette, initially looked on the Revolution calmly, but he and other European monarchs soon feared that the revolutionary spirit
might expand across the continent and in colonies.

- In August 1791, Leopold and King Frederick William II of Prussia, in consultation with emigrant French nobles, issued the Declaration of Pillnitz, which declared the interest of the monarchs of Europe in the well-being of Louis and his family and threatened vague but severe consequences if anything should befall them.

- Many in France wanted to wage war, including the King, many of the Feuillants, and the Girondins, although for very different reasons. The forces opposing war were much weaker. The Austrian emperor Leopold II, brother of Marie Antoinette, wished to avoid war but died in March 1792. France preemptively declared war on Austria (April 20, 1792) and Prussia joined on the Austrian side a few weeks later.

- What followed was a series of sweeping military conflicts lasting from 1792 until 1802 that would become known as the French Revolutionary Wars. They pitted the French First Republic against several monarchies, most notably Britain and Austria, and are divided in two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802).

- In July 1792, Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick, commander of the mostly Prussian army, issued a proclamation called the Brunswick Manifesto. Written by the French king’s cousin, Louis Joseph de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, the leader of an émigré corps within the Allied army, it declared the Allies’ intent to restore the king to his full powers and
to treat any person or town who opposed them as rebels to be condemned to death by martial law.

- The Revolutionary Wars ended with great success for France and revealed the talent of a new military leader, Napoleon Bonaparte. After a decade of constant warfare and aggressive diplomacy, France had succeeded in seizing and conquering a wide array of territories, from the Italian Peninsula and the Low Countries in Europe to the Louisiana Territory in North America. French success in these conflicts ensured the spread of revolutionary principles over much of Europe.

**Key Terms**

**Declaration of Pillnitz**

A statement issued on August 27, 1791, at Pillnitz Castle near Dresden (Saxony) by Frederick William II of Prussia and the Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor Leopold II, Marie Antoinette’s brother. It declared the joint support of the Holy Roman Empire and of Prussia for King Louis XVI of France against the French Revolution.

**Brunswick Manifesto**

A proclamation issued by Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick, commander of the Allied Army (principally Austrian and Prussian), on July 25, 1792, to
the population of Paris, France during the War of the First Coalition. It threatened that if the French royal family were harmed, then French civilians would be harmed. It was a measure intended to intimidate Paris, but instead, it helped further spur the increasingly radical French Revolution.

**Jacobins**

Members of a revolutionary political movement that was the most famous political club during the French Revolution, distinguished by its left wing, revolutionary politics. Unlike other sects like the Girondins, they were closely allied to the sans-culottes, a popular force of working-class Parisians that played a pivotal role in the development of the revolution. They had a significant presence in the National Convention and were dubbed ‘the Mountain’ for their seats in the uppermost part of the chamber.

**French Revolutionary Wars**

A series of sweeping military conflicts from 1792 until 1802, resulting from the French Revolution. They pitted the French First Republic against Britain, Austria, and several other monarchies. They are divided in two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802). Initially confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

**War of the First Coalition**

A 1792–1797 military conflict that was the first attempt by the European monarchies to defeat the French First Republic. France declared war on the
Habsburg Monarchy of Austria on April 20, 1792, and the Kingdom of Prussia joined the Austrian side a few weeks later. The two monarchies were joined by Great Britain and several smaller European states.

**War of the Second Coalition**

A 1798–1802 conflict that was the second war on revolutionary France by the European monarchies, led by Britain, Austria, and Russia and including the Ottoman Empire, Portugal, and Naples. Their goal was to contain the spread of chaos from France, but they failed to overthrow the revolutionary regime and French territorial gains since 1793 were confirmed.

**Girondins**

A political group operating in France from 1791 to 1795 during the French Revolution, active within the Legislative Assembly and the National Convention. They emerged from the Jacobin movement and campaigned for the end of the monarchy, but then resisted the spiraling momentum of the Revolution. They came into conflict with The Mountain (Montagnards), a radical faction within the Jacobin Club.

**Feuillants**

A political group that emerged during the French Revolution and consisted of monarchists and reactionaries who sat on the right of the Legislative Assembly of 1791. It came into existence when the left-wing Jacobins split between moderates, who sought to preserve the position of the king and supported the proposed plan of the National Assembly for a constitutional monarchy, and radicals (Jacobins), who
The Fear of Revolution Among European Monarchs

During the French Revolution, European monarchs watched the developments in France and considered whether they should intervene in support of Louis XVI or to take advantage of the chaos in France. The Holy Roman Emperor Leopold II, brother to the French Queen Marie Antoinette, initially looked on the Revolution calmly. He became disturbed as the Revolution became more radical, although he still hoped to avoid war. In August 1791, Leopold and King Frederick William II of Prussia, in consultation with emigrant French nobles, issued the Declaration of Pillnitz, which declared the interest of the monarchs of Europe in the well-being of Louis and his family and threatened vague but severe consequences if anything should befall them. Although Leopold saw the Pillnitz Declaration as a way of taking action that would enable him to avoid actually doing anything about France for the moment, Paris saw the Declaration as a serious threat and the revolutionary leaders denounced it.
The National Assembly of France interpreted the declaration to mean that Leopold was going to declare war. Radical Frenchmen who called for war used it as a pretext to gain influence and declare war on April 20, 1792, leading to the campaigns of 1792 in the French Revolutionary Wars.

The King, many of the Feuillants, and the Girondins wanted to wage war. Louis XVI and many Feuillants expected war would increase his personal popularity. He also foresaw an opportunity to exploit any defeat; either result would make him stronger. The Girondins, on the other hand, wanted to export the Revolution throughout Europe and, by extension defend the Revolution within France.

The forces opposing war were much weaker. Some Feuillants believed France had little chance to win and feared a loss might lead to greater radicalization of the revolution. On the other end of the political spectrum, Robespierre opposed a war on two grounds: he was concerned it would strengthen the monarchy and military at the expense of the revolution and that it would incur the anger
of ordinary people in Austria and elsewhere. The Austrian emperor Leopold II, brother of Marie Antoinette, wished to avoid war but died in March 1792. In addition to the ideological differences between France and the monarchical powers of Europe, disputes continued over the status of imperial estates in Alsace and the French authorities became concerned about the agitation of emigré nobles abroad, especially in the Austrian Netherlands and the minor states of Germany. France preemptively declared war on Austria (April 20, 1792) and Prussia joined on the Austrian side a few weeks later.

French Revolutionary Wars

What followed was a series of sweeping military conflicts lasting from 1792 until 1802 that would become known as the French Revolutionary Wars. They pitted the French First Republic against several monarchies, most notably Britain and Austria, and are divided in two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802). Initially confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

First Coalition

While the revolutionary government frantically raised fresh troops and reorganized its armies, a mostly Prussian Allied army under Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick assembled at Koblenz on the Rhine. In July the invasion commenced, with Brunswick’s army easily taking the fortresses of Longwy and Verdun. The duke then issued a proclamation called the Brunswick
Manifesto (July 1792), written by the French king’s cousin, Louis Joseph de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, the leader of an émigré corps within the Allied army. This document declared the Allies’ intent to restore the king to his full powers and treat any person or town who opposed them as rebels to be condemned to death by martial law. This, however, strengthened the resolve of the revolutionary army and government to oppose them by any means necessary. On August 10, a crowd stormed the Tuileries Palace, seizing the king and his family.

The Brunswick Manifesto, rather than intimidate the populace into submission, sent it into furious action and created fear and anger towards the Allies. It also spurred revolutionaries to take further action, organizing an uprising. On August 10, the Tuileries Palace was stormed in a bloody battle with Swiss Guards protecting it, the survivors of which were massacred by the mob.

The War of the First Coalition began with French victories, which rejuvenated the nation and emboldened the National Convention to abolish the monarchy. In 1793, the new French armies experienced numerous defeats, which allowed the Jacobins to rise to power and impose the Reign of Terror as a method of attempting to unify the
nation. In 1794, the situation improved dramatically for the French. By 1795, they had captured the Austrian Netherlands and knocked Spain and Prussia out of the war with the Peace of Basel. A hitherto unknown general Napoleon Bonaparte began his first campaign in Italy in April 1796. In less than a year, French armies under Napoleon decimated the Habsburg forces and evicted them from the Italian peninsula, winning almost every battle and capturing 150,000 prisoners. With French forces marching towards Vienna, the Austrians sued for peace and agreed to the Treaty of Campo Formio, ending the First Coalition against the Republic.

Second Coalition

The War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802) included an alliance of Britain, Austria, Russia, the Ottoman Empire, Portugal, and Naples. Their goal was to contain the spread of chaos from France but they failed to overthrow the revolutionary regime, and French territorial gains since 1793 were confirmed. The Coalition did very well in 1799, but Russia pulled out. Napoleon took charge in France in late 1799 and he and his generals defeated the Coalition. In the Treaty of Lunéville in 1801, France held all of its previous gains and obtained new lands in Tuscany, Italy, while Austria was granted Venetia and the Dalmatian coast. Britain and France signed the Treaty of Amiens in March 1802, bringing an interval of peace in Europe that lasted for 14 months.

After a decade of constant warfare and aggressive diplomacy, France seized and conquered a wide array of territories, from the Italian Peninsula and the Low Countries in Europe to the Louisiana Territory in North America. French success in these conflicts ensured the spread of revolutionary principles over much of Europe.
Attributions

- Foreign Intervention
60. Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette's Attempts to Escape

22.4.4: Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette’s Attempts to Escape

The Flight to Varennes, or the royal family's unsuccessful escape from Paris during the night of June 20–21, 1791, undermined the credibility of the king as a constitutional monarch and eventually led to the escalation of the crisis and the execution of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette.

Learning Objective

Analyze the consequences of the royal family's attempted escapes

Key Points

• Following the Women's March on Versailles, the royal family was forced to return to Paris. They
remained virtual prisoners in the Tuileries, the official residence of the king. Louis XVI became emotionally paralyzed, leaving most important decisions to the queen. At her insistence, Louis committed himself and his family to a disastrous attempt of escape from the capital to the eastern frontier on June 21, 1791.

- Due to the cumulative effect of a host of errors that in and of themselves would not have condemned the mission to failure, the royal family was thwarted in its escape after Jean-Baptiste Drouet, the postmaster of Sainte-Menéhould, recognized the king from his portrait. The king and his family were eventually arrested in the town of Varennes, 31 miles from their ultimate destination, the heavily fortified royalist citadel of Montmédy.

- The intended goal of the unsuccessful flight was to provide the king with greater freedom of action and personal security than was possible in Paris. At Montmédy, General François Claude de Bouillé concentrated a force of 10,000 regulars of the old royal army who were still considered loyal to the monarchy. The long-term political objectives of the royal couple and their closest advisers remain unclear.

- The credibility of the king as a constitutional monarch had been seriously undermined. However, on July 15, 1791 the National Constituent Assembly agreed that he could be restored to power if he agreed to the constitution, although some factions opposed the proposal. The decision led to the Champ de Mars Massacre two days later.

- From the autumn of 1791 on, the king tied his hopes
of political salvation to the dubious prospects of foreign intervention. Prompted by Marie Antoinette, Louis rejected the advice of the moderate constitutionalists, led by Antoine Barnave, to fully implement the Constitution of 1791 he had sworn to maintain.

- The outbreak of the war with Austria in April 1792 and the publication of the Brunswick Manifesto led to the storming of the Tuileries by Parisian radicals on August 10, 1792. This attack led in turn to the suspension of the king's powers by the Legislative Assembly and the proclamation of the First French Republic on September 21. Some republicans called for the king's deposition, others for his trial for alleged treason and intended defection to the enemies of the French nation. Convicted, Louis was sent to the guillotine on January 21, 1793. Nine months later, Marie Antoinette was also convicted of treason and beheaded on October 16.

---

**Key Terms**

**Flight to Varennes**

An unsuccessful attempt to escape Paris by King Louis XVI of France, his wife Marie Antoinette, and their immediate family during the night of June 20-21, 1791 to initiate a counter-revolution at the head of loyal troops under royalist officers concentrated at...
Montmédy near the frontier. They escaped only as far as the small town of Varennes, where they were arrested after having been recognized at their previous stop in Sainte-Menehould.

**Brunswick Manifesto**

A proclamation issued on July 25, 1792, by Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick, commander of the Allied Army (principally Austrian and Prussian) to the population of Paris during the War of the First Coalition. It threatened that if the French royal family were harmed, then French civilians would be harmed. It was a measure intended to intimidate Paris, but instead, it helped further spur the increasingly radical French Revolution.

**Champ de Mars Massacre**

A massacre that took place on July 17, 1791, in Paris in the midst of the French Revolution. Two days earlier, the National Constituent Assembly issued a decree that Louis XVI would remain king under a constitutional monarchy. This decision came after King Louis XVI and his family unsuccessfully tried to flee France in the Flight to Varennes the month before. Later that day, leaders of the republicans in France rallied against this decision, eventually leading royalist Lafayette to order the massacre.

**March on Versailles**

A march on October 5, 1789, during the French Revolution among women in the marketplaces of Paris who were near rioting over the high price and scarcity of bread. Their demonstrations quickly became intertwined with the activities of revolutionaries, who
Flight to Varennes

Following the Women’s March on Versailles, the royal family was forced to return to Paris. Louis XVI attempted to work within the framework of his limited powers but won little support. He and the royal family remained virtual prisoners in the Tuileries, a royal and imperial palace in Paris that served as the residence of most French monarchs. For the next two years, the palace remained the official residence of the king.

Louis XVI became emotionally paralyzed, leaving most important decisions to the queen. Prodded by the queen, Louis committed the family to a disastrous escape attempt from the capital to the eastern frontier on June 21, 1791. With the dauphin’s governess the Marquise de Tourzel taking on the role of a Russian baroness, the queen pretending to be a governess, the king’s sister, Madame Élisabeth a nurse, the king a valet, and the royal children the alleged baroness’ daughters, the royal family made their escape leaving the Tuileries around midnight. The escape was largely planned by the queen’s favorite, the Swedish Count Axel von Fersen and the Baron de Bréteuil, who had garnered support from Swedish King Gustavus III. Fersen had urged the use of two light carriages, which would
have made the 200-mile journey to Montmédy relatively quickly. However this would have involved splitting up the royal family and Louis and Marie-Antoinette decided on the use of a heavy, conspicuous coach drawn by six horses.

Due to the cumulative effect of a host of errors, which in and of themselves would not have condemned the mission to failure, the royal family was thwarted in its escape after Jean-Baptiste Drouet, the postmaster of Sainte-Menehould, recognized the king from his portrait. The king and his family were eventually arrested in the town of Varennes, 31 miles from their ultimate destination, the heavily fortified royalist citadel of Montmédy.

The arrest of Louis XVI and his family at the house of the registrar of passports, at Varennes in June 1791 by Thomas Falcon Marshall.

The king's flight was traumatic for France. The realization that the king had effectually repudiated the revolutionary reforms made to that point came as a shock to people who until then had seen him as a fundamentally decent king who governed as a manifestation of God's will. They felt betrayed. Republicanism burst out of the coffeehouses and became the dominant ideal of revolutionary leaders.
The Question of Goals

The intended goal of the unsuccessful flight was to provide the king with greater freedom of action and personal security than was possible in Paris. At Montmédy, General François Claude de Bouillé concentrated a force of 10,000 regulars of the old royal army who were still considered loyal to the monarchy. The long-term political objectives of the royal couple and their closest advisers remain unclear. A detailed document entitled Declaration to the French People prepared by Louis for presentation to the National Assembly and left behind in the Tuileries indicates that his personal goal was a return to the concessions and compromises contained in the declaration of the Third Estate in June 1789, immediately prior to the outbreak of violence in Paris and the storming of the Bastille. Private correspondence from Marie Antoinette takes a more reactionary line of restoration of the old monarchy without concessions, although referring to pardons for all but the revolutionary leadership and the city of Paris.

The Champ de Mars Massacre

When the royal family finally returned under guard to Paris, the revolutionary crowd met the royal carriage with uncharacteristic silence and the royal family was again confined to the Tuileries Palace. From this point forward, the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of a republic became an ever-increasing possibility. The credibility of the king as a constitutional monarch had been seriously undermined. However, on July 15, 1791, the National Constituent Assembly agreed that the king could be restored to power if he agreed to the constitution, although some factions opposed the proposal.
Later that day, Jacques Pierre Brissot, editor and main writer of *Le Patriote français* and president of the Comité des Recherches of Paris, drew up a petition demanding the removal of the king. A crowd of 50,000 people gathered at the Champ de Mars on July 17 to sign the petition, and about 6,000 had already signed. But earlier that day, two suspicious people hidigg at the Champ de Mars were hanged by those who found them. Jean Sylvain Bailly, the mayor of Paris, used this incident to declare martial law. The Marquis de Lafayette and the National Guard, which was under his command, were temporarily able to disperse the crowd but even more people returned later that afternoon. Lafayette again tried to disperse the crowd, who in response threw stones at the National Guard. After firing unsuccessful warning shots, the National Guard opened fire directly on the crowd, an event known as the Champ de Mars Massacre. The exact numbers of dead and wounded are unknown; estimates range from 12 to 50 dead.

**Execution of Louis and Marie Antoinette**

From the autumn of 1791 on, the king tied his hopes of political salvation to the dubious prospects of foreign intervention. Prompted by Marie Antoinette, Louis rejected the advice of the moderate constitutionalists, led by Antoine Barnave, to fully implement the Constitution of 1791 he had sworn to maintain. He instead secretly committed himself to covert counter-revolution. At the same time, the king’s failed escape attempt alarmed many other European monarchs, who feared that the revolutionary fervor would spread to their countries and result in instability outside France. Relations between France and its neighbors, already strained because of the revolution, deteriorated even further, with some foreign ministries calling for war against the revolutionary government.

The outbreak of the war with Austria in April 1792 and the
publication of the Brunswick Manifesto led to the storming of the Tuileries by Parisian radicals on August 10, 1792. This attack led in turn to the suspension of the king’s powers by the Legislative Assembly and the proclamation of the First French Republic on September 21. In November, proof of Louis XVI’s dealings with the deceased revolutionary politician Mirabeau and of his counterrevolutionary intrigues with foreigners was found in a secret iron chest in the Tuileries. It was now no longer possible to pretend that the reforms of the French Revolution had been made with the free consent of the king. Some republicans called for his deposition, others for his trial for alleged treason and intended defection to the enemies of the French nation. On December 3, it was decided that Louis XVI, who together with his family had been imprisoned since August, should be brought to trial for treason. He appeared twice before the National Convention. Convicted, Louis was sent to the guillotine on January 21, 1793. Nine months later, Marie Antoinette was also convicted of treason and beheaded on October 16.

Attributions

- Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette’s Attempts to Escape
22.5: The Reign of Terror

22.5.1: The Legislative Assembly

The Legislative Assembly, the legislature of revolutionary France from October 1, 1791 to September 20, 1792, provided the focus of political debate and revolutionary law-making. However, its tenure overlapped with a period of extreme political and social chaos.

**Learning Objective**

Explain the structure and role of the Legislative Assembly

**Key Points**

- The Legislative Assembly first met on October 1, 1791, under the Constitution of 1791, consisting of 745 members. Few were nobles, very few were clergymen, and the majority came from the middle class. The
members were generally young, and since none had sat in the previous Assembly they largely lacked national political experience.

- From the beginning, relations between the king and the Legislative Assembly were hostile. Louis repeatedly vetoed decrees proposed by the Assembly and the war against Austria (soon joined by Prussia) intensified tensions. Soon, the King dismissed Girondins from the Ministry.
- When the king formed a new cabinet mostly of Feuillants, the breach with the king and the Assembly on one side and the majority of the common people of Paris on the other. Events came to a head in June when Lafayette sent a letter to the Assembly recommending the suppression of the “anarchists” and political clubs in the capital. The Demonstration of June 20 followed.
- The Girondins made a last advance to Louis, offering to save the monarchy if he would accept them as ministers. His refusal united all the Jacobins in the project of overturning the monarchy by force. The local leaders of this new stage of the revolution were assisted in their work by the fear of invasion by the allied army.
- On the night of August 10, 1792, insurgents and popular militias, supported by the revolutionary Paris Commune, assailed the Tuileries Palace and massacred the Swiss Guards assigned for the protection of the king. The royal family became prisoners and a rump session of the Legislative Assembly suspended the monarchy.
- Chaos persisted until the National Convention,
elected by universal male suffrage and charged with writing a new constitution, met on September 20, 1792, and became the new de facto government of France. By the same token, the Legislative Assembly ceased to exist.

**Key Terms**

**September Massacres**
A wave of killings in Paris (September 2–7, 1792) and other cities in late summer 1792, during the French Revolution. They were partly triggered by a fear that foreign and royalist armies would attack Paris and that the inmates of the city's prisons would be freed and join them. Radicals called for preemptive action, which was undertaken by mobs of National Guardsmen and some fédérés. It was tolerated by the city government, the Paris Commune, which called on other cities to follow suit.

**Brunswick Manifesto**
A proclamation issued by Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick, commander of the Allied Army (principally Austrian and Prussian), on July 25, 1792, to the population of Paris during the War of the First Coalition. It threatened that if the French royal family were harmed, French civilians would be harmed. This measure was intended to intimidate Paris, but
instead helped further spur the increasingly radical French Revolution.

**Demonstration of June 20**

The last peaceful attempt (1792) made by the people of Paris during the French Revolution to persuade King Louis XVI of France to abandon his current policy and attempt to follow what they believed to be a more empathetic approach to governing. Its objectives were to convince the government to enforce the Legislative Assembly's rulings, defend France against foreign invasion, and preserve the spirit of the French Constitution of 1791. The demonstrators hoped that the king would withdraw his veto and recall the *Girondin* ministers. It was the last phase of the unsuccessful attempt to establish a constitutional monarchy in France.

**Paris Commune**

During the French Revolution, the government of Paris from 1789 until 1795. Established in the Hôtel de Ville just after the storming of the Bastille, it consisted of 144 delegates elected by the 48 divisions of the city. It became insurrectionary in the summer of 1792, essentially refusing to take orders from the central French government. It took charge of routine civic functions but is best known for mobilizing extreme views. It lost much power in 1794 and was replaced in 1795.

**Legislative Assembly**

The legislature of France from October 1, 1791, to September 20, 1792, during the years of the French Revolution. It provided the focus of political debate and
revolutionary law-making between the periods of the National Constituent Assembly and the National Convention.

Political Power at the Legislative Assembly

The Legislative Assembly first met on October 1, 1791 under the Constitution of 1791, and consisted of 745 members. Few were nobles, very few were clergymen, and the majority came from the middle class. The members were generally young, and since none had sat in the previous Assembly, largely lacked national political experience.

The rightists within the assembly consisted of about 260 Feuillants (constitutional monarchists), whose chief leaders, Gilbert du Motier de La Fayette and Antoine Barnave, remained outside the Assembly because of their ineligibility for re-election. They were staunch constitutional monarchists, firm in their defense of the King against the popular agitation. The leftists were 136 Jacobins (still including the party later known as the Girondins or Girondists) and Cordeliers (a populist group, whose many members would later become the radical Montagnards). Its most famous leaders were Jacques Pierre Brissot, the philosopher Condorcet, and Pierre Victurnien Vergniaud. The Left drew its inspiration from the more radical tendency of the Enlightenment, regarded the émigré nobles as traitors, and espoused anticlericalism. They were suspicious of Louis XVI, some favoring a general European war both to spread the new ideals of liberty and equality and to put the king’s loyalty to the test. The remainder of the House, 345 deputies, belonged to no
definite party and were called the Marsh (Le Marais) or the Plain (La Plaine). They were committed to the ideals of the Revolution and thus generally inclined to side with the left but would also occasionally back proposals from the right.

Some historians dispute these numbers and estimate that the Legislative Assembly consisted of about 165 Feuillants (the right), about 330 Jacobins (including Girondins; the left), and about 350 deputies, who did not belong to any definite party but voted most often with the left. The differences emerge from how historians approach data in primary sources, where numbers reported by the clubs do not overlap with analyses of club membership conducted independently by name.
The Legislative Assembly was driven by two opposing groups. The first were conservative members of the bourgeoisie (wealthy middle class in the Third Estate) that favored a constitutional monarchy, represented by the Feuillants, who felt that the revolution had already achieved its goal. The other group was the democratic faction for whom the king could no longer be trusted, represented by the new members of the Jacobin club that claimed that more revolutionary measures were necessary.

Louis XVI’s Relationship with the Assembly

From the beginning, relations between the king and the Legislative Assembly were hostile. Louis vetoed two decrees proposed in November: that the émigrés assembled on the frontiers should be liable to the penalties of death and confiscation if they remained so assembled and that every non-juring clergyman must take the civic oath on pain of losing his pension and potential deportation.

The war declared on April 20, 1792, against Austria (soon joined by Prussia) started as a disaster for the French. Tensions between Louis XVI and the Legislative Assembly intensified and the blame for war failures was thrown first upon the king and his ministers and the Girondins party. The Legislative Assembly passed decrees sentencing any priest denounced by 20 citizens to immediate deportation, dissolving the King’s guard on the grounds that it was manned by aristocrats, and establishing a camp of 20,000 national guardsmen (Fédérés) near Paris. The King vetoed the decrees and dismissed Girondins from the Ministry. When the king formed a new cabinet mostly of Feuillants, the breach between the king on the one hand and the Assembly and the majority of the common people of Paris on the other widened. Events came to a head in June when Lafayette sent a letter to the Assembly recommending the suppression of the “anarchists” and political clubs in the capital. The Demonstration of June 20, 1792, followed as the last peaceful
attempt made by the people of Paris to persuade King Louis XVI of France to abandon his current policy and attempt to follow what they believed to be a more empathetic approach to governing.

The King’s veto of the Legislative Assembly’s decrees was published on June 19, just one day before the 3rd anniversary of the Tennis Court Oath that inaugurated the Revolution. The popular demonstration of June 20, 1792, was organized to put pressure on the King.
Events of August 10

The Girondins made a last advance to Louis offering to save the monarchy if he would accept them as ministers. His refusal united all the Jacobins in the project of overturning the monarchy by force. The local leaders of this new stage of the revolution were assisted in their work by the fear of invasion by the allied army. The Assembly declared the country in danger and the Brunswick Manifesto, combined with the news that Austrian and Prussian armies had marched into French soil, heated the republican spirit to fury.

On the night of August 10, 1792, insurgents and popular militias supported by the revolutionary Paris Commune assailed the Tuileries Palace and massacred the Swiss Guards assigned for the protection of the king. The royal family became prisoners and a rump session of the Legislative Assembly suspended the monarchy. Little more than a third of the deputies were present, almost all of them Jacobins. What remained of a national government depended on the support of the insurrectionary Commune. With enemy troops advancing, the Commune looked for potential traitors in Paris and sent a circular letter to the other cities of France inviting them to follow this example. In Paris and many other cities, the massacres of prisoners and priests (known as September Massacres) followed. The Assembly could offer only feeble resistance. In October, however, there was a counterattack accusing the instigators of being terrorists. This led to a political contest between the more moderate Girondists and the more radical Montagnards inside the Convention, with rumor used as a weapon by both sides. The Girondists lost ground when they seemed too conciliatory, but the pendulum swung again after the men who endorsed the massacres were denounced as terrorists.

Chaos persisted until the National Convention, elected by universal male suffrage and charged with writing a new constitution, met on September 20, 1792, and became the new de facto government of France. The Legislative Assembly ceased to
exist. The next day, the Convention abolished the monarchy and declared a republic.

Attributions

- The Legislative Assembly
  - “LegislativeAssemblyMedal.jpg.” https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/
File:LegislativeAssemblyMedal.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.

- “PeopleStormingTuileries.jpg.”
62. The First French Republic and Regicide

22.5.2: The First French Republic and Regicide

The execution of Louis XVI on January 21, 1793, radicalized the French Revolution at home and united European monarchies against revolutionary France.

Learning Objective

Evaluate the decision to execute the king and queen

Key Points

• The Insurrection of August 10, 1792, led to the creation of the National Convention, elected by universal male suffrage and charged with writing a new constitution. On September 20, the Convention became the new de facto government of France, and the next day it abolished the monarchy and declared a republic.

• A commission was established to examine evidence
against the King while the Convention's Legislation Committee considered legal aspects of any future trial. Most Montagnards (radical republicans) favored judgement and execution, while the Girondins (moderate republicans) were divided concerning Louis's fate.

- The trial began on December 3. The following day, the Convention's president Bertrand Barère de Vieuzac presented it with the indictment and decreed the interrogation of Louis XVI. Louis XVI heard 33 charges.

- Given overwhelming evidence of Louis' collusion with the invaders during the ongoing war with Austria and Prussia, the verdict was a foregone conclusion. Ultimately, 693 deputies voted “yes” in favor of a guilty verdict. Not a single deputy voted “no,” although 26 attached some condition to their votes. For punishment, 361 voted for death without conditions, just carrying the vote by a marginal majority.

- On January 21, 1793, the former Louis XVI, now simply named Citoyen Louis Capet (Citizen Louis Capet), was executed by guillotine. Marie Antoinette was tried separately, after Louis's death. She was guillotined on October 16, 1793.

- In France, the Reign of Terror followed. Across Europe, conservatives were horrified and monarchies called for war against revolutionary France. The execution of Louis XVI united all European governments, including Spain, Naples, and the Netherlands, against the Revolution.
**Key Terms**

**Paris Commune**

During the French Revolution, the government of Paris from 1789 until 1795. Established in the Hôtel de Ville just after the storming of the Bastille, it consisted of 144 delegates elected by the 48 divisions of the city. It became insurrectionary in the summer of 1792, refusing to take orders from the central French government. It took charge of routine civic functions but is best known for mobilizing extreme views. It lost much power in 1794 and was replaced in 1795.

**Insurrection of August 10, 1792**

One of the defining events in the history of the French Revolution, the storming of the Tuileries Palace by the National Guard of the insurrectional Paris Commune and revolutionary fédérés from Marseilles and Brittany resulted in the fall of the French monarchy. King Louis XVI and the royal family took shelter with the Legislative Assembly, which was suspended. The formal end of the monarchy six weeks later was one of the first acts of the new National Convention.

**Legislative Assembly**

The legislature of France from October 1, 1791, to September 20, 1792, during the years of the French Revolution. It provided the focus of political debate and revolutionary law-making between the periods of the National Constituent Assembly and the National Convention.
The Aftermath of August 10

The Insurrection of August 10, 1792, was one of the defining events in the history of the French Revolution. The storming of the Tuileries Palace by the National Guard of the insurrectional Paris Commune and revolutionary fédérés (federates) from Marseilles and Brittany resulted in the fall of the French monarchy. King Louis XVI and the royal family took shelter with the Legislative Assembly, which was suspended. Chaos persisted until the National Convention, elected by universal male suffrage and charged with writing a new constitution, met on September 20, 1792, and became the new de facto government of France. The next day the Convention abolished the monarchy and declared a republic.

The Convention's unanimous declaration of a French Republic on September 21, 1792, left open the fate of the King. A commission was established to examine evidence against him while the Convention's Legislation Committee considered legal aspects of any future trial. Most Montagnards (radical republicans) favored judgement and execution, while the Girondins (moderate republicans) were divided concerning Louis's fate, with some arguing for royal inviolability, others for clemency, and still others for either lesser punishment or death. On November 20, opinion turned sharply against Louis following the discovery of a secret cache of 726 documents of his personal communications. Most of the pieces of correspondence in the cabinet involved ministers of Louis XVI, but others involved most of the big players of the Revolution. These documents, despite the likely gaps and pre-selection showed the duplicity of advisers and ministers—at least those that Louis XVI trusted—who had set up parallel policies.
The Trial

The trial began on December 3. The following day, the Convention’s president Bertrand Barère de Vieuza presented it with the indictment and decreed the interrogation of Louis XVI. The Convention’s secretary read the charges: “the French people” accused Louis of committing “a multitude of crimes in order to establish [his] tyranny by destroying its liberty.” Louis XVI heard 33 charges.

Louis XVI sought the most illustrious legal minds in France as his defense team. The task of lead counsel eventually fell to Raymond Desèze, assisted by François Denis Tronchet and Guillaume-Chrétien de Lamoignon de Malesherbes. Although he had only two weeks to prepare his defense arguments, on December 26 Desèze pleaded the king’s case for three hours, arguing eloquently yet discreetly that the revolution spare his life.

Given overwhelming evidence of Louis’s collusion with the invaders during the ongoing war with Austria and Prussia, the verdict was a foregone conclusion. Ultimately, 693 deputies voted “yes” for a guilty verdict. Not a single deputy voted “no,” although 26 attached some condition to their votes. 26 deputies were absent from the vote, most on official business. 23 deputies abstained for various reasons, several because they felt they had been elected to make laws rather than to judge.

For the king’s sentence, deputy Jean-Baptiste Mailhe proposed “Death, but (...) I think it would be worthy of the Convention to consider whether it would be useful to policy to delay the execution.” This “Mailhe amendment,” supported by 26 deputies, was regarded by some of Mailhe’s contemporaries as a conspiracy to save the king’s life. It was even suggested that Mailhe had been paid, perhaps by Spanish gold. Paris voted overwhelmingly for death, 21 to 3. Robespierre voted first and said “The sentiment that led me to call for the abolition of the death penalty is the same that today forces me to demand that it be applied to the tyrant of my
country.” Philippe Égalité, formerly the Duke of Orléans and Louis’ own cousin, voted for his execution, a cause of much future bitterness among French monarchists.

There were 721 voters in total. 34 voted for death with attached conditions (23 of whom invoked the Mailhe amendment), 2 voted for life imprisonment in irons, 319 voted for imprisonment until the end of the war (to be followed by banishment), and 361 voted for death without conditions, just carrying the vote by a marginal majority. Louis was to be put to death.

**Execution**

On January 21, 1793, Louis XVI awoke at 5 a.m. and heard his last Mass. Upon Father Edgeworth's advice, he avoided a farewell scene with his family. His royal seal was to go to the Dauphin and his wedding ring to the Queen. At 10 a.m., a carriage with the king arrived at *Place de la Révolutio* n and proceeded to a space surrounded by guns and drums and a crowd carrying pikes and bayonets, which had been kept free at the foot of the scaffold. The former Louis XVI, now simply named *Citoyen Louis Capet* (Citizen Louis Capet), was executed by guillotine.

Marie Antoinette was tried separately, after Louis's death. She was guillotined on October 16, 1793.
The body of Louis XVI was immediately transported to the old Church of the Madeleine (demolished in 1799), since the legislation in force forbade burial of his remains beside those of his father, the Dauphin Louis de France, at Sens. On January 21, 1815 Louis XVI and his wife’s remains were reburied in the Basilica of Saint-Denis where in 1816 his brother, King Louis XVIII, had a funerary monument erected by Edme Gaulle.

Aftermath of the Execution

In April 1793, members of the Montagnards went on to establish the Committee of Public Safety under Robespierre, which would be responsible for the Terror (September 5, 1793 – July 28, 1794), the bloodiest and one of the most controversial phases of the French Revolution. The time between 1792 and 1794 was dominated by the radical ideology until the execution of Robespierre in July 1794.

Across Europe, conservatives were horrified and monarchies called for war against revolutionary France. The execution of Louis XVI united all European governments, including Spain, Naples, and
the Netherlands, against the Revolution. France declared war against Britain and the Netherlands on February 1, 1793, and soon afterwards against Spain. In the course of 1793, the Holy Roman Empire, the kings of Portugal and Naples, and the Grand-Duke of Tuscany declared war against France. Thus, the First Coalition was formed.

Attributions
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22.5.3: Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety

The period of the Jacobin rule known as the Reign of Terror, under the leadership of Maximilien Robespierre, was the first time in history that terror became an official government policy with the stated aim to use violence to achieve a higher political goal.

Learning Objective

Break down the politics of fear and how Robespierre used them to control France

Key Points

- The Reign of Terror (September 5, 1793 – July 28, 1794), also known as The Terror, was a period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, the Girondins (moderate republicans) and the Jacobins.
(radical republicans), and marked by mass executions of “the enemies of the revolution.”

- The foundation of the Terror was centered around the April 1793 creation of the Committee of Public Safety. As a wartime measure, the Committee was given broad supervisory powers over military, judicial, and legislative efforts. Its power peaked between August 1793 and July 1794 under the leadership of Robespierre, who established a virtual dictatorship.

- In June 1793, Paris sections took over the Convention, calling for administrative and political purges, a low fixed price for bread, and a limitation of the electoral franchise to sans-culottes alone. The Jacobins identified themselves with the popular movement and the sans-culottes, who in turn saw popular violence as a political right. The sans-culottes, exasperated by the inadequacies of the government, invaded the Convention and overthrew the Girondins. In their place they endorsed the political ascendancy of the Jacobins.

- On June 24, the Convention adopted the first republican constitution of France, the French Constitution of 1793. It was ratified by public referendum, but never put into force. Like other laws, it was indefinitely suspended and in October, it was announced that the government of France would be “revolutionary until the peace.”

- Although the Girondins and the Jacobins were both on the extreme left and shared many of the same radical republican convictions, the Jacobins were more brutally efficient in setting up a war government. The year of Jacobin rule was the first
time in history that terror became an official government policy, with the stated aim to use violence to achieve a higher political goal.

- In June 1794, Robespierre, who favored deism over atheism, recommended that the Convention acknowledge the existence of his god. The next day, the worship of the deistic Supreme Being was inaugurated as an official aspect of the revolution. As a result of Robespierre’s insistence on associating terror with virtue, his efforts to make the republic a morally united patriotic community became equated with the endless bloodshed. Shortly after that, following a decisive military victory over Austria at the Battle of Fleurus, Robespierre was overthrown on July 27, 1794.

**Key Terms**

**sans-culottes**

The common people of the lower classes in late 18th century France, a great many of whom became radical and militant partisans of the French Revolution in response to their poor quality of life under the Ancien Régime.

**Committee of Public Safety**

A committee created in April 1793 by the National Convention and then restructured in July 1793 to form...
the de facto executive government in France during the Reign of Terror (1793–94), a stage of the French Revolution.

**Reign of Terror**
A period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, the Girondins and the Jacobins, and marked by mass executions of “the enemies of the revolution.” The death toll ranged in the tens of thousands, with 16,594 executed by guillotine and another 25,000 in summary executions across France.

**National Convention**
A single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the insurrection of August 10, 1792.

The Reign of Terror (September 5, 1793 – July 28, 1794), also known as The Terror, was a period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, the Girondins (moderate republicans) and the Jacobins (radical republicans), and marked by mass executions of “the enemies of the revolution.” The death toll ranged in the tens of
thousands, with 16,594 executed by guillotine and another 25,000 in summary executions across France.

The Committee of Public Safety

The foundation of the Terror was the April 1793 creation of the Committee of Public Safety. The National Convention believed that the Committee needed to rule with “near dictatorial power” and gave it new and expansive political powers to respond quickly to popular demands. The Committee—composed at first of nine and later of 12 members—assumed its role of protecting the newly established republic against foreign attacks and internal rebellion. As a wartime measure, the Committee was given broad supervisory powers over military, judicial, and legislative efforts. It was formed as an administrative body to supervise and expedite the work of the executive bodies of the Convention and the government ministers appointed by the Convention. As the Committee tried to meet the dangers of a coalition of European nations and counter-revolutionary forces within the country, it became more and more powerful.

In July 1793, following the defeat at the Convention of the Girondists, the prominent leaders of the radical Jacobins—Maximilien Robespierre and Saint-Just—were added to the Committee. The power of the Committee peaked between August 1793 and July 1794 under the leadership of Robespierre. In December 1793, the Convention formally conferred executive power upon the Committee and Robespierre established a virtual dictatorship.
Influenced by 18th-century Enlightenment *philosophes* such as Rousseau and Montesquieu, Robespierre was a capable articulator of the beliefs of the left-wing bourgeoisie and a deist. He opposed the dechristianization of France during the French Revolution. His steadfast adherence and defense of the views he expressed earned him the nickname *l’Incorruptible* (The Incorruptible).
The Terror

In June 1793, Paris sections took over the Convention, calling for administrative and political purges, a low fixed price for bread, and a limitation of the electoral franchise to sans-culottes alone. The Jacobins identified themselves with the popular movement and the sans-culottes, who in turn saw popular violence as a political right. The sans-culottes, exasperated by the inadequacies of the government, invaded the Convention and overthrew the Girondins. In their place they endorsed the political ascendancy of the Jacobins. Robespierre came to power on the back of street violence.

Meanwhile, on June 24, the Convention adopted the first republican constitution of France, the French Constitution of 1793. It was ratified by public referendum but never put into force. Like other laws, it was indefinitely suspended and in October, it was announced that the government of France would be “revolutionary until the peace.” In an attempt to make their stance known to the world, the National Convention, led by Robespierre, also released a statement of French foreign policy. It served to further highlight the convention’s fear of enemies of the Revolution. Because of this fear, several other pieces of legislation passed that furthered the Jacobin domination of the Revolution. This led to the consolidation, extension, and application of emergency government devices to maintain what the Revolution considered control.

Although the Girondins and the Jacobins were both on the extreme left and shared many of the same radical republican convictions, the Jacobins were more brutally efficient in setting up a war government. The year of Jacobin rule was the first time in history that terror became an official government policy, with the stated aim to use violence to achieve a higher political goal. The Jacobins were meticulous in maintaining a legal structure for the Terror, so clear records exist for official death sentences. However, many more were murdered without formal sentences pronounced in a court of law. The Revolutionary Tribunal summarily condemned
thousands of people to death by guillotine, while mobs beat other victims to death. Sometimes people died for their political opinions or actions, but many for little reason beyond mere suspicion or because others had a stake in getting rid of them. Among people who were condemned by the revolutionary tribunals, about 8% were aristocrats, 6% clergy, 14% middle class, and 72% were workers or peasants accused of hoarding, evading the draft, desertion, or rebellion.

The passing of the Law of Suspects stepped political terror up to a much higher level of cruelty. Anyone who ‘by their conduct, relations, words or writings showed themselves to be supporters of tyranny and federalism and enemies of freedom’ was targeted and suspected of treason. This created a mass overflow in the prison systems. As a result, the prison population of Paris increased from 1,417 to 4,525 people over a three months.
The Republic of Virtue and the Fall of Robespierre

In October 1793, a new law made all suspected priests and persons who harbored them liable to summary execution. The climax of extreme anti-clericalism was reached with the celebration of the goddess Reason in Notre Dame Cathedral in November. In June 1794, Robespierre, who favored deism over atheism and had previously condemned the Cult of Reason, recommended that the convention acknowledge the existence of his god. On the next day, the worship of the deistic Supreme Being was inaugurated as an official aspect of the revolution. This austere new religion of virtue was received with signs of hostility by the Parisian public. As a result of Robespierre’s insistence on associating Terror with Virtue, his efforts to make the republic a morally united patriotic community became equated with the endless bloodshed.

Following a decisive military victory over Austria at the Battle of Fleurus, Robespierre was overthrown on July 27, 1794. His fall was brought about by conflicts between those who wanted more power for the Committee of Public Safety (and a more radical policy than he was willing to allow) and moderates who completely opposed the revolutionary government. Robespierre tried to commit suicide before his execution by shooting himself, although the bullet only shattered his jaw. He was guillotined on July 28. The reign of the standing Committee of Public Safety was ended. New members were appointed the day after Robespierre’s execution and term limits were imposed. The Committee’s powers were reduced piece by piece.
Attributions
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The National Convention (1792–95), the first French assembly elected by universal male suffrage, transitioned from being paralyzed by factional conflicts to becoming the legislative body overseeing the Reign of Terror and eventually accepting the Constitution of 1795.

Learning Objective

Recall the composition and role of the National Convention

Key Points

• The National Convention was a single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the Insurrection of August 10, 1792. It was the first French assembly elected by universal male suffrage without distinctions of class.
• Most historians divide the National Convention into two main factions: the Girondins and the Montagnards. The Girondins represented the more moderate elements of the Convention and protested the vast influence held in the Convention by Parisians. The Montagnards were much more radical and held strong connections to the sans-culottes of Paris. Traditionally, historians have also identified a centrist faction called the Plain, but many historians tend to blur the line between the Plain and the Girondins.

• Within days, the Convention was overtaken by factional conflicts. The political deadlock, which had repercussions all over France, eventually drove both major factions to accept dangerous allies. In June 1792, under the pressure of armed sans-culottes, the Girondins ceased to be a political force.

• Throughout the winter of 1792 and spring of 1793, Paris was plagued by food riots and mass hunger. The new Convention, occupied mostly with matters of war, did little to remedy the problem until late spring of 1793. In April 1793, the Convention created the Committee of Public Safety. Its dominance marked the Reign of Terror.

• In June, the Convention drafted the Constitution of 1793, which was ratified by popular vote but not enacted. Simultaneously, the Committee of Public Safety carried out thousands of executions against supposed enemies of the young republic. Its laws and policies took the revolution to unprecedented heights—they introduced the revolutionary calendar in 1793, closed churches in and around Paris as a part
of a movement of dechristianization, tried and executed Marie Antoinette, and instituted the Law of Suspects, among other initiatives. Members of various revolutionary factions and groups were executed.

- In July 1794, Robespierre was overthrown, the Jacobin club was closed, and the surviving Girondins were reinstated. A year later, the National Convention adopted the Constitution of 1795. They reestablished freedom of worship, began releasing large numbers of prisoners, and initiated elections for a new legislative body. On November 3, 1795, a bicameral parliament called the Directory was established and the National Convention ceased to exist.

**Key Terms**

**Law of Suspects**

A decree passed by the Committee of Public Safety in September 1793 during the Reign of Terror of the French Revolution. It marked a significant weakening of individual freedoms leading to “revolutionary paranoia” that swept the nation. The law ordered the arrest of all avowed enemies and likely enemies of the Revolution, which included nobles, relatives of émigrés, officials removed from office, officers suspected of treason, and hoarders of goods.
**Reign of Terror**

A period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, the Girondins and the Jacobins, and marked by mass executions of “the enemies of the revolution.” The death toll ranged in the tens of thousands, with 16,594 executed by guillotine and another 25,000 in summary executions across France.

**Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen**

A fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human and civil rights passed by France’s National Constituent Assembly in August 1789. It was influenced by the doctrine of natural right, stating that the rights of man are held to be universal. It became the basis for a nation of free individuals protected equally by law.

**Insurrection of August 10, 1792**

One of the defining events in the history of the French Revolution, the storming of the Tuileries Palace by the National Guard of the insurrectional Paris Commune and revolutionary fédérés from Marseilles and Brittany resulted in the fall of the French monarchy. King Louis XVI and the royal family took shelter with the Legislative Assembly, which was suspended. The formal end of the monarchy six weeks later was one of the first acts of the new National Convention.

**Thermidorian Reaction**

A 1794 coup d’état within the French Revolution against the leaders of the Jacobin Club that...
dominated the Committee of Public Safety. It was triggered by a vote of the National Convention to execute Maximilien Robespierre, Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, and several other leading members of the revolutionary government. It ended the most radical phase of the French Revolution.

**Committee of Public Safety**

A committee created in April 1793 by the National Convention and then restructured in July 1793 that formed the de facto executive government in France during the Reign of Terror (1793–94), a stage of the French Revolution.

**National Convention**

A single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the Insurrection of August 10, 1792.

**sans-culottes**

The common people of the lower classes in late 18th century France, a great many of whom became radical and militant partisans of the French Revolution in response to their poor quality of life under the Ancien Régime.

The National Convention was a single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the Insurrection of August 10, 1792. The Legislative Assembly decreed the provisional suspension of
King Louis XVI and the convocation of a National Convention which was to draw up a constitution. At the same time, it was decided that deputies to that convention should be elected by all Frenchmen ages 25 and older domiciled for a year and living by the product of their labor. The National Convention was therefore the first French assembly elected by universal male suffrage, without distinctions of class.

The election took place in September 1792. Owing to the abstention of aristocrats and anti-republicans and the fear of victimization, the voter turnout was low – 11.9% of the electorate. The universal male suffrage had thus very little impact and the voters elected the same sort of men that the active citizens had chosen in 1791. 75 members sat in the National Constituent Assembly and 183 in the Legislative Assembly. The full number of deputies was 749, not counting 33 from the French colonies, of whom only some arrived in Paris.

According to its own ruling, the Convention elected its President, who was eligible for re-election, every fortnight. For both legislative and administrative purposes, the Convention used committees, with powers regulated by successive laws.

**Girondins v. Montagnards**

Most historians divide the National Convention into two main factions: the Girondins and the Mountain or the Montagnards (in this context, also referred to as Jacobins). The Girondins represented the more moderate elements of the Convention and protested the vast influence held in the Convention by Parisians. The Montagnards, representing a considerably larger portion of the deputies, were much more radical and held strong connections to the sans-culottes of Paris. Traditionally, historians have identified a centrist faction called the Plain, but many historians tend to blur the line between the Plain and the Girondins.
Within days, the Convention was overtaken by factional conflicts. Girondins were convinced that their opponents aspired to a bloody dictatorship, while the Montagnards believed that Girondins were ready for any compromise with conservatives and royalists that would guarantee their remaining in power. The bitter enmity soon paralyzed the Convention. The political deadlock, which had repercussions all over France, eventually drove both major factions to accept dangerous allies, royalists in the case of Girondins and the sans-culottes in that of the Montagnards. In June 1792, 80,000 armed sans-culottes surrounded the Convention. After deputies who attempted to leave were met with guns, they resigned themselves to declare the arrest of 29 leading Girondins. Thus, the Girondins ceased to be a political force.

Throughout the winter of 1792 and spring of 1793, Paris was plagued by food riots and mass hunger. The new Convention, occupied mostly with matters of war, did little to remedy the problem until April 1793 when they created the Committee of Public Safety. Eventually headed by Maximilien Robespierre, this committee was given the monumental task of dealing with radical movements, food shortages, riots and revolts (most notably in the Vendée and Brittany), and recent defeats of its armies. In response, the Committee of Public Safety instated a policy of terror and perceived enemies of the republic were persecuted at an ever-increasing rate. The period of the Committee’s dominance during the Revolution is known today as the Reign of Terror.
“La Marseillaise” is the national anthem of France. The song was written in 1792 by Claude Joseph Rouget de Lisle in Strasbourg after the declaration of war by France against Austria. The National Convention adopted it as the Republic's anthem in 1795. It acquired its nickname after being sung in Paris by volunteers from Marseille marching on the capital.
Despite growing discontent with the National Convention as a ruling body, in June the Convention drafted the Constitution of 1793, which was ratified by popular vote in early August. However, the Committee of Public Safety was seen as an “emergency” government and the rights guaranteed by the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen and the new constitution were suspended under its control. The Committee carried out thousands of executions against supposed enemies of the young Republic. Its laws and policies took the revolution to unprecedented heights—they introduced the revolutionary calendar in 1793, closed churches in and around Paris as a part of a movement of dechristianization, tried and executed Marie Antoinette, and instituted the Law of Suspects, among others. Members of various revolutionary factions and groups were executed including the Hébertists and the Dantonists.

Shortly after a decisive military victory over Austria at the Battle of Fleurus, Robespierre was overthrown in July 1794 and the reign of the standing Committee of Public Safety was ended. After the arrest and execution of Robespierre, the Jacobin club was closed, and the surviving Girondins were reinstated (Thermidorian Reaction). A year later, the National Convention adopted the Constitution of 1795. They reestablished freedom of worship, began releasing large numbers of prisoners, and most importantly, initiated elections for a new legislative body. On November 3, 1795, the Directory—a bicameral parliament—was established and the National Convention ceased to exist.

Attributions

- The National Convention

65. The Thermidorian Reaction

22.5.5: The Thermidorian Reaction

The Thermidorian Reaction was a coup d'état during the French Revolution resulting in a Thermidorian regime characterized by the violent elimination of its perceived opponents.

Learning Objective

Describe the events of the Thermidorian Reaction

Key Points

- The Thermidorian Reaction was a coup d'état within the French Revolution against the leaders of the Jacobin Club who dominated the Committee of Public Safety. It was triggered by a vote of the National Convention to execute Maximilien Robespierre, Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, and several other leading members of the revolutionary government.
With Robespierre the sole remaining strongman of the Revolution, his apparent total grasp on power became increasingly illusory. In addition to widespread reaction to the Reign of Terror, Robespierre’s tight personal control of the military, distrust of military might and banks, and opposition to supposedly corrupt individuals in government made him the subject of a number of conspiracies.

The conspiracies came together on Thermidor 9 (July 27) when members of the national bodies of the revolutionary government arrested Robespierre and the leaders of the Paris city government. Not all of the conspiratorial groupings were ideologically motivated.

The prime mover for the events was a Montagnard conspiracy, which was gradually coalescing and came to pass when the Montagnards finally swayed the deputies of the right over to their side. In the end, Robespierre himself united his enemies when he gave a speech to the Convention in which he railed against enemies and conspiracies, some within the powerful committees. As he did not give the names of the “traitors,” all in the Convention had reason to fear that they were the targets.

The Thermidorian regime that followed proved unpopular, facing many rebellions after the execution of Robespierre and his allies. The people who were involved with Robespierre became the target, including many members of the Jacobin club, their supporters, and individuals suspected of being past revolutionaries. In addition, the sans-culottes were violently suppressed by the Muscadin, a group of
street fighters organized by the new government. The massacre of these groups became known as the 
White Terror.

- Meanwhile, French armies overran the Netherlands and established the Batavian Republic, 
occupied the left bank of the Rhine and forced Spain, Prussia and several German states to sue for 
peace, enhancing the prestige of the National Convention. A new constitution was drawn up, which eased 
back some of the democratic elements of the Constitution of 1793 and the Thermidorian regime ended.

**Key Terms**

**Thermidorian Reaction**

A 1794 coup d'état within the French Revolution against the leaders of the Jacobin Club that 
dominated the Committee of Public Safety. It was triggered by a vote of the National Convention to 
execute Maximilien Robespierre, Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, and several other leaders of the 
revolutionary government. It ended the most radical phase of the French Revolution.

**Reign of Terror**

A period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, 
the Girondins and the Jacobins, and marked by mass
executions of “the enemies of the revolution.” The death toll ranged in the tens of thousands, with 16,594 executed by guillotine and another 25,000 in summary executions across France.

**White Terror**

A period of political violence during the French Revolution following the death of Robespierre and the end of the Reign of Terror. It was started by a group in the south of France calling themselves The Companions of Jehu. They planned a double uprising to coincide with invasions by Great Britain in the west and Austria in the east.

**Paris Commune**

During the French Revolution, the government of Paris from 1789 until 1795. Established in the Hôtel de Ville just after the storming of the Bastille, it consisted of 144 delegates elected by the 48 divisions of the city. It became insurrectionary in the summer of 1792, essentially refusing to take orders from the central French government. It took charge of routine civic functions but is best known for mobilizing extreme views. It lost much power in 1794 and was replaced in 1795.

**National Convention**

A single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the Insurrection of August 10, 1792.
The Thermidorian Reaction was a coup d'état within the French Revolution against the leaders of the Jacobin Club who dominated the Committee of Public Safety. It was triggered by a vote of the National Convention to execute Maximilien Robespierre, Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, and several other leaders of the revolutionary government. The name Thermidorian refers to Thermidor 9, Year II (July 27, 1794), the date according to the French Republican Calendar when Robespierre and other radical revolutionaries came under concerted attack in the National Convention. Thermidorian Reaction also refers to the period until the National Convention was superseded by the Directory (also called the era of the Thermidorian Convention).

Conspiracies against Robespierre

With Robespierre the sole remaining strongman of the Revolution following the assassination of Jean-Paul Marat and the executions of Jacques Hébert, Georges Danton, and Camille Desmoulins, his apparent total grasp on power became increasingly illusory, especially support from factions to his right. Robespierre’s only real political power at the time lay in the Jacobin Club, which had extended itself beyond the borders of Paris and into the country.
In addition to widespread reaction to the Reign of Terror, Robespierre's tight personal control of the military, distrust of military might and of banks, and opposition to supposedly corrupt individuals in government made him the subject of a number of conspiracies. The conspiracies came together on Thermidor 9 (July 27) when members of the national bodies of the revolutionary government arrested Robespierre and the leaders of the Paris city government. Not all the conspiratorial groupings were ideological in motivation. Many who conspired against Robespierre did so for strong practical and personal reasons, most notably self-preservation. The left was opposed to Robespierre because he rejected atheism and was not sufficiently radical.

The prime mover, however, for the events of Thermidor 9 was a Montagnard conspiracy led by Jean-Lambert Tallien and Bourdon de l'Oise, which was gradually coalescing and came to pass when the Montagnards finally swayed the deputies of the right over to their side (Robespierre and Saint-Just were themselves Montagnards). Joseph Fouché also played an important role as instigator of the events. In the end, Robespierre himself united his enemies. On Thermidor 8 (July 26), he gave a speech to the Convention in which he railed against enemies and conspiracies, some within the powerful committees. As he did not give the names of the “traitors,” all in the Convention had reason to fear that they were the targets.

Robespierre was declared an outlaw and condemned without judicial process. The following day, Thermidor 10 (July 28, 1794), he was executed with 21 of his closest associates.
For historians of revolutionary movements, the term Thermidor has come to mean the phase in some revolutions when power slips from the hands of the original revolutionary leadership and a radical regime is replaced by a more conservative regime, sometimes to the point at which the political pendulum swings back towards something resembling a pre-revolutionary state.

**Thermidorian Regime**

The Thermidorian regime that followed proved unpopular, facing many rebellions after the execution of Robespierre and his allies along with 70 members of the Paris Commune. This was the largest mass execution that ever took place in Paris and led to a fragile situation in France. The hostility towards Robespierre did not just vanish with his execution. Instead, the people involved with
Robespierre became the target, including many members of the Jacobin club, their supporters, and individuals suspected of being past revolutionaries. In addition, the sans-culottes faced violent suppression by the Muscadin, a group of street fighters organized by the new government. The massacre of these groups became known as the White Terror. Often members of targeted groups were the victims of prison massacres or put on trial without due process, similar conditions to those provided to the counter-revolutionaries during the Reign of Terror. The Thermidorian regime excluded the remaining Montagnards from power, even those who had joined in conspiring against Robespierre and Saint-Just. The White Terror of 1795 resulted in numerous imprisonments and several hundred executions, almost exclusively of people on the political left.

Meanwhile, French armies overran the Netherlands and established the Batavian Republic, occupied the left bank of the Rhine, and forced Spain, Prussia and several German states to sue for peace, enhancing the prestige of the National Convention. A new constitution called the Constitution of the Year III (1795) was drawn up, which eased back some of the democratic elements of the Constitution of 1793. On October 25, the Convention declared itself dissolved and was replaced by the French Directory on November 2.

Attributions

- The Thermidorian Reaction
First_White_Terror. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

66. Structure of the Directory

22.5.6: Structure of the Directory

The Directory, a five-member committee that governed France from November 1795 to November 1799, failed to reform the disastrous economy, relied heavily on army and violence, and represented another turn towards dictatorship during the French Revolution.

Learning Objective

Explain the structure and role of the Directory

Key Points

- The Constitution of 1795 created the Directory with a bicameral legislature consisting of the Council of Five Hundred (lower house) and the Council of Ancients (upper house). Besides functioning as legislative bodies, the Council of Five Hundred proposed the list from which the Council of Ancients chose five directors who jointly held executive power. The new Constitution sought to
create a separation of powers, but in reality power was in the hands of the five members of the Directory.

• In October 1795, the elections for the new Councils decreed by the new constitution took place, with the universal male suffrage of 1793 replaced by limited suffrage based on property. 379 members of the National Convention, for the most part moderate republicans, were elected to the new legislature. To assure that the Directory did not abandon the Revolution entirely, the Council required all members of the Directory to be former members of the Convention and regicides, those who had voted for the execution of Louis XVI.

• On October 31, 1795, the members of the Council of Five Hundred submitted a list of candidates to the Council of Ancients, which chose the first Directory. Only one out of the five original members served on the Directory throughout its entire existence.

• State finances were in total disarray. The government could only cover its expenses through the plunder and the tribute of foreign countries. The Directory was continually at war with foreign coalitions. The wars exhausted the state budget but if peace were made, the armies would return home and the directors would have to face the exasperation of the rank-and-file who had lost their livelihood, as well as the ambition of generals who could, in a moment, brush them aside.

• The Directory denounced the arbitrary executions of the Reign of Terror, but it also engaged in large-scale illegal repressions and even massacres of
civilians. Although committed to republicanism, it distrusted the existing, albeit limited, democracy. It also increasingly depended on the Army in foreign and domestic affairs, including finance. The patronage of the directors was ill-bestowed and the general maladministration heightened their unpopularity.

- On November 9, 1799 (18 Brumaire of the Year VIII), Napoleon Bonaparte staged the Coup of 18 Brumaire which installed the Consulate. This effectively led to Bonaparte’s dictatorship and in 1804 to his proclamation as emperor, which ended the specifically republican phase of the French Revolution.

**Key Terms**

**The Directory**

A five-member committee that governed France from November 1795, when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety, until it was overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (November 8-9, 1799) and replaced by the Consulate. It gave its name to the final four years of the French Revolution.

**Coup of 18 Fructidor**

A seizure of power by members of the French
Directory on September 4, 1797, when their opponents, the Royalists, were gaining strength.

**Council of Ancients**

The upper house of the legislature of France during the period commonly known (from the name of the executive branch during this time) as the Directory, from August 22, 1795 until November 9, 1799, roughly the second half of the French Revolution.

**Reign of Terror**

A period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, the Girondins and the Jacobins, and marked by mass executions of “the enemies of the revolution.” The death toll ranged in the tens of thousands, with 16,594 executed by guillotine and another 25,000 in summary executions across France.

**Coup of 18 Brumaire**

A bloodless coup d'état under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte that overthrew the Directory, replacing it with the French Consulate. It took place on November 9, 1799, 18 Brumaire, Year VIII under the French Republican Calendar.

**War in the Vendée**

A 1793-1796 uprising in the Vendée region of France during the French Revolution. Initially, the war was similar to the 14th-century Jacquerie peasant uprising, but quickly acquired themes considered by the Paris government to be counter-revolutionary and Royalist.
**Council of Five Hundred**

The lower house of the legislature of France during the period commonly known (from the name of the executive branch during this time) as the Directory, from August 22, 1795, until November 9, 1799, roughly the second half of the French Revolution.

**National Convention**

A single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the Insurrection of August 10, 1792.

---

**The New Legislature and the Government**

The Constitution of 1795 created the Directory with a bicameral legislature consisting of the Council of Five Hundred (lower house) and the Council of Ancients (upper house). Besides functioning as legislative bodies, the Council of Five Hundred proposed the list from which the Council of Ancients chose five Directors who jointly held executive power. The new Constitution sought to create a separation of powers: the Directors had no voice in legislation or taxation, nor could Directors or Ministers sit in either house. In essence, however, power was in the hands of the five members of the Directory.

In October 1795, immediately after the suppression of a royalist uprising in Paris, the elections for the new Councils decreed by the
new constitution took place. The universal male suffrage of 1793 was replaced by limited suffrage based on property. 379 members of the National Convention, for the most part moderate republicans, were elected to the new legislature. To assure that the Directory did not abandon the Revolution entirely, the Council required all the members of the Directory to be former members of the Convention and regicides, those who had voted for the execution of Louis XVI. Due to the rules established by the National Convention, a majority of members of the new legislature had served in the Convention and were ardent republicans, but many new deputies were royalists: 118 versus 11 from the left. The members of the upper house, the Council of Ancients, were chosen by lot from among all of the deputies.

On October 31, 1795, the members of the Council of Five Hundred submitted a list of candidates to the Council of Ancients, which chose the first Directory. It consisted of Paul François Jean Nicolas (commonly known as Paul Barras; the dominant figure in the Directory known for his skills in political intrigue), Louis Marie de La Révellière-Lépeaux (a fierce republican and anti-Catholic), Jean-François Rewbell (expert in foreign relations and a firm moderate republican), Étienne-François Le Tourneur (a specialist in military and naval affairs), and Lazare Nicolas Marguerite Carnot (an energetic and efficient manager who restructured the French military). Out of the five members, only Barras served during the entire time the Directory existed.

Administration of the Directory

State finances were in total disarray. The government could only cover its expenses through the plunder and tribute of foreign countries. The Directory was continually at war with foreign coalitions, which at different times included Britain, Austria, Prussia, the Kingdom of Naples, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire.
It annexed Belgium and the left bank of the Rhine, while Napoleon Bonaparte conquered a large part of Italy. The Directory established six short-lived sister republics modeled after France in Italy, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. The conquered cities and states were required to send to France huge amounts of money as well as art treasures, which were used to fill the new Louvre museum in Paris. An army led by Bonaparte conquered Egypt and marched as far as Saint-Jean-d'Acre in Syria. The Directory defeated a resurgence of the War in the Vendée, the royalist-led civil war in the Vendée region, but failed in its venture to support the Irish Rebellion of 1798 and create an Irish Republic. The wars exhausted the state budget but if peace was made, the armies would return home and the directors would have to face the exasperation of the rank-and-file who had lost their livelihoods and the ambition of generals who could at any moment brush them aside.

The Directory denounced the arbitrary executions of the Reign of Terror, but also engaged in large-scale illegal repressions and even massacres of civilians (War in the Vendée). The failing economy and high cost of food especially hurt the poor. Although committed to republicanism, the Directory distrusted the existing, albeit limited, democracy. When the elections of 1798 and 1799 were carried by the opposition, it used the Army to imprison and exile opposition leaders and close opposition newspapers. It also increasingly depended on the Army in foreign and domestic affairs, including finance. Barras and Rewbell were notoriously corrupt and screened corruption in others. The patronage of the directors was ill-bestowed and the general maladministration heightened their unpopularity.

Public Discord

With the establishment of the Directory, contemporary observers might have assumed that the Revolution was finished. Citizens of
the war-weary nation wanted stability, peace, and an end to conditions that at times bordered on chaos. Those on the right who wished to restore the monarchy by putting Louis XVIII on the throne, and those on the left who would have renewed the Reign of Terror tried but failed to overthrow the Directory. The earlier atrocities had made confidence or goodwill between parties impossible.

The new régime met opposition from Jacobins on the left and Royalists (secretly subsidized by the British government) on the right. The army suppressed riots and counter-revolutionary activities, but the rebellion and in particular Napoleon gained massive power. In the elections of 1797 for one-third of the seats, the Royalists won the great majority and were poised to take control of the Directory in the next election. The Directory reacted by purging all the winners in the Coup of 18 Fructidor, banishing 57 leaders to certain death in Guiana and closing 42 newspapers. By the same token, it rejected democratic elections and kept its old leaders in power.

Sent by Napoleon from Italy, Pierre Augereau and his troops storm Tuileries and capture Generals Charles Pichegru and Willot. Coup d’état of 18 Fructidor, year V (September 4, 1797). Engraving by Berthault, based on a drawing by Girardet.
On September 4, 1797, with the army in place, the Coup d'état of 18 Fructidor, Year V was set in motion. General Augereau’s soldiers arrested Pichegru, Barthélemy, and the leading royalist deputies of the Councils. The next day, the Directory annulled the elections of about two hundred deputies in 53 departments. 65 deputies were deported to Guiana, 42 royalist newspapers were closed, and 65 journalists and editors were deported.

On November 9, 1799 (18 Brumaire of the Year VIII) Napoleon Bonaparte staged the Coup of 18 Brumaire, which installed the Consulate. This effectively led to Bonaparte’s dictatorship and in 1804 to his proclamation as emperor. This ended the specifically republican phase of the French Revolution.

Historians have assessed the Directory as a government of self-interest rather than virtue that lost any claim on idealism. It never had a strong base of popular support. When elections were held, most of its candidates were defeated. Its achievements were minor and the approach reflected another turn towards dictatorship and the failure of liberal democracy. Violence, arbitrary and dubious forms of justice, and heavy-handed repression were methods commonly employed by the Directory.

- Structure of the Directory

Napoleon's Italian victories overshadowed his Egyptian defeats during the French Revolutionary Wars, while his position at home strengthened after the Directory became dependent on the military. This made Napoleon the greatest enemy of the same government that relied on his protection.

Learning Objective

Review Napoleon's career from the military to the Directory

Key Points

- Upon graduating from the prestigious École Militaire (military academy) in Paris in September 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned as a second lieutenant in an artillery regiment. He spent the early years of the Revolution in Corsica, fighting in a complex three-way struggle among royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. He
supported the republican Jacobin movement and was promoted to captain in 1792, despite exceeding his leave of absence and leading a riot against a French army in Corsica.

- Bonaparte was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 24. Catching the attention of the Committee of Public Safety, he was put in charge of the artillery of France’s Army of Italy.

- Following the fall of Robespierre and the Thermidorian Reaction in July 1794, Napoleon, although closely associated with Robespierre, was released from the arrest within two weeks and asked to draw up plans to attack Italian positions in the context of France’s war with Austria.

- In October 1795, royalists in Paris declared a rebellion against the National Convention. Under the leadership of Napoleon, the attackers were repelled on October 5, 1795 (13 Vendémiaire). 1,400 royalists died and the rest fled. The defeat of the royalist insurrection earned Bonaparte sudden fame, wealth, and the patronage of the new government, the Directory.

- During the French Revolutionary Wars, Napoleon was successful in a daring invasion of Italy although he failed to seize Egypt and thereby undermine Britain’s access to its trade interests in India. After the victories in the Italian campaign and despite the defeats in the Egyptian campaign, Napoleon was welcomed in France as a hero.

- Napoleon drew together an alliance with a number of prominent political figures and they overthrew the Directory by a coup d’état on November 9, 1799 (Coup
of 18th Brumaire). His power was confirmed by the new Constitution of 1799, which preserved the appearance of a republic but in reality established a dictatorship.

Key Terms

Thermidorian Reaction
A 1794 coup d’état within the French Revolution against the leaders of the Jacobin Club that dominated the Committee of Public Safety. It was triggered by a vote of the National Convention to execute Maximilien Robespierre, Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, and several other leaders of the revolutionary government. It ended the most radical phase of the French Revolution.

Committee of Public Safety
A committee created in April 1793 by the National Convention and restructured in July 1793 that formed the de facto executive government in France during the Reign of Terror (1793–94), a stage of the French Revolution.

13 Vendémiaire
A name given to an October 5, 1795, battle between the French Revolutionary troops and royalist forces in the streets of Paris. The battle was largely responsible for the rapid advancement of Republican General
Napoleon Bonaparte’s career. The name comes from the date of the battle according to the French Republican Calendar.

**Directory**

A five-member committee that governed France from November 1795, when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety, until it was overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (November 8–9, 1799) and replaced by the Consulate. It gave its name to the final four years of the French Revolution.

**National Convention**

A single-chamber assembly in France from September 20, 1792, to October 26, 1795, during the French Revolution. It succeeded the Legislative Assembly and founded the First Republic after the Insurrection of August 10, 1792.

**Coup of 18th Brumaire**

A bloodless coup d’état under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte that overthrew the Directory, replacing it with the French Consulate. It took place on November 9, 1799, 18 Brumaire, Year VIII under the French Republican Calendar.

**French Revolutionary Wars**

A series of sweeping military conflicts lasting from 1792 until 1802, resulting from the French Revolution. They pitted the French First Republic against Britain, Austria, and several other monarchies. They are divided in two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second
Coalition (1798–1802). Initially confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

**Coup of 18 Fructidor**

A seizure of power by members of the French Directory on September 4, 1797, when their opponents, the Royalists, were gaining strength.

Napoleon Bonaparte (1769 – 1821) was a French military and political leader who rose to prominence during the French Revolution and led several successful campaigns during the Revolutionary Wars. As Napoleon I, he was emperor of the French from 1804 until 1814, and again in 1815. He dominated European and global affairs for more than a decade while leading France against a series of coalitions in the Napoleonic Wars. He remains one of the most celebrated and controversial political figures in human history.

**Early Career**

Upon graduating from the prestigious École Militaire (military academy) in Paris in September 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned as a second lieutenant in an artillery regiment. He served in Valence and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789 and took nearly two years' leave in Corsica (where he was born and spent his early years) and Paris during this period. At this time, he was a fervent Corsican nationalist. He spent the early years of the Revolution in Corsica, fighting in a complex three-way struggle.
among royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. He was a supporter of the republican Jacobin movement, organizing clubs in Corsica, and was given command over a battalion of volunteers. He was promoted to captain in the regular army in 1792, despite exceeding his leave of absence and leading a riot against a French army in Corsica.

He returned to Corsica and came into conflict with the Corsican leader Pasquale Paoli, who decided to split with France and sabotage the French assault on the Sardinian island of La Maddalena. Bonaparte and his family fled to the French mainland in June 1793 because of the conflict with Paoli.
Napoleon Bonaparte, aged 23, lieutenant-colonel of a battalion of Corsican Republican volunteers, painting by Henri Félix Emmanuel Philippoteaux, ca. 1834. Born and raised in Corsica, Napoleon’s first language was Corsican and he always spoke French with a marked Corsican accent. The Corsican Buonapartes were descended from minor Italian nobility of Tuscan origin, who had come to Corsica from Liguria in the 16th century. His father Carlo Buonaparte was named Corsica’s representative to the court of Louis XVI in 1777.
Bonaparte was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 24. Catching the attention of the Committee of Public Safety, he was put in charge of the artillery of France's Army of Italy. He devised plans for attacking the Kingdom of Sardinia as part of France's campaign against the First Coalition. The French army carried out Bonaparte's plan in the Battle of Saorgio in April 1794 and then advanced to seize Ormea in the mountains. From Ormea, they headed west to outflank the Austro-Sardinian positions around Saorge. After this campaign, he was sent on a mission to the Republic of Genoa to determine that country's intentions towards France.

Rise as a Military Leader

Following the fall of Robespierre and the Thermidorian Reaction in July 1794, Napoleon, although closely associated with Robespierre, was released from the arrest within two weeks. He was asked to draw up plans to attack Italian positions in the context of France's war with Austria. He also took part in an expedition to take back Corsica from the British, but the French were repelled by the British Royal Navy.

In October 1795, royalists in Paris declared a rebellion against the National Convention. Paul Barras, a leader of the Thermidorian Reaction, knew of Bonaparte's earlier military exploits and gave him command of the improvised forces in defense of the Convention in the Tuileries Palace. Napoleon had seen the massacre of the King's Swiss Guard there three years earlier and realized that artillery would be the key to its defense. He ordered a young cavalry officer named Joachim Murat to seize large cannons and used them to repel the attackers on October 5, 1795 (13 Vendémiaire in the French Republican Calendar). 1,400 royalists died and the rest fled. The defeat of the royalist insurrection extinguished the threat to the
Convention and earned Bonaparte sudden fame, wealth, and the patronage of the new government, the Directory. He was promoted to Commander of the Interior and given command of the Army of Italy.

**Conquest of Italy**

During the French Revolutionary Wars, Napoleon was successful in a daring invasion of Italy. In the Montenotte Campaign, he separated the armies of Sardinia and Austria, defeating each one in turn, and then forced a peace on Sardinia. Following this, his army captured Milan and started the Siege of Mantua. Bonaparte defeated successive Austrian armies under three different leaders while continuing the siege.

The next phase of the conflict featured the French invasion of the Habsburg heartlands. In the first encounter between the two armies, Napoleon pushed back his opponents and advanced deep into Austrian territory. The Austrians were alarmed by the French thrust that reached all the way to Leoben, not very far from Vienna, and finally decided to sue for peace. The Treaty of Leoben, followed by the more comprehensive Treaty of Campo Formio, gave France control of most of northern Italy and the Low Countries, and a secret clause promised the Republic of Venice to Austria. Bonaparte marched on Venice and forced its surrender, ending 1,100 years of independence. He also authorized the French to loot treasures.

In the Italian campaign, Bonaparte's army captured 150,000 prisoners, 540 cannons, and 170 standards. The French army fought 67 actions and won 18 pitched battles through superior artillery technology and Bonaparte's tactics. During the campaign, Bonaparte became increasingly influential in French politics. The royalists attacked Bonaparte for looting Italy and warned that he might become a dictator. Bonaparte also sent General Pierre
Augereau to Paris to lead a coup d'état and purge the royalists on September 4 (Coup of 18 Fructidor). This left Barras and his republican allies in control again but dependent on Bonaparte, who proceeded to peace negotiations with Austria. These negotiations resulted in the Treaty of Campo Formio, and Bonaparte returned to Paris in December as a hero. He met Talleyrand, France’s new Foreign Minister—who served in the same capacity for Emperor Napoleon—and they began to prepare for an invasion of Britain.

Expedition to Egypt

Bonaparte decided on a military expedition to seize Egypt and thereby undermine Britain’s access to its trade interests in India. Bonaparte wished to establish a French presence in the Middle East, with the ultimate dream of linking with Tipu Sultan, a Muslim enemy of the British in India. In May 1798, Bonaparte was elected a member of the French Academy of Sciences. His Egyptian expedition included a group of 167 scientists, with mathematicians, naturalists, chemists, and geodesists among them (their discoveries included the Rosetta Stone).

General Bonaparte and his expedition eluded pursuit by the Royal Navy and landed at Alexandria in July. In August, the British fleet under Horatio Nelson captured or destroyed all but two French vessels in the Battle of the Nile, defeating Bonaparte’s goal to strengthen the French position in the Mediterranean. In early 1799, he moved an army into the Ottoman province of Damascus (Syria and Galilee). Bonaparte led 13,000 French soldiers in the conquest of the coastal towns of Arish, Gaza, Jaffa, and Haifa. The attack on Jaffa was particularly brutal. Bonaparte discovered that many of the defenders were former prisoners of war, ostensibly on parole, so he ordered the garrison and 1,400 prisoners to be executed by bayonet
or drowning to save bullets. Men, women, and children were robbed and murdered for three days.

Bonaparte began with an army of 13,000 men: 1,500 were reported missing, 1,200 died in combat, and thousands perished from disease. He failed to reduce the fortress of Acre, so he marched his army back to Egypt in May. To speed up the retreat, Bonaparte ordered plague-stricken men to be poisoned with opium. The number who died remains disputed, ranging from a low of 30 to a high of 580. He also brought out 1,000 wounded men.

The 18th Brumaire

Despite the failures in Egypt, Napoleon returned to a hero’s welcome. He allied with a number of prominent political figures to overthrow the Directory by a coup d’état on November 9, 1799 (Coup of 18th Brumaire, according to the revolutionary calendar), closing down the Council of Five Hundred. Napoleon became “first consul” for ten years, and appointed two consuls who had consultative voices only. His power was confirmed by the new Constitution of 1799, which preserved the appearance of a republic but in reality established a dictatorship.

Attributions

• Napoleon's Rise to Power
68. The Transition to Dictatorship

23.1: The Transition to Dictatorship

23.1.1: Napoleon’s Upbringing

Napoleon came from a noble and moderately affluent Corsican family, which afforded him opportunities to gain quality education and marked his youth with commitment to Corsican nationalism.

**Learning Objective**

Summarize Napoleon's childhood and the effects it had on him

**Key Points**

- Napoleon was born in 1769 to Carlo Maria di Buonaparte and Maria Letizia Ramolino, in his family's ancestral home Casa Buonaparte in Ajaccio, the
capital of the island of Corsica. This was a year after the island was transferred to France by the Republic of Genoa. The Corsican origins and Corsica’s history would play a very important role in Napoleon’s upbringing and shape his first political fascinations and activism. His first language was Corsican and he always spoke French with a marked Corsican accent.

- Napoleon’s father Nobile Carlo Buonaparte, an attorney, was named Corsica’s representative to the court of Louis XVI in 1777. The dominant influence of Napoleon’s childhood was his mother, Letizia Ramolino, whose firm discipline restrained a rambunctious child. Napoleon was piously raised as a Catholic but never developed much faith.
- Napoleon’s noble, moderately affluent background afforded him greater opportunities to study than available to a typical Corsican of the time. In 1779, he was enrolled at a religious school in Autun but the same year, he was admitted to a military academy at Brienne-le-Château. On completion of his studies at Brienne in 1784, Napoleon was admitted to the elite École Militaire in Paris.
- Upon graduating in 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned a second lieutenant in La Fère artillery regiment. He served in Valence and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789, and took nearly two years’ leave in Corsica and Paris during this period. At this time, he was a fervent Corsican nationalist.
- He returned to Corsica and came into conflict with Paoli, who had decided to split with France and sabotage the French assault on the Sardinian island of
La Maddalena. Bonaparte and his family fled to the French mainland in 1793 because of the split with Paoli.

- Historians emphasize the strength of the ambition that took Napoleon from an obscure village in Corsica to command of most of Europe. He was famously not very tall and thus not a physically imposing man, but his personality was described as “hypnotic.” Napoleon maintained strict, efficient work habits, prioritizing what needed to be done.

---

**Key Terms**

**deist**

An advocate of a theological/philosophical position that combines the rejection of revelation and authority as a source of religious knowledge with the conclusion that reason and observation of the natural world are sufficient to determine the existence of a single creator of the universe.

**Corsica**

An island in the Mediterranean Sea and one of the 18 regions of France. It is located west of the Italian Peninsula, southeast of the French mainland, and north of the Italian island of Sardinia. After being ruled by the Republic of Genoa since 1284, it was briefly independent from 1755 until it was conquered by
France in 1769. Due to its historical ties with the Italian peninsula, the island retains many elements of Italian culture.

Napoleon’s Family and Corsican Roots

Napoleon Bonaparte (1769 – 1821) was a French military and political leader who rose to prominence during the French Revolution and led several successful campaigns during the Revolutionary Wars. As Napoleon I, he was Emperor of the French from 1804 until 1814, and again in 1815.

Napoleon was born in 1769 to Carlo Maria di Buonaparte and Maria Letizia Ramolino, in his family’s ancestral home Casa Buonaparte in Ajaccio, the capital of the island of Corsica. He was their fourth child and third son. This was a year after the island was transferred to France by the Republic of Genoa. The Corsican origins and Corsica's history would play a very important role in Napoleon's upbringing and shape his first political fascinations and activism. His first language was Corsican and he always spoke French with a marked Corsican accent.
Carlo was a Corsican lawyer and politician who briefly served as a personal assistant of the revolutionary leader Pasquale Paoli and eventually rose to become Corsica's representative to the court of Louis XVI. After his death, while Napoleon became Emperor of the French, several of his other children received royal titles from their brother.

The Corsican Buonapartes descended from minor Italian nobility of Tuscan origin who had come to Corsica from Liguria in the 16th century. Napoleon’s father Nobile Carlo Buonaparte was an attorney and was named Corsica’s representative to the court of Louis XVI.
Louis XVI in 1777. The dominant influence of Napoleon's childhood was his mother, Letizia Ramolino, whose firm discipline restrained a rambunctious child. He had an elder brother, Joseph, and six younger siblings; two other siblings who died in infancy were born before Joseph. Napoleon was baptized as a Catholic. He was christened *Napoleone di Buonaparte* and adopted the more French-sounding *Napoléon Bonaparte* in his 20s. He was piously raised as a Catholic but never developed much faith. As an adult, Napoleon was a deist and his deity was an absent and distant God. However, he had a keen appreciation of the power of organized religion in social and political affairs and paid a great deal of attention to bending it to his purposes. He later noted the influence of Catholicism's rituals and splendors in his life.
Letizia was reportedly a harsh mother and down-to-earth woman. When most European mothers bathed children perhaps once a month, she had her children bathed every other day. Letizia spoke Italian and Corsican and never learned French. When she was 35, her husband died of cancer. She was decreed “Madam, the Mother of His Imperial Majesty The Emperor” (Madame Mère de l’Empereur), Imperial Highness in 1804 or 1805.
Childhood and Early Years

Napoleon’s noble, moderately affluent background afforded him greater opportunities to study than available to a typical Corsican of the time. In 1779, he was enrolled at a religious school in Autun but the same year, he was admitted to a military academy at Brienne-le-Château. Because of his Corsican origin, he was teased by other students for his accent, which inspired him to apply himself to reading. An examiner observed that Napoleon “has always been distinguished for his application in mathematics. He is fairly well acquainted with history and geography... This boy would make an excellent sailor.”

On completion of his studies at Brienne in 1784, Napoleon was admitted to the elite École Militaire in Paris. He trained to become an artillery officer and completed the two-year course in one year when his father’s death reduced his income. He was the first Corsican to graduate from the École Militaire.

Upon graduating in 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned a second lieutenant in La Fère artillery regiment. He served in Valence and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789, and took nearly two years’ leave in Corsica and Paris during this period. At this time, he was a fervent Corsican nationalist and wrote to Corsican leader Pasquale Paoli in 1789, “As the nation was perishing I was born. Thirty thousand Frenchmen were vomited on to our shores, drowning the throne of liberty in waves of blood. Such was the odious sight which was the first to strike me.” He spent the early years of the Revolution in Corsica, fighting in a complex three-way struggle among royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. He was a supporter of the republican Jacobin movement, organizing clubs in Corsica, and was given command over a battalion of volunteers. He was promoted to captain in the regular army in July 1792, despite exceeding his leave of absence and leading a riot against a French army in Corsica.

He returned to Corsica and came into conflict with Paoli, who
decided to split with France and sabotage the French assault on the Sardinian island of La Maddalena. Bonaparte and his family fled to the French mainland in 1793 because of the split with Paoli.

**Personality**

Historians emphasize the strength of the ambition that took Napoleon from an obscure village in Corsica to command of most of Europe. He was famously not very tall and thus not a physically imposing man, but his personality was described as “hypnotic.” Napoleon maintained strict, efficient work habits, prioritizing what needed to be done. He had to win at everything he attempted. He kept relays of staff and secretaries at work. Unlike many generals, Napoleon did not examine history to see what great leaders might have done in a similar situation. Historians also note that while he understood military technology, he was not an innovator in that regard and some of his victories heightened his sense of self-grandiosity and left him certain of his destiny and invincibility. In terms of influence on events, it was more than Napoleon’s personality that took effect. He reorganized France to supply the men and money needed for wars and was reportedly an incredibly inspiring leader on the battlefield.

**Attributions**

- **Napoleon’s Upbringing**
• “Robert_Lefèvre_001.jpg.”
  https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Robert_Lef%C3%A8vre_001.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
Napoleon rose to prominence as a military leader during the French Revolutionary Wars. His 20-year military career earned him remembrance as one of the finest commanders in world history and a military genius.

Learning Objective

Criticize Napoleon’s military record and examine the extent to which he was a hero of the Republic.

Key Points

- Upon graduating from the prestigious École Militaire in Paris in 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned a second lieutenant in an artillery regiment. He served in Valence and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789. He spent the early years of the Revolution in Corsica, fighting
in a complex three-way struggle among royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. He was promoted to captain in the regular army in 1792.

- Napoleon would witness the effects of Parisian mob violence against trained troops and became an exemplary officer in defense of revolutionary ideals. His firm beliefs would lead him to fight his own people, initially at the Siege of Toulon, where he would play a major role in crushing the royalist rebellion.

- Promoted to general in 1795, Napoleon was sent to fight the Austro-Piedmontese armies in Northern Italy the following year. In less than a year, French armies under Napoleon decimated the Habsburg forces and evicted them from the Italian peninsula. With French forces marching towards Vienna, the Austrians agreed to the Treaty of Campo Formio, ending the First Coalition against the Republic.

- The War of the Second Coalition began with the French invasion of Egypt, headed by Napoleon in 1798. His forces annihilated a series of Egyptian and Ottoman armies at the battles of the Pyramids, Mount Tabor, and Abukir. These victories and the conquest of Egypt further enhanced Napoleon’s popularity back in France. He returned in the fall of 1799 to cheering throngs in the streets despite the Royal Navy’s critical triumph at the Battle of the Nile in 1798.

- Napoleon's arrival from Egypt led to the fall of the Directory in the Coup of 18 Brumaire, with Napoleon installing himself as Consul. He then reorganized the French army and launched a new assault against the
European Coalition In 1802, with Austria and Russia out of the war, the United Kingdom found itself increasingly isolated and agreed to the Treaty of Amiens, concluding the Revolutionary Wars. The lingering tensions proved too difficult to contain, however, and the Napoleonic Wars began a few years later with the formation of the Third Coalition.

• The military career of Napoleon Bonaparte lasted more than 20 years. He is widely regarded as a military genius and one of the finest commanders in world history. He fought 60 battles and lost just seven, most at the end of his career.

Key Terms

Coup of 18 Brumaire
A bloodless coup d’État under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte that overthrew the Directory, replacing it with the French Consulate. It took place on November 9, 1799, 18 Brumaire, Year VIII under the French Republican Calendar.

Directory
A five-member committee that governed France from November 1795, when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety, until it was overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (November 8–9, 1799) and replaced by the
Consulate. It gave its name to the final four years of the French Revolution.

**French Revolutionary Wars**

A series of sweeping military conflicts lasting from 1792 until 1802, resulting from the French Revolution. They pitted the French First Republic against Britain, Austria, and several other monarchies. They are divided in two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802). Initially confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

**Siege of Toulon**

A military siege of republican forces over a royalist rebellion in the southern French city of Toulon that took place between September 8 and December 19, 1793. The royalists were supported by British, Spanish, Neapolitan, and Piedmontese troops.

---

**Early Military Career: The Revolution**

Napoleon’s noble, moderately affluent background afforded him greater opportunities to study than available to a typical Corsican of the time. Upon graduating from the prestigious École Militaire (military academy) in Paris in 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned as a second lieutenant in an artillery regiment. He served in Valence and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789 and
took nearly two years' leave in Corsica (where he was born and spent his early years) and Paris during this period. At this time, he was a fervent Corsican nationalist. He spent the early years of the Revolution in Corsica, fighting in a complex three-way struggle among royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. He was a supporter of the republican Jacobin movement, organizing clubs in Corsica, and was given command over a battalion of volunteers. He was promoted to captain in the regular army in 1792, despite exceeding his leave of absence and leading a riot against a French army in Corsica.

Napoleon would witness the effects of Parisian mob violence against trained troops and became an exemplary officer in defense of revolutionary ideals. His firm beliefs would lead him to fight his own people, initially at the Siege of Toulon where he played a major role in crushing the royalist rebellion by expelling an English fleet and securing the valuable French harbor. Almost two years later, he faced an uprising in the heart of Paris, again utilizing his skills as a gunner. Promoted to general in 1795, Napoleon was sent to fight the Austro-Piedmontese armies in Northern Italy the following year. After defeating both armies, he became France’s most distinguished field commander.

**French Revolutionary Wars**

The French Revolutionary Wars began from increasing political pressure on King Louis XVI of France to prove his loyalty to the country's new direction. In the spring of 1792, France declared war on Prussia and Austria, who responded with a coordinated invasion of the country. By 1795, the French monarchy had failed and the French army had recorded both triumphs and failures, but the French had captured the Austrian Netherlands and knocked Spain and Prussia out of the war with the Peace of Basel. Hitherto
unknown general Napoleon Bonaparte began his first campaign in Italy in April 1796. In less than a year, French armies under Napoleon decimated the Habsburg forces and evicted them from the Italian peninsula, winning almost every battle and capturing 150,000 prisoners. With French forces marching towards Vienna, the Austrians sued for peace and agreed to the Treaty of Campo Formio, ending the First Coalition against the Republic.

The War of the Second Coalition began with the French invasion of Egypt, headed by Napoleon in 1798. The Allies took the opportunity presented by the French strategic effort in the Middle East to regain territories lost from the First Coalition. Napoleon's forces annihilated a series of Egyptian and Ottoman armies at the battles of the Pyramids, Mount Tabor, and Abukir. These victories and the conquest of Egypt further enhanced Napoleon's popularity back in France. He returned in the fall of 1799 to cheering throngs in the streets despite the Royal Navy's critical triumph at the Battle of the Nile in 1798. This humiliating defeat further strengthened British control of the Mediterranean.

The Egyptian campaign ended in what some in France believed was a failure, with 15,000 French troops killed in action and 15,000 by disease. However, Napoleon's reputation as a brilliant military commander remained intact and even rose higher despite his failures during the campaign. This was due to his expert propaganda designed to bolster the expeditionary force and improve its morale.
That propaganda even spread back to France, where news of defeats such as at sea in Aboukir Bay and on land in Syria were suppressed.

Napoleon's arrival from Egypt led to the fall of the Directory in the Coup of 18 Brumaire, with Napoleon installing himself as Consul. Napoleon then reorganized the French army and launched a new assault against the Austrians in Italy during the spring of 1800. This latest effort culminated in a decisive French victory at the Battle of Marengo in June 1800, after which the Austrians withdrew from the peninsula once again. Another crushing French triumph at Hohenlinden in Bavaria forced the Austrians to seek peace for a second time, leading to the Treaty of Lunéville in 1801. With Austria and Russia out of the war, the United Kingdom found itself increasingly isolated and agreed to the Treaty of Amiens with Napoleon's government in 1802, concluding the Revolutionary Wars. The lingering tensions proved too difficult to contain, however, and the Napoleonic Wars began a few years later with the formation of the Third Coalition, continuing the series of Coalition Wars.

Napoleon as a Leader

The military career of Napoleon Bonaparte lasted more than 20 years. He is widely regarded as a military genius and one of the finest commanders in world history. He fought 60 battles and lost only seven, most of these at the end of his career.

In the field of military organization, Napoleon borrowed from previous theorists and reforms of preceding French governments, developing much of what was already in place. He continued the policy that emerged from the Revolution of promotion based primarily on merit. Corps replaced divisions as the largest army units, mobile artillery was integrated into reserve batteries, the staff
system became more fluid, and cavalry returned as an important formation in French military doctrine. These methods are now referred to as essential features of Napoleonic warfare.

Napoleon's biggest influence was in the conduct of warfare. Antoine-Henri Jomini explained Napoleon's methods in a widely used textbook that influenced all European and American armies. Influential military theorist Carl von Clausewitz regarded Napoleon as a genius in the operational art of war and historians rank him as a great military commander. Under Napoleon, a new emphasis towards the destruction, not just outmaneuvering, of enemy armies emerged. Invasions of enemy territory occurred over broader fronts, which made wars costlier and more decisive. The political effect of war increased. Defeat for a European power meant more than the loss of isolated enclaves, intensifying the Revolutionary phenomenon of total war.

Attributions

- Napoleon's Military Record
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Napoleon's marriage to Josephine was based on love and passion rather than political gain. However, it was ended for political reasons when it became clear that Josephine was unable to bear an heir.

**Learning Objective**

Explain the reasons behind Napoleon's marriage to Josephine

**Key Points**

- Marie Josèphe Rose Tascher de La Pagerie was born in 1763 in Martinique to a wealthy white Creole family that owned a sugarcane plantation. In 1779, she married Alexandre de Beauharnais, with whom she had two children. The marriage was not a happy one, leading to a court-ordered separation. In 1794, during
the Reign of Terror, Alexandre was executed but Josephine was freed thanks to the fall and execution of Robespierre.

- Josephine met Napoleon, six years her junior, in 1795. Napoleon was enamored with Josephine, with whom he had a passionate affair. In January 1796, Bonaparte proposed to Josephine and they married in March. Until meeting Bonaparte, Josephine was known as Rose, but Bonaparte preferred to call her Josephine, the name she adopted from then on.

- The marriage was not well received by Napoleon's family, who were shocked that he had married an older widow with two children. Two days after the wedding, Bonaparte left to lead the French army in Italy. During their separation he sent her many love letters, but both spouses also had lovers. Despite his own affairs, their relationship was never the same after he learnt about hers.

- The coronation ceremony, officiated by Pope Pius VII, took place at Notre Dame de Paris in December 1804. Following prearranged protocol, Napoleon first crowned himself, then put the crown on Josephine's head, proclaiming her empress.

- When after a few years it became clear Josephine could not have a child, Napoleon, though he still loved his wife, began to think seriously about the possibility of divorce and created lists of eligible princesses. In November 1809, he let Josephine know that in the interest of France he must find a wife who could produce an heir. Despite her anger, Josephine agreed to the divorce so the Emperor could remarry in the hope of having an heir.
Despite his divorce from Josephine, he showed his dedication to her for the rest of his life. When he heard the news of her death while on exile in Elba, he locked himself in his room and would not come out for two days. Her name would also be his final word on his deathbed in 1821.

Key Term

Reign of Terror
A period of violence during the French Revolution incited by conflict between two rival political factions, the Girondins and the Jacobins, and marked by mass executions of “the enemies of the revolution.” The death toll ranged in the tens of thousands, with 16,594 executed by guillotine and another 25,000 in summary executions across France.

Josephine de Beauharnais

Marie Josephe Rose Tascher de La Pagerie was born in 1763 in Martinique to a wealthy white Creole family that owned a sugarcane plantation. The family struggled financially after hurricanes destroyed their estate in 1766. Josephine’s aunt arranged
the advantageous marriage of Josephine’s younger sister, Catherine-Désirée, to Alexandre de Beauharnais, a member of an influential and wealthy family. However, when Catherine died in 1777, she was replaced by her older sister, Josephine, who married Alexandre in 1779 in France. The couple had two children. The marriage was an unhappy one, leading to a court-ordered separation. In 1794, during the Reign of Terror, Alexandre was arrested and jailed and Josephine, considered too close to the counter-revolutionary financial circles, was also imprisoned. She was freed five days after Alexandre’s execution thanks to the fall and execution of Robespierre, which ended the Reign of Terror.

Marriage of Napoleon and Josephine

Josephine met Napoleon, six years her junior, in 1795. Prior to that, she had had affairs with several leading political figures, including Paul François Jean Nicolas Barras. Napoleon was enamored with Josephine, with whom he had a passionate affair. In a letter to her from December 1795, he wrote, “I awake full of you. Your image and the memory of last night’s intoxicating pleasures has left no rest to my senses.” In January 1796, Bonaparte proposed to Josephine, and they married in March. Until meeting Bonaparte, Josephine was known as Rose, but Bonaparte preferred to call her Josephine, the name she adopted from then on.

The marriage was not well received by Napoleon’s family, who were shocked that he had married an older widow with two children. His mother and sisters were especially resentful of Josephine as they felt clumsy and unsophisticated in her presence. Two days after the wedding, Bonaparte left to lead the French army in Italy. During their separation, he sent her many love letters. In February 1797, he wrote: “You to whom nature has given spirit, sweetness, and beauty, you who alone can move and rule my
heart, you who know all too well the absolute empire you exercise over it!"

During Napoleon’s absence, Josephine had lovers, including lieutenant Hippolyte Charles. A letter Charles wrote about the affair was intercepted by the British and published widely in order to embarrass Napoleon. The relationship between Josephine and Napoleon was never the same after this. His letters became less loving. No subsequent lovers of Josephine are recorded, but Napoleon had sexual affairs with several other women.

Josephine was a renowned spendthrift and Barras may have
encouraged the relationship with Napoleon to get her off his hands. Napoleon reportedly said that the only thing to come between them was her debts. Despite the affairs of both spouses and the eventual divorce, evidence suggests that Napoleon and Josephine loved each other deeply throughout their lives.

**Emperor and Empress of the French**

The coronation ceremony, officiated by Pope Pius VII, took place at Notre Dame de Paris in December 1804. Following prearranged protocol, Napoleon first crowned himself, then put the crown on Josephine's head proclaiming her empress. Shortly before their coronation, Josephine caught Napoleon in the bedroom of her lady-in-waiting, Elisabeth de Vaudey, and Napoleon threatened to divorce her as she had not produced an heir. Eventually, through the efforts of Josephine's daughter Hortense, the two reconciled.

**Divorce**

When it became clear Josephine could not have a child, Napoleon began to think seriously about the possibility of divorce. The final die was cast when Josephine's grandson Napoleon Charles Bonaparte, who had been declared Napoleon's heir, died of croup in 1807. Napoleon began to create lists of eligible princesses. In November 1809, he let Josephine know that—in the interest of France—he must find a wife who could produce an heir. Despite her anger, Josephine agreed to the divorce so the Emperor could remarry in the hope of having an heir. The divorce ceremony took place in January 1810 and was a grand but solemn social occasion.
Both Josephine and Napoleon read a statement of devotion to the other.

In March 1810, Napoleon married Marie-Louise of Austria by proxy and the formal ceremony took place at the Louvre in April. Napoleon once remarked after marrying Marie-Louise that despite her quick infatuation with him “he had married a womb.” Even after their separation, Napoleon insisted Josephine retain the title of empress. Despite his divorce from Josephine, he showed his dedication to her for the rest of his life. When he heard the news of her death while on exile in Elba, he locked himself in his room and would not come out for two days. Her name would also be his final word on his deathbed in 1821.

Attributions

- Napoleon’s Marriage to Josephine
Napoleon’s consolidation of power was initiated by a coup and continued in a series of political maneuvers, but his rise as the sole ruler of France was linked with the power and popularity he gained as the foremost military leader.

**Learning Objective**

Describe how Napoleon became First Consul and consolidated power

**Key Points**

- After Habsburg-controlled Austria declared war in 1799, France returned to a war footing. With Napoleon and the republic’s best army engaged in the Egypt and Syria campaign, France suffered a series of reverses in Europe. The Coup of 30 Prairial VII (June 18) ousted the Jacobins and left Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès as the dominant figure in the government. As France’s military situation improved, the Jacobins
feared a revival of the pro-peace Royalist faction. When Napoleon returned to France in October, both factions hailed him as the country’s savior.

• Despite the failures in Egypt, Napoleon returned to a hero’s welcome, which convinced Sieyès he had found the general indispensable to his planned coup. However, from the moment of his return, Napoleon plotted a coup within the coup, ultimately gaining power for himself rather than Sieyès.

• On the 18 of Brumaire, three of the five Directors resigned, which prevented a quorum and thus practically abolished the Directory. The two remaining Directors protested, but were arrested and forced to give up their resistance. Both Councils resisted but eventually succumbed to the demands of the plotters.

• The plotters convened two commissions that they intimidated into declaring a provisional government, the first form of the Consulate with Napoleon, Sieyès, and Ducos as Consuls. The commissions then drew up the Constitution of the Year VIII (1799). Originally devised by Sieyès to give Napoleon a minor role but rewritten by Napoleon and accepted by direct popular vote, the Constitution preserved the appearance of a republic but in reality established a dictatorship.

• Bonaparte completed his coup within a coup by the adoption of a constitution under which the First Consul, a position he was sure to hold, had greater power than the other two consuls. Under the new constitution, The Sénat conservateur verified the draft bills and directly advised the First Consul;
Conseil d'État drafted bills; Tribunat debated bills but could not vote on them; and Corps législatif voted on laws deliberated before the Tribunat.

- Military victories, elimination of political opponents, and internal reforms continued to strengthen Napoleon's position and popularity. Finally, the 1802 Peace of Amiens gave the peacemaker a pretext for endowing himself with a Consulate, not for ten years but for life, as a recompense from the nation. The decision was approved in a referendum.

**Key Terms**

**the Consulate**

The government of France from the fall of the Directory in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (1799) until the start of the Napoleonic Empire in 1804. By extension, the term also refers to this period of French history. During this period, Napoleon Bonaparte, as First Consul, established himself as the head of a more liberal, authoritarian, autocratic, and centralized republican government in France while not declaring himself head of state.

**Tribunat**

One of the four assemblies set up in France by the Constitution of Year VIII (the other three were the
Council of State, the Corps législatif and the Sénat conservateur). It was set up officially in 1800 at the same time as the Corps législatif. It assumed some of the functions of the Council of Five Hundred, but its role consisted only of deliberating projected laws before their adoption by the Corps législatif, with the legislative initiative remaining with the Council of State.

**Sénat conservateur**

An advisory body established in France during the Consulate following the French Revolution. It was established in 1799 under the Constitution of the Year VIII following the Napoleon Bonaparte-led Coup of 18 Brumaire. It lasted until 1814 when Napoleon Bonaparte was overthrown and the Bourbon monarchy was restored, and was a key element in Napoleon’s regime.

**Coup of 30 Prairial**

A bloodless coup, also known as the Revenge of the Councils, that occurred in France on June 18, 1799—30 Prairial Year VII by the French Republican Calendar. It left Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès as the dominant figure of the French government and prefigured the Coup of 18 Brumaire that brought Napoleon Bonaparte to power.

**Corps législatif**

A part of the French legislature during the French Revolution and beyond. During the period of the French Directory beginning in 1795, the Corps législatif referred to the bicameral legislature of the Council of Five Hundred and the Council of Ancients. Under Napoleon’s Consulate, this was the law-making body of
the three-part government apparatus (alongside the Tribunat and the Sénat Conservateur). At the time, its role consisted solely of voting on laws deliberated before the Tribunat.

**Conseil d'État**

(French: Council of State): A body of the French national government that acts both as legal adviser of the executive branch and as the supreme court for administrative justice. Originally established in 1799 by Napoleon Bonaparte as a successor to the King’s Council and a judicial body mandated to adjudicate claims against the State and assist in the drafting of important laws.

**Directory**

A five-member committee that governed France from November 1795 when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety until it was overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (November 8–9, 1799) and replaced by the Consulate. It gave its name to the final four years of the French Revolution.

**Coup of 18 Brumaire**

A bloodless coup d'état under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte that overthrew the Directory, replacing it with the French Consulate. It took place on November 9, 1799, which was 18 Brumaire, Year VIII under the French Republican Calendar.
Coup of 18 Brumaire

After Habsburg-controlled Austria declared war in 1799, France returned to a war footing. Emergency measures were adopted and the pro-war Jacobin faction triumphed in the election. With Napoleon and the republic’s best army engaged in the Egypt and Syria campaign, France suffered a series of reverses in Europe. The Coup of 30 Prairial VII (June 18) ousted the Jacobins and left Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, a member of the five-man ruling Directory, the dominant figure in the government. As France’s military situation improved, the Jacobins feared a revival of the pro-peace Royalist faction. When Napoleon returned to France in October, both factions hailed him as the country’s savior.

Despite the failures in Egypt, Napoleon returned to a hero’s welcome, which convinced Sieyès he had found the general indispensable to his planned coup. However, from the moment of his return, Napoleon plotted a coup within the coup, ultimately gaining power for himself rather than Sieyès. Prior to the coup, troops were conveniently deployed around Paris. The plan was first to persuade the Directors to resign, then to get the Council of Ancients and the Council of Five Hundred (the upper and lower houses of the legislature) to appoint a pliant commission that would draw up a new constitution to the plotters’ specifications.

The plan succeeded. On the morning of 18 Brumaire, Lucien Bonaparte falsely persuaded the Councils that a Jacobin coup was at hand in Paris and induced them to depart for the safety in the suburbs, while Napoleon was charged with the safety of the two Councils and given command of all available local troops. On the same day, three of the five Directors resigned, which prevented a quorum and thus practically abolished the Directory. The two remaining Directors protested but were arrested and forced to give up their resistance.

By the following day, the deputies of the Councils realized that they were facing an attempted coup rather than being protected
from a Jacobin rebellion. Faced with their recalcitrance, Napoleon stormed into the chambers, which proved to be the coup within the coup: from this point, it was a military affair. Both chambers resisted but under the pressure of the events, they succumbed to the demands of the plotters.

Consolidation of Power: The Consulate

The Directory was crushed, but the coup within the coup was not yet complete. The use of military force had certainly strengthened Napoleon's hand vis à vis Sieyès and the other plotters. With the Council routed, the plotters convened two commissions, each consisting of 25 deputies from the two Councils. The plotters essentially intimidated the commissions into declaring a provisional government, the first form of the Consulate with Napoleon, Sieyès, and Roger Ducos as Consuls. The lack of reaction from the streets proved that the revolution was indeed over. Resistance by Jacobin officeholders in the provinces was quickly crushed. The commissions then drew up the Constitution of the Year VIII (1799), the first of the constitutions since the Revolution without a Declaration of Rights. Originally devised by Sieyès to give Napoleon a minor role but rewritten by Napoleon and accepted by direct popular vote, the Constitution preserved the appearance of a republic but in reality established a dictatorship.
Sieyès and Ducossurvived only two months as members of the Consulate. In December 1799, two new members (in the portrait above) joined Napoleon. As the years would progress, he would move to consolidate his own power as First Consul and leave the two other consuls, Jean Jacques Régis de Cambacérès and Charles-François Lebrun, duc de Plaisance, as well as the Assemblies, weak and subservient. By consolidating power, Bonaparte was able to transform the aristocratic constitution of Sieyès into a dictatorship.

Bonaparte thus completed his coup within a coup by the adoption of a constitution under which the First Consul, a position he was sure to hold, had greater power than the other two. In particular, he appointed the Senate and the Senate interpreted the constitution. The Sénat conservateur (Conservative Senate, which verified the draft bills and directly advised the First Consul on the implications of such bills) allowed him to rule by decree, so the more independent Conseil d'État (Council of State, which drafted bills) and Tribunat (debated bills but could not vote on them) were
relegated to unimportant roles. The legislature known as Corps législatif also partly replaced the Council of Five Hundred under the new constitution, but its role consisted solely of voting on laws deliberated before the Tribunat.

Napoleon, at least in theory, still shared the executive power with the two other Consuls. He now aspired to get rid of Sieyès and those republicans who had no desire to hand over the republic to one man. Military victories in the ongoing war increased his popularity and royalist plots served as an excuse to eliminate political opponents, usually by deportation, even if they were innocent. The 1801 Treaty of Lunéville with Austria restored peace in Europe, gave nearly the whole of Italy to France, and permitted Bonaparte to eliminate from the assemblies all the leaders of the opposition. The Concordat of 1801, drawn up not in the Church's interest but in that of Napoleon's own policy, allowed him to put down the constitutional democratic Church, rally round him the consciences of the peasants, and above all, deprive the royalists of their best weapon. The 1802 Peace of Amiens with the United Kingdom, of which France's allies, Spain and the Batavian Republic, paid all the costs, gave the peacemaker a pretext for endowing himself with a Consulate, not for ten years but for life, as a recompense from the nation. The same year, a second national referendum was held, this time to confirm Napoleon as “First Consul for Life.”

Attributions

- The First Consul


Napoleon’s early wars with Austria and Britain confirmed the French dominance over Austria, failed to stop British dominance in the Mediterranean, and ended with a precarious peace broken only a year after signing the final treaty of the French Revolutionary Wars.

**Learning Objective**

Discuss Napoleon’s early military successes against Austria and Britain

**Key Points**

- The War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) was the first attempt by the European monarchies to defeat the French First Republic. France declared war on the Habsburg Monarchy of Austria in April 1792 and the Kingdom of Prussia joined the Austrian side a few weeks later. A number of other European states,
including Britain, joined the First Coalition over the course of the war.

- Napoleon did not enter the war as the leader of the French army until 1796, although he faced the British forces at the 1793 Siege of Toulon, where he played a major role in crushing the royalist rebellion by expelling an English fleet and securing the valuable French harbor. Promoted to general in 1795, he was sent to the battlefields of the French Revolutionary Wars to fight the Austro-Piedmontese armies in Northern Italy the following year.

- Napoleon was successful in a daring invasion of Italy, a victory that contributed to Austria’s decision to sign the Treaty of Campo Formio, ceding Belgium to France and recognizing French control of the Rhineland and much of Italy. The ancient Republic of Venice was partitioned between Austria and France. This ended the War of the First Coalition, although Great Britain and France remained at war.

- The Mediterranean campaign of 1798 was a series of major naval operations surrounding a French expeditionary force sent to Egypt under Napoleon Bonaparte that serves as a bridge between the War of the First Coalition and the War of the Second Coalition. The French Republic sought to capture Egypt as the first stage in an effort to threaten British India and thus force Great Britain to make peace. The campaign was initially Napoleon’s success but he failed to stop the British dominance once it moved to Egypt.

- The War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802) was the second war on revolutionary France by the
European monarchies, led by Britain, Austria and Russia, and including the Ottoman Empire, Portugal, and Naples. Their goal was to contain the spread of chaos from France.

- In the end, the Austrians negotiated the Treaty of Lunéville, basically accepting the terms of the previous Treaty of Campo Formio. In Egypt, the Ottomans and British invaded and finally compelled the French to surrender after the fall of Cairo and Alexandria. In 1802, the British and French signed the Treaty of Amiens but the peace did not last long.

**Key Terms**

**Siege of Toulon**
A military siege of republican forces over a royalist rebellion in the southern French city of Toulon that took place between September 8 and December 19, 1793. The royalists were supported by British, Spanish, Neapolitan, and Piedmontese troops.

**Mediterranean campaign of 1798**
A series of major naval operations surrounding a French expeditionary force sent to Egypt under Napoleon Bonaparte during the French Revolutionary Wars. The French Republic sought to capture Egypt as the first stage in an effort to threaten British India and thus force Great Britain to make peace.
French Revolutionary Wars
A series of sweeping military conflicts lasting from 1792 until 1802, resulting from the French Revolution. They pitted the French First Republic against Britain, Austria, and several other monarchies. They are divided into two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802). Initially confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

War of the First Coalition
The 1792–1797 conflict of the French Revolutionary Wars that was the first attempt by the European monarchies to defeat the French First Republic. France declared war on the Habsburg Monarchy of Austria in April 1792 and the Kingdom of Prussia joined the Austrian side a few weeks later. A number of smaller states, including Spain, Portugal, and the Dutch Republic, also joined the anti-French coalition.

War of the Second Coalition
The 1798–1802 conflict that was the second war on revolutionary France by the European monarchies, led by Britain, Austria, and Russia and including the Ottoman Empire, Portugal, and Naples. Their goal was to contain the spread of chaos from France.
Napoleon vs. the First Coalition

The War of the First Coalition (1792–1797), one of the conflicts of the French Revolutionary Wars, was the first attempt by the European monarchies to defeat the French First Republic. France declared war on the Habsburg Monarchy of Austria in April 1792 and the Kingdom of Prussia joined the Austrian side a few weeks later. These powers made several invasions of France by land and sea, with Prussia and Austria attacking from the Austrian Netherlands and the Rhine and the Kingdom of Great Britain supporting revolts in provincial France and laying siege to Toulon. A number of smaller states, including Spain, Portugal, and the Dutch Republic, were also part of the First Coalition over the course of the war.

Napoleon did not enter the war as the leader of the French army until 1796, although he faced the British forces at the 1793 Siege of Toulon, where he played a major role in crushing the royalist rebellion by expelling an English fleet and securing the valuable French harbor. Promoted to general in 1795, Napoleon was sent to the battlefields of the French Revolutionary Wars to fight the Austro-Piedmontese armies in Northern Italy the following year. Napoleon's was one of three French armies sent with the aim to eventually reach Vienna (two other engaged in the campaign on the Rhine). He was successful in a daring invasion of Italy. In the Montenotte Campaign, he separated the armies of Sardinia and Austria, defeating each one in turn, and then forced a peace on Sardinia. His army then captured Milan and started the Siege of Mantua. Bonaparte defeated successive Austrian armies sent against him while continuing the siege.

In February, Napoleon finally captured Mantua, with the Austrians surrendering 18,000 men. Archduke Charles of Austria was unable to stop Napoleon from invading the Tyrol and the Austrian government sued for peace in April. At the same time there was a new French invasion of Germany under Moreau and Hoche. Austria signed the Treaty of Campo Formio in October, ceding Belgium to
France and recognizing French control of the Rhineland and much of Italy. The ancient Republic of Venice was partitioned between Austria and France. This ended the War of the First Coalition, although Great Britain and France remained at war.

The Mediterranean Campaign of 1798

The Mediterranean campaign of 1798 was a series of major naval operations surrounding a French expeditionary force sent to Egypt under Napoleon Bonaparte that serves as a bridge between the War of the First Coalition and the War of the Second Coalition. The French Republic sought to capture Egypt as the first stage in an effort to threaten British India and thus force Great Britain to make peace. Departing Toulon in May 1798 with over 40,000 troops and hundreds of ships, Bonaparte’s fleet sailed southeast across the Mediterranean Sea. They were followed by a small British squadron under Rear-Admiral Horatio Nelson, later reinforced to 13 ships of the line. Bonaparte’s first target was the island of Malta, which was under the government of the Knights of St. John and theoretically granted its owner control of the Central Mediterranean. Bonaparte’s forces landed on the island and rapidly overwhelmed the defenders, securing the port city of Valletta before continuing to Egypt. When Nelson learned of the French capture of the island, he guessed the French target to be Egypt and sailed for Alexandria.
Despite Napoleon's initial successes, including the temporary capture of the port city Valletta in Malta, the defeats of French Navy in the Mediterranean encouraged a number of states to join the Second Coalition and go to war with France.

Unable to find Bonaparte, Nelson turned back across the Mediterranean, eventually reaching Sicily. While Nelson was returning westwards, Bonaparte reached Alexandria and stormed the city, capturing the coast and marching his army inland. Nelson returned to the Egyptian coast and ordered an immediate attack on the French. Fighting continued for the next two days until all of the French ships had been captured, destroyed, or fled. At the Battle of the Nile, 11 French ships of the line and two frigates were eliminated, trapping Bonaparte in Egypt and changing the balance of power in the Mediterranean.

With the French Navy in the Mediterranean defeated, other nations were encouraged to join the Second Coalition and go to war with France. Portugal, the Kingdom of Naples, the Russian Empire, and the Ottoman Empire all subsequently deployed forces to the Mediterranean. The Russians and Turks participated in the blockade.
of Egypt and operations in the Adriatic Sea while the Portuguese joined the Siege of Malta, distantly conducted by Nelson from his lodgings in Naples.

**Napoleon vs. the Second Coalition**

The War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802) was the second war on revolutionary France by the European monarchies, led by Britain, Austria, and Russia and including the Ottoman Empire, Portugal and Naples. Their goal was to contain the spread of chaos from France.

Alerted to the political and military crisis in France, Napoleon returned from Egypt, leaving his army behind, and used his popularity and army support to mount a coup that made him First Consul, the head of the French government. Napoleon sent General Moreau to campaign in Germany and went to raise a new army at Dijon and march through Switzerland to attack the Austrian armies in Italy from behind. Narrowly avoiding defeat, he defeated the Austrians at the Battle of Marengo and reoccupied northern Italy. Moreau meanwhile invaded Bavaria and won a great battle against Austria at Hohenlinden. He continued toward Vienna and the Austrians sued for peace.
In one of the famous paintings of Napoleon, the Consul and his army are depicted crossing the Swiss Alps on their way to Italy. The daring maneuver surprised the Austrians and forced a decisive engagement at Marengo in 1800. Victory there allowed Napoleon to strengthen his political position back in France.

The Austrians negotiated the Treaty of Lunéville, basically accepting the terms of the previous Treaty of Campo Formio. In Egypt, the Ottomans and British invaded and finally compelled the French to surrender after the fall of Cairo and Alexandria. Britain continued the war at sea. A coalition of non-combatants including Prussia, Russia, Denmark, and Sweden joined to protect neutral shipping from Britain's blockade, resulting in Nelson's surprise attack on the Danish fleet in harbor at the Battle of Copenhagen. In December
1801, an expedition was sent to Saint-Domingue to quell the revolution that had started there in 1791 once and for all, but the blockade of the Caribbean island by the British fleet made the sending of reinforcements impossible.

In 1802, the British and French signed the Treaty of Amiens, ending the war. The treaty is generally considered to mark the transition between the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars. The peace, however, did not last long. Great Britain had broken the Treaty of Amiens by declaring war on France in May 1803. In December 1804, an Anglo-Swedish agreement became the first step towards the creation of the Third Coalition. By April 1805, Britain had also signed an alliance with Russia. Austria had been defeated by France twice in recent memory and wanted revenge, so it joined the coalition a few months later.

Attributions

- Early Wars with Austria and Britain
  - “French campaign in Egypt and Syria.”
  - “Military career of Napoleon Bonaparte.”
  - “Mediterranean campaign of 1798.”
3.0.
- “David_-_Napoleon_crossing_the_Alps_-_Malmaison1.jpg.” https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:David_-_Napoleon_crossing_the_Alps_-_Malmaison1.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
23.1.6: Napoleon’s Constitution

The Constitution of the Year VIII, adopted in 1799 and accepted by the popular vote in 1800, established the form of government known as the Consulate that presumed virtually dictatorial powers of the First Consul, Napoleon Bonaparte.

Learning Objective

Assess Napoleon’s Constitution and whether it upheld the ideals of the French Revolution

Key Points

- Napoleon and his allies overthrew the Directory by a coup d’état on November 9, 1799 (the Coup of 18 Brumaire), closing down the Council of Five Hundred. Napoleon became the First Consul for ten years, appointing two consuls who had consultative voices only. His power was confirmed by the new Constitution of the Year VIII, which preserved the appearance of a republic but established a
dictatorship.

• The Constitution of the Year VIII was adopted on December 24, 1799, and established the form of government known as the Consulate. The new government was composed of three parliamentary assemblies: the Council of State, which drafted bills; the Tribunate, which debated them but could not vote; and the Legislative Assembly, which could not discuss the bills, but whose members voted on them after reviewing the Tribunate’s debate record. The Conservative Senate (Sénat conservateur) was a governmental body equal to the three aforementioned legislative assemblies.

• The executive power was vested in three Consuls, but all actual power was held by the First Consul, Bonaparte, who never intended to be part of an equal triumvirate. As the years progressed, he moved to consolidate his own power as First Consul and leave the two other consuls and the Assemblies weak and subservient.

• On February 7, 1800, a public referendum confirmed the new constitution. It vested all of the real power in the hands of the First Consul, leaving only a nominal role for the other two consuls. Over 99% of voters approved the motion, according to the released results. While this near-unanimity is certainly doubtful, Napoleon was genuinely popular among many voters.

• The Constitution was amended twice and in each case, the amendments strengthened Napoleon’s already concentrated power. The Constitution of the Year X (1802) made Napoleon First Consul for Life. In
1804, the Constitution of the Year XII established the First French Empire with Napoleon Bonaparte as Napoleon I, Emperor of the French. The Constitution established the House of Bonaparte as France’s imperial dynasty, making the throne hereditary in Napoleon’s family.

- The Constitution of the Year XII was later extensively amended by the Additional Act (1815) after Napoleon returned from exile on Elba. The document virtually replaced the previous Napoleonic Constitutions.

Key Terms

Consulate

The government of France from the fall of the Directory in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (1799) until the start of the Napoleonic Empire in 1804. By extension, the term also refers to this period of French history. During this period, Napoleon Bonaparte, as First Consul, established himself as the head of a more liberal, authoritarian, autocratic, and centralized republican government in France while not declaring himself head of state.

Additional Act

A document known also as the Charter of 1815, signed on April 22, 1815, which was the French
constitution prepared by Benjamin Constant at the request of Napoleon I after he returned from exile on Elba. It extensively amended (in fact virtually replacing) the previous Napoleonic Constitutions (Constitution of the Year VIII, Constitution of the Year X, and Constitution of the Year XII). It was very liberal in spirit and gave the French people rights which were previously unknown to them, such as the right to elect a mayor in communes with populations of fewer than 5,000.

**Constitution of the Year VIII**

The French constitution adopted on December 24, 1799 (during the Year VIII of the French Revolutionary Calendar), that established the form of government known as the Consulate. The constitution tailor-made the position of First Consul to give Napoleon most of the powers of a dictator. It was the first constitution since the Revolution that did not include a Declaration of Rights.

**Coup of 18 Brumaire**

A bloodless coup d'état under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte that overthrew the Directory, replacing it with the French Consulate. It took place on November 9, 1799, which was 18 Brumaire, Year VIII under the French Republican Calendar.
The Constitution of the Year VIII

Despite the failures in Egypt (1798-99), Napoleon arrived in France to a hero's welcome. He drew together an alliance with director Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, his brother Lucien, speaker of the Council of Five Hundred Roger Ducos, director Joseph Fouché, and Talleyrand, and they overthrew the Directory by a coup d'état on November 9, 1799 (the Coup of 18 Brumaire), closing down the Council of Five Hundred (the lower house of the legislature). Napoleon became the First Consul for ten years, appointing two consuls with consultative voices only. His power was confirmed by the new Constitution of the Year VIII, originally devised by Sieyès to give Napoleon a minor role, but rewritten by Napoleon and accepted by direct popular vote. The constitution preserved the appearance of a republic but in reality established a dictatorship.

The Constitution of the Year VIII was adopted on December 24, 1799 (during the Year VIII of the French Revolutionary Calendar), and established the form of government known as the Consulate. The constitution tailor-made the position of First Consul to give Napoleon most of the powers of a dictator. It was the first constitution since the Revolution that did not include a Declaration of Rights.
Napoleon established a political system that historian Martyn Lyons called “dictatorship by plebiscite.” Worried by the democratic forces unleashed by the Revolution, but unwilling to ignore them entirely, Napoleon resorted to regular electoral consultation with the French people on his road to imperial power. He drafted the Constitution of the Year VIII and secured his own election as First Consul, taking up residence at the Tuileries. The constitution was approved in
plebiscite held the following January, with 99.94 percent officially listed as voting “yes.”

Separation of Powers

The new government was composed of three parliamentary assemblies: the Council of State (Conseil d’État), which drafted bills; the Tribunate, which debated bills but could not vote; and the Legislative Assembly (Corps législatif), which could not discuss the bills, but whose members voted on them after reviewing the Tribunate’s debate record. The Conservative Senate (Sénat conservateur) was a governmental body equal to the three aforementioned legislative assemblies. However, the Senate was more of an executive body as it verified the draft bills and directly advised the First Consul on their implications. Popular suffrage was retained but mutilated by the lists of notables. The term notables, commonly used under the monarchy, referred to prominent and more affluent men — landholders, merchants, scholars, professionals, clergymen, and officials. The people in each district chose a slate of notables by popular vote. The First Consul, Tribunate, and Corps législatif each nominated one Senatorial candidate to the rest of the Senate, which chose one candidate from among the three.

The executive power was vested in three Consuls, but all actual power was held by the First Consul, Bonaparte. Napoleon vetoed Sieyès’ original idea of having a single Grand Elector as supreme executive and Head of State. Sieyès had intended to reserve this important position for himself but by vetoing the proposal, Napoleon helped reinforce the authority of the consuls. However, Napoleon never intended to be part of an equal triumvirate. As the years progressed, he moved to consolidate his own power as First Consul and leave the two other consuls, Jean Jacques Régis de Cambacérès and Charles-François Lebrun, duc de Plaisance, as well as the Assemblies, weak and subservient. By consolidating power, Bonaparte was able to transform the aristocratic constitution of Sieyès into a dictatorship.
Amendments: Further Consolidation of Power

On February 7, 1800, a public referendum confirmed the new constitution. It vested all the real power in the hands of the First Consul, leaving only a nominal role for the other two consuls. More than 99% of voters approved the motion according to the released results. While this near-unanimity is certainly doubtful, Napoleon was genuinely popular among many voters and after a period of strife, many in France were reassured by his accomplishments in the War of the Second Coalition and his talk of stability of government, order, justice, and moderation. He created the impression that France was governed once more by a real statesman and that a competent government was finally in charge.

The Constitution was amended twice and in each case, the amendments strengthened Napoleon's already concentrated power. The Constitution of the Year X (1802) made Napoleon First Consul for Life. In 1804, the Constitution of the Year XII established the First French Empire with Napoleon Bonaparte — previously First Consul for Life, with wide-ranging powers — as Napoleon I, Emperor of the French. The Constitution established the House of Bonaparte as France's imperial dynasty, making the throne hereditary in Napoleon’s family. The Constitution of the Year XII was later extensively amended by the Additional Act (1815) after Napoleon returned from exile on Elba. The document virtually replaced the previous Napoleonic Constitutions and reframed the Napoleonic constitution into something more along the lines of the Bourbon Restoration Charter of 1814 of Louis XVIII while otherwise ignoring the Bourbon charter's existence. It was very liberal in spirit and gave the French people rights which were previously unknown.
to them, such as the right to elect the mayor in communes with populations fewer than 5,000. Napoleon treated it as a mere continuation of the previous constitutions, and it thus took the form of an ordinary legislative act “additional to the constitutions of the Empire.”

Attributions

- Napoleon’s Constitution
Napoleon's government quickly became an authoritarian one-man system, but he surrounded himself with talented and skilled collaborators and experts and supported a merit-based system in the military.

**Learning Objective**

Assess Napoleon’s governmental structure and merit system

**Key Points**

- Napoleon's new government, the Consulate, was composed of three parliamentary assemblies: the Council of State, which drafted bills; the Tribunate which debated bills but could not vote; and the Legislative Assembly, which could not discuss the bills, but whose members voted on them after reviewing the Tribunate's debate record. The Conservative Senate was a governmental body equal
to the three aforementioned legislative assemblies.

- The executive power was vested in three Consuls, but all actual power was held by the First Consul, Bonaparte. In 1802, Napoleon became the First Consul for Life and two years later he was elected as Emperor of the French.

- As Napoleon increased his power, he borrowed many techniques of the Ancien Régime in his new form of one-man government. Like the old monarchy, he re-introduced plenipotentiaries, an over-centralized, strictly utilitarian administration that constructed or consolidated the funds necessary for national institutions, local governments, a judiciary system, organs of finance, banking, codes, and a conscientious well-disciplined labor force.

- Napoleon was largely able to quell dissent within government by expelling his more vocal critics. However, he was also able to look beyond partisan and ideological divisions if he recognized exceptional skills and talents that could support his vision of France. The most illustrative example of this phenomenon is his collaboration with Charles Maurice de Talleyrand and Joseph Fouché.

- In strengthening the machinery of state, Napoleon created the elite order of the Légion d'honneur (The Legion of Honor – a substitute for the old royalist decorations and orders of chivalry, to encourage civilian and military achievements), signed the Concordat, and restored indirect taxes.

- Of permanent importance was the Napoleonic Code created by eminent jurists under Napoleon's supervision. Praised for its Gallic clarity, it spread
rapidly throughout Europe and the world, marking the end of feudalism where it took effect. The Code recognized the principles of civil liberty, equality before the law, and the secular character of the state.

**Key Terms**

**The Consulate**

The government of France from the fall of the Directory in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (1799) until the start of the Napoleonic Empire in 1804. By extension, the term also refers to this period of French history. During this period, Napoleon Bonaparte, as First Consul, established himself as the head of a more liberal, authoritarian, autocratic, and centralized republican government in France while not declaring himself head of state.

**Napoleonic Code**

The French civil code established under Napoleon I in 1804. It was drafted by a commission of four eminent jurists. With its stress on clearly written and accessible law, it was a major step in replacing the previous patchwork of feudal laws. Historian Robert Holtman regards it as one of the few documents that have influenced the whole world.

**Concordat**

Convention between the Holy See (the Vatican) and a
sovereign state that defines the relationship between the Catholic Church and the state in matters that concern both, i.e. the recognition and privileges of the Catholic Church in a particular country and with secular matters that impact on church interests.

Legion of Honor
The highest French order for military and civil merits, established in 1802 by Napoléon Bonaparte. It was originally established as a substitute for the old royalist decorations and orders of chivalry to encourage civilian and military achievements.

The Consulate
Napoleon's new government was composed of three parliamentary assemblies: the Council of State (Conseil d'État), which drafted bills; the Tribunate, which could not vote on the bills but debated them; and the Legislative Assembly (Corps législatif), which could not discuss the bills, but whose members voted on them after reviewing the Tribunate's debate record. The Conservative Senate (Sénat conservateur) was a governmental body equal to the three aforementioned legislative assemblies. However, the Senate was more of an executive body as it verified the draft bills and directly advised the First Consul on their implications. Popular suffrage was retained but mutilated by the lists of the so-called notables. This term referred to prominent and more affluent men: landholders, merchants, scholars, professionals, clergymen, and officials. The people in each district chose a slate of notables by popular vote.
The First Consul, Tribunate, and Corps législatif each nominated one Senatorial candidate to the rest of the Senate, which chose one candidate from among the three.

The executive power was vested in three Consuls, but all actual power was held by the First Consul, Bonaparte. Napoleon vetoed Sieyès’ original idea of having a single Grand Elector as supreme executive and Head of State. Sieyès had intended to reserve this important position for himself but by vetoing the proposal, Napoleon helped reinforce the authority of the consuls. However, Napoleon never intended to be part of an equal triumvirate. As the years progressed, he moved to consolidate his own power as First Consul, and leave the two other consuls, Jean Jacques Régis de Cambacérès and Charles-François Lebrun, duc de Plaisance, as well as the Assemblies, weak and subservient.

Further Centralization of Power

In 1802, Napoleon became the First Consul for Life and two years later he was elected as Emperor of the French. His coronation took place in December 1804. Two separate crowns were brought for the ceremony: a golden laurel wreath recalling the Roman Empire and a replica of Charlemagne’s crown. Napoleon entered the ceremony wearing the laurel wreath and kept it on his head throughout the proceedings. For the official coronation, he raised the Charlemagne crown over his own head in a symbolic gesture, but never placed it on top because he was already wearing the golden wreath. Instead he placed the crown on Josephine’s head. Napoleon was also crowned King of Italy with the Iron Crown of Lombardy at the Cathedral of Milan in 1805. He created 18 Marshals of the Empire from among his top generals to secure the allegiance of the army.

As Napoleon increased his power, he borrowed many techniques of the Ancien Régime in his new form of one-man government.
Like the old monarchy, he re-introduced plenipotentiaries, over-centralized, strictly utilitarian administrative and bureaucratic methods, and a policy of subservient pedantic scholasticism towards the nation's universities. He constructed or consolidated the funds necessary for national institutions, local governments, a judiciary system, organs of finance, banking, codes, and traditions of a conscientious, well-disciplined labor force.

Napoleon was largely able to quell dissent within government by expelling his more vocal critics, such as Benjamin Constant and Madame de Staël. However, he was also able to look beyond partisan and ideological divisions if he recognized exceptional skills and talents that could support his vision of France. The most illustrative example of this approach is his relationship with Charles Maurice de Talleyrand, a laicized bishop, politician, and diplomat whose career spanned the regimes of Louis XVI, the years of the French Revolution, Napoleon, Louis XVIII, and Louis-Philippe. Napoleon found him extremely useful and appointed Talleyrand to be his chief diplomat during the years when French military victories brought one European state after another under French hegemony. Most of the time, Talleyrand worked for peace so as to consolidate France's gains. He succeeded in obtaining peace with Austria through the 1801 Treaty of Luneville and with Britain in the 1802 Treaty of Amiens. He could not prevent the renewal of war in 1803, but by 1805 opposed his emperor's renewed wars against Austria, Prussia, and Russia. He resigned as foreign minister in 1807, but retained the trust of Napoleon and conspired to undermine the emperor's plans through secret dealings with Tsar Alexander of Russia and Austrian minister Metternich. Talleyrand sought a negotiated secure peace so as to perpetuate the gains of the French revolution. Napoleon rejected peace and when he fell in 1814, Talleyrand took charge of the Bourbon restoration based on the principle of legitimacy.
The name Talleyrand has become a byword for crafty, cynical diplomacy. Talleyrand polarizes scholarly opinion. Some regard him as one of the most versatile, skilled, and influential diplomats in European history, and some believe that he was a traitor, betraying the Ancien Régime, the French Revolution, Napoleon, and the Restoration.

The services of talented politicians were so important to Napoleon
that he was able to force his collaborators to work above their own political differences and personal animosities. Arguably the second most important person in his government, Joseph Fouché, was Talleyrand's opponent, yet the two served together under Napoleon. Fouché was careful to temper Napoleon's more arbitrary actions, which at times won him the gratitude even of the royalists. Fouché was thought to have saved the Jacobins from the vengeance of the Consulate and Bonaparte decided to rid himself of a man who had too much power to be desirable as a subordinate. On the proclamation of Bonaparte as First Consul for life (1802), Fouché was deprived of his office of minister of police. After the proclamation of the First French Empire, Fouché again became head of the reconstituted ministry of police (1804) and later of Internal Affairs, with activities as important as those carried out under the Consulate. His police agents were ubiquitous and the terror that Napoleon and Fouché inspired partly accounts for the absence of conspiracies after 1804. The two remained distrustful of each other and by the end of Napoleon's rule, Fouché, seeing the fall of the emperor to be imminent, took measures to expedite it and secure his own interests.
Portrait of Joseph Fouché by an unknown artist. Fouché, once a revolutionary using extreme terror against the Bourbon supporters, later initiated a campaign of White Terror against real and imaginary enemies of the Royalist restoration (officially directed against those who had plotted and supported Napoleon’s return to power). Even Prime Minister Talleyrand disapproved of such practices.

Napoleon’s France

In strengthening the machinery of state, Napoleon created the elite order of the Légion d’honneur (The Legion of Honor – a substitute
for the old royalist decorations and orders of chivalry, to encourage civilian and military achievements), signed the Concordat, and restored indirect taxes, an act seen as a betrayal of the Revolution. He centralized power in Paris, with all the provinces governed by all-powerful prefects he selected. They were more powerful than royal intendants of the Ancien Régime and had a long-term impact on minimizing regional differences and shifting all decisions to Paris. The French taxation system had collapsed in the 1780s, one of the key factors leading to the Revolution. Napoleon instituted a modern, efficient tax system that guaranteed a steady flow of revenues and made long-term financing possible. He also reformed the army, most notably the system of conscription created in the 1790s, which enabled every young man, regardless of his economic or social background, to serve in the army. Consequently, the army expanded rapidly. Before the Revolution, the aristocracy formed the officer corps. Now promotion was by merit and achievement— it was assumed that every private could reach the ranks of the officer.

Of permanent importance was the Napoleonic Code created by eminent jurists under Napoleon’s supervision. Praised for its Gallic clarity, it spread rapidly throughout Europe and the world, marking the end of feudalism where it took effect. The Code recognized the principles of civil liberty, equality before the law, and the secular character of the state. It discarded the old right of primogeniture (where only the eldest son inherited) and required that inheritances be divided equally among all the children. The court system was standardized and all judges were appointed by the national government in Paris.

Napoleon also resolved most of the outstanding problems resulting from the complex history of religious tensions and conflicts in France. He moved the clergy and large numbers of devout Catholics from hostility to the government to support for him after the Catholic system was reestablished by the Concordat of 1801 (signed with Pope Pius VII) that allowed the Church return to normal operations. The church lands were not restored, but the Jesuits were allowed to return and the bitter fights between the
government and the Church ended. Protestant, Jews, and atheists were tolerated.

Attributions

- Napoleon's Government
Napoleon and the New World

23.1.8: Napoleon and the New World

Napoleon’s decisions to reinstate slavery in French colonies and sell the Louisiana territory to the United States, together with the triumph of the Haitian Revolution, made his colonial policies some of the greatest failures of his rule.

Learning Objective

Evaluate Napoleon’s relationship to the New World, specifically Haiti

Key Points

- In the middle of the 18th century, a series of colonial conflicts began between France and Britain, ultimately resulting in the destruction of most of the existing French colonial empire and the near complete expulsion of France from the Americas.
- Modest recovery of the French colonial empire was
made during the French intervention in the American Revolution, with Saint Lucia returned to France by the Treaty of Paris in 1783. The end of France’s first colonial empire began in 1791 when Saint Domingue was torn apart by a massive slave revolt (Haitian Revolution).

- The French attempt to establish a colony in Egypt in 1798–1801 under the military leadership of Napoleon failed. During the following years Napoleon, already the ruler of France, did not manage to turn the country into an important colonial power.

- A brief peace in Europe allowed Napoleon to focus on the French colonies. Saint-Domingue managed to acquire a high level of political autonomy during the Revolutionary Wars, with Toussaint Louverture installing himself as de facto dictator by 1801. Napoleon saw his chance to recuperate the wealthy colony when he signed the Treaty of Amiens.

- During the Revolution, the National Convention voted to abolish slavery in 1794. Under the terms of Amiens, however, Napoleon agreed to appease British demands by not abolishing slavery in any colonies where the 1794 decree had never been implemented. The resulting Law of May 20 thus technically reestablished slavery in some French colonies.

- Although the French managed to capture Toussaint Louverture, the expedition failed when high rates of disease crippled the French army. In May 1803, the last 8000 French troops left the island and the slaves proclaimed an independent republic that they called Haïti in 1804. Seeing the failure of his colonial efforts, Napoleon decided in 1803 to sell the Louisiana
Territory to the United States. At the close of the Napoleonic Wars, most (although not all) of France’s colonies were restored to it by Britain.

**Key Terms**

**Haitian Revolution**
A successful anti-slavery and anti-colonial insurrection that took place in the former French colony of Saint Domingue from 1791 until 1804. It impacted the institution of slavery throughout the Americas. Self-liberated slaves destroyed slavery at home, fought to preserve their freedom, and collaborated with mulattoes to found the sovereign state of Haiti.

**Law of May 20**
A law passed in 1802 that revoked the Law of February 4, 1794, which had abolished slavery in all the French colonies. It explicitly concerned the territories, where the 1794 law had not been applied, and was linked to the 1802 Treaty of Amiens which restored Martinique to France. The 1802 law thus did not apply to Guadeloupe and Guyane and had little effect in Saint-Domingue except to re-inflame rebellion and accelerate its march towards independence in 1804.

**French Revolutionary Wars**
A series of sweeping military conflicts lasting from
1792 until 1802, resulting from the French Revolution. They pitted the French First Republic against Britain, Austria, and several other monarchies. They are divided in two periods: the War of the First Coalition (1792–1797) and the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1802). Initially confined to Europe, the fighting gradually assumed a global dimension as the political ambitions of the Revolution expanded.

**Louisiana Purchase**

The acquisition of the Louisiana territory (828,000 square miles) by the United States from France in 1803. The U.S. paid 50 million francs ($11.25 million USD) and a cancellation of debts worth 18 million francs ($3.75 million USD) for a total of 68 million francs ($15 million USD). The Louisiana territory included land from 15 present U.S. states and two Canadian provinces.

**Napoleonic Wars**

A series of major global conflicts pitting the French Empire, led by Napoleon I, against an array of European powers formed into various coalitions between 1803 and 1815. They revolutionized European armies and played out on an unprecedented scale, mainly owing to the application of modern mass conscription. The wars were a continuation of the Revolutionary Wars, which broke out in 1792 during the French Revolution.
The French Colonial Empire: Background

In the middle of the 18th century, a series of colonial conflicts began between France and Britain that ultimately resulted in the destruction of most of the existing French colonial empire and the near complete expulsion of France from the Americas. The Seven Years’ War (1756–63) was a particularly bad defeat for the French, with the numerically superior British conquering not only New France (excluding the small islands of Saint Pierre and Miquelon), but also most of France’s West Indian (Caribbean) colonies and all of the French Indian outposts. While the following peace treaty saw France’s Indian outposts and the Caribbean islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe restored to France, the competition for influence in India was won by the British and North America was entirely lost. Most of New France was taken by Britain (except Louisiana, which France ceded to Spain as payment for Spain’s late entrance into the war and as compensation for Britain’s annexation of Spanish Florida). Also ceded to the British were Grenada and Saint Lucia in the West Indies. Although the loss of Canada would cause regret in future generations, it did not seem like a French failure at the time. Colonialism was widely regarded as largely unimportant to France.

Modest recovery of the French colonial empire was made during the French intervention in the American Revolution, with Saint Lucia returned to France by the Treaty of Paris in 1783. The end of what remained of France’s first colonial empire began in 1791 when Saint Domingue (the Western third of the Caribbean island of Hispaniola), France’s richest and most important colony, was torn apart by a massive slave revolt (Haitian Revolution).
Napoleon and the Colonies

The French attempt to establish a colony in Egypt in 1798–1801 under the military leadership of Napoleon failed. During the years to come Napoleon, already the ruler of France, did not manage to turn the country into an important colonial power. After a decade of constant warfare, France and Britain signed the 1802 Treaty of Amiens, bringing the French Revolutionary Wars to an end. Amiens called for the withdrawal of British troops from recently conquered colonial territories as well as for assurances to curtail the
expansionary goals of the French Republic. With Europe at peace and the economy recovering, Napoleon's popularity soared to its highest levels under the Consulate, both domestically and abroad.

This brief peace in Europe allowed Napoleon to focus on the French colonies. Saint-Domingue managed to acquire a high level of political autonomy during the Revolutionary Wars, with Toussaint Louverture installing himself as de facto dictator by 1801. Napoleon saw his chance to recuperate the wealthy colony when he signed the Treaty of Amiens. During the Revolution, the National Convention voted to abolish slavery in 1794. Under the terms of Amiens, however, Napoleon agreed to appease British demands by not abolishing slavery in colonies where the 1794 decree had never been implemented. The resulting Law of May 20 never applied to colonies like Guadeloupe or Guyane, even though rogue generals and other officials used the pretext of peace as an opportunity to reinstate slavery in some of these places. The Law of May 20 officially restored the slave trade to the Caribbean colonies, not slavery itself. Napoleon sent an expedition under General Leclerc designed to reassert control over Sainte-Domingue. Although the French managed to capture Toussaint Louverture, the expedition failed when high rates of disease crippled the French army. In May 1803, the last 8,000 French troops left the island and the slaves proclaimed an independent republic that they called Haïti in 1804. Seeing the failure of his colonial efforts, Napoleon decided in 1803 to sell the Louisiana Territory to the United States, instantly doubling the size of the U.S. The selling price in the Louisiana Purchase was less than three cents per acre, a total of $15 million.

At the close of the Napoleonic Wars, most of France’s colonies were restored to it by Britain, notably Guadeloupe and Martinique in the West Indies, French Guiana on the coast of South America, various trading posts in Senegal, the Île Bourbon (Réunion) in the Indian Ocean, and France’s tiny Indian possessions. However, Britain finally annexed Saint Lucia, Tobago, the Seychelles, and the Isle de France (now Mauritius).
Attributions

- Napoleon and the New World
The Concordat of 1801 sought national reconciliation between revolutionaries and Catholics and solidified the Roman Catholic Church as the majority church of France. But while it restored France’s ties to the papacy, it was largely in favor of the state.

**Learning Objective**

Evaluate the significance of the Concordat of 1801

**Key Points**

- During the French Revolution, the National Assembly took Church properties and issued the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which made the Church a department of the state, effectively removing it from papal authority. These and other decisions that aimed to weaken the position of the Catholic Church in France triggered some social unrest.
- The Concordat was designed to regulate relations between Napoleon’s France and the Catholic Church.
It was drawn up by a commission with three representatives from each party and signed in 1801 in Paris. It sought national reconciliation between revolutionaries and Catholics and solidified the Roman Catholic Church as the majority church of France, with most of its civil status restored.

- While the Concordat restored some ties to the papacy, it was largely in favor of the state. It wielded greater power of the state vis-à-vis the Pope than previous French regimes, and church lands lost during the Revolution were not returned. Napoleon understood the utility of religion as a factor of social cohesion, and his approach was utilitarian. He could now win favor with French Catholics while also controlling Rome in a political sense.

- Napoleon looked for recognition by the Church of the disposition of its property and geographical reorganization of bishoprics, while Rome sought the protection of Catholics and the recognition of a special status of the Catholic Church in the French State.

- As a part of the Concordat, Napoleon presented another set of laws called the Organic Articles. They were published as a unilateral addition to the Concordat in 1802. Presenting the Organic Articles was Napoleon's method of granting the Tribunate and the legislative body partial control of the Concordat in order to help the state monitor any politically harmful Catholic or Protestant movements or activities.

- The hostility of devout Catholics against the state was now largely resolved. The Concordat did not
restore the vast church lands and endowments that were seized during the revolution and sold off. Catholic clergy returned from exile or hiding and resumed their traditional positions in their traditional churches. While the Concordat restored much power to the papacy, the balance of church-state relations tilted firmly in Napoleon’s favor.

**Key Terms**

**Civil Constitution of the Clergy**
A law passed in July 1790 during the French Revolution that subordinated the Roman Catholic Church in France to the French government.

**The Concordat of 1801**
An agreement between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII signed in July 1801 in Paris that remained in effect until 1905. It sought national reconciliation between revolutionaries and Catholics and solidified the Roman Catholic Church as the majority church of France, with most of its civil status restored.

**Organic Articles**
An 1801/02 law administering public worship in France. It was presented by Napoleon Bonaparte and consisted of 77 Articles relating to Catholicism and 44 Articles relating to Protestantism.
The Catholic Church in Revolutionary France

During the French Revolution, the National Assembly took Church properties and issued the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which made the Church a department of the state and effectively removed it from papal authority. At the time, the nationalized Gallican Church was the official church of France. Gallicanism was the theory that the power of monarchs is independent of the power of popes and that the church of each country should be under the joint control of the pope and the monarch, but the doctrine of the Gallican Church was essentially Catholicism. The Civil Constitution caused hostility among the Vendée resurgents, who resented the harsh conditions imposed on the Roman Catholic Church by the provisions of the Civil Constitution and broke into open revolt after the Revolutionary government’s imposition of military conscription. A guerrilla war known as the Revolt in the Vendée was led at the outset by peasants who were chosen in each locale. It cost more than 240,000 lives before it ended in 1796. Subsequent laws abolished the traditional Gregorian calendar and Christian holidays.
Development of the Concordat

The Concordat was drawn up by a commission with three representatives from each party. Napoleon Bonaparte, who was First Consul of the French Republic at the time, appointed Joseph Bonaparte, his brother, Emmanuel Crétet, a counselor of state, and Étienne-Alexandre Bernier, a doctor in theology. Pope Pius VII appointed Cardinal Ercole Consalvi, Cardinal Giuseppe Spina, archbishop of Corinth, and his theological adviser, Father Carlo Francesco Maria Caselli. The French bishops, whether abroad or back to their own countries, had no part in the negotiations.

The Concordat of 1801 was signed in Paris. It sought national reconciliation between revolutionaries and Catholics and solidified the Roman Catholic Church as the majority church of France, with most of its civil status restored. While the Concordat restored some ties to the papacy, it was largely in favor of the state. It wielded greater power of the state vis-à-vis the Pope than previous French regimes, and church lands lost during the Revolution were not returned. Napoleon understood the utility of religion as an important factor of social cohesion and his approach was utilitarian. He could now win favor with French Catholics while also controlling Rome politically.

Napoleon looked for the recognition by the Church of the disposition of its property and geographical reorganization of bishoprics, while Rome sought the protection of Catholics and the recognition of a special status of the Catholic Church in the French State. The main terms of the Concordat included:

- A declaration that “Catholicism was the religion of the great majority of the French” but not the official state religion, thus maintaining religious freedom for Protestants and other
French citizens.

- The Church was to be free to exercise its worship in public in accordance with police regulations that the Government deems necessary for the public peace. The authority to determine if a public religious observance would violate the public peace resided with each mayor, who had the power to prohibit a public ceremony if he considered it a threat to the peace of his commune.

- The Papacy had the right to depose bishops, but this made little difference because they were still nominated by the French government. The state paid clerical salaries and the clergy swore an oath of allegiance to the state.

- The Catholic Church gave up all its claims to Church lands that were confiscated after 1790.

- Sunday was reestablished as a “festival.” The rest of the French Republican Calendar was not replaced by the traditional Gregorian Calendar until January 1, 1806.
In the aftermath of signing the Concordat of 1801, the Catholic clergy returned from exile or hiding and resumed their traditional positions in their traditional churches. Very few parishes retained the priests who had accepted the “Civil Constitution of the Clergy.” Napoleon and the pope both found the Concordat useful. Similar arrangements were made with the Church in territories controlled by Napoleon, especially Italy and Germany.

**Organic Articles**

As part of the Concordat, Napoleon presented another set of laws called the Organic Articles. These consisted of 77 Articles relating to Catholicism and 44 Articles relating to Protestantism and were published as a unilateral addition to the Concordat in 1802. Napoleon presented the set of laws to the Tribunate and the legislative body at the same time that he had them vote on the Concordat itself. It met with opposition from the Catholic Church with Pope Pius VII claiming that the articles had been promulgated without his knowledge. Presenting the Organic Articles was Napoleon’s method of granting the Tribunate and the legislative body partial control of the Concordat to help the state monitor any politically harmful Catholic or Protestant movements or activities.

**Significance of the Concordat**

The hostility of devout Catholics against the state was now largely resolved. The Concordat did not restore the vast church lands and endowments that were seized upon during the revolution and sold off. Catholic clergy returned from exile or hiding, and resumed their former positions in their traditional churches. While the Concordat
restored much power to the papacy, the balance of church-state relations tilted firmly in Napoleon's favor. He selected the bishops and supervised church finances. Similar arrangements were made with the Church in territories controlled by Napoleon, especially Italy and Germany. The Concordat was abrogated by the law of 1905 on the separation of Church and state. However, some provisions of the Concordat are still in effect in the Alsace-Lorraine region under the local law of Alsace-Moselle, as the region was controlled by the German Empire at the time of the 1905 law's passage.

Attributions

- The Concordat of 1801
77. The Napoleonic Code

23.1.10: The Napoleonic Code

The 1804 Napoleonic Code, which influenced civil law codes across the world, replaced the fragmented laws of pre-revolutionary France, recognizing the principles of civil liberty, equality before the law (although not for women in the same sense as for men), and the secular character of the state.

**Learning Objective**

Synthesize the key tenets of the Napoleonic Code

**Key Points**

- Napoleon set out to reform the French legal system in accordance with the ideas of the French Revolution. Before the Napoleonic Code, France did not have a single set of laws. Law consisted mainly of local customs, which had sometimes been officially compiled in “customals.” There were also exemptions, privileges, and special charters granted by the kings or other feudal lords.
Specifically, Jean-Jacques Régis de Cambacérès led the drafting process of a single civil law code. His drafts of 1793, 1794, and 1799, however, were adopted only partially. When Napoleon came to power in 1799, a commission of four eminent jurists was appointed in 1800, chaired by Cambacérès (now Second Consul) and sometimes by the First Consul, Napoleon himself.

The Code was complete by 1801 but not published until 1804. Napoleon participated actively in the sessions of the Council of State that revised the drafts of the new civil code. The development of the code was a fundamental change in the nature of the civil law legal system as it stressed clearly written and accessible law. Other codes were commissioned by Napoleon to codify criminal and commerce law.

Praised for its clarity, the Code spread rapidly throughout Europe and the world and marked the end of feudalism and the liberation of serfs where it took effect. The Code recognized the principles of civil liberty, equality before the law (although not for women in the same sense as for men), and the secular character of the state.

Although the Napoleonic Code was not the first civil code and did not represent the whole of Napoleon's empire, it was one of the most influential. It was adopted in many countries occupied by the French during the Napoleonic Wars. It formed the basis of the law systems across most of continental Europe and has had a lasting impact on civil law codes in other regions of the world, including the Middle East where it has been combined with the Islamic law.
The development of the Napoleonic Code was a fundamental change in the nature of the civil law system, making laws clearer and more accessible. It also superseded the former conflict between royal legislative power and, particularly in the final years before the Revolution, protests by judges representing views and privileges of the social classes to which they belonged.

Key Terms

Council of State
A body of the French national government that acts both as legal adviser of the executive branch and as the supreme court for administrative justice. Originally established in 1799 by Napoleon Bonaparte as a successor to the King’s Council and a judicial body mandated to adjudicate claims against the State and assist in the drafting of important laws.

Napoleonic Code
The French civil code established under Napoleon I in 1804. It was drafted by a commission of four eminent jurists. The code, with its stress on clearly written and accessible law, was a major step in replacing the previous patchwork of feudal laws. Historian Robert Holtman regards it as one of the few documents that have influenced the whole world.
Legal System in France Before the Code

Napoleon set out to reform the French legal system in accordance with the ideas of the French Revolution. Before the Napoleonic Code, France did not have a single set of laws. Law consisted mainly of local customs, which had sometimes been officially compiled in “customals” (coutumes). There were also exemptions, privileges, and special charters granted by the kings or other feudal lords. During the Revolution, the last vestiges of feudalism were abolished and a new legal code was required to address changes in the social, economic, and political structure of French society.

Jean-Jacques Régis de Cambacérès led the drafting process of a single civil law code. His drafts of 1793, 1794, and 1799, however, were adopted only partially. When Napoleon came to power in 1799, a commission of four eminent jurists was appointed in 1800, chaired by Cambacérès (now Second Consul) and sometimes by the First Consul, Napoleon himself. The Code was complete by 1801, after intensive scrutiny by the Council of State, but was not published until 1804. It was promulgated as the Civil Code of the French (Code civil des Français), but was renamed the Napoleonic Code (Code Napoléon) from 1807 to 1815, and once again after the Second French Empire (1852–71).

The Napoleonic Code

Napoleon participated actively in the sessions of the Council of State that revised the drafts of the new civil code. The development
of the code was a fundamental change in the nature of the civil law legal system as it stressed clearly written and accessible law. Other codes were commissioned by Napoleon to codify criminal and commerce law.

The preliminary article of the Code established certain important provisions regarding the rule of law. Laws could be applied only if they had been duly promulgated and then published officially (including provisions for publishing delays, given the means of communication available at the time). Thus, no secret laws were authorized. It prohibited ex post facto laws (i.e. laws that apply to events that occurred before their introduction). The code also prohibited judges from refusing justice on grounds of insufficiency of the law, thereby encouraging them to interpret the law. On the other hand, it prohibited judges from passing general judgments of a legislative value (more below). With regard to family, the Code established the supremacy of the man over the wife and children, which was the general legal situation in Europe at the time.

Praised for its clarity, the Code spread rapidly throughout Europe and the world in and marked the end of feudalism and the liberation of serfs where it took effect. The Code recognized the principles of civil liberty, equality before the law (although not for women in the same sense as for men), and the secular character of the state. It discarded the old right of primogeniture (where only the eldest son inherited) and required that inheritances be divided equally among all children. The court system was standardized. All judges were appointed by the national government in Paris.
The Napoleonic Code was not the first legal code to be established in a European country with a civil legal system. It was preceded by the Codex Maximilianeus bavaricus civilis (Bavaria, 1756), the Allgemeines Landrecht (Prussia, 1794), and the West Galician Code (Galicia, then part of Austria, 1797). It was, however, the first modern legal code to be adopted with a pan-European scope and strongly influenced the law of many of the countries formed during and after the Napoleonic Wars. The Napoleonic Code was very influential in developing countries outside Europe, especially in the Middle East, that were attempting to modernize through legal reforms.
Significance and Lasting Impact

Although the Napoleonic Code was not the first civil code and did not represent the whole of Napoleon’s empire, it was one of the most influential. It was adopted in many countries occupied by the French during the Napoleonic Wars and thus formed the basis of the law systems of Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Portugal (and their former colonies), and Poland (1808–1946). In the German regions on the west bank of the Rhine (Rhenish Palatinate and Prussian Rhine Province), the former Duchy of Berg, and the Grand Duchy of Baden, the Napoleonic Code was in use until the introduction in 1900 of the first common civil code for the entire German Empire. A civil code with strong Napoleonic influences was also adopted in 1864 in Romania and remained in force until 2011. The Code was adopted in Egypt as part of the system of mixed courts introduced in Egypt after the fall of Khedive Ismail (1879). In the Persian Gulf Arab states of the Middle East, the influence of the Napoleonic Code mixed with hints of Islamic law is clear even in Saudi Arabia (which abides more towards Islamic law). In Kuwait, for example, property rights, women’s rights, and the education system were seen as Islamic reenactments of the French civil code.

Thus, the civil law systems of the countries of modern continental Europe, with the exception of Russia and the Scandinavian countries have, to different degrees, been influenced by the Napoleonic Code. In the United States, whose legal system is largely based on English common law, the state of Louisiana is unique in having a strong influence from the Napoleonic Code and Spanish legal traditions on its civil code.

The development of the Napoleonic Code was a fundamental change in the nature of the civil law system, making laws clearer and more accessible. It also superseded the former conflict between royal legislative power and, particularly in the final years before the Revolution, protests by judges representing views and privileges of the social classes to which they belonged. Such conflict led
revolutionaries to take a negative view of the judges and the judicial system. This is reflected in the Napoleonic Code provision prohibiting judges from deciding a case by way of introducing a general rule, since the creation of general rules is an exercise of legislative, not judicial power. In theory, there is thus no case law in France. However, the courts still had to fill in the gaps in the laws and regulations and, indeed, were prohibited from refusing to do so. Moreover, both the code and legislation have required judicial interpretation. Thus, a vast body of judicially-created law (jurisprudence) has come into existence. There is no rule of stare decisis (binding precedent) in French law, but decisions by important courts have become more or less equivalent to case law.

Attributions

- The Napoleonic Code
23.2: The French Empire

23.2.1: “Emperor of the French”

The title of Emperor of the French emphasized that the emperor ruled over the French people, the nation, and not over France, the republic. This moniker aimed to demonstrate that Napoleon’s coronation was not a restoration of monarchy but an introduction of a new political system: the French Empire.

**Learning Objective**

Differentiate between the French Directory, the French Consulate, and the French Empire

**Key Points**

- The Directory was a five-member committee that governed France from November 1795 when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety. French
military disasters in 1798 and 1799 damaged the Directory, eventually leading to its demise. In the Coup of 18 Brumaire, Napoleon seized French parliamentary and military power, forcing the sitting directors of the government to resign.

- A remnant of the Council of Ancients abolished the Constitution of the Year III, ordained the Consulate, and legalized the coup d'état in favor of Bonaparte with the Constitution of the Year VIII. The new constitution (adopted in 1799) established the form of government known as the Consulate. The constitution tailor-made the position of First Consul to give Napoleon most of the powers of a dictator.

- The constitution was amended twice and in each case, the amendments strengthened Napoleon's authority. The Constitution of the Year X (1802) made Napoleon First Consul for Life. In 1804, the Constitution of the Year XII established the First French Empire with Napoleon Bonaparte I, Emperor of the French.

- The title Emperor of the French was established when Napoleon Bonaparte received the title of Emperor in 1804 from the French Senate and was crowned Emperor of the French at the cathedral of Notre Dame. The title emphasized that the emperor ruled over the French people, the nation, and not over France, the republic. The old title of king of France indicated that the king owned France as a personal possession.

- The title was purposefully created to preserve the appearance of the French Republic and show that after the French Revolution, the feudal system was
abandoned and a nation state was created, with equal citizens as the subjects of their emperor. The title also aimed to demonstrate that Napoleon's coronation was not a restoration of monarchy, but an introduction of a new political system: the French Empire.

- Napoleon's reign lasted until 1815, interrupted by the Bourbon Restoration of 1814 and his own exile to Elba. He escaped reigning as Emperor for another 94 days before his final defeat and exile. The title, however, was later used by the House of Bonaparte.

**Key Terms**

**Emperor of the French**

The title established when Napoleon Bonaparte received the title of Emperor in 1804 from the French Senate and was crowned at the cathedral of Notre Dame. The title emphasized that the emperor ruled over the French people, the nation, and not over France, the republic.

**Directory**

A five-member committee that governed France from November 1795, when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety, until it was overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (November 8–9, 1799) and replaced by the
Consulate. It gave its name to the final four years of the French Revolution.

**Coup of 18 Brumaire**

A bloodless coup d'état under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte that overthrew the Directory, replacing it with the French Consulate. It took place on November 9, 1799, 18 Brumaire, Year VIII under the French Republican Calendar.

**Consulate**

The government of France from the fall of the Directory in the Coup of 18 Brumaire (1799) until the start of the Napoleonic Empire in 1804. By extension, the term also refers to this period of French history. Napoleon Bonaparte, as First Consul, established himself as the head of a more liberal, authoritarian, autocratic, and centralized republican government in France while not declaring himself head of state.

**Directory vs. Consulate vs. French Empire**

The Directory was a five-member committee that governed France from November 1795 when it replaced the Committee of Public Safety. French military disasters in 1798 and 1799 damaged the Directory and eventually led to its demise. In the Coup of 18 Brumaire, Napoleon seized French parliamentary and military power in a two-fold coup d'état, forcing the sitting directors of the government to resign. On the night of the 19 Brumaire (November
10, 1799) a remnant of the Council of Ancients abolished the Constitution of the Year III, ordained the Consulate, and legalized the coup d'état in favor of Bonaparte with the Constitution of the Year VIII.

The new constitution (adopted in 1799) established the form of government known as the Consulate. The constitution tailor-made the position of First Consul to give Napoleon most of the powers of a dictator. The new government was composed of three parliamentary assemblies: the Council of State (Conseil d'État), which drafted bills; the Tribunate, which debated but could not vote on bills; and the Legislative Assembly (Corps législatif), which could not discuss the bills, but whose members voted on them after reviewing the Tribunate's debate record. The Conservative Senate (Sénat conservateur) was a governmental body equal to the three aforementioned legislative assemblies. However, the Senate was more of an executive body as it verified the draft bills and directly advised the First Consul on their implications. The executive power was vested in three Consuls, but all actual power was held by the First Consul, Bonaparte.

The Constitution was amended twice, each time strengthening Napoleon's already concentrated power. The Constitution of the Year X (1802) made Napoleon First Consul for Life. In 1804, the Constitution of the Year XII established the First French Empire with Napoleon Bonaparte — previously First Consul for Life, with wide-ranging powers — as Napoleon I, Emperor of the French. That ended the period of the French Consulate and of the French First Republic. Napoleon's rule was constitutional, and although autocratic, it was much more advanced than traditional European monarchies of the time.
Napoleon’s coronation took place on December 2, 1804. Two separate crowns were brought for the ceremony: a golden laurel wreath recalling the Roman Empire and a replica of Charlemagne’s crown. Napoleon entered the ceremony wearing the laurel wreath and kept it on his head throughout the proceedings.
A New Title

The title Emperor of the French was established when Napoleon Bonaparte received the title of Emperor in 1804 from the French Senate and was crowned Emperor of the French at the cathedral of Notre Dame. The title emphasized that the emperor ruled over the French people, the nation, and not over France, the republic. The old title of king of France indicated that the king owned France as a personal possession. The new term indicated a constitutional monarchy. The title was purposefully created to preserve the appearance of the French Republic and to show that after the French Revolution, the feudal system was abandoned and a nation state was created, with equal citizens as the subjects of their emperor. The title also aimed to demonstrate that Napoleon’s coronation was not a restoration of monarchy, but an introduction of a new political system: the French Empire. Napoleon’s reign lasted until 1815, when he was defeated at the Battle of Waterloo, exiled, and imprisoned on the island of Saint Helena, where he died in 1821. His reign was interrupted by the Bourbon Restoration of 1814 and his own exile to Elba, from where he escaped less than a year later to reclaim the throne, reigning as Emperor for another 94 days before his final defeat and exile. The title, however, was used by the House of Bonaparte – Napoleon II (1815) and Napoleon III (1852–70).

Emperor of the French was the title established when Napoleon Bonaparte received the title of Emperor in 1804 from the French Senate and was crowned Emperor of the French at the cathedral of Notre Dame. The title emphasized that the emperor ruled over the French people, the nation, and not over France, the republic. The old title of king of France indicated that the king owned France as a personal possession. The new term indicated a constitutional monarchy. The title was purposefully created to preserve the appearance of the French Republic and to show that after the French Revolution, the feudal system was abandoned and a nation state was created, with equal citizens as the subjects of their emperor.
emperor. The title also aimed to demonstrate that Napoleon's coronation was not a restoration of monarchy, but an introduction of a new political system: the French Empire. Napoleon's reign lasted until 1815, when he was defeated at the Battle of Waterloo, exiled, and imprisoned on the island of Saint Helena, where he died in 1821. His reign was interrupted by the Bourbon Restoration of 1814 and his own exile to Elba, from where he escaped less than a year later to reclaim the throne, reigning as Emperor for another 94 days before his final defeat and exile. The title, however, was used by the House of Bonaparte – Napoleon II (1815) and Napoleon III (1852–70).

Attributions

- “Emperor of the French”
  - “800px-Ingres_Napoleon_on_his_Imperial_throne.jpg.” https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ingres._Napoleon_on_his_Imperial_throne.jpg. Wikimedia Commmons Public domain.
79. The Confederation of the Rhine

23.2.2: The Confederation of the Rhine

The Confederation of the Rhine was an alliance of various German states that served as a satellite and major military ally of the French Empire with Napoleon as its “Protector,” and was created as a buffer state from any future aggression from Austria, Russia, or Prussia against France.

Learning Objective

Explain how creating the Confederation of the Rhine benefited Napoleon’s long-term goals

Key Points

- The Fourth Coalition (1806–1807) of Prussia, Russia, Saxony, Sweden, and Britain formed against France within months of the collapse of the previous coalition. Following his triumph at the 1805 Battle of Austerlitz and the subsequent demise of the Third
Coalition, Napoleon looked forward to achieving a general peace in Europe, especially with his two main remaining antagonists, Britain and Russia.

- One point of contention was the fate of Hanover, a German electorate in personal union with the British monarchy that had been occupied by France since 1803. Dispute over this state would eventually become a casus belli for both Britain and Prussia against France. This issue also dragged Sweden into the war. The path to war seemed inevitable and the final straw was Napoleon’s formation of the Confederation of the Rhine out of various German states in July 1806.

- The Confederation was a virtual satellite of the French Empire with Napoleon as its “Protector” and was intended to act as a buffer state from any future aggression from Austria, Russia, or Prussia against France (a policy that was an heir of the French revolutionary doctrine of maintaining France’s “natural frontiers”). The formation of the Confederation was the final nail in the coffin of the Holy Roman Empire.

- Napoleon consolidated the various smaller states of the former Holy Roman Empire, which allied with France into larger electorates, duchies, and kingdoms to make the governance of non-Prussian and Austrian Germany more efficient. According to the founding treaty, the confederation was to be run by common constitutional bodies, but the individual states (in particular the larger ones) wanted unlimited sovereignty. In the end, the Confederation was above all a military alliance.
• In return for continued French protection, member states were compelled to supply France with many of their own military personnel and contribute much of the resources to support the French armies still occupying western and southern Germany.

• The Confederation was at its largest in 1808, when it included 35 states and collapsed in 1813, in the aftermath of Napoleon’s failed campaign against the Russian Empire. Many of its members changed sides after the 1813 Battle of Leipzig, when it became apparent Napoleon would lose the War of the Sixth Coalition.

Key Terms

Confederation of the Rhine
A confederation of client states of the First French Empire formed by Napoleon in 1806 from 16 German states after he defeated Austria and Russia in the Battle of Austerlitz. 19 other states joined later, creating a territory of over 15 million subjects. It provided a significant strategic advantage to the French Empire on its eastern front.

Battle of Austerlitz
An 1805 battle, also known as the Battle of the Three Emperors, that was one of the most important and decisive engagements of the Napoleonic Wars. In what
Causes of the War of the Fourth Coalition

The Fourth Coalition (1806–1807) of Prussia, Russia, Saxony, Sweden, and Britain formed against France within months of the collapse of the previous coalition. Following his triumph at the 1805 Battle of Austerlitz and the subsequent demise of the Third Coalition, Napoleon looked forward to achieving a general peace in Europe, especially with his two main remaining antagonists, Britain and Russia. Meanwhile, he sought to isolate Prussia from the influence of these two powers by offering a tentative alliance while also seeking to curb Prussia’s political and military influence among the German states.

Britain and its new Whig administration remained committed to checking the growing power of France. Peace overtures between the two nations early in the new year proved ineffectual due to the still unresolved issues that led to the breakdown of the 1802 Peace of Amiens. One point of contention was the fate of Hanover, a German electorate in personal union with the British monarchy that had been occupied by France since 1803. Dispute over this state would eventually become a casus belli for both Britain and Prussia against France. This issue also involved Sweden, whose forces were deployed there as part of the effort to liberate Hanover during the
war of the previous coalition. The path to war seemed inevitable after French forces ejected the Swedish troops in April 1806. Another cause of the eventual war was Napoleon's formation of the Confederation of the Rhine out of various German states in July 1806.

Creating the Confederation

The Confederation was a virtual satellite of the French Empire with Napoleon as its “Protector” and was intended to serve as a buffer against any future aggression from Austria, Russia, or Prussia against France (a policy that was an heir of the French revolutionary doctrine of maintaining France’s “natural frontiers”). The formation of the Confederation was the final nail in the coffin of the Holy Roman Empire and subsequently its last Habsburg emperor, Francis II, changed his title to simply Francis I, Emperor of Austria. On August 1, the members of the confederation formally seceded from the Holy Roman Empire and on August 6, following an ultimatum by Napoleon, Francis II declared the Holy Roman Empire dissolved. Francis and his Habsburg dynasty continued as emperors of Austria.
The original members of the confederation were 16 German states from the Holy Roman Empire. They were later joined by 19 others, forming a territory that totaled more than 15 million subjects and provided a significant strategic advantage to the French Empire on its eastern front. Prussia and Austria were not members. Napoleon sought to consolidate the modernizing achievements of the revolution, but, above all, he wanted the soldiers and supplies these subject states could provide for his wars.

Napoleon consolidated the various smaller states of the former Holy Roman Empire, which had allied with France into larger electorates, duchies, and kingdoms to make the governance of non-Prussian and Austrian Germany more efficient. He also elevated the electors of the two largest Confederation states, his allies Württemberg and Bavaria, to the status of kings. According to the founding treaty, the confederation was to be run by common constitutional bodies, but the individual states (in particular the larger ones) wanted unlimited
sovereignty. Instead of a monarchical head of state, as was the case under the Holy Roman Emperor, its highest office was held by Karl Theodor von Dalberg, the former Arch Chancellor, who now bore the title of a Prince-Primate of the confederation. As such, he was President of the College of Kings and presided over the Diet of the Confederation, designed to be a parliament-like body although it never actually assembled. The President of the Council of the Princes was the Prince of Nassau-Usingen.

The Confederation was above all a military alliance: in return for continued French protection, member states were compelled to supply France with many of their own military personnel (mainly to serve as auxiliaries to the Grande Armée), and contribute much of the resources needed to support the French armies still occupying western and southern Germany.

The Confederation was at its largest in 1808, when it included 35 states. Some sources cite slightly different numbers because several member states merged; consequently, some sources count all the separate member states, while others cite numbers following the mergers. Only Austria, Prussia, Danish Holstein, and Swedish Pomerania stayed outside, not counting the west bank of the Rhine and the Principality of Erfurt, which were annexed by the French Empire. The Confederation of the Rhine collapsed in 1813, in the aftermath of Napoleon’s failed campaign against the Russian Empire. Many of its members changed sides after the 1813 Battle of Leipzig, when it became apparent Napoleon would lose the War of the Sixth Coalition.

Attributions

- The Confederation of the Rhine
23.2.3: Abdication in Spain

In an attempt to control the Iberian Peninsula, in 1808 Napoleon forced the abdications of Charles IV and Ferdinand VII of Spain and granted the Spanish crown to his brother Joseph, provoking a violent conflict that overlapped with the Peninsular War.

Learning Objective

Determine why Napoleon pushed for the abdication of the Spanish monarchy

Key Points

- In the aftermath of the War of the Fourth Coalition, one of Napoleon’s major objectives became enforcing the Continental System against the British. He decided to focus his attention on the Kingdom of Portugal, which consistently violated his trade prohibitions.
- Internal political struggles and an economic crisis in Spain made the country vulnerable to the
increasing impact of France. In addition, under terms of the 1807 Treaty of Fontainebleau, Charles IV and his unpopular prime minister Godoy allowed Napoleon's troops to cross Spain to attack Portugal. This move was extremely unpopular with the Spanish people, who saw the entry as a humiliating invasion.

- Under the pretext of reinforcing the Franco-Spanish army occupying Portugal, French imperial troops entered Spain. Napoleon turned on his ally and ordered French commanders to seize key Spanish fortresses. Barcelona was taken in February 1808 and the Spanish Royal Army found itself paralyzed.

- The events led to what is known as the Mutiny of Aranjuez, an 1808 uprising against Charles IV. The mutineers made Charles dismiss Godoy and the court forced the King to abdicate in favor of his son and rival, who became Ferdinand VII. Napoleon, under the false pretense of resolving the conflict, invited both Charles and Ferdinand to Bayonne, where he forced them both to renounce the throne. He then named his brother Joseph Bonaparte king of Spain.

- The abdications led to what the Spanish-speaking world calls the Spanish War of Independence (1808-1814), which overlaps with the Peninsular War. Marshal Murat led 120,000 troops into Spain and the French arrived in Madrid, where riots against the occupation erupted just a few weeks later (The Dos de Mayo of 1808 Uprising). Resistance to French aggression soon spread throughout the country.

- The years of fighting in Spain were a heavy burden on France's Grande Armée, but the burden of war destroyed the social and economic fabric of Portugal.
and Spain and ushered in an era of social turbulence, political instability, and economic stagnation that lasted until the mid 19th century.

**Key Terms**

**Mutiny of Aranju**

An 1808 uprising against Charles IV that took place in the town of Aranjuez. The mutineers made Charles dismiss unpopular prime minister Godoy and two days later, the court forced the King himself to abdicate in favor of his son and rival, who became Ferdinand VII.

**Peninsular War**

An 1807–1814 military conflict between Napoleon's empire and the allied powers of Spain, Britain, and Portugal for control of the Iberian Peninsula during the Napoleonic Wars. The war started when French and Spanish armies invaded and occupied Portugal in 1807 and escalated in 1808 when France turned on Spain, its ally. The war lasted until the Sixth Coalition defeated Napoleon in 1814, and is regarded as one of the first wars of national liberation, significant for the emergence of large-scale guerrilla warfare.

**El Escorial Conspiracy**

An attempted coup d'état led by the Crown Prince Fernando of Asturias that took place in 1807, but was quickly discovered and led to an investigation known as
the Process of El Escorial.

The Dos de Mayo
An 1808 rebellion by the people of Madrid against the occupation of the city by French troops, provoking the repression by the French Imperial forces and triggering the Peninsular War.

1807 Treaty of Fontainebleau
An 1807 treaty between Charles IV of Spain and Napoleon I of France regarding the occupation of Portugal. Under this treaty, Portugal was divided into three regions- the Entre-Douro-e-Minho Province for the King of the Etrúria, the Principality of the Algarves under Spanish minister D. Manuel Godoy and the remaining provinces and overseas territories to be distributed under a later agreement.

Abdications of Bayonne
The name given to a series of forced abdications of the Kings of Spain, Charles IV and his son Ferdinand VII, that led to what the Spanish-speaking world calls the Spanish War of Independence (1808-1814), which overlaps with the Peninsular War.

Napoleon and the Iberian Peninsula

In the aftermath of the War of the Fourth Coalition (1806–07), one of Napoleon’s major objectives became enforcing the Continental System against the British. He decided to focus his attention on
the Kingdom of Portugal, which consistently violated his trade prohibitions. After defeat in the War of the Oranges in 1801, Portugal adopted a double-sided policy. At first, John VI agreed to close his ports to British trade. The situation changed dramatically after the Franco-Spanish defeat at Trafalgar in 1805. John grew bolder and officially resumed diplomatic and trade relations with Britain. Unhappy with this change of policy by the Portuguese government, Napoleon sent an army to invade Portugal in 1807. The attack was the first step in what would eventually become the Peninsular War, a six-year struggle that significantly sapped French strength.

Napoleon and Internal Power Struggles in Spain

The prime minister under Charles IV, Manuel de Godoy, became unpopular among both the nobles and the Spanish people. The nobility resented how Godoy had attained power even though he was born in poverty and obscurity. Most notable among them was the King’s own son Ferdinand, who had led the El Escorial Conspiracy (an 1807 attempted and quickly discovered coup d’état led by Ferdinand) a few months earlier. The people were upset about Godoy’s ambitious nature and his willingness to have Catholic Spain make treaties with atheist Revolutionary France against Christian (Anglican) Great Britain.

Furthermore, an economic crisis affecting the country was heightened after Spain lost its navy in the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805. This impaired trade with the American colonies, causing food shortages and affecting industrial production. In addition, under terms of the 1807 Treaty of Fontainebleau, the King and Godoy allowed French Emperor Napoleon’s troops to cross Spain to attack Portugal (see above). This move was extremely unpopular with the
Spanish people, who saw the entry as a humiliating invasion. Under the pretext of reinforcing the Franco-Spanish army occupying Portugal, French imperial troops entered Spain. Napoleon turned on his ally and ordered French commanders to seize key Spanish fortresses. Barcelona was taken in February 1808 and the Spanish Royal Army found itself paralyzed.

These events led the Mutiny of Aranjuez, an 1808 uprising against Charles IV that took place in the town of Aranjuez, where the royal family and the government were staying on their way south to flee an anticipated French invasion from the north. Soldiers, peasants, and members of the general public assaulted Godoy’s quarters and captured him. The mutineers made Charles dismiss Godoy and two days later, the court forced the King himself to abdicate in favor of his son and rival, who became Ferdinand VII. Ferdinand ascended the throne and turned to Napoleon for support.

Throughout the winter of 1808, French agents became increasingly involved in Spanish internal affairs, attempting to incite discord between members of the Spanish royal family. Secret French machinations finally materialized when Napoleon announced that he would intervene to mediate between the rival political factions in the country. Napoleon, under the false pretense of resolving the conflict, invited both Charles and Ferdinand to Bayonne, France. Both were afraid of the French ruler’s power and thought it appropriate to accept the invitation. Once in Bayonne, Napoleon forced them both to renounce the throne and grant it to him. The Emperor then named his brother Joseph Bonaparte king of Spain. This episode, known as the Abdications of Bayonne, led to what the Spanish-speaking world calls the Spanish War of Independence (1808-1814), which overlaps with the Peninsular War.
The liberal, republican, and radical segments of the Spanish and Portuguese populations supported a potential French invasion. Napoleon relied on this support both in the conduct of the war and administration of the country. But while Napoleon—through his brother Joseph—fulfilled his promises to remove all feudal and clerical privileges, most Spanish liberals soon came to oppose the occupation because of the violence and brutality it brought.
The Peninsular War

Marshal Murat led 120,000 troops into Spain and the French arrived in Madrid, where riots against the occupation erupted just a few weeks later (The Dos de Mayo of 1808 Uprising). The appointment of Joseph Bonaparte as the King of Spain enraged the Spanish. Resistance to French aggression soon spread throughout the country. The shocking French defeat at the Battle of Bailén in July gave hope to Napoleon's enemies and partly persuaded the French emperor to intervene in person. The French army, under the Emperor’s personal command, crossed the Ebro River in November 1808 and inflicted a series of crushing defeats against the Spanish forces. After clearing the last Spanish force guarding the capital at Somosierra, Napoleon entered Madrid in December with 80,000 troops. He then unleashed his soldiers against Moore and the British forces.

The French occupation destroyed the Spanish administration, which fragmented into quarreling provincial juntas. In 1810, a reconstituted national government, the Cádiz Cortes—in effect a government-in-exile—fortified itself in Cádiz but could not raise effective armies because it was besieged by 70,000 French troops. British and Portuguese forces eventually secured Portugal, using it as a safe position from which to launch campaigns against the French army and provide whatever supplies they could get to the Spanish, while the Spanish armies and guerrillas tied down vast numbers of Napoleon's troops. These combined regular and irregular allied forces prevented Napoleon's marshals from subduing the rebellious Spanish provinces by restricting French control of territory, and the war continued through years of stalemate.

The years of fighting in Spain were a heavy burden on France's Grande Armée. While the French were victorious in battle, their communications and supplies were severely tested and their units frequently isolated, harassed, or overwhelmed by partisans fighting
an intense guerrilla war of raids and ambushes. The Spanish armies were repeatedly beaten and driven to the peripheries, but would regroup and relentlessly hound the French. This drain on French resources led Napoleon, who had unwittingly provoked a total war, to call the conflict the “Spanish Ulcer.” The Spanish people continued to rally around the cause of “Ferdinand the Desired” who, imprisoned in France, became a national hero. In 1813, Napoleon reinstated him as Ferdinand VII.

The burden of war destroyed the social and economic fabric of Portugal and Spain and ushered in an era of social turbulence, political instability, and economic stagnation. Devastating civil wars between liberal and absolutist factions led by officers trained in the Peninsular War persisted in Iberia until 1850. The cumulative crises and disruptions of invasion, revolution, and restoration led to the independence of most of Spain’s American colonies and the independence of Brazil from Portugal.

Attributions

- **Abdication in Spain**
Napoleon conquered most of Italy in the name of the French Revolution by 1799 and established a number of France's client states under his own control or nearly absolute authority.

**Learning Objective**

Classify the political structure exemplified by the Italian states under Napoleon’s rule

**Key Points**

- In 1796, the French Army of Italy under Napoleon invaded Italy with the aims of forcing the First Coalition to abandon Sardinia and forcing Austria to withdraw from Italy. Within only two weeks, Victor Amadeus III of Sardinia was forced to sign an armistice. Napoleon then entered Milan, where he was welcomed as a liberator.
- In 1797, Napoleon signed the Treaty of Campo Formio, by which the Republic of Venice was annexed
to the Austrian state, dashing Italian nationalists’ hopes that it might become an independent state. This treaty forced Austria to recognize the existence of the Cisalpine Republic and the annexation of Piedmont by France.

- Napoleon conquered most of Italy in the name of the French Revolution by 1799. He consolidated old units and split up Austria’s holdings. He set up a series of new republics, complete with new codes of law and abolition of old feudal privileges. The new republics were satellite states of Napoleon’s France, some of them joined with France by personal union under Napoleon’s authority. As all of these republics were imposed by an outside force, none had popular support in Italy.

- Napoleon's Italian Republic was the successor of the Cisalpine Republic, which changed its constitution to allow the French First Consul Napoleon to become its president. While the constitution gave the republic some level of sovereignty, in practice it was largely controlled by Napoleon.

- The Kingdom of Italy was established in 1805, when the Italian Republic became the Kingdom of Italy, with the same man (now styled Napoleon I) as King of Italy, and the 24-year-old Eugène de Beauharnais (Napoleon’s stepson) as his viceroy. Napoleon's title was Emperor of the French and King of Italy, implying the importance of the Italian Kingdom to his empire.

- Napoleon's dominance over Italian states ended with his fall as Emperor of the French.
**Key Terms**

**Kingdom of Italy**
A French client state founded in Northern Italy by Napoleon I, fully influenced by revolutionary France, that ended with his defeat and fall. Formally in personal union with the French Empire, with Napoleon I reigning as its king throughout its existence (1805-14), direct governance was conducted by Napoleon's stepson, Eugène de Beauharnais, who served as Viceroy for his step-father.

**Napoleon’s Italian Republic**
A short-lived (1802–1805) republic located in Northern Italy created by Napoleon as a successor of the Cisalpine Republic. It was a sister republic of Napoleonic France (the two were joined by the personal union).

**Cisalpine Republic**
A sister republic and a satellite state of France created by Napoleon out of territories in Northern Italy that lasted from 1797 to 1802.

**Napoleon’s Conquest of Italy**

At the end of the 18th century, Italy used here to refer to a number of separate Italian states as at the time sm Italy was not yet a
unified state) found itself dominated by Austria while the dukes of Savoy (a mountainous region between Italy and France) had become kings of Sardinia by increasing their Italian possessions, which now included Sardinia and the north-western region of Piedmont. This situation was shaken in 1796, when the French Army of Italy under Napoleon invaded Italy with the aims of forcing the First Coalition to abandon Sardinia (where they had created an anti-revolutionary puppet-ruler) and forcing Austria to withdraw from Italy. Within only two weeks, Victor Amadeus III of Sardinia was forced to sign an armistice. Napoleon then entered Milan, where he was welcomed as a liberator.

In 1797, Napoleon signed the Treaty of Campo Formio, by which the Republic of Venice was annexed to the Austrian state, dashing Italian nationalists' hopes that it might become an independent state. This treaty forced Austria to recognize the existence of the Cisalpine Republic (made up of Lombardy, Emilia Romagna and small parts of Tuscany and Veneto) and the annexation of Piedmont by France. Napoleon conquered most of Italy in the name of the French Revolution by 1799. He consolidated old units and split up Austria's holdings. He set up a series of new republics, complete with new codes of law and abolition of old feudal privileges. The Cisalpine Republic was centered on Milan. Genoa became a republic while its hinterland became the Ligurian Republic. The Roman Republic was formed out of the papal holdings while the pope himself was sent to France. The Neapolitan Republic was formed around Naples, but lasted only five months before the enemy forces of the Coalition recaptured it. All of these republics were France's client states, some connected with France by personal union (with Napoleon as the common head of the states).

Even if some of these states were created by the French invasion and were just satellites of France, they sparked a nationalist movement. As all of these republics were imposed by an outside force, none had popular support in Italy, especially since the peasantry was alienated by Jacobin anti-clericalism. Even native republicans became disillusioned when they realized that the
French expected them to be obedient satellites of Paris, which included frequent interference in local affairs and massive taxes. Return to the old feudal order was equally undesirable, so the republican movement would gradually establish its nationalist goals.

Formally, the Cisalpine Republic was an independent state allied with France, but the treaty of alliance established the effective subalternity of the new republic to France. The French in fact had control over the local police and left an army consisting of 25,000 Frenchmen, financed by the republic. The maps shows that the Cisalpine Republic was made up of Lombardy, Emilia Romagna, and small parts of Tuscany and Veneto, all of which are regions of modern-day northern Italy. The Italian Republic

Napoleon’s Italian Republic was the successor of the Cisalpine Republic, which changed its constitution to allow the French First Consul Napoleon to become its president. Sovereignty resided in three electoral colleges located in Milan, Bologna, and Brescia. All elected a commission of control and supreme rule called the Censorship, composed of twenty-one members and based in Cremona. The head of state was the president of the republic, Napoleon Bonaparte, elected for 10 years. The president had full executive powers, appointed the vice-president and the secretary of state, took legislative and diplomatic initiative, chose the ministers, public agents, ambassadors, and chiefs of the army, summoned the executive councils, and prepared the budget. The vice-president, Francesco Melzi d’Eril, acted for the president during his absence. The Legislative Council was a commission of at least 10 members appointed by the president for three years. The government comprised seven ministers. The parliament of the republic was a legislative body with limited powers. It was summoned by the president of the republic and could only approve or reject a law, the discussion reserved to a more restricted committee of 15 speakers.

The Kingdom of Italy

The Kingdom of Italy was established in 1805 when the Italian Republic became the Kingdom of Italy, with the same man (now styled Napoleon I) as King of Italy and the 24-year-old Eugène de Beauharnais (Napoleon’s stepson) as his viceroy. Napoleon’s title was Emperor of the French and King of Italy, implying the importance of the Italian Kingdom to his empire.

Although the earlier republican constitution was never formally abolished, a series of constitutional statutes completely altered it. The first declared Napoleon as king and established that his sons would succeed him, even if the French and the Italian crowns had
to be separated after the Emperor's death. The most important was the third, which proclaimed Napoleon as the head of state with full powers of government. The Consulta (a commission of eight members led by the president of the republic and in charge of foreign policy), Legislative Council, and Speakers were merged in a Council of State, whose opinions became only optional and not binding for the king. The Legislative Body, the old parliament, remained in theory, but was never summoned after 1805. The fourth statute, decided in 1806, indicated Beauharnais as the heir to the throne.

Originally, the Kingdom consisted of the territories of the Italian Republic: former Duchy of Milan, Duchy of Mantua, Duchy of Modena, the western part of the Republic of Venice, part of the Papal States in Romagna, and the province of Novara. Within the next several years, its territory shifted a number of times as the Kingdom served as a theater in Napoleon’s operations against Austria during the wars of the various coalitions. In practice, the Kingdom was a dependency of the French Empire.

After Napoleon abdicated both the thrones of France and Italy in 1814, Beauharnais surrendered and was exiled to Bavaria by the Austrians. The remains of the kingdom were eventually annexed by the Austrian Empire.

Attributions

- **Italy under Napoleon**
The Continental System

23.2.5: The Continental System

The Continental System was Napoleon’s strategy to weaken Britain’s economy by banning trade between Britain and states occupied by or allied with France, which proved largely ineffective and eventually led to Napoleon’s fall.

**Learning Objective**

Identify Napoleon’s goals with the Continental System

**Key Points**

- Great Britain was the central force in encouraging and financing alliances against Napoleonic France. As France lacked the naval strength to invade Britain or decisively defeat the Royal Navy at sea, Napoleon resorted instead to economic warfare. Napoleon believed that embargo on trade with Britain imposed on the European nations under his control would weaken the British economy. The strategy became to be known as the Continental System or Continental
Blockade.

- In 1806, having recently conquered or allied with every major power in continental Europe, Napoleon issued the Berlin Decree forbidding his allies and conquests from trading with the British. The British responded with the Orders in Council of 1807 that forbade trade with France, its allies, or neutrals and instructed the Royal Navy to blockade French and allied ports. Napoleon retaliated with the Milan Decree, which declared that all neutral shipping using British ports or paying British tariffs were to be regarded as British and seized.

- The embargo was effective intermittently for about half the time but in terms of economic damage to Great Britain, it largely failed. It encouraged British merchants to engage in smuggling with continental Europe and seek out new markets. Napoleon’s exclusively land-based customs enforcers could not stop British smugglers.

- The British countered the Continental system by threatening to sink any ship that did not come to a British port or chose to comply with France. This double threat created a difficult time for neutral nations like the United States.

- The embargo also had an effect on France. Ship building and its trades declined, as did many other industries that relied on overseas markets. With few exports and a loss of profits, many industries were closed down. Southern France especially suffered from the reduction in trade. Moreover, the prices of staple foods rose for most of continental Europe.

- British allies, including Sweden and Portugal,
refused to comply, which resulted in damaging wars. Russia's withdrawal from the system in 1810 was a motivating factor behind Napoleon's decision to invade Russia in 1812, which proved the turning point of the war and ultimately led to Napoleon's fall.

**Key Terms**

**Continental System**

The foreign policy of Napoleon I of France in his struggle against Great Britain during the Napoleonic Wars that used the economic warfare as a strategy to weaken Britain. As a response to the naval blockade of the French coasts enacted by the British government in 1806, Napoleon issued the Berlin Decree, which brought into effect a large-scale embargo against British trade that banned trade between Britain and states occupied by or allied with France.

**Orders in Council of 1807**

An 1807 series of decrees made by the Privy Council of the United Kingdom in the course of the wars with Napoleonic France, which instituted its policy of commercial warfare. They played an important role in shaping the British war effort against France as well as strained relations—and sometimes military conflicts—between the United Kingdom and neutral countries.
**Milan Decree**

A decree issued in 1807 by Napoleon I of France to enforce the Berlin Decree of 1806, which initiated the Continental System. It authorized French warships and privateers to capture neutral ships sailing from any British port or from any country occupied by British forces. It also declared that any ships submitted to search by the Royal Navy on the high seas were to be considered lawful prizes if captured by the French.

**Berlin Decree**

A decree issued in Berlin by Napoleon in 1806 that forbade the import of British goods into European countries allied with or dependent upon France and installed the Continental System in Europe. All connections were to be cut, even the mail. Any ships discovered trading with Great Britain were liable to French maritime attacks and seizures. The ostensible goal was to weaken the British economy by closing French-controlled territory to its trade.

**Great Britain and Napoleon: Economic Warfare**

Great Britain was the central force in encouraging and financing alliances against Napoleonic France. As France lacked the naval strength to invade Britain or decisively defeat the Royal Navy at sea, Napoleon resorted instead to economic warfare. Britain was
Europe's manufacturing and business center and Napoleon believed that embargo on trade with Britain imposed on the European nations under his control would cause inflation and debt that would weaken the British economy. In 1806, having recently conquered or allied with every major power in continental Europe, Napoleon issued the Berlin Decree forbidding his allies and conquests from trading with the British. The British responded with the Orders in Council of 1807 that forbade trade with France, its allies, and neutrals and instructed the Royal Navy to blockade French and allied ports. Napoleon retaliated with the Milan Decree, which declared that all neutral shipping using British ports or paying British tariffs were to be regarded as British and seized.

As an island nation, trade was Britain's most vital lifeline. Napoleon believed that if he could isolate Britain economically, he would be able to invade the nation after its economic collapse. He decreed that all commerce ships wishing to do business in Europe must first stop at a French port in order to ensure that there could be no trade with Britain. He also ordered all European nations and French allies to stop trading with Britain and threatened Russia with an invasion if they did not comply. Napoleon's strategy became known as the Continental System or Continental Blockade.

The Continental System: Effects

The embargo was effective intermittently for about half the time but in terms of economic damage to Great Britain largely failed. It encouraged British merchants to engage in smuggling with continental Europe and seek out new markets. Napoleon's exclusively land-based customs enforcers could not stop British smugglers, especially as they operated with the connivance of Napoleon's chosen rulers of Spain, Westphalia, and other German states. The System had mixed effects on British trade, with British
exports to the Continent falling between 25% to 55% compared to pre-1806 levels. However, trade sharply increased with the rest of the world, making up for much of the decline.

The British countered the Continental system by threatening to sink any ship that did not come to a British port or chose to comply with France. This double threat created a difficult time for neutral nations like the United States. In response to this prohibition, the U.S. government adopted the Embargo Act of 1807 (against both Great Britain and France) and eventually Macon’s Bill No. 2. The embargo was designed as an economic counterattack to hurt Britain, but proved even more damaging to American merchants. Macon’s Bill lifted all embargoes against Britain and France for three months. It stated that if either one of the two countries ceased attacks upon American shipping, the United States would end trade with the other, unless that other country agreed to recognize the rights of the neutral American ships as well.

Ograbme A political cartoon showing merchants dodging the “Ograbme,” which is “Embargo” spelled backwards. The embargo was also ridiculed in the New England press as Dambargo, Mob-Rage, or Go-bar-‘e m.
The embargo also had an effect on France. Ship building and its trades declined, as did many other industries that relied on overseas markets. With few exports and a loss of profits, many industries closed entirely. Southern France especially suffered from the reduction in trade. Moreover, the prices of staple foods rose for most of continental Europe. Napoleon’s St. Cloud Decree of 1810 opened the southwest of France and the Spanish frontier to limited British trade and reopened French trade to the United States. It was an admission that his blockade had hurt the French economy more than the British. It also failed to reduce British financial support to its allies.

Britain’s response to the Continental system was to launch a major naval attack on the weakest link in Napoleon’s coalition, Denmark. Although ostensibly neutral, Denmark was under heavy French and Russian pressure to pledge its fleet to Napoleon. In 1807, the British occupied the island Heligoland outside the west coast of Denmark. This base made it easier for Britain to control the trade to the ports of the North sea coast and facilitate smuggling.

Sweden, Britain’s ally in the Third Coalition, first refused to comply with French demands and was attacked by Russia and by Denmark/Norway in 1808. At the same time, a French force threatened to invade southern Sweden but the plan was stopped as the British Navy controlled the Danish straits. The Royal Navy set up a base outside the port of Gothenburg in 1808 to simplify the operations into the Baltic sea. In 1810, France demanded that Sweden should declare war to Great Britain and stop all trade. The result was a war between Sweden and Britain, but the British continued to control smuggling through the Baltic.

Portugal openly refused to join the Continental System. In 1793, Portugal signed a treaty of mutual assistance with Britain. The Portuguese population rose in revolt against the French invaders with the help of the British Army. Napoleon intervened and the Peninsular War began in 1808.

Finally, Russia chafed under the embargo and in 1810 reopened trade with Britain. Russia’s withdrawal from the system was a
motivating factor behind Napoleon’s decision to invade Russia in 1812, which proved the turning point of the war and ultimately led to Napoleon’s fall. The Continental System formally ended in 1814 after Napoleon’s first abdication.

Attributions

- The Continental System
Napoleon's marriage to Marie-Louise, triggered by his desire to have an heir and marry into one of the major European royal families, was shaped by European politics. However, the two also developed a close personal relationship.

**Learning Objective**

Identify the reasons why Napoleon divorced Josephine and married Marie-Louise

**Key Points**

- When after a few years of marriage it became clear that Josephine could not have a child, Napoleon began to think seriously about the possibility of divorce even though he still loved his wife. Despite her anger, Josephine agreed to the divorce so the Emperor could remarry in the hope of having an heir.
In addition to the desire for an heir, Napoleon sought the validation and legitimization of his Empire by marrying a member of one of the leading royal families of Europe. In 1810, he married 19-year-old Marie-Louise, Archduchess of Austria, and a great niece of Marie Antoinette by proxy. Thus, he married into a German royal and imperial family.

Marie-Louise was daughter of Archduke Francis of Austria and his second wife, Maria Theresa of Naples and Sicily. Her father became Holy Roman Emperor as Francis II. Marie-Louise was a great-granddaughter of Empress Maria Theresa through her father and thus a great niece of Marie Antoinette. She was also a maternal granddaughter of Queen Maria Carolina of Naples, Marie Antoinette’s favorite sister.

Marie-Louise’s formative years overlapped with a period of conflict between France and her family. She was brought up to detest France and French ideas but became an obedient wife and settled in quickly in the French court. Napoleon initially remarked that he had “married a womb,” but their relationship soon matured.

Despite the initial excitement and peace over the marriage and resulting alliance between the two long-time enemies, France and Austria soon engaged in another military conflict. Until Napoleon’s abdication and exile, the marriage between him and Marie-Louise was always shaped by European politics.

Although Marie-Louise did not join her husband in exile and returned to Vienna, she remained loyal to her husband.
**Key Terms**

**Congress of Vienna**
A conference of ambassadors of European states chaired by Austrian statesman Klemens Wenzel von Metternich and held in Vienna from November 1814 to June 1815. The objective was to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars.

**Treaty of Fontainebleau**
An agreement established in Fontainebleau, France in 1814 between Napoleon I and representatives from the Austrian Empire, Russia, and Prussia. With this treaty, the allies ended Napoleon’s rule as emperor of France and sent him into exile on Elba.

---

**Napoleon and Josephine: Divorce**

When after a few years of marriage it became clear that Josephine could not have a child, Napoleon began to think seriously about the possibility of divorce even though he still loved his wife. The final die was cast when Josephine's grandson Napoleon Charles Bonaparte,
declared Napoleon's heir, died of croup in 1807. Napoleon began to create lists of eligible princesses. He let Josephine know that in the interest of France, he must find a wife who could produce an heir. Despite her anger, Josephine agreed to the divorce so the Emperor could remarry in the hope of having an heir. The divorce ceremony took place in 1810 and was a grand but solemn social occasion. Both Josephine and Napoleon read a statement of devotion to the other. Despite the divorce, Napoleon showed his dedication to her for the rest of his life. When he heard the news of her death while on exile in Elba, he locked himself in his room and would not come out for two full days. Her name would also be his final word on his deathbed in 1821. However, in 1810, he married 19-year old Marie-Louise, Archduchess of Austria, and a great niece of Marie Antoinette by proxy. Thus, he married into a German royal and imperial family.

Marie-Louise

Archduchess Marie-Louise of Austria was born in 1791 to Archduke Francis of Austria and his second wife, Maria Theresa of Naples and Sicily. Her father became Holy Roman Emperor a year later as Francis II. Marie-Louise was a great granddaughter of Empress Maria Theresa through her father and thus a great niece of Marie Antoinette. She was also a maternal granddaughter of Queen Maria Carolina of Naples, Marie Antoinette’s favorite sister.

Marie-Louise’s formative years overlapped with a period of conflict between France and her family; she was thus brought up to detest France and French ideas. She was influenced by her grandmother Maria Carolina, who despised the French Revolution that ultimately caused the death of her sister, Marie Antoinette. Maria Carolina’s Kingdom of Naples also came into direct conflict with French forces led by Napoleon. The War of the Third Coalition
brought Austria to the brink of ruin, increasing Marie-Louise's resentment towards Napoleon. The Imperial family was forced to flee Vienna in 1805; Marie-Louise took refuge in Hungary and later Galicia before returning to Vienna in 1806. Napoleon also contributed directly to the final dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and Maria-Louise's father relinquished the title of Holy Roman Emperor although he remained Emperor of Austria. Another war broke out between France and Austria in 1809, resulting in another defeat for the Austrians. The Imperial family had to flee Vienna again.

Napoleon and Marie-Louise: Marriage

In addition to the desire to have an heir, Napoleon sought the validation and legitimization of his Empire by marrying a member of one of the leading royal families of Europe. His wish to marry Tsar Paul I of Russia's daughter Grand Duchess Anna caused alarm in Austria, whose officials grew concerned about being sandwiched between two great powers allied with each other. At the persuasion of Count Metternich, a marriage between Napoleon and Marie-Louise was suggested. Frustrated by the Russians delaying the marriage negotiations, Napoleon rescinded his proposal and began negotiations to marry Marie-Louise. The civil wedding and the religious wedding ceremony the next day were held in 1810. The excitement surrounding the wedding ushered in a period of peace and friendship between France and Austria, at war for most of the previous two decades.
Marie-Louise was less than happy with the arrangement, at least at first, stating “Just to see the man would be the worst form of torture.” However, she seemed to warm up to Napoleon over time. After her wedding, she wrote to her father “He loves me very much. I respond to his love sincerely. There is something very fetching and very eager about him that is impossible to resist.”

Marie-Louise was an obedient wife and settled in quickly in the French court. Napoleon initially remarked that he had “married a womb,” but their relationship soon matured. While he loved Josephine and claimed she remained his greatest friend even after their divorce, he was critical of her affairs and extravagant lifestyle leading to massive debts, whereas with Marie-Louise, there was reportedly “never a lie, never a debt.” However, the marriage was not without tension. Napoleon sometimes remarked to aides that Marie-Louise was too shy and timid compared to the outgoing and
passionate Josephine, whom he remained in close contact with, upsetting Marie-Louise. During public occasions, Marie-Louise spoke little due to reserve and timidity, which some observers mistook for haughtiness. She was regarded as a virtuous woman and never interfered in politics. Marie-Louise gave birth to a son in 1811. The boy, Napoléon François Joseph Charles Bonaparte, was given the title King of Rome in accordance with the practice where the heir apparent to the Holy Roman Empire was called the King of the Romans.

Collapse of the Empire

The weakened French position triggered the Sixth Coalition (1813–14). Prussia and the United Kingdom joined Russia in declaring war on France, but Austria stayed out due to relations between the Imperial families. In 1813, Marie Louise was appointed Regent as Napoleon set off for battle in Germany. The regency was only de jure, as all decisions were still taken by Napoleon and implemented by his most senior officials. Marie-Louise tried unsuccessfully to get her father to ally with France, but Austria too joined the opposition to France. She maintained a correspondence with Napoleon, informing him of increasing demands for peace in Paris and the provinces. In January 1814, Marie-Louise was appointed Regent for the second time and two days later Napoleon embraced Marie-Louise and his son for the last time. He left to lead a hastily formed army to stave off the Allied invasion from the north.

As the Allies neared Paris, Marie-Louise was reluctant to leave. She felt that as the daughter of the sovereign of Austria, one of the allied members, she would be treated with respect by allied forces. In addition, her son would be a possible successor to the throne should Napoleon be deposed. She was also afraid that her departure would strengthen the royalist supporters of the Bourbons. Marie-Louise was finally persuaded to leave but she did not expect her
father to dethrone Napoleon and deprive her son of the crown of France. In April 1814, the Senate, at the instigation of Talleyrand, announced the deposition of the Emperor. Marie-Louise was astonished to discover the turn of events.

Napoleon abdicated the throne in April 1814. The Treaty of Fontainebleau exiled him to Elba, allowed Marie-Louise to retain her imperial rank and style, and made her ruler of the duchies of Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla, with her son as heir. Marie-Louise was strongly dissuaded by her advisers from rejoining her husband, who had heard accounts of Napoleon's distraught grief over the death of Josephine. When Napoleon escaped in 1815 and reinstated his rule, the Allies once again declared war. Marie-Louise was asked by her stepmother to join in the processions to pray for the success of the Austrian armies but rejected the insulting invitation. Napoleon was defeated for the last time at the Battle of Waterloo, was exiled to Saint Helena in 1815, and made no further attempt to contact his wife personally. The Congress of Vienna recognized Marie-Louise as ruler of Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla, but prevented her from bringing her son to Italy. It also made her Duchess of Parma for her life only, as the Allies did not want a descendant of Napoleon to have a hereditary claim over Parma.

Attributions

- Napoleon's Marriage to Marie-Louise
23.3.1: The Holy Alliance

The Holy Alliance was a coalition created in 1815 by the monarchist great powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia to prevent revolutionary influences in Europe and serve as a bastion against democracy, revolution, and secularism.

Learning Objective

Identify the members and explain the function of the Holy Alliance

Key Points

- The Holy Alliance was a coalition created by the monarchist great powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. It was established after the ultimate defeat of Napoleon at the behest of Tsar Alexander I of
Russia and signed in Paris in 1815. Ostensibly, the alliance was formed to instill the divine right of kings and Christian values in European political life.

- In practice, the Austrian state chancellor Prince Klemens von Metternich made the Alliance a bastion against democracy, revolution, and secularism. The monarchs of the three countries involved used it to band together to prevent revolutionary influence (especially from the French Revolution) from entering these nations.

- The Alliance is usually associated with the later Quadruple and Quintuple Alliances, which included the United Kingdom and (from 1818) France with the aim of upholding the European peace settlement and balance of power in the Concert of Europe concluded at the Congress of Vienna.

- The meetings of the Alliances were irregular and focused on reactionary initiatives that aimed to preserve the old royal order in Europe. The last meetings revealed the rising antagonism between Britain and France, especially on Italian unification, the right to self-determination, and the Eastern Question.

- The Holy Alliance, the brainchild of Tsar Alexander I, gained a lot of support because most European monarchs did not wish to offend the Tsar by refusing to sign it. As it bound monarchs personally rather than their governments, it was easy to ignore once signed. The Quadruple Alliance, by contrast, was a standard treaty, and the four Great Powers did not invite any of their allies to sign it although the wording of the treaty left its provisions vague.
The intention of the Holy Alliance was to restrain republicanism and secularism in Europe in the wake of the devastating French Revolutionary Wars and the alliance nominally succeeded in this until Crimean War (1853–1856). By extension, the Alliance can be considered as the most potent prevention against any other general wars of Europe between 1815 and 1914.

**Key Terms**

**The Holy Alliance**

A coalition created by the monarchist great powers of Russia, Austria and Prussia. It was established after the ultimate defeat of Napoleon at the behest of Tsar Alexander I of Russia and signed in Paris in 1815. Ostensibly, the alliance was formed to instill the divine right of kings and Christian values in European political life.

**Concert of Europe**

A system, also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose
revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s.

**Quadruple Alliance**

A treaty signed in Paris in 1815 by the great powers of United Kingdom, Austria, Prussia, and Russia. It renewed the use of the Congress System which advanced European international relations. The alliance was originally formed to counter France and the powers promised aid to each other. It functioned until 1818.

**Quintuple Alliance**

An alliance that came into being at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, when France joined the earlier alliance created by Russia, Austria, Prussia and the United Kingdom.

The Holy Alliance was a coalition created by the monarchist great powers of Russia, Austria and Prussia, established after the ultimate defeat of Napoleon at the behest of Tsar Alexander I of Russia and signed in Paris in 1815. Ostensibly, the alliance was formed to instill the divine right of kings and Christian values in European political life. About three months after the Final Act of the Vienna Congress, the monarchs of Orthodox (Russia), Catholic (Austria), and Protestant (Prussia) confession promised to act on the basis of “justice, love and peace,” both in internal and foreign affairs, for “consolidating human institutions and remedying their imperfections.” Despite this noble wording, the Alliance was rejected as ineffective by the United Kingdom, the Papal States, and the Islamic Ottoman Empire.
In practice, the Austrian state chancellor Prince Klemens von Metternich made the Alliance a bastion against democracy, revolution, and secularism. The monarchs of the three countries involved used it to band together to prevent revolutionary influence (especially from the French Revolution) from entering these nations.

Quadruple and Quintuple Alliances

The Alliance is usually associated with the later Quadruple and Quintuple Alliances, which included the United Kingdom and (from 1818) France. It aimed to uphold the European peace settlement and balance of power in the Concert of Europe concluded at the Congress of Vienna. In 1818, the Tsar, Emperor Francis I of Austria, and King Frederick William III of Prussia met with the Duke of Wellington, Viscount Castlereagh, and the Duc de Richelieu at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle to demand stern measures against university demagogues. The gesture resulted in tangible action when the Carlsbad Decrees were issued the following year. The Carlsbad Decrees were a set of reactionary restrictions introduced in the states of the German Confederation that banned nationalist fraternities (“Burschenschaften”), removed liberal university professors, and expanded the censorship of the press. They aimed to quell a growing sentiment for German unification.

At the 1820 Congress of Troppau and the succeeding Congress of Laibach, Metternich tried to align his allies in the suppression of the Carbonari revolt against King Ferdinand I of the Two Sicilies. The Quintuple Alliance met for the last time at the 1822 Congress of Verona to discuss the Italian question (in light of the efforts leading to Italian unification), the Greek question (in light of the Greek Revolution striving for Greek independence), and the Spanish question (in light of a potential French invasion of Spain to help the Spanish Royalists restore King Ferdinand VII of Spain to the
absolute power). The last meetings revealed the rising antagonism between Britain and France, especially on Italian unification, the right to self-determination, and the Eastern Question (the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries).

Contemporary caricature of the 1822 Congress of Verona, the last meeting of the Quintuple Alliance.

While Britain stood largely aloof from the Alliance’s illiberal actions, the four Continental monarchies were successful in authorizing Austrian military action in Italy in 1821 and French intervention in Spain in 1823. The Quintuple Alliance is considered defunct along with the Holy Alliance of the three original Continental members with the death of Tsar Alexander I of Russia in 1825.

The Alliance is considered defunct with Alexander’s death in 1825. France ultimately went separate ways in 1830, leaving the core of Russia, Austria, and Prussia as the Central-Eastern European block which again congregated to suppress the Revolutions of 1848. The Austro-Russian alliance finally broke up in the Crimean War. Although Russia helped crush the Hungarian Revolution of 1848,
Austria took no action to support its ally, declared itself neutral, and even occupied the Wallachian and Moldavian lands on the Danube upon the Russian retreat in 1854. Thereafter, Austria remained isolated, which added to the loss of her leading role in the German lands, culminating in the defeat of the Austro-Prussian War in 1866.

Assessment

The Holy Alliance, the brainchild of Tsar Alexander I, gained support because most European monarchs did not wish to offend the Tsar by refusing to sign it. As it bound monarchs personally rather than their governments, it was easy to ignore once signed. Only three notable princes did not sign: Pope Pius VII (it was not Catholic enough), Sultan Mahmud II of Ottoman Empire, and the British Prince Regent (because his government did not wish to pledge itself to the policing of continental Europe). Although it did not fit comfortably within the complex, sophisticated, and cynical web of power politics that epitomized diplomacy of the post Napoleonic era, its influence was more lasting than its contemporary critics expected and was revived in the 1820s as a tool of repression when the terms of the Quintuple Alliance did not fit the purposes of some of the Great Powers of Europe.

The Quadruple Alliance, by contrast, was a standard treaty and the four Great Powers did not invite any of their allies to sign it. It included a provision for the High Contracting Parties to “renew their meeting at fixed periods...for the purpose of consulting on their common interests” which were the “prosperity of the Nations, and the maintenance of peace in Europe.” The wording of Article VI of the treaty did not specify what these “fixed periods” should be, and there were no provisions in the treaty for a permanent commission to arrange and organize the conferences. This meant that the first conference in 1818 dealt with remaining issues of the
French wars, but after that meetings were held ad hoc to address specific threats, such as those posed by revolutions, for which the treaty was not drafted.

The intention of the Holy Alliance was to restrain republicanism and secularism in Europe in the wake of the devastating French Revolutionary Wars, and the alliance nominally succeeded in this until the Crimean War (1853–1856). Otto von Bismarck managed to reunite the Holy Alliance after the unification of Germany, but the alliance again faltered by the 1880s over Austrian and Russian conflicts of interest with regard to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. By extension, the Alliance can be considered the most potent prevention against other general wars of Europe between 1815 and 1914.

Attributions

- The Holy Alliance
  - “Hundred Thousand Sons of Saint Louis.”
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/

- “Congress_of_Verona.jpg.”
  https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/
  File:Congress_of_Verona.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
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Invasion of Russia

23.3.2: Invasion of Russia

Although during the 1812 Invasion of Russia Napoleon achieved tactical victories and entered Moscow, the campaign exhausted the French forces, demonstrating the weaknesses of the French strategy, shaking Napoleon’s reputation, and dramatically weakening French hegemony in Europe.

Learning Objective

Critique Napoleon’s decision to invade Russia

Key Points

- The Treaty of Schönbrunn, which ended the 1809 war between Austria and France, had a clause removing Western Galicia from Austria and annexing it to the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Russia, seeing the territory as a potential launching-point for others to invade, in response developed a plan of war in 1811. Russia's withdrawal from the Continental System was a further incentive for Napoleon to start a campaign.
against it.

- Napoleon ignored repeated advice against an invasion of the Russian heartland and prepared for an offensive campaign. The invasion commenced in June 1812. To gain increased support from Polish nationalists and patriots, Napoleon termed this war the Second Polish War. Liberating Poland from the Russian threat became one of the stated reasons behind the invasion.

- The invasion of Russia demonstrates the importance of logistics in military planning. Napoleon and the Grande Armée developed a proclivity for living off the land that had served them well in densely populated and agriculturally rich central Europe with its network of roads. In Russia, many of the Grande Armée’s methods of operation did not work and they were additionally handicapped by the lack of supplies and harsh winter, although the last factor was not as decisive as the popular narrative of the campaign suggested.

- The Grande Armée was a very large force, numbering 680,000 soldiers. Through a series of long marches, Napoleon pushed the army rapidly through Western Russia in an attempt to bring the Russian army to battle, winning a number of minor engagements and a major battle at Smolensk in August 1812. As the Russian army fell back, Cossacks were given the task of burning villages, towns, and crops to deny the invaders the option of living off the land. These scorched-earth tactics surprised and disturbed the French as the strategy also destroyed the Russian territory.
Napoleon then achieved a tactical victory at Borodino, entered Moscow, and forced the Russian army to retreat at Maloyaroslavets. However, in the weeks that followed, lack of food and fodder for the horses, hypothermia from the bitter cold, and persistent attacks upon isolated troops from Russian peasants and Cossacks led to great loss of men and a general lack of discipline and cohesion in the army. After crossing the Berezina River, Napoleon returned to Paris.

The campaign effectively ended in December 1812, with the last French troops leaving Russian soil. The campaign was a turning point in the Napoleonic Wars. The reputation of Napoleon was severely shaken and French hegemony in Europe was dramatically weakened. These events triggered a major shift in European politics.

**Key Terms**

**Continental System**

The foreign policy of Napoleon I of France in his struggle against Great Britain during the Napoleonic Wars that used the economic warfare as a strategy. As a response to the naval blockade of the French coasts enacted by the British government in 1806, Napoleon issued the Berlin Decree, which brought into effect a large-scale embargo against British trade that banned
trade between Britain and states occupied by or allied with France.

**Peninsular War**

An 1807–1814 military conflict between Napoleon's empire and the allied powers of Spain, Britain, and Portugal for control of the Iberian Peninsula during the Napoleonic Wars. The war started when French and Spanish armies invaded and occupied Portugal in 1807 and escalated in 1808 when France turned on Spain, previously its ally. The war lasted until the Sixth Coalition defeated Napoleon in 1814 and is regarded as one of the first wars of national liberation, significant for the emergence of large-scale guerrilla warfare.

**The French Invasion of Russia**

A military campaign, known in Russia as the Patriotic War of 1812 and in France as the Russian Campaign, that began in June 1812 when Napoleon's Grande Armée crossed the Niemen River to engage and defeat the Russian army. Napoleon hoped to compel Tsar Alexander I of Russia to cease trading with British merchants through proxies in an effort to pressure the United Kingdom to sue for peace. The official political aim of the campaign was to liberate Poland from the threat of Russia.
Causes of Napoleon’s Invasion of Russia

Although most of Western and Central European states were under Napoleon’s control—either directly or indirectly through various protectorates, alliances, or under treaties favorable for France—Napoleon had embroiled his armies in the costly Peninsular War (1807/8–1814) in Spain and Portugal. France’s economy, army morale, and political support at home noticeably declined. Most importantly, Napoleon himself was not in the same physical and mental state. He was overweight and increasingly prone to various maladies.

The Treaty of Schönbrunn, which ended the 1809 war between Austria and France, had a clause removing Western Galicia from Austria and annexing it to the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Russia saw the territory as a potential launching-point for another country to invade and thus developed a plan of offensive war in 1811, assuming a Russian assault on Warsaw and Danzig. Furthermore, Tsar Alexander found Russia in an economic bind as his country had little in the way of manufacturing yet was rich in raw materials, depending heavily on Napoleon’s Continental System for both money and manufactured goods. Russia’s withdrawal from the system was a further incentive for Napoleon to start the campaign.

Napoleon ignored repeated advice against an invasion of the Russian heartland and prepared for an offensive campaign. The invasion commenced in June 1812. In an attempt to gain increased support from Polish nationalists and patriots, Napoleon termed this war the Second Polish War (Napoleon’s “First Polish War” was in fact the War of the Fourth Coalition, 1806–08, one of declared goals of which was the resurrection of the Polish state on territories of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). Polish patriots wanted the Russian part of Poland to be joined with the Duchy of Warsaw and independent Poland reestablished. These demands were rejected by Napoleon, who stated he promised Austria, one of
powers that had partitioned Poland at the end of the 18th century, that this would not happen.

Logistical Challenges

The invasion of Russia demonstrates the importance of logistics in military planning. Napoleon and the Grande Armée developed a proclivity for living off the land that served them well in the densely populated and agriculturally rich central Europe with its network of roads. Rapid forced marches dazed and confused old order Austrian and Prussian armies and made foraging difficult. In Russia, many of the Grande Armée’s methods of operation did not work and they were handicapped by the lack of winter horse shoes, which made it impossible for the horses to obtain traction on snow and ice. Forced marches often left troops without supplies as the wagons struggled to keep up. Lack of food and water in thinly populated, agriculturally sparse regions led to the death of troops by exposing them to waterborne diseases through drinking from mud puddles and eating rotten food and forage. The front of the army received whatever could be provided while the formations behind starved. In fact, starvation, desertion, typhus, and suicide would cost the French Army more men than all the battles of the Russian invasion combined. Following the campaign, a saying arose that the Generals Janvier and Février (January and February) defeated Napoleon, alluding to the Russian Winter. While the harsh weather was an important factor in the final defeat of the French Army, historians point out that most French losses took place before the winter and the common narrative that identified the extremely cold weather as the main reason behind the French loss is a myth (perpetuated also by Napoleon’s advisers).
The French Invasion of Russia

Through a series of long marches, Napoleon pushed the army rapidly through Western Russia in an attempt to bring the Russian army to battle, winning a number of minor engagements and a major battle at Smolensk in August 1812. As the Russian army fell back, Cossacks were given the task of burning villages, towns, and crops. This was intended to deny the invaders the option of living off the land. These scorched-earth tactics surprised and disturbed the French as the strategy also destroyed Russian territory.

The Russian army retreated into Russia for almost three months. The continual retreat and loss of lands to the French upset the Russian nobility. They pressured Alexander I to relieve the commander of the Russian army, Field Marshal Barclay. Alexander I complied, appointing an old veteran, Prince Mikhail Kutuzov, to take over command.

In September, the French caught up with the Russian army, which had dug itself in on hillsides before a small town called Borodino 70 miles west of Moscow. The battle that followed was the largest and bloodiest single-day action of the Napoleonic Wars, involving more than 250,000 soldiers and resulting in 70,000 casualties. The French gained a tactical victory, but at the cost of 49 general officers and thousands of men. Napoleon entered Moscow a week later. In another turn of events the French found puzzling, there was no delegation to meet the Emperor. The Russians evacuated the city and the city's governor, Count Fyodor Rostopchin, ordered several strategic points in Moscow set ablaze. The loss of Moscow did not compel Alexander I to sue for peace and both sides were aware that Napoleon's position weakened with each passing day. After staying a month in Moscow, Napoleon moved his army out southwest toward Kaluga, where Kutuzov was encamped with the Russian army.
Michail Illarionovich Kutuzov (1745 – 1813), commander-in-chief of the Russian army on the far left, with his generals at the talks deciding to surrender Moscow to Napoleon. The room is the home of peasant A.S. Frolov. Painting by Aleksey Danilovich Kivshenko.

Kutuzov’s military career was closely associated with the period of Russia’s growing power from the end of the 18th century to the beginning of the 19th century. Kutuzov contributed much to the military history of Russia and is considered one of the best Russian generals. He took part in the suppression of the Bar Confederation’s uprising, in three of the Russo-Turkish Wars, and in the Napoleonic War, including two major battles at Austerlitz and the battle of Borodino.

Napoleon tried once more to engage the Russian army in a decisive action at the Battle of Maloyaroslavets. Despite holding a superior position, the Russians retreated with troops exhausted, few rations, no winter clothing, and the remaining horses in poor condition. Napoleon hoped to reach supplies at Smolensk and later at Vilnius. In the weeks that followed, lack of food and fodder for the horses,
hypothermia from the bitter cold, and persistent attacks upon isolated troops from Russian peasants and Cossacks led to great loss of men and a general lack of discipline and cohesion in the army. After crossing the Berezina River, Napoleon left the army with urging from his advisers. He returned to Paris to protect his position as Emperor and raise more forces to resist the advancing Russians. The campaign effectively ended in December 1812, with the last French troops leaving Russian soil.

The main body of Napoleon's Grande Armée diminished by a third during the first eight weeks of his invasion before the major battle of the campaign. The central French force under Napoleon's direct command crossed the Niemen River with 286,000 men, but by the time of the Battle of Borodino his force was reduced to 161,475. Napoleon's invasion of Russia is among the most lethal military operations in world history.

The painting shows Napoleon's army retreating in the snow.
Effects

The campaign was a turning point in the Napoleonic Wars. The reputation of Napoleon was severely shaken and French hegemony in Europe dramatically weakened. The Grande Armée, made up of French and allied invasion forces, was reduced to a fraction of its initial strength. These events triggered a major shift in European politics. France’s ally Prussia broke their imposed alliance with France and switched sides, soon followed by Austria. This triggered the War of the Sixth Coalition.

Attributions

- Invasion of Russia
23.3.3: The Fall of Paris

Following Napoleon’s retreat from Russia and the subsequent defeat of his army by the Sixth Coalition at Leipzig (1813), the armies of the Sixth Coalition invaded France and advanced toward Paris, which capitulated on March 31, 1814.

Learning Objective

Connect the invasion of Russia to the fall of Paris.

Key Points

- Following defeats in the Wars of the Fourth and Fifth Coalitions, Prussia and Austria were forcibly allied with France during the Russian Campaign. When this campaign resulted in the destruction of Napoleon’s Grande Armée, Prussia and Austria took advantage of the situation by forming a Sixth Coalition against France (1813–1814).
- The retreat from Russia turned into a new war on German soil. The decisive battle of the war, the so-
called Battle of Nations (October 16-19, 1813), took place in Leipzig where Napoleon was defeated. After the battle, the pro-French German Confederation of the Rhine collapsed and the supreme commander of the Coalition forces in the theater, the Russian Tsar Alexander I, ordered all Coalition forces in Germany to cross the Rhine and invade France.

• After retreating from Germany, Napoleon fought a series of battles, including the Battle of Arcis-sur-Aube in France, but was steadily forced back against overwhelming odds. In early February 1814, Napoleon fought his Six Days’ Campaign in which he won multiple battles against numerically superior enemy forces marching on Paris. However, the Emperor's victories were not significant enough to make any changes to the overall strategic picture.

• Napoleon realized he could no longer continue with his current strategy of defeating the Coalition armies. He had two options: fall back on Paris and hope that the Coalition members would come to terms or copy the Russians and leave Paris to his enemies. He decided to move eastward to Saint-Dizier and raise the whole country against the invaders. He started on the execution of this plan when a letter to Empress Marie-Louise outlining his intention to move on the Coalition lines of communications was intercepted and his projects exposed to his enemies.

• Tsar Alexander I of Russia and King Frederick of Prussia along with their advisers reconsidered; realizing the weakness of their opponent, they decided to march to Paris. The battle ended when the French commanders surrendered the city to Tsar
Alexander on March 31.

- On April 2, the Senate declared Napoleon deposed. He abdicated in favor of his son on April 4. The Allies forced Napoleon to abdicate unconditionally on April 6. The terms of his abdication, which included his exile to the Isle of Elba, were settled in the Treaty of Fontainebleau on April 11. A reluctant Napoleon ratified it two days later.

**Key Terms**

**French Invasion of Russia**

A military campaign, known in Russia as the Patriotic War of 1812 and in France as the Russian Campaign, that began in June 1812 when Napoleon's Grande Armée crossed the Neman River to engage and defeat the Russian army. Napoleon hoped to compel Tsar Alexander I of Russia to cease trading with British merchants through proxies to pressure the United Kingdom to sue for peace. The official political aim of the campaign was to liberate Poland from the threat of Russia.

**War of the Sixth Coalition**

A war fought from March 1813 to May 1814 in which a coalition of Austria, Prussia, Russia, the United Kingdom, Portugal, Sweden, Spain, and a number of German states finally defeated France and drove...
Napoleon into exile on Elba.

**Six Days’ Campaign**

A final series of victories by the forces of Napoleon I of France as the Sixth Coalition closed in on Paris, February 10-15, 1814.

**Battle of Paris of 1814**

A battle fought on March 30–31, 1814 between the Sixth Coalition—consisting of Russia, Austria, and Prussia—and the French Empire. After a day of fighting in the suburbs of Paris, the French surrendered on March 31, ending the War of the Sixth Coalition and forcing Emperor Napoleon to abdicate and go into exile.

**German Campaign of 1813**

A military campaign fought in 1813, in which members of the Sixth Coalition fought a series of battles in Germany against the French Emperor Napoleon and his Marshals. The campaign liberated the German states from the domination of the First French Empire.

**Background: German Campaign of 1813**

Following defeats in the Wars of the Fourth and Fifth Coalitions, Prussia and Austria were forcibly allied with France during the Russian Campaign (the French Invasion of Russia). When this campaign resulted in the destruction of Napoleon's Grande Armée,
Prussia and Austria took advantage of the situation by forming a Sixth Coalition against France (1813-1814). The retreat from Russia turned into a new war on German soil. Napoleon vowed to create a new army as large as that he sent into Russia. Although he inflicted 40,000 casualties on the Allies at Lützen and Bautzen (1813), lost about the same number of men during those encounters. The belligerents declared an armistice, during which both sides attempted to recover from losses. During this time, Allied negotiations finally brought Austria out in open opposition to France.

Following the end of the armistice, Napoleon seemed to regain the initiative at Dresden, where he defeated a numerically superior allied army and inflicted enormous casualties while sustaining relatively few. However, at about the same time, the French sustained defeats in the north at Grossbeeren, Katzbach, and Dennewitz. Napoleon, lacking reliable cavalry, was unable to fully take advantage of his victory and could not avoid the destruction of a whole corps at the Battle of Kulm, further weakening his army. He withdrew to Leipzig in Saxony where he thought he could fight a defensive action against the converging Allied armies. There, at the so-called Battle of Nations (October 16-19, 1813) Napoleon was defeated. After the battle, the pro-French German Confederation of the Rhine collapsed, ending Napoleon’s hold on Germany east of the Rhine. The supreme commander of the Coalition forces in the theater and the paramount monarch among the three main Coalition monarchs, the Russian Tsar Alexander I, ordered all Coalition forces in Germany to cross the Rhine and invade France.
The Battle of Leipzig or Battle of the Nations was fought on October 16-19, 1813, at Leipzig, Saxony. The coalition armies of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Sweden, led by Tsar Alexander I of Russia and Karl Philipp, Prince of Schwarzenberg, decisively defeated the French army of Napoleon I that also contained Polish, Italian, and German troops (from the Confederation of the Rhine). Being decisively defeated for the first time in battle, Napoleon was compelled to return to France while the Coalition hurried to keep their momentum, invading France early the next year.

**March on Paris**

After retreating from Germany, Napoleon fought a series of battles including the Battle of Arcis-sur-Aube in France, but was steadily forced back against overwhelming odds. During the campaign, he issued a decree for 900,000 fresh conscripts, but only a fraction of these were ever raised. In early February 1814, Napoleon fought his Six Days’ Campaign in which he won multiple battles against numerically superior enemy forces marching on Paris. With an army of only 70,000, the Emperor was faced with at least half a million Allied troops advancing in several main armies. The Six Days’
Campaign was fought from February 10 to February 15, during which time Napoleon inflicted four defeats: in the Battle of Champaubert, the Battle of Montmirail, the Battle of Château-Thierry, and the Battle of Vauchamps. However, the Emperor’s victories were not significant enough to make any changes to the overall strategic picture.

However, after six weeks of fighting, the Coalition armies hardly gained any ground. The generals still hoped to bring Napoleon to battle against their combined forces. However, after Arcis-sur-Aube, Napoleon realized he could no longer continue with his current strategy of defeating the Coalition armies in detail and decided to change his tactics. He had two options: fall back on Paris and hope that the Coalition members would come to terms, as capturing Paris with a French army under his command would be difficult and time-consuming, or copy the Russians and leave Paris to his enemies as they had left Moscow to him two years earlier. He decided to move eastward to Saint-Dizier, rally what garrisons he could find, and raise the whole country against the invaders. He started on the execution of this plan when a letter to Empress Marie-Louise outlining his intention to move on the Coalition lines of communications was intercepted and his projects exposed to his enemies.

The Coalition commanders held a council of war at Pougy in March and initially decided to follow Napoleon, but the next day Tsar Alexander I of Russia and King Frederick of Prussia along with their advisers reconsidered and realizing the weakness of their opponent, decided to march to Paris and let Napoleon do his worst to their lines of communications. The Coalition armies marched straight for the capital.
The Battle of Paris of 1814

The Austrian, Prussian, and Russian armies were joined together and put under the command of Field Marshal Count Barclay de Tolly who would also be responsible for the taking of the city, but the driving force behind the army was the Tsar of Russia and the King of Prussia. Napoleon left his brother Joseph Bonaparte in defense of Paris with additional troops under Marshals Auguste Marmont, Bon Adrien Jeannot de Moncey, and Édouard Mortier.

The Coalition army arrived outside Paris in late March. Nearing the city, Russian troops broke rank and ran forward to get their first glimpse of the city. Camping outside the city on March 29, the Coalition forces were to assault the city from its northern and eastern sides the next morning. Marmont and Mortier rallied available troops at a position on Montmartre Heights to oppose them. The battle ended when the French commanders surrendered the city. Alexander sent an envoy to meet with the French and hasten the surrender. He offered generous terms to the French and although willing to avenge Moscow more than a year earlier, declared himself to be bringing peace to France rather than destruction. On March 31, Talleyrand gave the key of the city to the Tsar. Later that day, the Coalition armies triumphantly entered the city with the Tsar at the head of the army followed by the King of Prussia and Prince Schwarzenberg. On April 2, the Senate declared Napoleon deposed.
The Battle of Paris was fought on March 30–31, 1814 between the Sixth Coalition—consisting of Russia, Austria, and Prussia—and the French Empire. After a day of fighting in the suburbs of Paris, the French surrendered on March 31, ending the War of the Sixth Coalition and forcing Emperor Napoleon to abdicate and go into exile.

Napoleon had advanced as far as Fontainebleau when he heard that Paris had surrendered. Outraged, he wanted to march on the capital, but his marshals would not fight for him and repeatedly urged him to surrender. He abdicated in favor of his son on April 4. The Allies rejected this out of hand, forcing Napoleon to abdicate unconditionally on April 6. The terms of his abdication, which included his exile to the Isle of Elba, were settled in the Treaty of Fontainebleau on April 11. A reluctant Napoleon ratified it two days later. The War of the Sixth Coalition was over.

Attributions

- The Fall of Paris
23.4: The 100 Days

23.4.1: Napoleon’s Exile and Return to Power

Napoleon’s exile from Elba and his short-lived return to power were fueled by the popular support of the French, including the military, who were disappointed with the royal decisions to reverse the results of the French Revolution and disfranchise the majority.

**Learning Objective**

Explain how Napoleon was able to raise support after his escape

**Key Points**

- According to the 1814 Treaty of Fontainebleau, Napoleon was stripped of his powers as ruler of the French Empire and all of Napoleon’s successors and family members were prohibited from attaining
power in France. The treaty also established the island of Elba where Napoleon was exiled as a separate principality to be ruled by Napoleon.

- Louis XVIII’s restoration to the throne in 1814 was linked to a new written constitution, the Charter of 1814, which guaranteed a bicameral legislature with a hereditary/appointive Chamber of Peers and an elected Chamber of Deputies. Their role was consultative (except on taxation), as only the King had the power to propose or sanction laws and appoint or recall ministers.

- The franchise was now limited to men with considerable property holdings and just 1% of people could vote. Many of the legal, administrative, and economic reforms of the revolutionary period were left intact, but after a first sentimental flush of popularity, Louis’ gestures towards reversing the results of the French Revolution quickly lost him support among the disenfranchised majority.

- Napoleon escaped from Elba in February 1815. Two days later, he landed on the French mainland at Golfe-Juan and started heading north. He was enthusiastically welcomed by the military despite their earlier allegiance to the king. The unpopular Louis XVIII fled to Belgium after realizing he had little political support. Napoleon arrived in Paris on March 20 and governed for a period now called the Hundred Days.

- In an attempt to strengthen the trust of a public disappointed by the restored royal authority, Napoleon took up a constitutional reform that resulted in the Charter of 1815, signed on April 22,
1815, and prepared by Benjamin Constant. The document extensively amended (virtually replacing) the previous Napoleonic Constitutions. It was liberal in spirit and gave the French people rights which were previously unknown to them.

- The Charter was adopted by a plebiscite on June 1, 1815, by an immense majority of the five million voters, although many eligible voters abstained. The rapid fall of Napoleon prevented it from being fully applied.

**Key Terms**

**Charter of 1814**

An 1814 constitution granted by King Louis XVIII of France shortly after his restoration. The Congress of Vienna demanded that Louis bring in a constitution of some form before he was restored. The document was presented as a gift from the King to the people, not as a constituent act of the people.

**Charter of 1815**

A constitution signed on April 22, 1815 and prepared by Benjamin Constant at the request of Napoleon I when he returned from exile on Elba. More correctly known as the “Additional Act to the Constitutions of the Empire,” the document extensively amended (virtually replacing) the previous Napoleonic...
Constitutions (Constitution of the Year VIII, Constitution of the Year X, and Constitution of the Year XII).

**Hundred Days**

The period between Napoleon's return from exile on the island of Elba to Paris on March 20, 1815, and the second restoration of King Louis XVIII on July 8, 1815 (a period of 111 days). This period saw the War of the Seventh Coalition and includes the Waterloo Campaign, the Neapolitan War, and several minor campaigns.

**Treaty of Fontainebleau of 1814**

An agreement established in Fontainebleau, France, on April 11, 1814, between Napoleon I and representatives from the Austrian Empire, Russia, and Prussia. With this treaty, the allies ended Napoleon’s rule as emperor of France and sent him into exile on Elba.

---

**Napoleon’s Exile to Elba**

The Treaty of Fontainebleau was an agreement established in 1814 between Napoleon I and representatives from the Austrian Empire, Russia, and Prussia, containing 21 articles. Based on the most significant terms of the accord, Napoleon was stripped of his powers as ruler of the French Empire, but both Napoleon and Marie-Louise of Austria were permitted to preserve their respective
titles as emperor and empress. All Napoleon’s successors and family members were prohibited from attaining power in France. The treaty also established the island of Elba, where Napoleon was exiled, as a separate principality to be ruled by Napoleon. Elba’s sovereignty and flag were guaranteed recognition by foreign powers in the accord, but only France was allowed to assimilate the island.

The British position was that the French nation was in a state of rebellion and Napoleon Bonaparte was a usurper. Lord Castlereagh explained that he would not sign on behalf of the king of the United Kingdom because to do so would recognize the legitimacy of Napoleon as emperor of the French and that to exile him to an island over which he had sovereignty only a short distance from France and Italy, both of which had strong Jacobin factions, could easily lead to further conflict.
British etching from 1814 in celebration of Napoleon’s exile to Elba at the close of the War of the Sixth Coalition. The print shows Napoleon seated backwards on a donkey on the road “to Elba” from Fontainebleau. He holds a broken sword in one hand and the donkey’s tail in the other while two drummers follow him playing a farewell march.

The First Bourbon Restoration

Louis XVIII’s restoration to the throne in 1814 was effected largely through the support of Napoleon’s former foreign minister, Talleyrand, who convinced the victorious Allied Powers of the desirability of a Bourbon restoration. Louis granted a written constitution, the Charter of 1814, which guaranteed a bicameral legislature with a hereditary/appointive Chamber of Peers and an elected Chamber of Deputies. Its role was consultative (except on
taxation), as only the King had the power to propose or sanction laws and appoint or recall ministers. The franchise was limited to men with considerable property holdings, so just 1% of the population could vote. Many of the legal, administrative, and economic reforms of the revolutionary period were left intact, including the Napoleonic Code.

After a first sentimental flush of popularity, Louis’ gestures towards reversing the results of the French Revolution quickly lost him support among the disenfranchised majority. Symbolic acts such as the replacement of the tricolore with the white flag, the titling of Louis as the “XVIII” (as successor to Louis XVII, who never ruled) and as “King of France” rather than “King of the French,” as well as the monarchy's recognition of the anniversaries of the deaths of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, were significant in the eyes of the increasingly disappointed public. A more tangible source of antagonism was the pressure applied to possessors of biens nationaux (properties confiscated during the French Revolution from the Catholic Church, the monarchy, émigrés, and suspected counter-revolutionaries) by the Catholic Church and returning émigrés attempting to repossess their former lands. Other groups bearing ill sentiment towards Louis included the army, non-Catholics, and workers hit by a post-war slump and British imports. The growing anti-royal sentiments would soon help Napoleon to gather popular support for his own restoration.

**Escape from Elba**

Separated from his wife and son who had returned to Austria, cut off from the allowance guaranteed to him by the Treaty of Fontainebleau, and aware of rumors he was about to be banished to a remote island in the Atlantic Ocean, Napoleon escaped from Elba in February 1815. Two days later, he landed on the French mainland.
at Golfe-Juan and started heading north. The 5th Regiment was sent to intercept him and made contact just south of Grenoble. Napoleon approached the regiment alone, dismounted his horse and, when he was within gunshot range, shouted to the soldiers, “Here I am. Kill your Emperor, if you wish.” The soldiers quickly responded with, “Vive L’Empereur!” Marshal Michel Ney, who had pledged loyalty to the restored Bourbon king, Louis XVIII, affectionately kissed his former emperor and forgot his oath of allegiance to the Bourbon monarch. The two then marched together towards Paris with a growing army. The unpopular Louis XVIII fled to Belgium after realizing he had little political support. On March 13, the powers at the Congress of Vienna declared Napoleon an outlaw. Napoleon arrived in Paris on 20 March and governed for a period now called the Hundred Days.

**Constitutional Reform: The Charter of 1815**

In an attempt to strengthen the trust of the public disappointed by the restored royal authority, Napoleon took up a constitutional reform, which resulted in the Charter of 1815, signed on April 22, 1815 and prepared by Benjamin Constant. More correctly known as the “Additional Act to the Constitutions of the Empire” the document extensively amended (virtually replacing) the previous Napoleonic Constitutions (Constitution of the Year VIII, Constitution of the Year X, and Constitution of the Year XII). The Additional Act reframed the Napoleonic constitution into something more along the lines of the Bourbon Restoration Charter of 1814 of Louis XVIII, while otherwise ignoring the Bourbon charter’s existence. It was very liberal in spirit and gave the French people rights which were previously unknown to them, such as the right to elect the mayor in communes with population of less than 5,000. Napoleon treated it as a mere continuation of the previous constitutions and it therefore took the
form of an ordinary legislative act “additional to the constitutions of the Empire.”

The legislative power was to be exercised by the Emperor together with the Parliament, composed of two chambers: the Chamber of Peers, hereditary members appointed by the Emperor, and the Chamber of Representatives, 629 citizens elected for five-year terms by electoral colleges in the individual départements. The ministers were to be responsible to the Parliament for their actions. The liberalization dealt both with the guarantees of rights and the end of censorship. In the end, the two chambers held sessions for only one month, from June 3 to July 7, 1815. The Charter was adopted by a plebiscite on June 1, 1815, by an immense majority of the five million voters, although a great many eligible voters abstained. The rapid fall of Napoleon prevented it from being fully applied.

Attributions

- Napoleon’s Exile and Return to Power
• “1024px-Napoleon’s_exile_to_Elba3.jpg.” 
  https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Napoleon%27s_exile_to_Elba3.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
23.4.2: Napoleon's Defeat at Waterloo

The Waterloo Campaign (June 15 – July 8, 1815) was fought between the French Army of the North and two Seventh Coalition armies, an Anglo-allied army and a Prussian army, that defeated Napoleon in the decisive Battle of Waterloo, forced him to abdicate for the second time, and ended the Napoleonic Era.

Learning Objective

Identify the contributing factors to Napoleon’s ultimate defeat at Waterloo

Key Points

- At the Congress of Vienna, the Great Powers of Europe – Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia – and their allies declared Napoleon an outlaw and with the signing of this declaration on March 13, 1815, began the War of the Seventh Coalition. The hopes of
peace that Napoleon had entertained were gone; war was now inevitable.

• Some time after the allies began mobilizing, the invasion of France was planned for July 1, 1815. This invasion date, later than some military leaders expected, allowed all invading Coalition armies to be ready at the same time. Yet this postponed invasion date also gave Napoleon more time to strengthen his forces and defenses. Napoleon chose to attack, which entailed a preemptive strike at his enemies before they were fully assembled and able to cooperate.

• Napoleon’s decision to attack in today’s Belgium was supported by several considerations: he had learned that the British and Prussian armies were widely dispersed and might be defeated in detail; the British troops in Belgium were largely second-line troops as most of the veterans of the Peninsular War had been sent to America to fight the War of 1812; and a French victory might have triggered a friendly revolution in French-speaking Belgium.

• Hostilities started on June 15, when the French drove away the Prussian outposts and crossed the river Sambre at Charleroi, placing their forces between the cantonment areas of Wellington’s Army (to the west) and Blücher’s army to the east. On June 18, the Battle of Waterloo proved to be the decisive battle of the campaign.

• After the defeat at Waterloo, Napoleon chose not to remain with the army and attempt to rally it, but returned to Paris to try to secure political support for further action. He failed to do so and was forced to abdicate; a provisional government with Joseph
Fouché as acting president was formed.

The two Coalition armies entered Paris on July 7. The next day Louis XVIII was restored to the French throne and a week later (July 15), Napoleon surrendered to Captain Frederick Maitland of HMS Bellerophon. Napoleon was exiled to the island of Saint Helena, where he died in 1821. The war ended with signing the Treaty of Paris in November 1815.

**Key Terms**

**Convention of St. Cloud**

An 1815 military convention at which the French surrendered Paris to the armies of Prince Blücher and the Duke of Wellington, ending surrender hostilities between the armies of the Seventh Coalition and the French army. Under the terms of the convention, the commander of the French army, Marshal Davout, surrendered Paris to the two allied armies of the Seventh Coalition and agreed to move the French army well away from Paris to the south. In return, the allies promised to respect the rights and property of the local government, French civilians, and members of the French armed forces.

**Waterloo Campaign**

A military campaign (June 15 – July 8, 1815) fought between the French Army of the North and two
Seventh Coalition armies, an Anglo-allied army and a Prussian army. Initially, the French army was commanded by Napoleon Bonaparte, but he left for Paris after the French defeat at the Battle of Waterloo. Command then rested on Marshals Soult and Grouchy, who were replaced by Marshal Davout at the request of the French Provisional Government. The Anglo-allied army was commanded by the Duke of Wellington and the Prussian army by Prince Blücher.

**Treaty of Paris of 1815**
A treaty signed on November 20, 1815, following the defeat and second abdication of Napoleon Bonaparte. Under the treaty, France was ordered to pay 700 million francs in indemnities and the country's borders were reduced to their 1790 levels. France was to cover the cost of providing additional defensive fortifications to neighboring Coalition countries. Furthermore, Coalition forces remained in Northern France as an army of occupation under the command of the Duke of Wellington.

**Battle of Waterloo**
A battle fought on June 18, 1815 near Waterloo in present-day Belgium, then part of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. A French army under the command of Napoleon Bonaparte was defeated by two of the armies of the Seventh Coalition: an Anglo-led Allied army under the command of the Duke of Wellington, and a Prussian army under the command of Gebhard Leberecht von Blücher.
The Seventh Coalition

At the Congress of Vienna, the Great Powers of Europe – Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia – and their allies declared Napoleon an outlaw and with the signing of this declaration on March 13, 1815, began the War of the Seventh Coalition. The hopes of peace that Napoleon had entertained were gone; war was now inevitable. Furthermore, the Treaty of Alliance against Napoleon, in which each of the European powers agreed to pledge 150,000 men for the coming conflict, was ratified on March 25. Such a number was not possible for Great Britain, as its standing army was smaller than the armies of its peers and its forces were scattered around the globe, with many units still in Canada where the War of 1812 had recently ceased. Consequently, it made up its numerical deficiencies by paying subsidies to the other powers and to the other states of Europe that would contribute contingents.

Some time after the allies began mobilizing, it was agreed that the planned invasion of France would commence on July 1, 1815. The advantage of this invasion date, later than some military leaders expected, was that it allowed the invading Coalition armies a chance to be ready at the same time. Thus, they could deploy their combined numerically superior forces against Napoleon’s smaller, thinly spread forces, ensuring his defeat and avoiding a possible defeat within the borders of France. Yet this postponed invasion date gave Napoleon more time to strengthen his forces and defenses, which would make defeating him harder and more costly in lives, time, and money.

Napoleon chose to attack, which entailed a preemptive strike at his enemies before they were fully assembled and able to cooperate. By destroying some of the major Coalition armies, Napoleon believed he would then be able to bring the governments of the Seventh Coalition to the peace table to discuss peace for France with Napoleon remaining in power. If peace were rejected by the allies despite preemptive military success he might have achieved
using the offensive military option available to him, then the war would continue and he could turn his attention to defeating the rest of the Coalition armies.

Napoleon’s decision to attack in today’s Belgium was supported by several considerations. First, he had learned that the British and Prussian armies were widely dispersed and might be defeated in detail. Also, the British troops in Belgium were largely second-line troops as most of the veterans of the Peninsular War had been sent to America to fight the War of 1812. Also, a French victory might trigger a friendly revolution in French-speaking Belgium.

Waterloo Campaign

Hostilities started on June 15 when the French drove away the Prussian outposts and crossed the river Sambre at Charleroi, placing their forces between the cantonment areas of Wellington’s Army (to the west) and Blücher’s army to the east. On June 16, the French prevailed with Marshal Ney commanding the left wing of the French army and holding Wellington at the Battle of Quatre Bras and Napoleon defeating Blücher at the Battle of Ligny. On June 17, Napoleon left Grouchy with the right wing of the French army to pursue the Prussians while he took the reserves and command of the left wing of the army to pursue Wellington towards Brussels.

On the night of June 17, the Anglo-allied army prepared for battle on a gentle escarpment about a mile (1.6 km) south of the village of Waterloo. The next day this proved the decisive battle of the campaign. The Anglo-allied under Wellington army stood fast against repeated French attacks until they managed to rout the French army with the aid of several Prussian corps under Blücher that arrived at the east side of the battlefield in the early evening. With the right wing of the army, Grouchy engaged a Prussian rearguard at the simultaneous Battle of Wavre. Although he won
a tactical victory, his failure to prevent the Prussian march to Waterloo meant that his actions contributed to the French defeat at Waterloo. The next day (June 19) he left Wavre and started a long retreat back to Paris.
Battle of Waterloo (1815) by William Sadler II. Waterloo was the decisive engagement of the Waterloo Campaign and Napoleon’s last. According to Wellington, the battle was “the nearest-run thing you ever saw in your life.” Napoleon abdicated four days later and on July 7, Coalition forces entered Paris. The defeat at Waterloo ended Napoleon’s rule as Emperor of the French and marked the end of his Hundred Days return from exile. The battle also ended the First French Empire and set a chronologica
The Ultimate End of the Napoleonic Era

After the defeat at Waterloo, Napoleon chose not to remain with the army and attempt to rally it, but returned to Paris to try to secure political support for further action. He failed to do it and was forced to abdicate. With the abdication of Napoleon, a provisional government with Joseph Fouché as acting President was formed. Initially, the remnants of the French left wing and the reserves that were routed at Waterloo were commanded by Marshal Soult while Grouchy kept command of the left wing. However, on June 25, Soult was relieved of his command by the Provisional Government and replaced by Grouchy, who in turn was placed under the command of Marshal Davout. On the same day, Napoleon received from Fouché (Napoleon’s former police chief) an intimation that he must leave Paris. He retired to Malmaison, the former home of Joséphine, where she had died shortly after his first abdication. On June 29, the near approach of the Prussians, who had orders to seize Napoleon dead or alive, caused him to retire westwards toward Rochefort in an attempt to eventually reach the United States. The presence of blockading Royal Navy warships under Vice Admiral Henry Hotham with orders to prevent his escape forestalled this plan.

When the French Provisional Government realized that the French army under Marshal Davout was unable to defend Paris, they authorized delegates to accept capitulation terms that led to the Convention of St. Cloud. Under the terms of the convention, the commander of the French army, Marshal Davout, surrendered Paris to the two allied armies of the Seventh Coalition and agreed to move the French army well away from Paris, to the south “beyond the Loire.” In return, the allies promised to respect the rights and
property of the local government, French civilians, and members of the French armed forces.

The two Coalition armies entered Paris on July 7. The next day Louis XVIII was restored to the French throne and a week later (July 15), Napoleon surrendered to Captain Frederick Maitland of HMS Bellerophon. Napoleon was exiled to the island of Saint Helena where he died in May 1821. Under the terms of the Treaty of Paris of 1815, France was ordered to pay 700 million francs in indemnities and the country's borders were reduced to their 1790 level. France covered the cost of providing additional defensive fortifications to be built by neighboring Coalition countries. Under the terms of the treaty, parts of France were to be occupied by up to 150,000 soldiers for five years, with France footing the bill. However, the Coalition occupation, under the command of the Duke of Wellington, was only deemed necessary for three years and the foreign troops pulled out in 1818.
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PART V
CH. 24 POST-NAPOLEONIC EUROPE
89. The Congress of Vienna

24.1: The Congress of Vienna

24.1.1: The Balance of Power

The Concert of Europe was a system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power.

Learning Objective

Define the Balance of Power

Key Points

- As the Napoleonic Wars came to close in the second decade of the 19th century, the Great Powers of Europe (Britain, Prussia, Russia and Austria) started planning for the postwar world.
- To bring about a balance of power in Europe and
prevent further conflict, they developed what became known as the Concert of Europe, beginning with the Congress of Vienna.

- The Congress of Vienna dissolved the Napoleonic world and attempted to restore the monarchies Napoleon had overthrown.
- The Congress was the first occasion in history where on a continental scale, national representatives came together to formulate treaties instead of relying mostly on messages between the several capitals.
- The Concert of Europe, despite later changes and diplomatic breakdowns a few decades later, formed the basic framework for European international politics until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.

**Key Terms**

**Concert of Europe**

Also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, a system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power.

**Great Powers**

A sovereign state recognized as having the ability and
expertise to exert its influence on a global scale. They characteristically possess military and economic strength, as well as diplomatic and soft power influence, which may cause middle or small powers to consider the Great Powers' opinions before taking actions of their own.

**balance of power**
A theory in international relations that suggests that national security is enhanced when military capability is distributed so that no one state is strong enough to dominate all others. If one state becomes much stronger than others, the theory predicts it will take advantage of its strength and attack weaker neighbors, thereby providing an incentive for those threatened to unite in a defensive coalition.

**Congress of Vienna**

As the four major European powers (Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Austria) opposing the French Empire in the Napoleonic Wars saw Napoleon's power collapsing in 1814, they started planning for the postwar world. The Treaty of Chaumont of March 1814 reaffirmed decisions that would be ratified by the more important Congress of Vienna of 1814–15. The Congress of Vienna was the first of a series of international meetings that came to be known as the Concert of Europe, an attempt to forge a peaceful balance of power in Europe. It served as a model for later organizations such as the League of Nations in 1919 and the United Nations in 1945. They included the establishment of a confederated Germany, the division of French protectorates and annexations into independent states, the
restoration of the Bourbon kings of Spain, the enlargement of the Netherlands to include what in 1830 became modern Belgium, and the continuation of British subsidies to its allies. The Treaty of Chaumont united the powers to defeat Napoleon and became the cornerstone of the Concert of Europe, which formed the balance of power for the next two decades. The basic tenet of the European balance of power is that no single European power should be allowed to achieve hegemony over a substantial part of the continent and that this is best curtailed by having a small number of ever-changing alliances contend for power.

The Congress of Vienna dissolved the Napoleonic world and attempted to restore the monarchies Napoleon had overthrown, ushering in an era of reaction. Under the leadership of Metternich, the prime minister of Austria (1809–48) and Lord Castlereagh, the foreign minister of Great Britain (1812–22), the Congress set up a system to preserve the peace. Under the Concert of Europe, the major European powers—Britain, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and (after 1818) France—pledged to meet regularly to resolve differences. The goal was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other and remain at peace. The leaders were conservatives with little use for republicanism or revolution, both of which threatened to upset the status quo in Europe. This plan was the first of its kind in European history and seemed to promise a way to collectively manage European affairs and promote peace.

The Congress resolved the Polish–Saxon crisis at Vienna and the question of Greek independence at Laibach. Three major European congresses took place. The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818) ended the occupation of France. The others were meaningless as each nation realized the Congresses were not to their advantage, as disputes were resolved with a diminishing degree of effectiveness.

The Congress was the first occasion in history where, on a continental scale, national representatives came together to formulate treaties instead of relying mostly on messages between the several capitals. The Congress of Vienna settlement, despite
later changes, formed the framework for European international politics until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.

Conservative Order

The Conservative Order is a term applied to European political history after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. From 1815 to 1830 a conscious program by conservative statesmen, including Metternich and Castlereagh, was put in place to contain revolution and revolutionary forces by restoring old orders, particularly previous ruling aristocracies.

Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Austria renewed their commitment to prevent any restoration of Bonapartist power and agreed to meet regularly in conferences to discuss their common interests. This period contains the time of the Holy Alliance, a military agreement. The Concert of Europe was the political framework that grew out of the Quadruple Alliance in November 1815.

The goal of the conservatives at the Congress, led by Prince Klemens von Metternich of Austria, was to reestablish peace and stability in Europe. To accomplish this, a new balance of power had to be established. Metternich and the other four represented states sought to do this by restoring old ruling families and creating buffer zones between major powers. To contain the still powerful French, the House of Orange-Nassau was put on the throne in the Netherlands, which formerly comprised the Dutch Republic and the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium). To the southeast of France, Piedmont (officially part of the kingdom of Sardinia) was enlarged. The Bourbon dynasty was restored to France and Spain as well as a return of other legitimate rulers to the Italian states. And to contain the Russian empire, Poland was divided up between Austria, Prussia, and Russia.
Concert of Europe

The Concert of Europe, also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, was a System of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It grew out of Congress of Vienna. It operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s.

The Concert of Europe was founded by the powers of Austria, Prussia, the Russian Empire, and the United Kingdom, who were the members of the Quadruple Alliance that defeated Napoleon and his 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 Tsar Alexander I of Russia. Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord of France was largely responsible for quickly returning that country to its place alongside the other major powers in international diplomacy.

The Concert of Europe had no written rules or permanent institutions, but at times of crisis any of the member countries could propose a conference. Meetings of the Great Powers during this period included: Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Carlsbad (1819), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), Verona (1822), London (1832), and Berlin (1878).
The basic tenet of the European balance of power that reigned from 1814 to WWI is that no single European power should be allowed to achieve hegemony over a substantial part of the continent and that this is best curtailed by having a small number of ever-changing alliances contend for power.

An image of a cartoon by Honore Daumier, L'Equilibre Europea, that depicts many people holding up the globe with bayonets.
Attributions

- The Balance of Power
Participants of the Congress

24.1.2: Participants of the Congress

The leading participants of the Congress of Vienna were British foreign secretary Lord Castlereagh, Austrian Chancellor Klemens von Metternich, and Tsar Alexander I of Russia, all of whom had a reactionary, conservative vision for Europe after the Napoleonic Wars, favoring stability and the status quo over liberal progress.

Learning Objective

Identify the participants in the Congress of Vienna and their representatives

Key Points

- The objective of the Congress of Vienna was to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars.
- The leading personalities of the Congress were...
British foreign secretary Lord Castlereagh, Austrian Chancellor Klemens von Metternich, and Tsar Alexander I of Russia.

- These three leaders in the Congress are known for their conservatism, aimed at creating lasting peace and maintaining the status quo and opposed to liberal progress and nationalism.
- This conservative agenda has been heavily criticized by many historians who argue that it stood in the way of progress and created the conditions for World War I.
- Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord of France was largely responsible for quickly returning France to its place alongside the other major powers in international diplomacy after their defeat in the Napoleonic Wars.
- Virtually every state in Europe had a delegation in Vienna – more than 200 states and princely houses were represented at the Congress.

Key Terms

Napoleonic Wars
A series of major conflicts pitting the French Empire and its allies, led by Napoleon I, against a fluctuating array of European powers formed into various coalitions, primarily led and financed by the United Kingdom. War broke out as a continuation of the
French Revolution, which had plunged the European continent into war since 1792.

**reactionary**

A person who holds political views that favor a return to the status quo ante, the previous political state of society, which they believe possessed characteristics (discipline, respect for authority, etc.) that are negatively absent from the contemporary status quo of a society.

**Klemens von Metternich**

A politician and statesman of Rhenish extraction and one of the most important diplomats of his era, serving as the Austrian Empire’s Foreign Minister from 1809 and Chancellor from 1821 until the liberal revolutions of 1848 forced his resignation. He led the Austrian delegation at the Congress of Vienna that divided post-Napoleonic Europe amongst the major powers.

The Congress of Vienna was a conference of ambassadors of European states chaired by Austrian statesman Klemens Wenzel von Metternich and held in Vienna from November 1814 to June 1815, though the delegates had arrived and were already negotiating by late September 1814. The objective of the Congress was to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars. In a technical sense, the “Congress of Vienna” was not properly a Congress: it never met in plenary session, and most of the discussions occurred in informal, face-to-face sessions among the Great Powers of Austria, Britain, France, Russia, and sometimes Prussia, with limited or no participation by other delegates.
Major Participants of the Congress

The Congress functioned through formal meetings such as working groups and official diplomatic functions; however, a large portion was conducted informally at salons, banquets, and balls.

Austria was represented by Prince Klemens von Metternich, the Foreign Minister, and by his deputy, Baron Johann von Wessenberg. As the Congress's sessions were in Vienna, Emperor Francis was kept closely informed. Metternich was one of main architects of the balance of power in Europe and approached the matter from a perspective of conservatism. He was a staunch opponent of liberalism and nationalism, favoring instead the preservation of the status quo in the face of the revolutionary challenge. He was also wary of Russian dominance. Critics of his diplomatic agenda paint him as the man who prevented Austria and the rest of central Europe from “developing along normal liberal and constitutional lines.” Had Metternich not stood in the way of “progress,” some argue, Austria might have reformed and dealt better with its problems of nationality, and the First World War might never have happened.

Great Britain was represented first by its Foreign Secretary, Viscount Castlereagh, then by the Duke of Wellington, after Castlereagh's return to England in February 1815. In the last weeks it was headed by the Earl of Clancarty after Wellington left to face Napoleon during the Hundred Days. Castlereagh, a conservative like Metternich, had a vision of long-term peace in Europe that united efforts of the great powers. At the same time he was watchful of Britain's mercantile and imperial interests. He saw that a harsh treaty based on vengeance and retaliation against France would fail, and anyway the conservative Bourbons were back in power. He employed his diplomatic skills to block harsh terms. Bringing France back into diplomatic balance was important to his vision of peace.

Tsar Alexander I controlled the Russian delegation formally led by the foreign minister, Count Karl Robert Nesselrode. The tsar
had three main goals: to gain control of Poland, to form a league that could intervene and stop revolutions against monarchies and traditionalism, and to promote the peaceful coexistence of European nations. He succeeded in forming the Holy Alliance (1815), based on monarchism and anti-secularism, and formed to combat any threat of revolution or republicanism.

Prussia was represented by Prince Karl August von Hardenberg, the Chancellor, and the diplomat and scholar Wilhelm von Humboldt. King Frederick William III of Prussia was also in Vienna, playing his role behind the scenes. Hardenberg was more liberal than the other main participants, and earlier in his career implemented a variety of liberal reforms. To him and Baron von Stein, Prussia was indebted for improvements in its army system, the abolition of serfdom and feudal burdens, the opening of civil service to all classes, and the complete reform of the educational system. However, by the time of the Congress of Vienna, the zenith of his influence, if not of his fame, was passed. In diplomacy he was no match for Metternich, whose influence soon overshadowed his own. During his late career he acquiesced to reactionary policies along the lines of the rest of the Congress.

France, the “fifth” power, was represented by its foreign minister, Talleyrand, as well as the Minister Plenipotentiary the Duke of Dalberg. Talleyrand had already negotiated the Treaty of Paris (1814) for Louis XVIII of France; the king, however, distrusted him and was also secretly negotiating with Metternich by mail. Talleyrand played a major role at the Congress, where he negotiated a favorable settlement for France while undoing Napoleon’s conquests. He sought a negotiated secure peace so as to perpetuate the gains of the French revolution.

Initially, the representatives of the four victorious powers hoped to exclude the French from serious participation in the negotiations, but Talleyrand skillfully managed to insert himself into “her inner councils” in the first weeks of negotiations. He allied himself to a Committee of Eight lesser powers (including Spain, Sweden, and Portugal) to control the negotiations. Once Talleyrand was able to
use this committee to make himself a part of the inner negotiations, he then left it, once again abandoning his allies.

Congress Secretary Friedrich von Gentz reported, “The intervention of Talleyrand and Labrador has hopelessly upset all our plans. Talleyrand protested against the procedure we have adopted and soundly [be]rated us for two hours. It was a scene I shall never forget.”

Other Participants

- Spain – Marquis Pedro Gómez de Labrador
- Sweden – Count Carl Löwenhielm
- Denmark – Count Niels Rosenkrantz, foreign minister. King Frederick VI was also present in Vienna.
- The Netherlands – Earl of Clancarty, the British Ambassador at the Dutch court, and Baron Hans von Gagern
- Switzerland – Every canton had its own delegation. Charles Pictet de Rochemont from Geneva played a prominent role.
- The Papal States – Cardinal Ercole Consalvi
- Republic of Genoa – Marquise Agostino Pareto, Senator of the Republic
- Bavaria – Maximilian Graf von Montgelas
- Württemberg – Georg Ernst Levin von Wintzingerode
- Hanover, then in a personal union with the British crown – Georg Graf zu Münster.
- Mecklenburg-Schwerin – Leopold von Plessen

Virtually every state in Europe had a delegation in Vienna – more
than 200 states and princely houses were represented at the Congress. In addition, there were representatives of cities, corporations, religious organizations (for instance, abbeys), and special interest groups (e.g. a delegation representing German publishers, demanding a copyright law and freedom of the press). The Congress was noted for its lavish entertainment: according to a famous joke it did not move, but danced.
Participants of the Congress of Vienna
1. Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington
2. Joaquim Lobo Silveira, 7th Count of Oriola
3. António de Saldanha da Gama, Count of Porto Santo
4. Count Carl Löwenhielm
5. Jean-Louis-Paul-François, 5th Duke of Noailles
6. Klemens Wenzel, Prince von Metternich
7. André Dupin
8. Count Karl Robert Nesselrode
9. Pedro de Sousa Holstein, 1st Count of Palmela
10. Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh
11. Emmerich Joseph, Duke of Dalberg
12. Baron Johann von Wessenberg
13. Prince Andrey Kirillovich
Participants of the Congress
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91. Territorial Changes in Europe

24.1.3: Territorial Changes in Europe

The goal of the Congress of Vienna was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other and remain at peace.

---

**Learning Objective**

Outline the borders that changed in Europe after the Congress of Vienna

---

**Key Points**

- The Final Act, embodying all the separate treaties created at and around the Congress of Vienna, was signed on June 9, 1815, ushering in major territorial changes to Europe to create a balance of power between nations.
- France lost all of its territorial conquests from the Napoleonic Wars.
• Russia gained much of Poland, while Prussia added smaller German states in the west, Swedish Pomerania, and 40% of the Kingdom of Saxony.
• The Congress created a Confederated Germany, a consolidation of the nearly 300 states of the Holy Roman Empire (dissolved in 1806) into a much less complex system of 39 states.
• The Italian peninsula became a mere “geographical expression” divided into seven parts: Lombardy-Venetia, Modena, Naples-Sicily, Parma, Piedmont-Sardinia, Tuscany, and the Papal States under the control of different powers.

Key Terms

**Holy Roman Empire**
A multi-ethnic complex of territories in central Europe that developed during the Early Middle Ages and continued until its dissolution in 1806. The largest territory of the empire after 962 was the Kingdom of Germany, though it also came to include the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Kingdom of Burgundy, the Kingdom of Italy, and numerous other territories.

**Hundred Days**
The period between Napoleon's return from exile on the island of Elba to Paris on March 20, 1815, and the second restoration of King Louis XVIII on July 8, 1815, (a
period of 111 days). Napoleon returned during the Congress of Vienna. On March 13, seven days before Napoleon reached Paris, the powers at the Congress of Vienna declared him an outlaw. On March 25, Austria, Prussia, Russia, and the United Kingdom, members of the Seventh Coalition, bound themselves to put 150,000 men each into the field to end his rule. This set the stage for the last conflict in the Napoleonic Wars, the defeat of Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo, the restoration of the French monarchy for the second time, and the permanent exile of Napoleon to the distant island of Saint Helena, where he died in May 1821.

**Duchy**

A country, territory, fief, or domain ruled by a duke or duchess. The term is used almost exclusively in Europe, where in the present day there is no sovereign duchy (i.e. with the status of a nation state) left.

The Congress of Vienna (1814–1815) dissolved the Napoleonic world and attempted to restore the monarchies Napoleon had overthrown, ushering in an era of conservatism. Under the leadership of Metternich, the prime minister of Austria (1809–48) and Lord Castlereagh, the foreign minister of Great Britain (1812–22), the Congress set up a system to preserve the peace. The goal was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other.

France lost all its recent conquests, while Prussia, Austria, and Russia made major territorial gains. Prussia added smaller German states in the west, Swedish Pomerania, and 40% of the Kingdom of Saxony; Austria gained Venice and much of northern Italy. Russia gained parts of Poland. The new Kingdom of the Netherlands had
been created just months before and included formerly Austrian territory that in 1830 became Belgium.

**Territorial Changes**

The Final Act, embodying all the separate treaties, was signed on June 9, 1815, (a few days before the Battle of Waterloo).

The Congress's principal results were the enlargements of Russia, which gained most of the Duchy of Warsaw (Poland), and Prussia, which acquired the district of Poznań, Swedish Pomerania, Westphalia, and the northern Rhineland. The consolidation of Germany from the nearly 300 states of the Holy Roman Empire (dissolved in 1806) into a much less complex system of 39 states (four of which were free cities) was confirmed. These states formed a loose German Confederation under the leadership of Austria and Prussia. The Congress also confirmed France's loss of the territories annexed between 1795–1810, which had already been settled by the Treaty of Paris.

Representatives at the Congress agreed to numerous other territorial changes. By the Treaty of Kiel, Norway was ceded by the king of Denmark-Norway to the king of Sweden. This sparked the nationalist movement which led to the establishment of the Kingdom of Norway on May 17, 1814, and the subsequent personal union with Sweden. Austria gained Lombardy–Venetia in Northern Italy, while much of the rest of North-Central Italy went to Habsburg dynasties (the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Duchy of Modena, and the Duchy of Parma).

The Papal States were restored to the Pope. The Kingdom of Piedmont–Sardinia was restored to its mainland possessions and gained control of the Republic of Genoa. In Southern Italy, Napoleon's brother-in-law, Joachim Murat, was originally allowed to retain his Kingdom of Naples, but his support of Napoleon in the
Hundred Days led to the restoration of the Bourbon Ferdinand IV to the throne.

A large United Kingdom of the Netherlands was formed for the Prince of Orange, including both the old United Provinces and the formerly Austrian-ruled territories in the Southern Netherlands. Other, less important territorial adjustments included significant gains for the German Kingdoms of Hanover (which gained East Frisia from Prussia and various other territories in Northwest Germany) and Bavaria (which gained the Rhenish Palatinate and territories in Franconia). The Duchy of Lauenburg was transferred from Hanover to Denmark, and Prussia annexed Swedish Pomerania. Switzerland was enlarged and Swiss neutrality was established. Swiss mercenaries had played a significant role in European wars for several hundred years; the Congress intended to put a stop to these activities permanently.

During the wars, Portugal lost its town of Olivença to Spain and moved to have it restored. Portugal is historically Britain’s oldest ally and with British support succeeded in having the reincorporation of Olivença decreed in Article 105 of the Final Act, which stated that the Congress “understood the occupation of Olivença to be illegal and recognized Portugal’s rights.” Portugal ratified the Final Act in 1815 but Spain would not sign, and this became the most important hold-out against the Congress of Vienna. Deciding in the end that it was better to become part of Europe than to stand alone, Spain finally accepted the Treaty on May 7, 1817; however, Olivença and its surroundings were never returned to Portuguese control and this question remains unresolved.

Great Britain received parts of the West Indies at the expense of the Netherlands and Spain and kept the former Dutch colonies of Ceylon and the Cape Colony as well as Malta and Heligoland. Under the Treaty of Paris, Britain obtained a protectorate over the United States of the Ionian Islands and the Seychelles.
Congress of Vienna The national boundaries within Europe set by the Congress of Vienna, 1815
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Diplomatic Consequences of the Congress of Vienna

Despite the efforts of the Great Powers of Europe to prevent conflict and war with the Congress of Vienna, in many ways the Congress system failed by 1823. The rest of the 19th century was marked by more revolutionary fervor, more war, and the rise of nationalism.

Learning Objective

Describe the diplomatic consequences of the Congress of Vienna

Key Points

- The Congress of Vienna and the resulting Concert of Europe, aimed at creating a stable and peaceful Europe after the Napoleonic Wars, succeeded in creating a balance of power and peaceful diplomacy.
for almost a decade.

- The Great Powers, the main participants of the Congress, also formed the Holy Alliance and the Quadruple Alliance, treaties to further the conservative vision of the Congress.
- However, by 1823 the diplomatic system developed by the Congress by which the main powers could propose a conference to solve a crisis had failed.
- In 1818, the British decided not to become involved in continental issues that did not directly affect them and did not support the Tsar in his vision to prevent revolution.
- No Congress was called to restore the old system during the great revolutionary upheavals of 1848; thus, nationalism and liberalism began to triumph over the conservatism of the Congress system.
- The diplomatic alliances that formed out of the Congress were shattered during the Crimean War, in which Russia was defeated by the other Powers.

Key Terms

**Quadruple Alliance**
A treaty signed in Paris on November 20, 1815, by the great powers of United Kingdom, Austria, Prussia, and Russia. It renewed the use of the Congress System, which advanced European international relations.
Holy Alliance
A coalition created by the monarchist great powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. It was created with the intention to restrain republicanism and secularism in Europe in the wake of the devastating French Revolutionary Wars.

Crimean War
A military conflict fought from October 1853 to March 1856 in which the Russian Empire lost to an alliance of France, Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and Sardinia. The immediate cause involved the rights of Christian minorities in the Holy Land, part of the Ottoman Empire.

International Relations and Diplomacy

With the Concert of Europe, the territorial boundaries laid down at the Congress of Vienna were maintained, and even more importantly there was an acceptance of the theme of balance with no major aggression. Otherwise, the Congress system failed by 1823. In 1818 the British decided not to become involved in continental issues that did not directly affect them. They rejected the plan of Tsar Alexander I to suppress future revolutions. The Concert system fell apart as the common goals of the Great Powers were replaced by growing political and economic rivalries. Artz says the Congress of Verona in 1822 “marked the end.” There was no Congress called to restore the old system during the great revolutionary upheavals of 1848, which called for revision of the Congress of Vienna's frontiers along national lines.
The Revolutions of 1848, known in some countries as the Spring of Nations, People's Spring, Springtime of the Peoples, or the Year of Revolution, were a series of political upheavals throughout Europe in 1848. It remains the most widespread revolutionary wave in European history. These diverse revolutionary movements were in opposition to the conservative agenda of the Congress of Vienna and marked a major challenge to its vision for a stable Europe.

The revolutions were essentially democratic in nature, with the aim of removing the old feudal structures and creating independent national states. The revolutionary wave began in France in February and immediately spread to most of Europe and parts of Latin America. Over 50 countries were affected, but with no coordination or cooperation between their respective revolutionaries. According to Evans and von Strandmann (2000), some of the major contributing factors were widespread dissatisfaction with political leadership, demands for more participation in government and democracy, demands for freedom of press, demands made by the working class, the upsurge of nationalism, and the regrouping of established governmental forces.

The uprisings were led by shaky ad hoc coalitions of reformers, the middle classes, and workers, which did not hold together for long. Tens of thousands of people were killed and many more forced into exile. Significant lasting reforms included the abolition of serfdom in Austria and Hungary, the end of absolute monarchy in Denmark, and the introduction of parliamentary democracy in the Netherlands. The revolutions were most important in France, the Netherlands, the states that would make up the German Empire in the late 19th and early 20th century, Italy, and the Austrian Empire.

Before 1850 Britain and France dominated Europe, but by the 1850s they had become deeply concerned by the growing power of Russia and Prussia. The Crimean War of 1854–55 and the Italian War of 1859 shattered the relations among the Great Powers in Europe. Victory over Napoleonic France left the British without any serious international rival, other than perhaps Russia in central Asia.

The Crimean War (1853–56) was fought between Russia, who tried
expanding its influence in the Balkans, against an alliance of Great Britain, France, Sardinia, and the Ottoman Empire. Russia was defeated.

In 1851, France under Napoleon III compelled the Ottoman government to recognize it as the protector of Christian sites in the Holy Land. Russia denounced this claim, since it claimed to be the protector of all Eastern Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. France sent its fleet to the Black Sea; Russia responded with its own show of force. In 1851, Russia sent troops into the Ottoman provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia. Britain, now fearing for the security of the Ottoman Empire, sent a fleet to join with the French, expecting the Russians would back down.

Diplomatic efforts failed. The Sultan declared war against Russia in October 1851. Following an Ottoman naval disaster in November, Britain and France declared war against Russia. Most of the battles took place in the Crimean peninsula, which the Allies finally seized. London, shocked to discover that France was secretly negotiating with Russia to form a postwar alliance to dominate Europe, dropped its plans to attack St. Petersburg and instead signed a one-sided armistice with Russia that achieved almost none of its war aims.

The Treaty of Paris, signed March 30, 1856, ended the war. It admitted the Ottoman Empire to the Concert of Europe, and the Powers promised to respect its independence and territorial integrity. Russia gave up a little land and relinquished its claim to a protectorate over the Christians in the Ottoman domains. The Black Sea was demilitarized and an international commission was set up to guarantee freedom of commerce and navigation on the Danube River.

After 1870 the creation and rise of the German Empire as a dominant nation restructured the European balance of power. For the next twenty years, Otto von Bismarck managed to maintain this balance by proposing treaties and creating many complex alliances between the European nations, such as the Triple Alliance.
The Holy Alliance and the Quadruple Alliance

As an extension of the vision of the Congress of Vienna, the Kingdom of Prussia and the Austrian and Russian Empires formed the Holy Alliance (September 26, 1815) to preserve Christian social values and traditional monarchism. The intention of the alliance was to restrain republicanism and secularism in Europe in the wake of the devastating French Revolutionary Wars, and the alliance nominally succeeded in this until the Crimean War (1853–1856). Every member of the coalition promptly joined the Alliance, except for the United Kingdom, a constitutional monarchy with a more liberal political philosophy.

Britain did however ratify the Quadruple Alliance, signed on the same day as the Second Peace Treaty of Paris (November 20, 1815) by the same three powers that signed the Holy Alliance on September 26, 1815. It renewed the use of the Congress System, which advanced European international relations. The alliance first formed in 1813 to counter France and promised aid to each other. It became the Quintuple Alliance when France joined in 1818.

Much debate has occurred among historians as to which treaty
was more influential in the development of international relations in Europe in the two decades following the end of the Napoleonic Wars. In the opinion of historian Tim Chapman, the differences are somewhat academic as the powers were not bound by the terms of the treaties and many of them intentionally broke the terms if it suited them.

The Holy Alliance was the brainchild of Tsar Alexander I. It gained support because most European monarchs did not wish to offend the Tsar by refusing to sign it, and as it bound monarchs personally rather than their governments, it was easy to ignore once signed. Although it did not fit comfortably within the complex, sophisticated, and cynical web of power politics that epitomized diplomacy of the post Napoleonic era, its influence was more lasting than contemporary critics expected and was revived in the 1820s as a tool of repression when the terms of the Quintuple Alliance were not seen to fit the purposes of some of the Great Powers of Europe.

The Quadruple Alliance, by contrast, was a standard treaty and the four Great Powers did not invite any of their allies to sign it. The primary objective was to bind the signatures to support the terms of the Second Treaty of Paris for 20 years. It included a provision for the High Contracting Parties to “renew their meeting at fixed periods...for the purpose of consulting on their common interests” which were the “prosperity of the Nations, and the maintenance of peace in Europe.” A problem with the wording of Article VI of the treaty is that it did not specify what these “fixed periods” would be, and there were no provisions in the treaty for a permanent commission to arrange and organize the conferences. This meant that the first conference in 1818 dealt with remaining issues of the French wars, but after that, meetings were arranged on an ad hoc basis to address specific threats such as those posed by revolutions.
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24.2: France after 1815

24.2.1: Louis XVIII and the Bourbon Restoration

The Bourbon Restoration, which restored the pre-Napoleonic monarchy to the throne, was marked by conflicts between reactionary Ultra-royalists, who wanted to restore the pre-1789 system of absolute monarchy, and liberals, who wanted to strengthen constitutional monarchy.

**Learning Objective**

Define the Bourbon Restoration and its goals

**Key Points**

- The Bourbon Restoration was the period of French history following the fall of Napoleon in 1814 until the July Revolution of 1830.
- After Napoleon abdicated as emperor in March
1814, Louis XVIII, the brother of Louis XVI, was installed as king and France was granted a quite generous peace settlement, restored to its 1792 boundaries and not required to pay war indemnity.

- On becoming king, Louis issued a constitution known as the Charter which preserved many of the liberties won during the French Revolution and provided for a parliament composed of an elected Chamber of Deputies and a Chamber of Peers that was nominated by the king.

- A constitution, the Charter of 1814, was drafted; it presented all Frenchmen as equal before the law, but retained substantial prerogative for the king and nobility and limited voting to those paying at least 300 francs a year in direct taxes.

- After the Hundred Days, when Napoleon briefly returned to power, Louis XVIII was restored a second time by the allies in 1815, ending more than two decades of war.

- At this time, a more harsh peace treaty was imposed on France, returning it to its 1789 boundaries and requiring a war indemnity.

- There were large-scale purges of Bonapartists from the government and military, and a brief “White Terror” in the south of France claimed 300 victims.

- Despite the return of the House of Bourbon to power, France was much changed; the egalitarianism and liberalism of the revolutionaries remained an important force and the autocracy and hierarchy of the earlier era could not be fully restored.
Key Terms

Napoleonic Code
The French civil code established under Napoléon I in 1804. It marked the end of feudalism and the liberation of serfs where it took effect. It recognized the principles of civil liberty, equality before the law, and the secular character of the state. It discarded the old right of primogeniture (where only the eldest son inherited) and required that inheritances be divided equally among all children. The court system was standardized; all judges were appointed by the national government in Paris.

White Terror
Following the return of Louis XVIII to power in 1815, people suspected of having ties with the governments of the French Revolution or of Napoleon suffered arrest and execution.

House of Bourbon
A European royal house of French origin, a branch of the Capetian dynasty, who first ruled France and Navarre in the 16th century and by the 18th century, also held thrones in Spain, Naples, Sicily, and Parma.

biens nationaux
Properties confiscated during the French Revolution from the Catholic Church, the monarchy, émigrés, and suspected counter-revolutionaries for “the good of the nation.”
the fall of Napoleon in 1814 until the July Revolution of 1830. The brothers of executed Louis XVI of France reigned in highly conservative fashion, and the exiles returned. They were nonetheless unable to reverse most of the changes made by the French Revolution and Napoleon. At the Congress of Vienna they were treated respectfully, but had to give up all the territorial gains made since 1789.

King Louis XVI of the House of Bourbon had been overthrown and executed during the French Revolution (1789–1799), which in turn was followed by Napoleon as ruler of France. A coalition of European powers defeated Napoleon in the War of the Sixth Coalition, ended the First Empire in 1814, and restored the monarchy to the brothers of Louis XVI. The Bourbon Restoration lasted from (about) April 6, 1814, until the popular uprisings of the July Revolution of 1830. There was an interlude in spring 1815—the “Hundred Days”—when the return of Napoleon forced the Bourbons to flee France. When Napoleon was again defeated they returned to power in July.

During the Restoration, the new Bourbon regime was a constitutional monarchy, unlike the absolutist Ancien Régime, so it had limits on its power. The period was characterized by a sharp conservative reaction and consequent minor but consistent civil unrest and disturbances. It also saw the reestablishment of the Catholic Church as a major power in French politics.

First Restoration

Louis XVIII’s restoration to the throne in 1814 was effected largely through the support of Napoleon’s former foreign minister, Talleyrand, who convinced the victorious Allied Powers of the desirability of a Bourbon Restoration. The Allies had initially split on the best candidate for the throne: Britain favored the Bourbons, the Austrians considered a regency for Napoleon’s son, François Bonaparte, and the Russians were open to either the duc d’Orléans,
Louis Philippe, or Jean-Baptiste Bernadotte, Napoleon’s former Marshal, who was in line for the Swedish throne. Napoleon was offered to keep the throne in February 1814 on the condition that France return to its 1792 frontiers, but he refused.

The Great Powers occupying Paris demanded that Louis XVIII implement a constitution. Louis responded with the Charter of 1814, which included many progressive provisions: freedom of religion, a legislature composed of the Chamber of Deputies, and the Chamber of Peers, a press that would enjoy a degree of freedom, and a provision that the Biens nationaux would remain in the hands of their current owners. The two Chambers’ role was consultative (except on taxation), as only the King had the power to propose or sanction laws and appoint or recall ministers. Voting was limited to men with considerable property holdings, and just 1% of people could vote.

Louis XVIII signed the Treaty of Paris on May 30, 1814. The treaty gave France its 1792 borders, which extended east of the Rhine. The country had to pay no war indemnity, and the occupying armies of the Sixth Coalition withdrew instantly from French soil.

Despite the return of the House of Bourbon to power, France was much changed from the era of the Ancien Régime. The egalitarianism and liberalism of the revolutionaries remained an important force and the autocracy and hierarchy of the earlier era could not be fully restored. The economic changes, which were underway long before the revolution, had been further enhanced during the years of turmoil and were firmly entrenched by 1815. These changes saw power shift from the noble landowners to the urban merchants.

Many of the legal, administrative, and economic reforms of the revolutionary period were left intact; the Napoleonic Code, which guaranteed legal equality and civil liberties, the peasants’ biens nationaux, and the new system of dividing the country into départements were not undone by the new king. Relations between church and state remained regulated by the Concordat of 1801. However, in spite of the fact that the Charter was a condition of the
After a first sentimental flush of popularity, Louis’ gestures towards reversing the results of the French Revolution quickly lost him support among the disenfranchised majority. Symbolic acts such as the replacement of the tricolore flag with the white flag, the titling of Louis as the “XVIII” (as successor to Louis XVII, who never ruled) and as “King of France” rather than “King of the French”, and the monarchy’s recognition of the anniversaries of the deaths of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were significant. A more tangible source of antagonism was the pressure applied to possessors of biens nationaux by the Catholic Church and returning émigrés attempting to repossess their former lands.

Hundred Days

On February 26, 1815, Napoleon Bonaparte escaped his island prison of Elba and embarked for France. He arrived with about 1,000 troops near Cannes on March 1. Louis XVIII was not particularly worried by Bonaparte’s excursion, as such a small number of troops could be easily overcome. There was, however, a major underlying problem for the Bourbons: Louis XVIII failed to purge the military of its Bonapartist troops. This led to mass desertions from the Bourbon armies to Bonaparte’s. Furthermore, Louis XVIII could not join the campaign against Napoleon in the south of France because he was suffering from gout.

Louis XVIII’s underestimation of Bonaparte proved disastrous. On March 19, the army stationed outside Paris defected to Bonaparte, leaving the city vulnerable to attack. That same day, Louis XVIII quit the capital with a small escort at midnight. Louis decided to go first to Lille, then crossed the border into the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, staying in Ghent.

However, Napoleon did not rule France again for very long,
suffering a decisive defeat at the hands of the armies of the Duke of Wellington and Field Marshal Blücher at the Battle of Waterloo on June 18. The Allies came to the consensus that Louis XVIII should be restored to the throne of France.

Second Restoration

Talleyrand was again influential in seeing that the Bourbons reigned, as was Fouché, Napoleon's minister of police during the Hundred Days. After the Hundred Days, a harsher peace treaty was imposed on France, returning it to its 1789 boundaries and requiring a war indemnity. Allied troops were to remain in the country until it was paid.

Louis XVIII's role in politics from the Hundred Days onward was voluntarily diminished; he resigned most of his duties to his council. He and his ministry embarked on a series of reforms through the summer of 1815. The king's council, an informal group of ministers that advised Louis XVIII, was dissolved and replaced by a tighter knit privy council, the “Ministère de Roi.” Talleyrand was appointed as the first Président du Conseil, i.e. Prime Minister of France. On July 14, the ministry dissolved the units of the army deemed “rebellious.” Hereditary peerage was reestablished to Louis's behest by the ministry.

In August, elections for the Chamber of Deputies returned unfavorable results for Talleyrand. The ministry wished for moderate deputies, but the electorate voted almost exclusively for ultra-royalists. Talleyrand tendered his resignation on September 20. Louis XVIII chose the Duke of Richelieu to be his new Prime Minister. Richelieu was chosen because he was accepted by Louis's family and the reactionary Chamber of Deputies.

Anti-Napoleonic sentiment was high in Southern France, and this was prominently displayed in the White Terror, the purge of all important Napoleonic officials from government and the execution
of others. The people of France committed barbarous acts against some of these officials. Guillaume Marie Anne Brune (a Napoleonic marshal) was savagely assassinated and his remains thrown into the Rhône River. Louis XVIII deplored such illegal acts, but vehemently supported the prosecution of marshals that helped Napoleon in the Hundred Days. The White Terror claimed 300 victims.

The king was reluctant to shed blood, which greatly irritated the ultra-reactionary Chamber of Deputies, who felt that Louis XVIII was not executing enough people. The government issued a proclamation of amnesty to the “traitors” in January 1816, but the trials in progress were finished in due course. That same declaration banned any member of the House of Bonaparte from owning property in or entering France.

In 1823, France intervened in Spain where a civil war had deposed King Ferdinand VII. The British objected as this brought back memories of the still recent Peninsular War. However, the French troops marched into Spain, retook Madrid from the rebels, and left almost as quickly as they came. Despite worries to the contrary, France showed no sign of returning to an aggressive foreign policy and was admitted to the Concert of Europe in 1818.

Louis XVIII died on September 16, 1824, and was succeeded by his brother, the comte d’Artois, who took the title of Charles X.
Allegory of the Return of the Bourbons on 24 April 1814: Louis XVIII Lifting France from Its Ruins A painting by Louis-Philippe symbolizing the Bourbon Restoration as “lifting France from its ruins.” It shows the newly appointed king, Louis XVIII, lifting up a falling woman, who symbolized France after the Napoleonic Wars.
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24.2.2: Charles X and the July Revolution

In 1830 the discontent caused by Charles X’s conservative policies and his nomination of the Ultra prince de Polignac as minister culminated in an uprising in the streets of Paris, known as the July Revolution, which brought about an end to the Bourbon Restoration.

Learning Objective

Evaluate why the July Revolution occurred

Key Points

- Charles X of France took a far more conservative line than his brother Louis XVIII.
- He attempted to rule as an absolute monarch in the style of Ancien Régime and reassert the power of the Catholic Church in France.
- His coronation in 1824 also coincided with the
height of the power of the Ultra-royalist party, who also wanted a return of the aristocracy and absolutist politics.

- A few years into his rule, unrest among the people of France began to develop, caused by an economic downturn, resistance to the return to conservative politics, and the rise of a liberal press.
- In 1830 the discontent caused by these changes and Charles X’s authoritarian nomination of the Ultra prince de Polignac as minister culminated in an uprising in the streets of Paris known as the 1830 July Revolution.
- Charles was forced to flee and Louis-Philippe d’Orléans, a member of the Orléans branch of the family and son of Philippe Égalité who had voted the death of his cousin Louis XVI, ascended the throne, beginning the more liberal July Monarchy.

**Key Terms**

**ultra-royalist**

A political part in 19th century France who wished for a return to the Ancien Régime of before 1789, with a view toward absolutism: domination by the nobility and “other devoted Christians.” They were anti-republican, anti-democratic, and preached *Government on High* by a marked noble elite. They tolerated vote censitaire, a form of democracy limited to those paying taxes above
a high threshold.

**Ancien Régime**

The monarchic, aristocratic, social, and political system established in the Kingdom of France from approximately the 15th century until the latter part of the 18th century (“early modern France”) under the late Valois and Bourbon dynasties.

**July Revolution**

This uprising of 1830 saw the overthrow of King Charles X, the French Bourbon monarch, and the ascent of his cousin Louis Philippe, Duke of Orléans, who after 18 precarious years on the throne would be overthrown in 1848. It marked the shift from one constitutional monarchy, the Bourbon Restoration, to another, the July Monarchy.

Compared to his brother Louis XVIII, who ruled from 1814-1824, Charles X of France took a far more conservative line. He attempted to rule as an absolute monarch and reassert the power of the Catholic Church in France. Acts of sacrilege in churches became punishable by death, and freedom of the press was severely restricted. Finally, he tried to compensate the families of the nobles who had had their property destroyed during the Revolution.

In 1830 the discontent caused by these changes and Charles X’s authoritarian nomination of the Ultra prince de Polignac as minister culminated in an uprising in the streets of Paris, known as the 1830 July Revolution (or, in French, “Les trois Glorieuses,” the three glorious days of July 27-29). Charles was forced to flee and Louis-Philippe d’Orléans, a member of the Orléans branch of the family and son of Philippe Égalité who had voted the death of his cousin Louis XVI, ascended the throne. Louis-Philippe ruled not as “King
of France” but as “King of the French” (an evocative difference for contemporaries). It was made clear that his right to rule came from the people and was not divinely granted. He also revived the tricolore as the flag of France in place of the white Bourbon flag that had been used since 1815, an important distinction because the tricolore was the symbol of the revolution.

Charles X (1824–1830)

The ascension to the throne of Charles X, the leader of the Ultra-royalist faction, coincided with the Ultras’ control of power in the Chamber of Deputies; thus, the ministry of the comte de Villèle was able to continue, and the last “restraint” (i.e., Louis) on the Ultra-royalists was removed. As the country underwent a Christian revival in the post-Revolutionary years, the Ultras saw fit to raise the status of the Roman Catholic Church once more.

On May 29, 1825, Charles was crowned in Reims in an opulent and spectacular ceremony that was reminiscent of the royal pomp of the coronations of the Ancien Régime. Some innovations were included upon request by Villèle; although Charles was hostile towards the 1814 Charter, commitment to the “constitutional charter” was affirmed with four of Napoleon’s generals in attendance.

While his brother had been sober enough to realize that France would never accept an attempt to resurrect the Ancien Régime, Charles had never been willing to accept the changes of the past four decades. He gave his Prime Minister, Jean-Baptiste de Villèle, lists of laws that he wanted ratified every time he opened parliament. In April 1825, the government approved legislation proposed by Louis XVIII but implemented only after his death, that paid an indemnity to nobles whose estates had been confiscated during the Revolution (the biens nationaux).

The law gave government bonds to those who had lost their lands in exchange for their renunciation of their ownership. This cost
the state approximately 988 million francs. In the same month, the Anti-Sacrilege Act was passed. Charles's government attempted to re-establish male-only primogeniture for families paying over 300 francs in tax, but the measure was voted down in the Chamber of Deputies.

On May 29, 1825, King Charles was anointed at the cathedral of Reims, the traditional site of consecration of French kings; it had been unused since 1775, as Louis XVIII had forgone the ceremony to avoid controversy. It was in the venerable cathedral of Notre-Dame at Paris that Napoleon consecrated his revolutionary empire, but in ascending the throne of his ancestors, Charles reverted to the old place of coronation used by the kings of France from the early ages of the monarchy.

That Charles was not a popular ruler became apparent in April 1827, when chaos ensued during the king's review of the National Guard in Paris. In retaliation, the National Guard was disbanded but as its members were not disarmed, it remained a potential threat.

**Downfall of the Bourbons**

There is still considerable debate among historians as to the actual cause of the downfall of Charles X. What is generally conceded, though, is that between 1820 and 1830, a series of economic downturns combined with the rise of a liberal opposition within the Chamber of Deputies ultimately felled the conservative Bourbons.

Between 1827 and 1830, France faced an economic downturn, industrial and agricultural, that was possibly worse than the one that sparked the Revolution of 1789. A series of progressively worsening grain harvests in the late 1820s pushed up the prices on various staple foods and cash crops. In response, the rural peasantry throughout France lobbied for the relaxation of protective tariffs on grain to lower prices and ease their economic situation. However,
Charles X, bowing to pressure from wealthier landowners, kept the tariffs in place.

While the French economy faltered, a series of elections brought a relatively powerful liberal bloc into the Chamber of Deputies. The 17-strong liberal bloc of 1824 grew to 180 in 1827 and 274 in 1830. This liberal majority grew increasingly dissatisfied with the policies of the centrist Martignac and the Ultra-royalist Polignac, seeking to protect the limited protections of the Charter of 1814.

Also, the growth of the liberal bloc within the Chamber of Deputies corresponded roughly with the rise of a liberal press within France. Generally centered around Paris, this press provided a counterpoint to the government’s journalistic services and to the newspapers of the right. It grew increasingly important in conveying political opinions and the political situation to the Parisian public and can thus be seen as a crucial link between the rise of the liberals and the increasingly agitated and economically suffering French masses.

July Revolution

Protest against the absolute monarchy was in the air. The elections of deputies on May 16, 1830, had gone very badly for King Charles X. In response, he tried repression but that only aggravated the crisis as suppressed deputies, gagged journalists, students from the University, and many working men of Paris poured into the streets and erected barricades during the “three glorious days” (French Les Trois Glorieuses) of July 26–29 1830. Charles X was deposed and replaced by King Louis-Philippe in the July Revolution. It is traditionally regarded as a rising of the bourgeoisie against the absolute monarchy of the Bourbons. Participants in the July Revolution included Marie Joseph Paul Ives Roch Gilbert du Motier, marquis de Lafayette. Working behind the scenes on behalf of the bourgeois-propertied interests was Louis Adolphe Thiers.
The July Revolution marked the shift from one constitutional monarchy, the Bourbon Restoration, to another, the July Monarchy; the transition of power from the House of Bourbon to its cadet branch, the House of Orléans; and the replacement of the principle of hereditary right by popular sovereignty. Supporters of the Bourbon were called Legitimists, and supporters of Louis Philippe Orléanists.

The Revolution broke out on July 27, 1830. Throughout the day, Paris grew quiet as the milling crowds grew larger. At 4:30 pm, commanders of the troops of the First Military division of Paris and the Garde Royale were ordered to concentrate their troops, and guns, on the Place du Carrousel facing the Tuileries, the Place Vendôme, and the Place de la Bastille. To maintain order and protect gun shops from looters, military patrols throughout the city were established, strengthened, and expanded. However, no special measures were taken to protect either the arm depots or gunpowder factories. For a time, those precautions seemed premature, but with the coming of twilight, the fighting began. According to historian Phil Mansel, “Parisians, rather than soldiers, were the aggressor. Paving stones, roof tiles, and flowerpots from the upper windows... began to rain down on the soldiers in the streets.” At first, soldiers fired warning shots into the air. But before the night was over, 21 civilians were killed. Fighting in Paris continued throughout the night.

On day two, Charles X ordered Maréchal Auguste Marmont, Duke of Ragusa, the on-duty Major-General of the Garde Royale, to repress the disturbances. Marmont’s plan was to have the Garde Royale and available line units of the city garrison guard the vital thoroughfares and bridges of the city and protect important buildings such as the Palais Royal, Palais de Justice, and the Hôtel de Ville. This plan was both ill-considered and wildly ambitious; not only were there not enough troops, but there were also nowhere near enough provisions. At 4 p.m., Charles X received Colonel Komierowski, one of Marmont’s chief aides. The colonel was carrying a note from Marmont to his Majesty:
Sire, it is no longer a riot, it is a revolution. It is urgent for Your Majesty to take measures for pacification. The honour of the crown can still be saved. Tomorrow, perhaps, there will be no more time... I await with impatience Your Majesty's orders.

On day three, the revolutionaries were well-organized and very well-armed. In only a day and a night, over 4,000 barricades had been thrown up throughout the city. The tricolore flag of the revolutionaries – the “people's flag” – flew over buildings, an increasing number of them important buildings. By 1:30 pm, the Tuileries Palace had been sacked. By mid-afternoon the greatest prize, the Hôtel de Ville, had been captured. A few hours later, politicians entered the battered complex and set about establishing a provisional government. Though there would be spots of fighting throughout the city for the next few days, the revolution, for all intents and purposes, was over.

The revolution of July 1830 created a constitutional monarchy. On August 2, Charles X and his son the Dauphin abdicated their rights to the throne and departed for Great Britain. Although Charles had intended that his grandson, the Duke of Bordeaux, would take the throne as Henry V, the politicians who composed the provisional government instead placed on the throne a distant cousin, Louis Philippe of the House of Orléans, who agreed to rule as a constitutional monarch. This period became known as the July Monarchy.
Liberty Leading the People A painting by Eugène Delacroix commemorating the July Revolution of 1830, which toppled King Charles X of France. A woman personifying the concept and the Goddess of Liberty leads the people forward over the bodies of the fallen, holding the flag of the French Revolution – the tricolore flag, which remains France’s national flag – in one hand and brandishing a bayonetted musket with the other. The figure of Liberty is also viewed as a symbol of France and the French Republic known as Marianne.
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The July Monarchy (1830–1848) is generally seen as a period during which the upper-middle class (haute bourgeoisie) was dominant. It marked the shift from the counter-revolutionary Legitimists to the Orleanists, who were willing to make some compromises with the changes of the 1789 Revolution, but maintained a conservative regime marked by constant civil unrest.

Learning Objective

Contrast the July monarchy with the reign of Charles X

Key Points

- In 1830, the discontent caused by Charles X's authoritarian policies culminated in an uprising in the streets of Paris known as the 1830 July Revolution.
- Charles was forced to flee and Louis-Philippe d'Orléans, a member of the Orléans branch of the family and son of Philippe Égalité who had voted the death of his cousin Louis XVI, ascended the throne,
marking the beginning of the July Monarchy, so named for the Revolution.

- Louis-Philippe ruled not as “King of France” but as “King of the French,” which made clear that his right to rule came from the people and was not divinely granted.
- Despite this and other such gestures (for example, reviving the tricolore as the flag of France in place of the white Bourbon flag that had been used since 1815), Louis-Philippe remained conservative, and reforms mainly benefited the upper-class citizens.
- Because of the conservative character of Louis-Philippe’s regime, civil unrest remained a permanent feature of the July Monarchy, with riots and uprising continuing throughout his rule.
- In February 1848, the French government banned the holding of the Campagne des banquets, fundraising dinners by activists where critics of the regime would meet (as public demonstrations and strikes were forbidden).
- As a result, protests and riots broke out in the streets of Paris. An angry mob converged on the royal palace, after which the hapless king abdicated and fled to England; the Second Republic was then proclaimed, ending the July Monarchy.
**Key Terms**

**campagne des banquets**
Political meetings during the July Monarchy in France that destabilized the King of the French Louis-Philippe. The campaign officially took place from July 9, 1847, to December, 25 1847, but in fact continued until the February 1848 Revolution during which the Second Republic was proclaimed.

**Louis Philippe I**
King of the French from 1830 to 1848 as the leader of the Orléanist party. His government, known as the July Monarchy, was dominated by members of a wealthy French elite and numerous former Napoleonic officials. He followed conservative policies, especially under the influence of the French statesman François Guizot from 1840–48.

**haute bourgeoisie**
A social rank in the bourgeoisie that can only be acquired through time. In France, it is composed of bourgeois families that have existed since the French Revolution. They hold only honorable professions and have experienced many illustrious marriages in their family's history. They have rich cultural and historical heritages, and their financial means are more than secure. These families exude an aura of nobility that prevents them from certain marriages or occupations. They only differ from nobility in that due to circumstances, lack of opportunity, and/or political regime, they have not been ennobled.
The French Kingdom, commonly known as the July Monarchy, was a liberal constitutional monarchy in France under Louis Philippe I, starting with the July Revolution of 1830 (also known as the Three Glorious Days) and ending with the Revolution of 1848. It began with the overthrow of the conservative government of Charles X and the House of Bourbon. Louis Philippe, a member of the traditionally more liberal Orléans branch of the House of Bourbon, proclaimed himself Roi des Français (“King of the French”) rather than “King of France,” emphasizing the popular origins of his reign. The king promised to follow the “juste milieu”, or the middle-of-the-road, avoiding the extremes of the conservative supporters of Charles X and radicals on the left. The July Monarchy was dominated by wealthy bourgeoisie and numerous former Napoleonic officials. It followed conservative policies, especially under the influence (1840–48) of François Guizot. The king promoted friendship with Great Britain and sponsored colonial expansion, notably the conquest of Algeria. By 1848, a year in which many European states had a revolution, the king’s popularity had collapsed, and he was overthrown.

**Louis Philippe I**

The July Monarchy (1830–1848) is generally seen as a period during which the haute bourgeoisie was dominant. It marked the shift from the counter-revolutionary Legitimists to the Orleanists, who were willing to make compromises with the changes brought by the 1789 Revolution. Louis-Philippe’s taking of the title “King of the French” marked his acceptance of popular sovereignty, which replaced the Ancien Régime’s divine right. Louis-Philippe clearly understood his base of power: the wealthy bourgeoisie carried him aloft during the July Revolution through their work in the Parliament, and throughout his reign, he kept their interests in mind.

During the first several years of his regime, Louis-Philippe
appeared to move his government toward legitimate, broad-based reform. The government found its source of legitimacy within the Charter of 1830, written by reform-minded members of Chamber of Deputies upon a platform of religious equality, the empowerment of the citizenry through the reestablishment of the National Guard, electoral reform, the reformation of the peerage system, and the lessening of royal authority. Indeed, Louis-Phillippe and his ministers adhered to policies that seemed to promote the central tenets of the constitution. However, the majority of these were veiled attempts to shore up the power and influence of the government and the bourgeoisie, rather than legitimate attempts to promote equality and empowerment for a broad constituency of the French population. Thus, though the July Monarchy seemed to move toward reform, this movement was largely illusory.

During the years of the July Monarchy, enfranchisement roughly doubled, from 94,000 under Charles X to more than 200,000 by 1848. However, this represented less than one percent of population, and as the requirements for voting were tax-based, only the wealthiest gained the privilege. By implication, the enlarged enfranchisement tended to favor the wealthy merchant bourgeoisie more than any other group.

The reformed Charter of 1830 limited the power of the King – stripping him of his ability to propose and decree legislation, as well as limiting his executive authority. However, the King of the French still believed in a version of monarchy that held the king as much more than a figurehead for an elected Parliament, and as such, he was quite active in politics. One of the first acts of Louis-Philippe in constructing his cabinet was to appoint the rather conservative Casimir Perier as the premier. Perier, a banker, was instrumental in shutting down many of the Republican secret societies and labor unions that had formed during the early years of the regime. In addition, he oversaw the dismemberment of the National Guard after it proved too supportive of radical ideologies.

The regime acknowledged early on that radicalism and republicanism threatened it by undermining its laissez-faire
policies. Thus, the Monarchy declared the very term republican illegal in 1834. Guizot shut down republican clubs and disbanded republican publications. Republicans within the cabinet, like the banker Dupont, were all but excluded by Perier and his conservative clique. Distrusting the sole National Guard, Louis-Philippe increased the size of the army and reformed it in order to ensure its loyalty to the government.
Unrest in the July Monarchy: Revolution of 1848

Louis-Philippe, who had flirted with liberalism in his youth, rejected much of the pomp and circumstance of the Bourbons and surrounded himself with merchants and bankers. The July Monarchy, however, remained a time of turmoil. A large group of Legitimists on the right demanded the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne. On the left, Republicanism and later Socialism, remained a powerful force.

Civil unrest continued after the July Revolution, supported by the left-wing press. Louis-Philippe’s government was not able to end it, mostly because the National Guard was headed by one of the Republican leaders, the marquis de La Fayette, who requested a “popular throne surrounded by Republican institutions.” The Republicans then gathered themselves in popular clubs in the tradition established by the 1789 Revolution. Some of those were fronts for secret societies, which requested political and social reforms or the execution of Charles X’s ministers. Strikes and demonstrations were permanent.

Despite the reforms made by Louis-Philippe’s regime, which targeted the bourgeoisie rather than the people, Paris was once again rocked by riots on February 14-15, 1831. Riots and protests continued throughout his reign, including the Canuts Revolt, started on November 21, 1831, during which parts of the National Guard took the demonstrators’ side.

Late in his reign, Louis-Philippe became increasingly rigid and dogmatic. For example, his President of the Council, François Guizot, had become deeply unpopular, but Louis-Philippe refused to remove him.

Around this same time, there was another economic downturn, which especially affected the lower classes. There was an increase in workers’ demonstrations, with riots in the Buzançais in 1847. In Roubaix, a city in the industrial north, 60% of the workers were
unemployed. At the same time, the regime was marred by several political scandals (Teste-Cubières corruption scandal, revealed in May 1847, and Charles de Choiseul-Praslin’s suicide after murdering his wife, daughter of Horace Sébastiani).

Since the right of association was strictly restricted and public meetings prohibited after 1835, the opposition was paralyzed. To sidestep this law, political dissidents used civil funerals of their comrades as occasions for public demonstrations. Family celebrations and banquets also served as pretexts for gatherings. This campaign of banquets (Campagne des banquet), was intended to circumvent the governmental restriction on political meetings and provide a legal outlet for popular criticism of the regime. The campaign began in July 1847. Friedrich Engels was in Paris from October 1847 and was able to observe and attend some of these banquets.

The banquet campaign lasted until all political banquets were outlawed by the French government in February 1848. As a result, the people revolted, helping to unite the efforts of the popular Republicans and the liberal Orleanists, who turned their backs on Louis-Philippe.

Anger over the outlawing of the political banquets brought crowds of Parisians flooding into the streets at noon on February 22, 1848. The crowds directed their anger against the Citizen King Louis Philippe and his chief minister for foreign and domestic policy, François Pierre Guillaume Guizot. At 2 p.m. the next day, Prime Minister Guizot resigned. Upon hearing the news of Guizot’s resignation, a large crowd gathered outside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. An officer ordered the crowd not to pass, but people in the front of the crowd were being pushed by the rear. The officer ordered his men to fix bayonets, probably wishing to avoid shooting. However, in what is widely regarded as an accident, a soldier discharged his musket, which resulted in the rest of the soldiers firing into the crowd. Fifty-two people were killed.

Paris was soon a barricaded city. Omnibuses were turned into barricades, and thousands of trees were felled. Fires were set, and
angry citizens began converging to the royal palace. King Louis Philippe abdicated and fled to the UK.

- The July Monarchy
24.2.4: The Second French Republic

On February 26, 1848, the liberal opposition from the 1848 Revolution came together to organize a provisional government, called the Second Republic, which was marked by disorganization and political ambiguity.

Learning Objective

Break down some of the challenges faced by the Second French Republic

Key Points

- The 1848 Revolution in France ended the Orleans monarchy (1830–48) and led to the creation of the French Second Republic.
- Following the overthrow of King Louis Philippe in February, a provisional government (Constituent Assembly) was created, which was disorganized as it
attempted to deal with France's economic problems created by the political upheaval.

- Frustration among the laboring classes arose when the Constituent Assembly did not address the concerns of the workers, leading to strikes and worker demonstrations.
- Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was elected president on December 10, 1848, by a landslide; his support came from a wide section of the French public.
- Because of the ambiguity surrounding Louis Napoleon's political positions, his agenda as president was very much in doubt.
- The 1850 elections resulted in a conservative body, which renewed the power of the Church, especially in education.
- As 1851 opened, Louis-Napoleon was not allowed by the Constitution of 1848 to seek re-election as President of France; instead he proclaimed himself President for Life following a coup in December that was confirmed and accepted in a dubious referendum.

**Key Terms**

**National Workshops**

Areas of work provided for the unemployed by the French Second Republic after the Revolution of 1848. The political issues that resulted in the abdication of
Louis Philippe caused an acute industrial crisis adding to the general agricultural and commercial distress which had prevailed throughout 1847. It greatly exacerbated the problem of unemployment in Paris. The provisional government under the influence of one of its members, Louis Blanc, passed a decree (February 25, 1848) guaranteeing government-funded jobs.

**French Second Republic**

The republican government of France between the 1848 Revolution and the 1851 coup by Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte that initiated the Second Empire.

**French Revolution of 1848**

Sometimes known as the February Revolution, one of a wave of revolutions in 1848 in Europe. In France the revolutionary events ended the Orleans monarchy (1830–48) and led to the creation of the French Second Republic.

The French Revolution of 1848 had major consequences for all of Europe; popular democratic revolts against authoritarian regimes broke out in Austria and Hungary, in the German Confederation and Prussia, and in the Italian States of Milan, Venice, Turin and Rome. Economic downturns and bad harvests during the 1840s contributed to growing discontent.

In February 1848, the French government banned the holding of the Campagne des banquets, fundraising dinners by activists where critics of the regime would meet (as public demonstrations and strikes were forbidden). As a result, protests and riots broke out in the streets of Paris. An angry mob converged on the royal palace, after which the hapless king abdicated and fled to England. The Second Republic was then proclaimed.

The revolution in France brought together classes of wildly
different interests. The bourgeoisie desired electoral reforms (a democratic republic); socialist leaders (like Louis Blanc, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, and the radical Auguste Blanqui) asked for a “right to work” and the creation of national workshops (a social welfare republic) and for France to liberate the oppressed peoples of Europe (Poles and Italians). Moderates (like the aristocrat Alphonse de Lamartine) sought a middle ground. Tensions between groups escalated, and in June 1848, a working class insurrection in Paris cost the lives of 1,500 workers and eliminated once and for all the dream of a social welfare constitution.

The constitution of the Second Republic, ratified in September 1848, was extremely flawed and permitted no effective resolution between the President and the Assembly in case of dispute. In December 1848, a nephew of Napoléon Bonaparte, Charles Louis Napoléon Bonaparte, was elected as President of the Republic, and pretexting legislative gridlock, in 1851 he staged a coup d’état. Finally, in 1852 he had himself declared Emperor Napoléon III of the Second Empire of France.

# Founding of the Second Republic

The French Second Republic was the republican government of France between the 1848 Revolution and the 1851 coup by Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte that initiated the Second Empire. It officially adopted the motto Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité. The Second Republic witnessed the tension between the “Social and Democratic Republic” and a liberal form of Republic, which exploded during the June Days Uprising of 1848.

On February 26, 1848, the liberal opposition came together to organize a provisional government. The poet Alphonse de Lamartine was appointed president. Lamartine served as a virtual dictator of France for the next three months. Elections for a Constituent Assembly were scheduled for April 23, 1848. The Constituent
Assembly was to establish a new republican government for France. In preparation for these elections, two major goals of the provisional government were universal suffrage and unemployment relief. Universal male suffrage was enacted on March 2, 1848, giving France nine million new voters. As in all other European nations, women did not have the right to vote. However, during this time a proliferation of political clubs emerged, including women’s organizations.

Naturally, the provisional government was disorganized as it attempted to deal with France’s economic problems. The conservative elements of French society were wasting no time in organizing against the provisional government. After roughly a month, conservatives began to openly oppose the new government, using the rallying cry “order,” which the new republic lacked.

Frustration among the laboring classes arose when the Constituent Assembly did not address the concerns of the workers. Strikes and worker demonstrations became more common as the workers gave vent to these frustrations. These demonstrations reached a climax when on May 15, 1848, workers from the secret societies broke out in armed uprising against the anti-labor and anti-democratic policies being pursued by the Constituent Assembly and the Provisional Government. Fearful of a total breakdown of law and order, the Provisional Government invited General Louis Eugene Cavaignac back from Algeria in June 1848 to put down the worker’s armed revolt. From June 1848 until December 1848 General Cavaignac became head of the executive of the Provisional Government.

Additionally, there was a major split between the citizens of Paris and citizens of the more rural areas of France. The provisional government set out to establish deeper government control of the economy and guarantee a more equal distribution of resources. To deal with the unemployment problem, the provisional government established National Workshops. The unemployed were given jobs building roads and planting trees without regard for the demand for these tasks. The population of Paris ballooned as job seekers from all over France came to Paris to work in the newly formed
National Workshops. To pay for these and other social programs, the provisional government placed new taxes on land. These taxes alienated the “landed classes”—especially the small farmers and the peasantry of the rural areas of France—from the provisional government. Hardworking rural farmers were resistant to paying for the unemployed city people and their new “Right to Work” National Workshops. The taxes were widely disobeyed in the rural areas and the government remained strapped for cash. Popular uncertainty about the liberal foundations of the provisional government became apparent in the April 23, 1848 elections. Despite agitation from the left, voters elected a constituent assembly which was primarily moderate and conservative.

**Election of Napoleon III and a Short-Lived Republic**

The election was keenly contested; the democratic republicans adopted as their candidate Ledru-Rollin, the “pure republicans” Cavaignac, and the recently reorganized Imperialist party Prince Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte. Unknown in 1835 and forgotten or despised since 1840, Louis Napoleon had in the last eight years advanced sufficiently in the public estimation to be elected to the Constituent Assembly in 1848 by five departments. He owed this rapid increase of popularity partly to blunders of the government of July, which had unwisely aroused the memory of the country with recollections of the Empire, and partly to Louis-Napoléon’s campaign carried on from his prison at Ham by means of pamphlets of socialistic tendencies. Moreover, the monarchists, led by Thiers and the committee of the Rue de Poitiers, were no longer content even with the safe dictatorship of the upright Cavaignac, and joined forces with the Bonapartists. On December 10 the peasants gave
over 5 million votes to Napoléon, who stood for order at all costs, against 1.4 million for Cavaignac.

Louis Napoleon’s support came from a wide section of the French public. Various classes of French society voted for him for very different and often contradictory reasons; he encouraged this contradiction by “being all things to all people.” One of his major promises to the peasantry and other groups was that there would be no new taxes.

The new National Constituent Assembly was heavily composed of royalist sympathizers of both the Legitimist (Bourbon) wing and the Orleanist (Citizen King Louis Philippe) wing. Because of the ambiguity surrounding Louis Napoleon’s political positions, his agenda as president was very much in doubt. For prime minister, he selected Odilon Barrot, an unobjectionable middle-road parliamentarian, who had led the “loyal opposition” under Louis Philippe. Other appointees represented various royalist factions.

In June 1849, demonstrations against the government broke out and were suppressed. Leaders were arrested, including prominent politicians. The government banned several democratic and socialist newspapers in France; the editors were arrested. Karl Marx, who was living in Paris at the time, was at risk so he moved to London in August.

The government sought ways to balance its budget and reduce its debts. Toward this end, Hippolyte Passy was appointed Finance Minister. When the Legislative Assembly met at the beginning of October 1849, Passy proposed an income tax to help balance the finances of France. The bourgeoisie, who would pay most of the tax, protested. The furore over the income tax caused the resignation of Barrot as prime minister, but a new wine tax also caused protests.

The 1850 elections resulted in a conservative body. As 1851 opened, Louis-Napoleon was not allowed by the Constitution of 1848 to seek re-election as President of France. Instead he proclaimed himself President for Life following a coup in December that was confirmed and accepted in a dubious referendum.
“Messieurs Victor Hugo and Emile de Girardin try to raise Prince Louis upon a shield [in the heroic Roman fashion]: not too steady!” Honoré Daumier’s satirical lithograph published in Charivari, December 11, 1848.

Attributions

- The Second French Republic
The Second French Republic
The Second French Empire was the Imperial Bonapartist regime of Napoleon III from 1852 to 1870, between the Second Republic and the Third Republic, an era of great industrialization, urbanization (including the massive rebuilding of Paris by Baron Haussmann), and economic growth, as well as major disasters in foreign affairs.

**Learning Objective**

Summarize the reign of Napoleon III and his efforts to recreate his uncle’s empire

**Key Points**

- In 1851, Louis Napoleon was not allowed by the Constitution of 1848 to seek re-election as President of the Second Republic of France; instead, he proclaimed himself President for Life following a coup in December and in 1852 declared himself the Emperor of France, Napoleon III.
- The structure of the French government during the
Second Empire was little changed from the First under Napoleon Bonaparte.

- Despite his promises in 1852 of a peaceful reign, the Emperor could not resist the temptations of glory in foreign affairs.
- Napoleon did have some successes; he strengthened French control over Algeria, established bases in Africa, began the takeover of Indochina, and opened trade with China.
- In Europe, however, Napoleon failed again and again; the Crimean war of 1854-56 produced no gains, in the 1860s Napoleon nearly blundered into war with the United States in 1862, and his takeover of Mexico in 1861-67 was a total disaster.
- In July 1870, Napoleon entered the Franco-Prussian War without allies and with inferior military forces; the French army was rapidly defeated and Napoleon III was captured at the Battle of Sedan.
- The French Third Republic was proclaimed in Paris, and Napoleon went into exile in England, where he died in 1873.

Key Terms

Franco-Prussian War
A conflict between the Second French Empire of Napoleon III and the German states of the North German Confederation led by the Kingdom of Prussia.
The conflict was caused by Prussian ambitions to extend German unification and French fears of the shift in the European balance of power that would result if the Prussians succeeded. A series of swift Prussian and German victories in eastern France, culminating in the Siege of Metz and the Battle of Sedan, saw Napoleon III captured and the army of the Second Empire decisively defeated.

**Napoleon III**

The only President (1848–52) of the French Second Republic and, as Napoleon III, the Emperor (1852–70) of the Second French Empire. He was the nephew and heir of Napoleon I. He was the first President of France to be elected by a direct popular vote. He was blocked by the Constitution and Parliament from running for a second term, so he organized a coup d’état in 1851 and then took the throne as Napoleon III on December 2, 1852, the 48th anniversary of Napoleon I’s coronation. He remains the longest-serving French head of state since the French Revolution.

**reconstruction of Paris**

A vast public works program commissioned by Emperor Napoléon III and directed by his prefect of the Seine, Georges-Eugène Haussmann, between 1853 and 1870. It included the demolition of crowded and unhealthy medieval neighborhoods; the building of wide avenues, parks, and squares; the annexation of the suburbs surrounding Paris; and the construction of new sewers, fountains, and aqueducts. Haussmann’s work met with fierce opposition and was finally dismissed by Napoleon III in 1870, but work on his projects continued until 1927. The street plan and
The constitution of the Second Republic, ratified in September 1848, was extremely flawed and permitted no effective resolution between the President and the Assembly in case of dispute. In 1848, a nephew of Napoléon Bonaparte, Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, was elected President of France through universal male suffrage, taking 74% of the vote. He did this with the support of the Parti de l’Ordre after running against Louis Eugène Cavaignac. Subsequently, he was in constant conflict with the members of the National Assembly.

Ascension to Power

Contrary to the Party’s expectations that Louis-Napoleon would be easy to manipulate (Adolphe Thiers had called him a “cretin whom we will lead [by the nose]”), he proved himself an agile and cunning politician. He succeeded in imposing his choices and decisions on the Assembly, which had once again become conservative in the aftermath of the June Days Uprising in 1848.

The provisions of the constitution that prohibited an incumbent president from seeking re-election appeared to force the end of Louis-Napoleon’s rule in December 1852. Not one to admit defeat, Louis-Napoleon spent the first half of 1851 trying to change the constitution through Parliament so he could be re-elected. Bonaparte traveled through the provinces and organized petitions to rally popular support but in January 1851, the Parliament voted no.

Louis-Napoleon believed that he was supported by the people, and he decided to retain power by other means. His half-brother
Morny and a few close advisers began to quietly organize a coup d’état. They brought Major General Jacques Leroy de Saint Arnaud, a former captain from the French Foreign Legion and a commander of French forces in Algeria, and other officers from the French army in North Africa to provide military backing for the coup.

On the morning of December 2, troops led by Saint-Arnaud occupied strategic points in Paris from the Champs-Élysées to the Tuileries. Top opposition leaders were arrested and six edicts promulgated to establish the rule of Louis-Napoleon. The Assemblée Nationale was dissolved and universal male suffrage restored. Louis-Napoleon declared that a new constitution was being framed and said he intended to restore a “system established by the First Consul.” He thus declared himself President for Life, and in 1852, Emperor of France, Napoleon III.

France was ruled by Emperor Napoleon III from 1852 to 1870. During the first years of the Empire, Napoleon’s government imposed censorship and harsh repressive measures against his opponents. Some six thousand were imprisoned or sent to penal colonies until 1859. Thousands more went into voluntary exile abroad, including Victor Hugo. From 1862 onward, he relaxed government censorship, and his regime came to be known as the “Liberal Empire.” Many of his opponents returned to France and became members of the National Assembly.

Legacy

Napoleon III is best known today for his grand reconstruction of Paris, carried out by his prefect of the Seine, Baron Haussmann. He launched similar public works projects in Marseille, Lyon, and other French cities. Napoleon III modernized the French banking system, greatly expanded and consolidated the French railway system, and made the French merchant marine the second largest in the world.
He promoted the building of the Suez Canal and established modern agriculture, which ended famines in France and made France an agricultural exporter. Napoleon III negotiated the 1860 Cobden–Chevalier free trade agreement with Britain and similar agreements with France's other European trading partners. Social reforms included giving French workers the right to strike and the right to organize. Women's education greatly expanded, as did the list of required subjects in public schools.

**Foreign Policy**

In foreign policy, Napoleon III aimed to reassert French influence in Europe and around the world. He was a supporter of popular sovereignty and nationalism. Despite his promises in 1852 of a peaceful reign, the Emperor could not resist the temptations of glory in foreign affairs. He was visionary, mysterious, and secretive; had a poor staff; and kept running afoul of his domestic supporters. In the end he was incompetent as a diplomat. Napoleon did have some successes: he strengthened French control over Algeria,
established bases in Africa, began the takeover of Indochina, and opened trade with China. He facilitated a French company building the Suez Canal, which Britain could not stop. In Europe, however, Napoleon failed again and again. The Crimean war of 1854–56 produced no gains, although his alliance with Britain did defeat Russia. His regime assisted Italian unification and in doing so, annexed Savoy and the County of Nice to France; at the same time, his forces defended the Papal States against annexation by Italy. On the other hand, his army’s intervention in Mexico to create a Second Mexican Empire under French protection ended in failure.

The Prussian chancellor Otto von Bismarck provoked Napoleon into declaring war on Prussia in July 1870, beginning the Franco–Prussian War. The French troops were swiftly defeated in the following weeks, and on September 1, the main army, which the emperor himself was with, was trapped at Sedan and forced to surrender. A republic was quickly proclaimed in Paris, but the war was far from over. As it was clear that Prussia would expect territorial concessions, the provisional government vowed to continue resistance. The Prussians laid siege to Paris, and new armies mustered by France failed to alter this situation. The French capital began experiencing severe food shortages, to the extent that even the animals in the zoo were eaten. As the city was bombarded by Prussian siege guns in January 1871, King William of Prussia was proclaimed Emperor of Germany in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. Shortly afterwards, Paris surrendered. The subsequent peace treaty was harsh. France ceded Alsace and Lorraine to Germany and had to pay an indemnity of 5 billion francs. German troops were to remain in the country until it was paid off. Meanwhile, the fallen Napoleon III went into exile in England where he died in 1873.
Structure of Second French Empire

The structure of the French government during the Second Empire was little changed from the First. But Emperor Napoleon III stressed his own imperial role as the foundation of the government. If government was to guide the people toward domestic justice and external peace, it was his role as emperor, holding his power by universal male suffrage and representing all of the people, to function as supreme leader and safeguard the achievements of the revolution. He had so often, while in prison or in exile, chastised previous oligarchical governments for neglecting social questions that it was imperative France now prioritize their solutions. His answer was to organize a system of government based on the principles of the “Napoleonic Idea.” This meant that the emperor, the elect of the people as the representative of the democracy, ruled supreme. He himself drew power and legitimacy from his role as representative of the great Napoleon I of France, “who had sprung
armed from the French Revolution like Minerva from the head of Jove."

The anti-parliamentary French Constitution of 1852, instituted by Napoleon III on January 14, 1852, was largely a repetition of that of 1848. All executive power was entrusted to the emperor who as head of state was solely responsible to the people. The people of the Empire, lacking democratic rights, were to rely on the benevolence of the emperor rather than on the benevolence of politicians. He was to nominate the members of the council of state, whose duty it was to prepare the laws, and of the senate, a body permanently established as a constituent part of the empire.

One innovation was made, namely that the Legislative Body was elected by universal suffrage, but it had no right of initiative as all laws were proposed by the executive power. This new political change was rapidly followed by the same consequence as of Brumaire. On December 2, 1852, France, still under the effect of Napoleon's legacy and the fear of anarchy, conferred almost unanimously by a plebiscite the supreme power and the title of emperor upon Napoleon III.

The Legislative Body was not allowed to elect its own president, regulate its own procedure, propose a law or an amendment, vote on the budget in detail, or make its deliberations public. Similarly, universal suffrage was supervised and controlled by means of official candidature by forbidding free speech and action in electoral matters to the Opposition and gerrymandering in such a way as to overwhelm the Liberal vote in the mass of the rural population.

For seven years France had no democratic life. The Empire governed by a series of plebiscites. Up to 1857 the Opposition did not exist. From then till 1860 it was reduced to five members: Darimon, Émile Ollivier, Hénon, Jules Favre, and Ernest Picard. The royalists waited inactively after the new and unsuccessful attempt made at Frohsdorf in 1853 by a combination of the legitimists and Orléanists to recreate a living monarchy out of the ruin of two royal families.
Attributions

- **Napoleon III**
  - “France in the long nineteenth century.”
98. Russia after Napoleon

24.3: Russia after Napoleon

24.3.1: Alexander I’s Domestic Reforms

Tsar Alexander I wanted to reform the serf system but was stymied. With his new law, only 7,300 male peasants with families were freed (about 0.5%), but all classes except the serfs could own land, a privilege previously confined to the nobility.

Learning Objective

Determine the significance of Alexander I’s efforts to reform the serf system in Russia

Key Points

- Alexander I, who ruled as Tsar of Russia from 1801-1825, was raised on the ideals of the Enlightenment by his grandmother, Catherine II, leading him to adopt liberal rhetoric and a spirit of
reform.

- In the first years of his reign, he initiated some minor social reforms and in 1803–04 major liberal education reforms, such as building more universities.

- One of his main goals was to reform the inefficient, highly centralized systems of government that Russia relied upon.

- He promised to reform serfdom in Russia but made no concrete proposals; his new laws only freed 0.5% of the serf population.

- However, he did extend land ownership to all classes except serfs, a privilege previously confined to the nobility.

- After 1815, military settlements (farms worked by soldiers and their families under military control) were introduced, with the idea of making the army or part of it self-supporting economically and for providing it with recruits.

**Key Terms**

**serf**

The status of many peasants under feudalism, specifically relating to manorialism. It was a condition of bondage, which developed primarily during the High Middle Ages in Europe and lasted in some countries until the mid-19th century. Those who occupied a plot
of land were required to work for the lord of the manor who owned that land, and in return were entitled to protection, justice, and the right to exploit certain fields within the manor for their own subsistence. They were often required not only to work on the lord's fields, but also his mines, forests, and roads.

**Age of Enlightenment**

An intellectual movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. It centered on reason as the primary source of authority and legitimacy and advanced ideals like liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state. It was marked by an emphasis on the scientific method and reductionism along with increased questioning of religious orthodoxy.

**state-owned peasants**

A special class in 18th-19th century Russia that during some periods comprised half of the agricultural population. In contrast to private Russian serfs, these were considered personally free although attached to the land.

Alexander I reigned as Emperor of Russia from March 23, 1801, to December 1, 1825. He was born in Saint Petersburg to Grand Duke Paul Petrovich, later Emperor Paul I, and succeeded to the throne after his father was murdered. He ruled Russia during the chaotic period of the Napoleonic Wars. As prince and emperor, Alexander often used liberal rhetoric, but continued Russia's absolutist policies in practice. In the first years of his reign, he initiated some minor social reforms and in 1803–04 major, liberal educational reforms, such as building more universities. He promised constitutional
reforms and a desperately needed reform of serfdom in Russia but made no concrete proposals. Alexander appointed Mikhail Speransky, the son of a village priest, as one of his closest advisers. The Collegia was abolished and replaced by the State Council, created to improve legislation. Plans were also made to set up a parliament and sign a constitution.

In the second half of his reign he was increasingly arbitrary, reactionary, and fearful of plots against him; he ended many earlier reforms. He purged schools of foreign teachers as education became more religiously oriented and politically conservative. Speransky was replaced as adviser with the strict artillery inspector Aleksey Arakcheyev, who oversaw the creation of military settlements. Alexander died of typhus in December 1825 while on a trip to southern Russia. He left no children as heirs and both of his brothers wanted the other to become emperor. After a period of great confusion that included the failed Decembrist revolt of liberal army officers, he was succeeded by his younger brother, Nicholas I.

**Early Reign**

At first, the Orthodox Church exercised little influence on Alexander’s reign. The young tsar was determined to reform the inefficient, highly centralized systems of government upon which Russian relied. While he retained the old ministers for a time, one of the first acts of his reign was to appoint the Private Committee, comprising young and enthusiastic friends of his own—Victor Kochubey, Nikolay Novosiltsev, Pavel Stroganov, and Adam Jerzy Czartoryski—to draw up a plan of domestic reform, which was supposed to result in the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in accordance with the teachings of the Age of Enlightenment.

In a few years the liberal Mikhail Speransky became one of the...
Tsar’s closest advisors, and drew up many plans for elaborate reforms. By the Government reform of Alexander I the old Collegia were abolished and new Ministries created in their place, headed by ministers responsible to the Crown. A Council of Ministers under the chairmanship of the Sovereign dealt with all interdepartmental matters. The State Council was created in order to improve technique of legislation. It was intended to become the Second Chamber of representative legislature. The Governing Senate was reorganized as the Supreme Court of the Empire. The codification of the laws initiated in 1801 was never carried out during his reign.

Domestic Improvements

When Alexander's reign began, there were three universities in Russia, at Moscow, Vilna (Vilnius), and Dorpat (Tartu). These were strengthened, and three others were founded at St. Petersburg, Kharkov, and Kazan. Literary and scientific bodies were established or encouraged, and the reign became noted for the aid lent to the sciences and arts by the Emperor and the wealthy nobility. Alexander later expelled foreign scholars.

After 1815, military settlements (farms worked by soldiers and their families under military control) were introduced, with the idea of making the army, or part of it, self-supporting economically and providing it with recruits.

The Status of Serfs

Alexander wanted to resolve another crucial issue in Russia—the
status of the serfs, although this was not achieved until 1861 during the reign of his nephew Alexander II. His advisers quietly discussed the options at length. Cautiously, he extended the right to own land to most classes of subjects, including state-owned peasants, in 1801 and created a new social category of “free agriculturalist” for peasants voluntarily emancipated by their masters in 1803. The new laws allowed all classes except the serfs to own land, a privilege previously confined to the nobility. As the title of the 1803 decree, informally known as “Decree on Free Ploughmen” says, the serfs were freed and endowed with land by the will on the serf owner under payment or work obligations. During the reign of Alexander I only about 7,300 male peasants (with families) or about 0.5% of serfs were freed.

The Russian state also continued to support serfdom due to military conscription. The conscripted serfs dramatically increased the size of the Russian military, leading to victory in the Napoleonic Wars and Russo-Persian Wars; this did not change the disparity between Russia and the rest of Western Europe, who were experiencing agricultural and industrial revolutions. Compared to Western Europe it was clear that Russia was at an economic disadvantage. European philosophers during the Age of Enlightenment criticized serfdom and compared it to medieval labor practices which were almost non-existent in the rest of continent. Most Russian Nobles were not interested in change toward western labor practices that Catherine the Great proposed. Instead they preferred to mortgage serfs for profit. In 1820, 20% of all serfs were mortgaged to state credit institutions by their owners. This was increased to 66% in 1859.
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A Peasant Leaving His Landlord on Yuriev Day A painting by Sergei V. Ivanov from 1908, depicting a family of serfs leaving their landlord on Yuriev Day, a two-week period that was the only time of the year when the Russian peasants were free to move from one landowner to another before the abolition of serfdom in 1861.

Attributions

- **Alexander I’s Domestic Reforms**
• “S._V._Ivanov._Yuri’s_Day._(1908).jpg.”
Tsar Alexander I, one of the most brilliant diplomats of his time, focused his foreign affairs on the Napoleonic Wars and the expansion of Russian territory.

**Learning Objective**

List some of the territorial gains made by Tsar Alexander I

**Key Points**

- Tsar Alexander I, who ruled the Russian Empire from 1801-1825, had a complicated relationship with Napoleon during the lengthy Napoleonic Wars.
- He changed Russia’s position relative to France four times between 1804 and 1812 among neutrality, opposition, and alliance.
- In 1805 he joined Britain in the War of the Third
Coalition against Napoleon, but after the massive defeat at the Battle of Austerlitz he switched and formed an alliance with Napoleon by the Treaty of Tilsit (1807) and joined Napoleon’s Continental System.

- The tsar’s greatest triumph came in 1812 as Napoleon's invasion of Russia proved a total disaster for the French.
- As part of the winning coalition against Napoleon, Russia gained Finland and Poland at the Congress of Vienna.
- He formed the Holy Alliance to suppress revolutionary movements in Europe that he saw as immoral threats to legitimate Christian monarchs.
- Under Alexander, Russia also fought a successful war with Persia, gaining disputed territory in the Caucasus region, which provides vital access to the Black Sea and Caspian Sea.

**Key Terms**

**Napoleonic Wars**

A series of major conflicts pitting the French Empire and its allies, led by Napoleon I, against a fluctuating array of European powers formed into various coalitions, primarily led and financed by the United Kingdom. The wars resulted from the unresolved disputes associated with the French Revolution and the
Revolutionary Wars, which had raged for years before concluding with the Treaty of Amiens in 1802. The resumption of hostilities the following year paved the way for more than a decade of constant warfare. The wars had profound consequences for global and European history, leading to the spread of nationalism and liberalism, the rise of the British Empire as the world's premier power, the independence movements in Latin America and subsequent collapse of the Spanish Empire, the fundamental reorganization of German and Italian territories into larger states, and the establishment of radically new methods in warfare.

**Russo-Persian War (1804–13)**

One of the many wars between the Persian Empire and Imperial Russia that like many of their wars began as a territorial dispute. The new Persian king, Fath Ali Shah Qajar, wanted to consolidate the northernmost reaches of his kingdom—modern day Georgia—which had been annexed by Tsar Paul I several years after the Russo-Persian War of 1796. Like his Persian counterpart, the Tsar Alexander I was also new to the throne and equally determined to control the disputed territories. The war ended in 1813 with the Treaty of Gulistan, which irrevocably ceded the previously disputed territory of Georgia to Imperial Russia, but added the Iranian territories of Dagestan, most of what is nowadays Azerbaijan, and minor parts of Armenia.

**Caucasus region**

A strategically valuable region at the border of Europe and Asia, situated between the Black and the Caspian seas. It is home to the Caucasus Mountains, which contain Europe’s highest mountain, Mount
Alexander I’s Foreign Affairs: Persia and France

Tsar Alexander I was perhaps the most brilliant diplomat of his time. His primary focus was not on domestic policy but foreign affairs, particularly Napoleon. Fearing Napoleon’s expansionist ambitions and the growth of French power, Alexander joined Britain and Austria against Napoleon. Napoleon defeated the Russians and Austrians at Austerlitz in 1805 and the Russians at Friedland in 1807. The Battle of Austerlitz in 1805 was one of the most important and decisive engagements of the Napoleonic Wars. In what is widely regarded as the greatest victory achieved by Napoleon, the Grande Armée of France defeated a larger Russian and Austrian army. Austerlitz brought the War of the Third Coalition to a rapid end, with the Treaty of Pressburg signed by the Austrians later in the month. The battle is often cited as a tactical masterpiece, in the same league as other historic engagements like Cannae or Arbela.

After these defeats, Alexander was forced to sue for peace with France, and with the Treaty of Tilsit, signed in 1807, he became Napoleon’s ally. Russia lost little territory under the treaty, and Alexander made use of his alliance with Napoleon for further expansion. By the Finnish War he wrested the Grand Duchy of Finland from Sweden in 1809, and acquired Bessarabia from Turkey as a result of the Russo-Turkish War, 1806-1812.

Alexander was determined to acquire disputed territories in the Caucasus region and beyond, mainly held by Persia. His predecessors had already waged small wars against Persia, but they
had not been able to consolidate Russian authority over the regions, so these were either ceded or conquered back by Persia.

After the Russian armies officially liberated allied Georgia from centuries-long Persian occupation in 1801, Alexander fought the Russo-Persian War (1804–13), the first full-scale war against the neighboring Persia, over the control and consolidation of Georgia and eventually Azerbaijan, Dagestan, and the entire Caucasus.

After nine long years of battle, Russia managed to end the war on highly favorable terms, completing Russian consolidation and suzerainty over major parts of the Caucasus including the gains of Dagestan, Georgia, most of Azerbaijan, and other regions and territories in the Caucasus over Persia. By now, Russia had full, comfortable access to the Black Sea and Caspian Sea and would use these newly gained grounds for further wars against Persia and Turkey.

The Russo-French alliance gradually became strained. Napoleon was concerned about Russia's intentions in the strategically vital Bosporus and Dardanelles straits. At the same time, Alexander viewed the Duchy of Warsaw, the French-controlled reconstituted Polish state, with suspicion. The requirement of joining France's Continental Blockade against Britain was a serious disruption of Russian commerce, and in 1810 Alexander repudiated the obligation. In June 1812, Napoleon invaded Russia with 600,000 troops—a force twice as large as the Russian regular army. Napoleon hoped to inflict a major defeat on the Russians and force Alexander to sue for peace. As Napoleon pushed the Russian forces back, however, he became seriously overextended. Obstinate Russian forces, members of which declared the Patriotic War, brought Napoleon a disastrous defeat: Less than 30,000 of his troops returned to their homeland. Victory came at a high cost as the areas of the country the French army had marched through lay in ruins. The campaign was a turning point in the Napoleonic Wars. The reputation of Napoleon was severely shaken and French hegemony in Europe was dramatically weakened. The Grande Armée, made up of French and allied invasion forces, was reduced to a fraction of its initial strength. These events
triggered a major shift in European politics. France’s ally Prussia, soon followed by Austria, broke its imposed alliance with France and switched sides. This triggered the War of the Sixth Coalition.

Congress of Vienna and Beyond

As the French retreated, the Russians pursued them into Central and Western Europe and to the gates of Paris. After the allies defeated Napoleon, Alexander became known as the savior of Europe and played a prominent role in the redrawing of the map
of Europe at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. In the same year, Alexander initiated the creation of the Holy Alliance, a loose agreement pledging the rulers of the nations involved—including most of Europe—to act according to Christian principles. More pragmatically, in 1814 Russia, Britain, Austria, and Prussia formed the Quadruple Alliance. When Napoleon suddenly reappeared, Russia was part of the alliance that chased him down. The conservative Bourbons were back in power in Paris and on good terms with Russia. The allies created an international system to maintain the territorial status quo and prevent the resurgence of an expansionist France. The Quadruple Alliance, confirmed by a number of international conferences, ensured Russia’s influence in Europe.

At the same time, Russia continued its expansion. The Congress of Vienna, held in Vienna from November 1814 to June 1815, aimed to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars. The tsar had two main goals: to gain control of Poland and promote the peaceful coexistence of European nations. The Congress created the Congress Poland (formerly the Duchy of Warsaw), to which Alexander granted a constitution. Though officially the Kingdom of Poland was a state with considerable political autonomy guaranteed by a liberal constitution, its rulers, the Russian Emperors, generally disregarded any restrictions on their power. Effectively it was little more than a puppet state of the Russian Empire. Thus, Alexander I became the constitutional monarch of Poland while remaining the autocratic tsar of Russia. He was also the monarch of Finland, which had been annexed in 1809 and awarded autonomous status. The Congress finalized Russia control of Finland.

Despite the liberal, romantic inclinations of his youth, later in his rule Alexander I grew steadily more conservative, isolated from the day-to-day affairs of the state, and inclined to religious mysticism. Once a supporter of limited liberalism, as seen in his approval of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Poland in 1815, at the end of 1818 Alexander’s views began to change. A revolutionary conspiracy
among the officers of the guard and a foolish plot to kidnap him on his way to the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle are said to have shaken the foundations of his liberalism. At Aix he came for the first time into intimate contact with Metternich, initiating the ascendancy of conservatism over the mind of the Russian emperor and in the councils of Europe. It was the apparent triumph of disorder in the revolutions of Naples and Piedmont, combined with increasingly disquieting symptoms of discontent in France, Germany, and among his own people, that completed Alexander’s conversion.

Alexander had upheld the ideal of a free confederation of the European states, symbolized by the Holy Alliance, against the policy of a dictatorship of the great powers, symbolized by the Quadruple Treaty; he had protested against the claims of collective Europe to interfere in the internal concerns of the sovereign states. But on November 19, 1820, he signed the Troppau Protocol, which consecrated the principle of intervention against revolution and wrecked the harmony of the concert created at the Congress of Vienna.

The lofty hopes that the tsar had once held for his country were frustrated by its immense size and backwardness. While vacationing on the Black Sea in 1825, Alexander fell ill with typhus and died at only 47, although there were unfounded stories that he faked his own death, became a monk, and wandered the Siberian wilderness for many years afterwards.

Attributions

- Territorial Gains Under Alexander I
24.3.3: The Decembrist Revolt

On December 26, 1825, Russian army officers led about 3,000 soldiers in a protest against Nicholas I’s assumption of the throne after the death of Tsar Alexander I.

Learning Objective

Identify the impetuses for the Decembrist Revolt

Key Points

- A revolutionary movement was born during the reign of Alexander I.
- The background of the Decembrist Revolt lay in the Napoleonic Wars, when a number of well-educated Russian officers in Western Europe during the course of military campaigns were exposed to its liberalism and encouraged to seek change on their return to autocratic Russia.
- Army officers created the Union of Salvation, aimed at the abolishment of serfdom and introduction of
constitutional monarchy by means of armed revolt at the next emperor's succession to the throne.

- The revolt occurred on December 1825, when about 3,000 officers and soldiers refused to swear allegiance to the new tsar, Alexander's brother Nicholas, proclaiming instead their loyalty to the idea of a Russian constitution and a constitutional monarchy.

- The revolt was easily crushed, and the surviving rebels exiled to Siberia, leading Nicholas to turn away from the modernization program begun by Peter the Great.

Key Terms

**Peter the Great**

He ruled the Tsardom of Russia and later the Russian Empire from May 7, 1682, until his death, jointly ruling before 1696 with his elder half-brother, Ivan V. Through a number of successful wars, he expanded the Tsardom into a much larger empire that became a major European power. He led a cultural revolution that replaced some of the traditionalist and medieval social and political systems with ones that were modern, scientific, westernized, and based on The Enlightenment. His reforms made a lasting impact on Russia, and many institutions of Russian government trace their origins to his reign.
Union of Salvation

The first secret political society of the Decembrists. Founded in 1816 at the initiative of Alexander Nikolayevich Muravyov by a group of young officers of the Russian army who had taken part in the Patriotic War of 1812 and foreign campaigns of 1813–1814. They aimed at the abolishment of serfdom and introduction of constitutional monarchy by means of armed revolt at the time of next emperor’s succession to the throne.

The Decembrist revolt took place in Imperial Russia on December 26, 1825. Russian army officers led about 3,000 soldiers in a protest against Nicholas I’s assumption of the throne after his elder brother Constantine removed himself from the line of succession.

The Decembrist revolt was an aristocratic movement whose chief actors were army officers and members of the nobility. The reasons for Decembrist Uprising were manifold: opposition on part of the nobility to the regime that successfully limited its privileges through its peasant policy spread among a section of young officers with liberal and even radical ideas, along with fears among the nationalist section of society inspired by some of Alexander's policies. Officers were particularly angry that Alexander granted Poland a constitution while Russia remained without one.

Several clandestine organizations were preparing for an uprising after Alexander’s death. There was confusion about who would succeed him because the next in line, his brother Constantine Pavlovich, relinquished his right to the throne. A group of officers commanding about 3,000 men refused to swear allegiance to the new tsar, Alexander's brother Nicholas, proclaiming instead their loyalty to the idea of a Russian constitution. Because these events occurred in December 1825, the rebels were called Decembrists.
Nicholas easily overcame the revolt, and the surviving rebels were exiled to Siberia.

**Background: Union of Salvation**

In 1816, several officers of the Imperial Russian Guard founded a society known as the Union of Salvation, or of the Faithful and True Sons of the Fatherland. The society acquired a more liberal cast after it was joined by the idealistic Pavel Pestel. After a mutiny in the Semenovsky Regiment in 1820, the society decided to suspend activity in 1821. Two groups, however, continued to function secretly: a Southern Society, based at Tulchin, a small garrison town in Ukraine, in which Pestel was the outstanding figure, and a Northern Society, based at St Petersburg, led by Guard officers Nikita Muraviev, Prince S. P. Trubetskoy and Prince Eugene Obolensky. The political aims of the more moderate Northern Society were a British-style constitutional monarchy with a limited franchise, the abolition of serfdom, and equality before the law. The Southern Society, under Pestel’s influence, was more radical and wanted to abolish the monarchy, establish a republic, and redistribute land, taking half into state ownership and dividing the rest among the peasants.

At first, many officers were encouraged by Tsar Alexander’s early liberal reformation of Russian society and politics. In 1819 Count Mikhail Mikhailovich Speransky was appointed as the Governor of Siberia, with the task of reforming local government. Equally, in 1818 the Tsar asked Count Nikolay Nikolayevich Novosiltsev to draw up a constitution. However, internal and external unrest, which the Tsar believed stemmed from political liberalization, led to a series of repressions and a return to a former government of restriction and conservatism.

Meanwhile, spurred by their experiences of the Napoleonic Wars
and realizing many of the harsh indignities through which the peasant soldiers were forced, Decembrist officers and sympathizers displayed their contempt for the regime by rejecting court lifestyle, wearing their cavalry swords at balls (indicating their unwillingness to dance), and committing themselves to academic study. This new lifestyle captured the spirit of the times, as a willingness to embrace both the peasant (i.e. the “Russian way of life”) and ongoing reformative movements abroad.

The Events of the Revolt

When Tsar Alexander I died on December 1, 1825, the royal guards swore allegiance to the presumed heir, Alexander's brother Constantine. When Constantine made his renunciation public and Nicholas stepped forward to assume the throne, the Northern Society acted. With the capital in temporary confusion and one oath to Constantine having already been sworn, the society scrambled in secret meetings to convince regimental leaders not to swear allegiance to Nicholas. These efforts would culminate in the Decembrist Revolt. The leaders of the society (many of whom belonged to the high aristocracy) elected Prince Sergei Trubetskoy as interim dictator.

On the morning of December 26, a group of officers commanding about 3,000 men assembled in Senate Square, where they refused to swear allegiance to the new tsar, Nicholas I, proclaiming instead their loyalty to Constantine and their Decembrist Constitution. They expected to be joined by the rest of the troops stationed in Saint Petersburg, but were disappointed. The revolt was further hampered when it was deserted by its supposed leader Prince Trubetskoy, who had a last minute change of heart and failed to turn up at the Square. His second in command, Colonel Bulatov,
also vanished from the scene. After a hurried consultation the rebels appointed Prince Eugene Obolesky as a replacement leader.

For long hours there was a stand-off between the 3,000 rebels and the 9,000 loyal troops stationed outside the Senate building, with some desultory shooting from the rebel side. A vast crowd of civilian on-lookers began fraternizing with the rebels, but did not join the action. Eventually Nicholas, the new Tsar, appeared in person at the square and sent Count Mikhail Miloradovich, a military hero who was greatly respected by ordinary soldiers, to parley with the rebels. Miloradovich was fatally shot by Pyotr Kakhovsky while delivering a public address to defuse the situation. At the same time, a rebelling grenadier squad, led by lieutenant Nikolay Panov, entered the Winter Palace but failed to seize it and retreated.

After spending most of the day in fruitless attempts to parley with the rebel force, Nicholas ordered a cavalry charge which slipped on the icy cobbles and retired in disorder. Eventually, at the end of the day, Nicholas ordered three artillery pieces to open fire, with devastating effect. To avoid the slaughter the rebels broke and ran. Some attempted to regroup on the frozen surface of the river Neva to the north but were targeted there by the artillery and suffered many casualties. As the ice was broken by the cannon fire, many of the dead and dying were cast into the river. After a nighttime mopping-up operation by loyal army and police units, the revolt in the north came to an end. The surviving rebels were tried and sentenced to exile in Siberia.

For the most part, the rebellion led Nicholas to turn away from the modernization program begun by Peter the Great and champion the doctrine of Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality.

Though defeated, the Decembrists did effect some change on the regime. Their dissatisfaction forced Nicholas to turn his attention inward to address the issues of the empire. To some extent, the Decembrists were in the tradition of a long line of palace revolutionaries who wanted to place their candidate on the throne, but because the Decembrists also wanted to implement classical
liberalism, their revolt has been considered the beginning of a revolutionary movement. The uprising was the first open breach between the government and reformist elements of the Russian nobility, which would subsequently widen.

Attributions

• The Decembrist Revolt
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101. The Wars of Nicholas I

24.3.4: The Wars of Nicholas I

In war, Tsar Nicholas I was successful against Russia’s neighboring southern rivals, Persia and the Ottoman Empire, seizing the last territories in the Caucasus held by Persia. Later in his rule, however, he led Russia into the Crimean War (1853–56) with disastrous results.

Learning Objective

Recall some of the wars fought by Nicholas I

Key Points

• Nicholas I became Tsar of Russia in 1925 after crushing the Decembrist revolt against him and went on to become the most reactionary of all Russian leaders.
• His reign had an ideology called “Official Nationality,” proclaimed officially in 1833, that was a reactionary policy based on orthodoxy in religion, autocracy in government, and Russian nationalism.
• His aggressive foreign policy involved many expensive wars that had a disastrous effect on the empire’s finances.
• The late 1820s were successful military years. Despite losing almost all recently consolidated territories in the first year of the Russo-Persian War of 1826–28, Russia managed to end the war with highly favorable terms. This included the official gains of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Iğdır Province, earning the clear geopolitical and territorial upper hand in the Caucasus region.
• In the 1828–29 Russo-Turkish War, Russia invaded northeastern Anatolia and occupied strategic Ottoman holdings, posing as protector and savior of the Greek Orthodox population and thus receiving extensive support from the region’s Greek population.
• In 1854–55, Russia lost to Britain, France, and Turkey in the Crimean War.
• Since playing a major role in the defeat of Napoleon, Russia was regarded as militarily invincible, but once opposed against a coalition of the great powers of Europe, the defeats it suffered in the Crimean War revealed the weakness and backwardness of Tsar Nicholas’ regime.
Key Terms

**Eastern Question**

Refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries. Characterized as the “sick man of Europe,” the relative weakening of the empire’s military strength in the second half of the 18th century threatened to undermine the fragile balance of power system largely shaped by the Concert of Europe.

**Crimean War**

A military conflict fought from October 1853 to March 1856 in which the Russian Empire lost to an alliance of France, Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and Sardinia. The immediate cause involved the rights of Christian minorities in the Holy Land, part of the Ottoman Empire. The French promoted the rights of Roman Catholics while Russia promoted those of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The longer-term causes involved the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the unwillingness of Britain and France to allow Russia to gain territory and power at Ottoman expense.

**“Official Nationality”**

The dominant ideological doctrine of Russian emperor Nicholas I. It was “the Russian version of a general European ideology of restoration and reaction” that followed the Napoleonic Wars. It was a reactionary policy based on orthodoxy in religion, autocracy in
Tsar Nicholas I

Nicholas I was the Emperor of Russia from 1825 until 1855 as well as King of Poland and Grand Duke of Finland. He is best-known as a political conservative whose reign was marked by geographical expansion, repression of dissent, economic stagnation, poor administrative policies, a corrupt bureaucracy, and frequent wars that culminated in Russia's disastrous defeat in the Crimean War of 1853-56. His biographer Nicholas V. Riasanovsky says that Nicholas displayed determination, singleness of purpose, and an iron will, along with a powerful sense of duty and a dedication to hard work. He saw himself as a soldier – a junior officer totally consumed by spit and polish. Trained as an engineer, he was a stickler for minute detail. In his public persona, says Riasanovsky, “Nicholas I came to represent autocracy personified: infinitely majestic, determined and powerful, hard as stone, and relentless as fate.”

His reign had an ideology called “Official Nationality” that was proclaimed officially in 1833. It was a reactionary policy based on orthodoxy in religion, autocracy in government, and Russian nationalism. He was the younger brother of his predecessor, Alexander I. Nicholas inherited his brother’s throne despite the failed Decembrist revolt against him and went on to become the most reactionary of all Russian leaders. His aggressive foreign policy involved many expensive wars, with a disastrous effect on the empire's finances.

He was successful against Russia's neighboring southern rivals as he seized the last territories in the Caucasus held by Persia (comprising modern day Armenia and Azerbaijan) by successfully
ending the Russo-Persian War (1826–28). Russia had gained what is now Dagestan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia from Persia, and therefore had the clear geopolitical and territorial upper hand in the Caucasus. He ended the Russo-Turkish War (1828–29) successfully as well. Later, however, he led Russia into the Crimean War (1853–56) with disastrous results. Historians emphasize that his micromanagement of the armies hindered his generals, as did his misguided strategy. Fuller notes that historians have frequently concluded that “the reign of Nicholas I was a catastrophic failure in both domestic and foreign policy.” On the eve of his death, the Russian Empire reached its geographical zenith, spanning over 7.7 million square miles but in desperate need of reform.

Military and Foreign Policy

For much of Nicholas's reign, Russia was seen as a major military power with considerable strength. At last the Crimean war at the end of his reign demonstrated to the world what no one had previously realized: Russia was militarily weak, technologically backward, and administratively incompetent. Despite his grand ambitions toward the south and Turkey, Russia had not built its railroad network in that direction, and communications were bad. The bureaucracy was riddled with graft, corruption, and inefficiency and was unprepared for war. The Navy was weak and technologically backward; the Army, although very large, was good only for parades, suffering from colonels who pocketed their men's pay, poor morale, and disconnection with the latest technology developed by Britain and France. By war's end, the Russian leadership was determined to reform the Army and the society.

In foreign policy, Nicholas I acted as the protector of ruling legitimism and guardian against revolution. In 1830, after a popular uprising occurred in France, the Poles in Russian Poland revolted.
They resented limitation of the privileges of the Polish minority in the lands annexed by Russia in the 18th century, and sought to reestablish the 1772 borders of Poland. Nicholas crushed the rebellion, abrogated the Polish constitution, and reduced Congress Poland to the status of a Russian province, Privislinsky Krai.

In 1848, when a series of revolutions convulsed Europe, Nicholas was in the forefront of reaction. In 1849, he helped the Habsburgs suppress the uprising in Hungary and urged Prussia not to adopt a liberal constitution.

While Nicholas was attempting to maintain the status quo in Europe, he followed a somewhat more aggressive policy toward the neighboring empires to the south, namely the Ottoman Empire and Persia. Nicholas was widely believed to be following the traditional Russian policy of resolving the so-called Eastern Question by seeking to partition the Ottoman Empire and establish a protectorate over the Orthodox population of the Balkans, still largely under Ottoman control in the 1820s. In fact, in line with his commitment to upholding the status quo in Europe, he feared any attempt to devour the decaying Ottoman Empire would both upset its ally Austria, which also had interests in the Balkans, and bring about an Anglo-French coalition in defense of the Ottomans.

Further, during the war of 1828–29, the Russians had defeated the Ottomans in every battle fought in the field and advanced deep into the Balkans, but the discovered that they lacked the necessary logistical strength to take Constantinople. Nicholas's policy towards the Ottoman Empire was to use the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, which gave Russia a vague right to be the protector of the Orthodox peoples in the Balkans, to place the Ottoman Empire into the Russian sphere of influence. This was seen as a more achievable goal than conquering the entire Ottoman Empire. Nicholas actually wanted to preserve the Ottoman Empire as a stable but weak state that would be unable to stand up to Russia, as he viewed the country first and foremost as a European power and regarded Europe as more important than the Middle East.

In 1826–1828, Nicholas fought the Russo-Persian War (1826–28),
which ended with Persia being forced to cede its last remaining territories in the Caucasus, comprising modern-day Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Iğdır. By now, Russia had conquered all Caucasian territories of Iran in both the North and South Caucasus, comprising modern-day Georgia, Dagestan, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, through the course of the 19th century.

Fearing the results of an Ottoman defeat by Russia, in 1854 Britain, France, the Kingdom of Sardinia, and the Ottoman Empire joined forces in the conflict known as the Crimean War to the Ottomans and Western Europeans and in Russia as the “Eastern War.” In April 1854, Austria signed a defensive pact with Prussia. Thus, Russia found itself in a war with the whole of Europe.

Austria offered the Ottomans diplomatic support and Prussia remained neutral, thus leaving Russia without any allies on the continent. The European allies landed in Crimea and laid siege to the well-fortified Russian base at Sebastopol. The Russians lost battles at Alma in September 1854 followed by lost battles at Balaklava and Inkerman. After the prolonged Siege of Sevastopol (1854–55) the base fell, exposing Russia’s inability to defend a major fortification on its own soil. On the death of Nicholas I, Alexander II became Tsar. On January 15, 1856, the new tsar took Russia out of the war on very unfavorable terms which included the loss of a naval fleet on the Black Sea. Since playing a major role in the defeat of Napoleon, Russia was regarded as militarily invincible, but once opposed against a coalition of the great powers of Europe, the reverses it suffered on land and sea exposed the decay and weakness of Tsar Nicholas’ regime. Russia now faced the choice of initiating major reforms or losing its status as a major European power.
After the prolonged Siege of Sevastopol (1854–55) the base fell, exposing Russia's inability to defend a major fortification on its own soil and leading to defeat in Crimean War.

Attributions

- The Wars of Nicholas I
  - “Panorama_dentro.JPG.” https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Panorama_dentro.JPG. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
The Westerners and the Slavophiles

24.3.5: The Westerners and the Slavophiles

During the second half of the 19th century, a group of “Slavophiles” emerged in intellectual circles. They opposed the modernization and westernization begun by Peter the Great and Catherine the Great and advocated for a return to a simple peasant-based society centered on the Orthodox faith.

Learning Objective

Compare and contrast the opinions and goals of the Westerners and the Slavophiles

Key Points

- Peter the Great, the Tsar of Russia from 1672-1725, started a trend in Russia of modernization and westernization of Russian culture and economics.
- Peter implemented absolute social modernization by introducing French and western dress to his court
and requiring courtiers, state officials, and the military to shave their beards and adopt modern clothing styles.

- Catherine the Great, who ruled from 1762 until her death in 1796, continued Peter’s project and helped herald the Russian Enlightenment, transforming education and culture to mirror the European Enlightenment.

- This trend of westernization and modernization continued into the 19th century, but was eventually opposed by the “Slavophiles,” a group of intellectuals opposing the influences of Western Europe in Russia.

- The Slavophiles aimed at returning Russia to a simple peasant-based society centered on the Orthodox faith.

**Key Terms**

**Pochvennichestvo**
A late 19th-century Russian movement tied closely with its contemporary ideology, the Slavophile movement, whose primary focus was to change Russian society by the humbling of the self and social reform through the Russian Orthodox Church rather than the radical implementations of the intelligentsia.

**enlightened despot**
A form of absolute monarchy or despotism inspired
by the Enlightenment, that embraced rationality, fostered education, and allowed religious tolerance, freedom of speech, and the right to hold private property.

**Slavophiles**

An intellectual movement originating in the 19th century that wanted the Russian Empire to be developed upon values and institutions derived from its early history, opposing the influences of Western Europe in Russia.

During the second half of the 19th century, a faction of so-called “Slavophiles” emerged in intellectual circles. They were convinced that Peter the Great made a mistake in trying to modernize and Westernize the country and that Russia’s salvation lay in the rejection of Western ideas. Slavophiles believed that while the West polluted itself with science, atheism, materialism, and wealth, they should return to a simple peasant-based society centered on the Orthodox faith. The government rejected these ideas in favor of rapid modernization.

**The Westernization of Russia**

Peter the Great, the Tsar of Russia from 1672-1725, started a cultural revolution in Russia that replaced some of the traditionalist and medieval social and political systems with those that were modern, scientific, westernized, and based on the Enlightenment. Peter’s reforms made a lasting impact on Russia and many institutions of Russian government trace their origins to his reign.
Peter implemented sweeping reforms aimed at modernization. Heavily influenced by his advisers from Western Europe, Peter reorganized the Russian army along modern lines and dreamed of making the country a maritime power. He faced much opposition to these policies at home, but brutally suppressed any and all rebellions against his authority: Streltsy, Bashkirs, Astrakhan, and the greatest civil uprising of his reign, the Bulavin Rebellion.

Peter implemented absolute social modernization by introducing French and western dress to his court and requiring courtiers, state officials, and the military to shave their beards and adopt modern clothing styles. One means of achieving this end was the introduction of taxes for long beards and robes in September 1698. Peter also taxed many Russian cultural customs such as traditional bathing, fishing, and beekeeping.

Catherine the Great, the most renowned and the longest-ruling female leader of Russia from 1762 until her death in 1796, revitalized Russia under her reign, allowing it to grow larger and stronger than ever and become recognized as one of the great powers of Europe. An admirer of Peter the Great, Catherine continued to modernize Russia along Western European lines. She enthusiastically supported the ideals of The Enlightenment, thus earning the status of an enlightened despot. Catherine held western European philosophies and culture, especially from the French Enlightenment, close to her heart, and she wanted to surround herself with like-minded people within Russia. She believed a “new kind of person” could be created by inculcating Russian children with European education. This meant developing individuals both intellectually and morally, providing them knowledge and skills, and fostering a sense of civic responsibility.

“Westernization” carries different meanings in different countries at different times. In reference to 18th century Russia, it meant legislative changes to economics, politics, and culture. It also entailed the Russian gentry’s adherence to a set standard and its imitation of the Western values. Westernization in Russia included
the modernization of machinery, the refinement of a more efficient bureaucracy, and the acceptance of Western European tastes.

Peter and Catherine’s reforms set the tone for Russian domestic policies for centuries to come. His legacy could be seen into the 19th century and beyond. Westernizers were a group of 19th century intellectuals who believed that Russia’s development depended upon the adoption of Western European technology and liberal government. In their view, western ideas such as industrialization needed to be implemented throughout Russia to make it a more successful country.
Slavophilia

Slavophilia was an intellectual movement originating in the 19th century that wanted the Russian Empire to be developed upon values and institutions derived from its early history. Slavophiles opposed the influences of Western Europe in Russia. There were similar movements in Poland, Hungary, and Greece. Depending on the historical context, its opposite could be termed Slavophobia, a fear of Slavic culture, or even what some Russian intellectuals called Westernism, begun by Peter the Great's efforts in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.

Slavophonism developed into many branches of the same movement. Some were leftist and noted that progressive ideas such as democracy were intrinsic to the Russian experience, as proved by what they considered to be the rough democracy of medieval Novgorod. Some were rightist and pointed to the centuries-old tradition of the autocratic tsar as the essence of the Russian nature.

The Slavophiles were determined to protect what they believed were unique Russian traditions and culture. In doing so, they rejected individualism. The role of the Orthodox Church was seen as more significant than the role of the state. Socialism was opposed by Slavophiles as an alien thought, and Russian mysticism was preferred over “Western rationalism.” Rural life was praised by the movement, which opposed industrialization and urban development, and protection of the “mir” (peasant village communities) was an important measure to prevent the growth of the working class.

The movement originated in Moscow in the 1830s. Drawing on the works of Greek Church Fathers, the poet Aleksey Khomyakov (1804–60) and his devoutly Orthodox colleagues elaborated a traditionalistic doctrine that claimed Russia has its own distinct way that should avoid imitating “Western” institutions. The Russian Slavophiles criticized the modernization of Peter the Great and
Catherine the Great, and some of even adopted traditional pre-Petrine dress.

Pochvennichestvo (roughly “return to the soil”) was a late 19th-century Russian movement tied closely with its contemporary ideology, the Slavophile movement. Both were for the complete emancipation of serfdom, stressed a strong desire to return to the idealized past of Russia’s history, and opposed Europeanization. The movement also chose a complete rejection of the nihilist, classical liberal, and Marxist movements of the time. Their primary focus was to change Russian society by the humbling of the self and social reform through the Russian Orthodox Church rather than the radical implementations of the intelligentsia.

The major differences between the Slavophiles and the movement were that the former detested the Westernization policies of Peter the Great, but the latter praised what were seen as the benefits of the notorious ruler but maintained a strong patriotic mentality for the Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality. Another major difference was that many of the movement’s leaders and supporters adopted a militantly anti-Protestant, anti-Catholic, and anti-Semitic stance.

The concept had its roots in the works of the German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder, who focused primarily on emphasizing the differences among people and regional cultures. In addition, it rejected the universalism of the Enlightenment period. The most prominent Russian intellectuals who founded the ideology were Nikolay Strakhov, Nikolay Danilevsky, and Konstantin Leontyev.
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103. The 1861 Emancipation of the Serfs

24.3.6: The 1861 Emancipation of the Serfs

In 1861 Alexander II freed all serfs (over 23 million people) in a major agrarian reform, stimulated in part by his view that “it is better to liberate the peasants from above” than to wait until they won their freedom by uprisings “from below.”

Learning Objective

Determine the effectiveness of the 1861 emancipation of the serfs

Key Points

- The emancipation reform of 1861 that freed the serfs was the single most important event in 19th-century Russian history; it was the beginning of the end for the landed aristocracy’s monopoly of power.
- Serfdom was abolished in 1861, but its abolition was achieved on terms not always favorable to the
The 1861 Emancipation Manifesto proclaimed the emancipation of the serfs on private estates and by this edict more than 23 million people received their liberty. Through emancipation, serfs gained the full rights of free citizens, including rights to marry without having to gain consent, to own property, and to own a business. The serfs from private estates were given less land than they needed to survive, which led to civil unrest.

Key Terms

1848 revolutions
A series of political upheavals throughout Europe in 1848 that remains the most widespread revolutionary wave in European history. The revolutions were essentially democratic in nature, with the aim of removing the old feudal structures and creating independent national states. The revolutionary wave began in France in February and immediately spread to most of Europe and parts of Latin America. Over 50 countries were affected, but with no coordination or cooperation between their respective revolutionaries.

mir
Peasant village communities, as opposed to
individual farmsteads or khutors, in Imperial Russia. The vast majority of Russian peasants held their land in communal ownership within a community, which acted as a village government and a cooperative. Arable land was divided in sections based on soil quality and distance from the village. Each household had the right to claim one or more strips from each section depending on the number of adults in the household.

**Alexander II**

The Tsar of Russia from March 2, 1855, until his assassination in 1881. He was also the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Finland. His most significant reform as emperor was emancipation of Russia’s serfs in 1861, for which he is known as Alexander the Liberator.

The Emancipation Reform of 1861 in Russia was the first and most important of liberal reforms effected during the reign (1855–1881) of Tsar Alexander II of Russia. The reform effectively abolished serfdom throughout the Russian Empire.

The 1861 Emancipation Manifesto proclaimed the emancipation of the serfs on private estates and of the domestic (household) serfs. By this edict more than 23 million people received their liberty. Serfs gained the full rights of free citizens, including rights to marry without having to gain consent, to own property, and to own a business. The Manifesto prescribed that peasants would be able to buy the land from the landlords. Household serfs were the least affected, gaining only their freedom and no land.

In Georgia the emancipation took place later, in 1864, and on much better terms for the nobles than in Russia. The serfs were emancipated in 1861, following a speech given by Tsar Alexander
II on March 30, 1856. State-owned serfs, those living on Imperial lands, were emancipated in 1866.

Background

The liberal politicians who stood behind the 1861 manifesto recognized that their country was one of a few remaining feudal states in Europe. The pitiful display by Russian forces in the Crimean War left the government acutely aware of the empire's backwardness. Eager to grow and develop industrial and therefore military and political strength, they introduced a number of economic reforms, including the end of serfdom. It was optimistically hoped that after the abolition the mir (peasant village communities) would dissolve into individual peasant land owners and the beginnings of a market economy.

The main issue was whether the serfs should remain dependent on the landlords or be transformed into a class of independent communal proprietors. The land owners initially pushed for granting the peasants freedom but not land. The tsar and his advisers, mindful of 1848 revolutions in Western Europe, were opposed to creating a proletariat and the instability this could bring. But giving the peasants freedom and land left existing land owners without the large and cheap labor force they needed to maintain their estates and lifestyles. By 1859, however, a third of their estates and two-thirds of their serfs were mortgaged to the state or noble banks, so they had no choice but to accept the emancipation.

To balance this, the legislation contained three measures to reduce the potential economic self-sufficiency of the peasants. First, a transition period of two years was introduced, during which the peasant was obligated as before to the land owner. Second, large parts of common land were passed to the major land owners as otrezki (“cut off lands”), making many forests, roads, and rivers
accessible only for a fee. The serfs also had to pay the land owner for their allocation of land in a series of redemption payments, which in turn were used to compensate the land owners with bonds. Three-quarters of the total sum would be advanced by the government to the land owner and then the peasants would repay the money plus interest to the government over 49 years. These redemption payments were finally canceled in 1907.

Effects of Emancipation

Although the emancipation reform was commemorated by the construction of the enormous Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Moscow and history books give Alexander II the name of “Alexander the Liberator,” its results were far from ideal. Household serfs were the worst affected as they gained only their freedom and no land. Many of the more enlightened bureaucrats had an understanding that the freeing of the serfs would bring about drastic changes in both Russian society and government. However, their idea that these changes would affect only the “lower stories” of society and strengthen the autocracy, rather than weaken it was wrong. In
reality, the reforms created a new system in which the monarch had to coexist with an independent court, free press, and local governments that operated differently and more freely than in the past.

More specifically, in regards to new localized government, the reforms put in place a system where the land owners had more of a say within their newly formed “provinces.” While this was not the direct intent of the reforms, it was evident that it significantly weakened the idea of the autocracy. Now, the “well-to-do” serfs, along with previously free peoples, were able to purchase land as private property. While early in the reforms the creation of local government changed few things about Russian society, the rise in capitalism drastically affected not only the social structure of Russia, but the behaviors and activities of the self-government institutions.

The serfs from private estates were given less land than they needed to survive, which led to civil unrest. The redemption tax was so high that the serfs had to sell all the grain they produced to pay the tax, which left nothing for their survival. Land owners also suffered because many of them were deeply in debt, and the forced selling of their land left them struggling to maintain their lavish lifestyles. In many cases, the newly freed serfs were forced to “rent” their land from wealthy landowners. Furthermore, when the peasants had to work for the same landowners to pay their “labor payments,” their own fields were often neglected. Over the next few years, the yields from the peasants’ crops remained low, and soon famine struck a large portion of Russia. With little food and in a similar condition as when they were serfs, many peasants started to voice their disdain for the social system.

Lastly, the reforms transformed the Russian economy. The individuals who led the reform were in favor of an economic system similar to that of other European countries, which promoted the ideas of capitalism and free trade. The idea of the reformers was to promote development and encourage private property ownership, free competition, entrepreneurship, and hired labor. They hoped
this would bring about an a more laissez-faire economic system with minimal regulations and tariffs. Soon after the reforms, there was a substantial rise in the amount of grain production for sale.
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24.4: German Unification

24.4.1: The German Confederation

The German Confederation was the loose association of 39 states created in 1815 to coordinate the economies of separate German-speaking countries, which most historians have judged to be weak and ineffective as well as an obstacle to German nationalist aspirations.

Learning Objective

Diagram the political relations and structure of the German Confederation

Key Points

- One of the major outcomes of the Congress of Vienna was the creation of German Confederation, a loose association of 39 states designed to coordinate
the economies of separate German-speaking countries.

- It acted as a buffer between the powerful states of Austria and Prussia to preserve the Concert of Europe.
- Most historians have judged the Confederation as weak and ineffective, as well as an obstacle to German nationalist aspirations.
- Further efforts to improve the Confederation began in 1834 with the establishment of a customs union, the Zollverein, to manage tariffs and economic policies.
- It collapsed due to the rivalry between Prussia and Austria, warfare, the 1848 revolution, and the inability of the multiple members to compromise.
- It was replaced by the North German Confederation in 1866.

**Key Terms**

**Zollverein**

A coalition of German states formed to manage tariffs and economic policies within their territories, formed during the German Confederation.

**Rights of Man**

A book by Thomas Paine, including 31 articles, that posits that popular political revolution is permissible
when a government does not safeguard the natural rights of its people. Using these points as a basis, it defends the French Revolution.

**German dualism**

A long-standing conflict and rivalry for supremacy between Prussia and Austria in Central Europe during the 18th and 19th centuries. While wars were a part of the rivalry, it was also a race for prestige to be seen as the legitimate political force of the German-speaking peoples. The conflict first culminated in the Seven Years’ War.

**Holy Roman Empire**

A multi-ethnic complex of territories in central Europe that developed during the Early Middle Ages and continued until its dissolution in 1806. The largest territory of the empire after 962 was the Kingdom of Germany, though it also came to include the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Kingdom of Burgundy, the Kingdom of Italy, and numerous other territories.

The German Confederation (German: *Deutscher Bund*) was an association of 39 German states in Central Europe, created by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to coordinate the economies of separate German-speaking countries and to replace the former Holy Roman Empire. It acted as a buffer between the powerful states of Austria and Prussia. Britain approved of the confederation because London felt there was need for a stable, peaceful power in central Europe that could discourage aggressive moves by France or Russia. Most historians have judged the Confederation as weak and ineffective, as well as an obstacle to the creation of a German nation-state. It collapsed because of the rivalry between Prussia and Austria (known as German dualism), warfare, the 1848 revolution, and the inability
of members to compromise. It was replaced by the North German Confederation in 1866.

In 1848, revolutions by liberals and nationalists were failed attempts to establish a unified German state. Talks between the German states failed in 1848, and the Confederation briefly dissolved but was reestablished in 1850. It decidedly fell apart only after the Prussian victory in the Seven Weeks' War of 1866.

The dispute between the two dominant member states of the Confederation, Austria and Prussia, over which had the inherent right to rule German lands ended in favor of Prussia after the Seven Weeks' War of 1866. This led to the creation of the North German Confederation under Prussian leadership in 1867. A number of South German states remained independent until they joined the North German Confederation, which was renamed the German Empire.

History and Structure of the Confederation

Between 1806 and 1815, Napoleon organized the German states into the Confederation of the Rhine, but this collapsed after his defeats in 1812 to 1815. The German Confederation had roughly the same boundaries as the Empire at the time of the French Revolution (less what is now Belgium). It also kept intact most of Confederation's reconstituted member states and their boundaries. The member states, drastically reduced to 39 from more than 300 under the Holy Roman Empire, were recognized as fully sovereign. The members pledged themselves to mutual defense, and joint maintenance of the fortresses at Mainz, the city of Luxembourg, Rastatt, Ulm, and Landau.

The only organ of the Confederation was the Federal Assembly, consisting of the delegates of the states' governments. There was no head of state; the Austrian delegate presided the Assembly but was not granted extra power. The Assembly met in Frankfurt.
The Confederation was enabled to accept and deploy ambassadors. It allowed ambassadors of the European powers to the Assembly, but rarely deployed ambassadors itself.

During the revolution of 1848–49, the Federal Assembly was inactive and transferred its powers to the revolutionary German Central Government of the Frankfurt National Assembly. After crushing the revolution and illegally disbanding the National Assembly, the Prussian King failed to create a German nation state by himself. The Federal Assembly was revived in 1850 on Austrian initiative, but only fully reinstalled only in the Summer of 1851.

Rivalry between Prussia and Austria grew substantially beginning in 1859. The Confederation was dissolved in 1866 after the Austro-Prussian War, and was succeeded in 1866 by the Prussian-dominated North German Confederation. Unlike the German Confederation, the North German Confederation was in fact a true state. Its territory comprised the parts of the German Confederation north of the river Main, plus Prussia's eastern territories and the Duchy of Schleswig, but excluded Austria and the other southern German states.

Prussia's influence was widened by the Franco-Prussian War resulting in the proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles on January 18, 1871, which united the North German Federation with the southern German states. Constituent states of the former German Confederation became part of the German Empire in 1871, except Austria, Luxembourg, the Duchy of Limburg, and Liechtenstein.

Politics and Economy of the Confederation

Although the forces unleashed by the French Revolution were seemingly under control after the Vienna Congress, the conflict between conservative forces and liberal nationalists was only
deferred. The era until the failed 1848 revolution when these tensions escalated is commonly referred to as Vormärz (“pre-March”), in reference to the outbreak of riots in March 1848.

This conflict pitted the forces of the old order against those inspired by the French Revolution and the Rights of Man. The sociological breakdown of the competition was roughly one side engaged mostly in commerce, trade, and industry, and the other side associated with landowning aristocracy or military aristocracy (the Junker) in Prussia, the Habsburg monarchy in Austria, and the conservative notables of the small princely states and city-states in Germany.

Meanwhile, demands for change from below had been stirring since the influence of the French Revolution. Throughout the German Confederation, Austrian influence was paramount, drawing the ire of the nationalist movements. Metternich considered nationalism, especially the nationalist youth movement, the most pressing danger: German nationalism might not only reject Austrian dominance of the Confederation, but also stimulate nationalist sentiment within the Austrian Empire itself. In a multinational multilingual state in which Slavs and Magyars outnumbered the Germans, the prospects of Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Polish, Serb, or Croatian sentiment along with middle-class liberalism was certainly horrifying.

Further efforts to improve the Confederation began in 1834 with the establishment of a customs union, the Zollverein. In 1834, the Prussian regime sought to stimulate wider trade advantages and industrialism by decree—a logical continuation of the program of Stein and Hardenberg less than two decades earlier. Historians have seen three Prussian goals: as a political tool to eliminate Austrian influence in Germany; as a way to improve the economies; and to strengthen Germany against potential French aggression while reducing the economic independence of smaller states.

Inadvertently, these reforms sparked the unification movement and augmented a middle class demanding further political rights, but at the time backwardness and Prussia’s fears of its stronger...
neighbors were greater concerns. The customs union opened up a common market, ended tariffs between states, and standardized weights, measures, and currencies within member states (excluding Austria), forming the basis of a proto-national economy.
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24.4.2: Toward a German Identity

The surge of German nationalism, stimulated by the experience of Germans in the Napoleonic period, the development of a German cultural and artistic identity, and improved transportation through the region, moved Germany toward unification in the 19th century.

**Learning Objective**

Break down the cultural aspects that lent themselves to a common German identity in the 19th century

**Key Points**

- The transition of German-speaking people throughout central Europe into a unified nation-state had been developing for some time through alliances formal and informal between princely rulers, as well as the gradual emergence of a German cultural identity.
The German identity is largely centered around the common German language, but at the turn of the 19th century, German intellectuals began to develop a sense of artistic and philosophical identity freed from the leadership of France during the Enlightenment. Under the dominance of the Napoleonic French Empire (1804–1814), various justifications emerged to identify “Germany” as a single state. The Burschenschaft student organizations and popular demonstrations, such as those held at Wartburg Castle in October 1817, contributed to a growing sense of unity among German speakers of Central Europe. Historians regard the development of the German railway as the first indicator of a unified state. As travel became easier, faster, and less expensive, Germans started to see unity in factors other than their language.

Key Terms

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe
A German writer and statesman. His body of work includes epic and lyric poetry written in a variety of meters and styles; prose and verse dramas; memoirs; an autobiography; literary and aesthetic criticism; treatises on botany, anatomy, and color; and four novels. In addition, numerous literary and scientific
fragments, more than 10,000 letters, and nearly 3,000 drawings by him exist.

**Burschenschaften**

One of the traditional student fraternities of Germany. They were founded in the 19th century as associations of university students inspired by liberal and nationalistic ideas. They were significantly involved in the March Revolution and the unification of Germany.

**Carlsbad Decrees**

A set of reactionary restrictions introduced in the states of the German Confederation on September 20, 1819, after a conference held in the spa town of Carlsbad, Bohemia. They banned nationalist fraternities (“Burschenschaften”), removed liberal university professors, and expanded the censorship of the press. They were aimed to quell a growing sentiment for German unification.

---

**Unification of Germany**

The unification of Germany into a politically and administratively integrated nation state officially occurred on January 18, 1871, in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles in France. Princes of the German states gathered there to proclaim Wilhelm I of Prussia as German Emperor after the French capitulation in the Franco-Prussian War. Unofficially, the de facto transition of most of the German-speaking populations into a federated organization of states had been developing in fits and starts for some time through
alliances formal and informal between princely rulers. Self-interests of the various parties hampered the process over nearly a century of autocratic experimentation beginning in the era of the Napoleonic Wars, which saw the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire (1806) and subsequent rise of German nationalism.

Unification exposed tensions caused by religious, linguistic, social, and cultural differences among the inhabitants of the new nation, suggesting that 1871 only represented one moment in the larger unification process. Given the mountainous terrains of much of the territory, it was inevitable that isolated peoples would develop cultural, educational, linguistic, and religious differences over such a long period. Germany of the 19th century enjoyed transportation and communications improvements that began uniting people and culture.

The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, which included more than 500 independent states, was effectively dissolved when Emperor Francis II abdicated during the War of the Third Coalition in August 1806. Despite the legal, administrative, and political disruption associated with the end of the Empire, the people of the German-speaking areas of the old Empire had a common linguistic, cultural, and legal tradition further enhanced by their shared experience in the French Revolutionary Wars and Napoleonic Wars.

European liberalism offered an intellectual basis for unification by challenging dynastic and absolutist models of social and political organization; its German manifestation emphasized the importance of tradition, education, and linguistic unity of people in a geographic region. Economically, the creation of the Prussian Zollverein (customs union) in 1818 and its subsequent expansion to include other states of the German Confederation reduced competition between and within states. Emerging modes of transportation facilitated business and recreational travel, leading to contact and sometimes conflict among German speakers from throughout Central Europe.
German Cultural Identity

In the late 18th century, the sense of a German cultural identity began to emerge. Before 1750, the German upper classes looked to France for intellectual, cultural, and architectural leadership; French was the language of high society. By the mid-18th century the “Aufklärung” (The Enlightenment) had transformed German high culture in music, philosophy, science, and literature. Christian Wolff (1679–1754) was the pioneer as a writer who expounded the Enlightenment to German readers; he legitimized German as a philosophic language.

Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) broke new ground in philosophy and poetry as a leader of the Sturm und Drang movement of proto-Romanticism. Weimar Classicism was a cultural and literary movement based in Weimar that sought to establish a new humanism by synthesizing Romantic, Classical, and Enlightenment ideas. The movement, from 1772 until 1805, involved Herder as well as polymath Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) and Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805), a poet and historian. Herder argued that every folk had its own particular identity expressed in its language and culture. This legitimized the promotion of German language and culture and helped shape the development of German nationalism. Schiller’s plays expressed the restless spirit of his generation, depicting the hero’s struggle against social pressures and the force of destiny.

Rise of German Nationalism

Under the hegemony of the Napoleonic French Empire (1804–1814), popular German nationalism thrived in the reorganized German states. Due in part to the shared experience under French
dominance, various justifications emerged to identify “Germany” as a single state. For the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte,

The first, original, and truly natural boundaries of states are beyond doubt their internal boundaries. Those who speak the same language are joined to each other by a multitude of invisible bonds by nature herself, long before any human art begins; they understand each other and have the power of continuing to make themselves understood more and more clearly; they belong together and are by nature one and an inseparable whole.

A common language may have been seen to serve as the basis of a nation, but as contemporary historians of 19th-century Germany noted, it took more than linguistic similarity to unify these several hundred polities. The experience of German-speaking Central Europe during the years of French hegemony contributed to a sense of common cause to remove the French invaders and reassert control over their own lands. The exigencies of Napoleon’s campaigns in Poland (1806–07), the Iberian Peninsula, western Germany, and his disastrous invasion of Russia in 1812 disillusioned many Germans, princes and peasants alike. Napoleon’s Continental System nearly ruined the Central European economy. The invasion of Russia included nearly 125,000 troops from German lands, and the loss of that army encouraged many Germans, both high- and low-born, to envision a Central Europe free of Napoleon’s influence.

The surge of German nationalism, stimulated by the experience of Germans in the Napoleonic period and initially allied with liberalism, shifted political, social, and cultural relationships within the German states during the beginning of the German Confederation. Figures like August Heinrich Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Ludwig Uhland, Georg Herwegh, Heinrich Heine, Georg Büchner, Ludwig Börne, and Bettina von Arnim rose in the Vormärz era. Father Friedrich Jahn’s gymnastic associations exposed middle-class German youth to nationalist and democratic ideas,
which took the form of the nationalistic and liberal democratic college fraternities known as the Burschenschaften.

The Wartburg Festival in 1817 celebrated Martin Luther as a proto-German nationalist, linking Lutheranism to German nationalism, and helping arouse religious sentiments for the cause of German nationhood. The festival culminated in the burning of several books and other items that symbolized reactionary attitudes. One item was a book by August von Kotzebue, who was accused of spying for Russia in 1819 and then murdered by a theological student, Karl Ludwig Sand, who was executed for the crime. Sand belonged to a militant nationalist faction of the Burschenschaften. Metternich used the murder as a pretext to issue the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819, which dissolved the Burschenschaften, cracked down on the liberal press, and seriously restricted academic freedom.

Metternich was able to harness conservative outrage at the assassination to consolidate legislation that would further limit the press and constrain the rising liberal and nationalist movements. Consequently, these decrees drove the Burschenschaften underground, restricted the publication of nationalist materials, expanded censorship of the press and private correspondence, and limited academic speech by prohibiting university professors from encouraging nationalist discussion.

Other Factors for Unification

By the early 19th century, German roads had deteriorated to an appalling extent. Travelers both foreign and local complained bitterly about the state of the Heerstraßen, the military roads previously maintained for the ease of moving troops. As German states ceased to be a military crossroads, however, the roads improved; the length of hard-surfaced roads in Prussia increased from 3,800 kilometers (2,400 mi) in 1816 to 16,600 kilometers (10,300...
mi) in 1852. By 1835, Heinrich von Gagern wrote that roads were the “veins and arteries of the body politic...” and predicted that they would promote freedom, independence, and prosperity. As people moved around, they came into contact with others on trains, at hotels, in restaurants, and for some, at fashionable resorts such as the spa in Baden-Baden. Water transportation also improved.

As important as these improvements were, they could not compete with the impact of the railway. Historians of the Second Empire later regarded the railways as the first indicator of a unified state; the patriotic novelist, Wilhelm Raabe, wrote: “The German empire was founded with the construction of the first railway...” Rail travel changed how cities looked and how people traveled. Its impact reached throughout the social order, affecting everyone from the highest-born to the lowest. Although some of the outlying German provinces were not serviced by rail until the 1890s, the majority of the population, manufacturing centers, and production centers were linked to the rail network by 1865.

As travel became easier, faster, and less expensive, Germans started to see unity in factors other than language. The Brothers Grimm, who compiled a massive dictionary known as The Grimm, also assembled a compendium of folk tales and fables that highlighted the storytelling parallels between different regions. Karl Baedeker wrote guidebooks to different cities and regions of Central Europe, indicating places to stay, sites to visit, and giving a short history of castles, battlefields, famous buildings, and famous people. His guides also included distances, roads to avoid, and hiking paths to follow.

The words of August Heinrich Hoffmann von Fallersleben expressed not only the linguistic unity of the German people but also their geographic unity. Patriotic songs as “Die Wacht am Rhein” (“The Watch on the Rhine”) by Max Schneckenburger began to focus attention on geographic space, not limiting “German-ness” to a common language. Schneckenburger wrote “The Watch on the Rhine” in a specific patriotic response to French assertions that the Rhine was France’s “natural” eastern boundary.
Germania, a personification of the German nation, appears in Philipp Veit’s fresco (1834–36). She is holding a shield with the coat of arms of the German Confederation. The shields on which she stands are the arms of the seven traditional Electors of the Holy Roman Empire. She holds the “Reichsschwert” (imperial sword) and the Imperial Crown of the Holy Roman Empire sits at her side.

Attributions

- Toward a German Identity
Unification of Germany. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
Growing discontent with the political and social order imposed by the Congress of Vienna led to the outbreak in 1848 of the March Revolution in the German states.

**Learning Objective**

Connect the German Revolutions of 1848 to other revolutions happening throughout Europe

**Key Points**

- News of the 1848 Revolution in Paris quickly reached discontented bourgeois liberals, republicans, and more radical working-men.
- The first revolutionary uprisings in Germany began in the state of Baden in March 1848 and within a few days, there were revolutionary uprisings in other states including Austria and Prussia.
• On March 15, 1848, the subjects of Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia vented their long-repressed political aspirations in violent rioting in Berlin, while barricades were erected in the streets of Paris.

• Friedrich Wilhelm gave in to the popular fury and promised a constitution, a parliament, and support for German unification, safeguarding his own rule and regime.

• On May 18, the Frankfurt Assembly opened its first session with delegates from various German states, and after long and controversial debates, the assembly produced the so-called Frankfurt Constitution, which proclaimed a German Empire based on the principles of parliamentary democracy.

• In the end, the 1848 revolutions turned out to be unsuccessful: King Frederick William IV of Prussia refused the imperial crown, the Frankfurt parliament was dissolved, the ruling princes repressed the risings by military force, and the German Confederation was re-established by 1850.

• Many leaders went into exile, including a number who went to the United States and became a political force there.

---

**Key Terms**

**Frankfurt Assembly**

The first freely elected parliament for all of Germany,
elected on May 1, 1848. The session was held from May 18, 1848, to May 31, 1849, in the Paulskirche at Frankfurt am Main. Its existence was both part of and the result of the “March Revolution” in the states of the German Confederation. After long and controversial debates, the assembly produced the so-called Frankfurt Constitution.

**Forty-Eighters**

Europeans who participated in or supported the revolutions of 1848 that swept Europe. Disappointed at the failure of the revolution to bring about the reform of the system of government in Germany or the Austrian Empire and sometimes on the government’s wanted list because of their involvement in the revolution, they gave up their old lives to try again abroad. Many emigrated to the United States, England, and Australia after the revolutions failed.

**Zollverein**

A coalition of German states formed to manage tariffs and economic policies within their territories. It was the first instance in history in which independent states had consummated a full economic union without the simultaneous creation of a political federation or union.

The revolutions of 1848 in the German states, the opening phase of which was also called the March Revolution, were initially part of the Revolutions of 1848 that broke out in many European countries. They were a series of loosely coordinated protests and rebellions in the states of the German Confederation, including the Austrian Empire. The revolutions, which stressed pan-Germanism, demonstrated popular discontent with the traditional, largely
autocratic political structure of the 39 independent states of the Confederation that inherited the German territory of the former Holy Roman Empire. They demonstrated the popular desire for the Zollverein movement.

The middle-class elements were committed to liberal principles while the working class sought radical improvements to their working and living conditions. As the middle class and working class components of the Revolution split, the conservative aristocracy defeated it. Liberals were forced into exile to escape political persecution, where they became known as Forty-Eighters. Many immigrated to the United States, settling from Wisconsin to Texas.

Unrest Spreads

The groundwork of the 1848 uprising in Germany was laid long beforehand. The Hambacher Fest of 1832, for instance, reflected growing unrest in the face of heavy taxation and political censorship. The Hambacher Fest is noteworthy for the republicans adopting the black-red-gold colors (used on today's national flag of Germany) as a symbol of the republican movement and of unity among the German-speaking people.

Activism for liberal reform spread through many of the German states, each of which had distinct revolutions. They were also inspired by street demonstrations of workers and artisans in Paris, France, from February 22-24, 1848, which resulted in the abdication by King Louis Philippe of France and his exile in Britain. In France the revolution of 1848 became known as the February Revolution.

The revolutions spread across Europe; they erupted in Austria and Germany, beginning with the large demonstrations on March 13, 1848, in Vienna. This resulted in the resignation of Prince von Metternich as chief minister to Emperor Ferdinand I of Austria, and his exile in Britain. Because of the date of the Vienna
demonstrations, the revolutions in Germany are usually called the March Revolution.

Fearing the fate of Louis-Philippe of France, some monarchs in Germany accepted some of the demands of the revolutionaries, at least temporarily. In the south and west, large popular assemblies and mass demonstrations took place. They demanded freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, written constitutions, arming of the people, and a parliament.

Uprisings: Austria and Prussia

In 1848, Austria was the predominant German state. It was considered the successor to the Holy Roman Empire, which had been dissolved by Napoleon in 1806, and was not resurrected by the Congress of Vienna in 1815. German Austrian chancellor Metternich had dominated Austrian politics from 1815 until 1848.

On March 13, 1848, university students mounted a large street demonstration in Vienna, and it was covered by the press across the German-speaking states. Following the important but relatively minor demonstrations against Lola Montez in Bavaria on February 9, 1848, the first major revolt of 1848 in German lands occurred in Vienna on March 13, 1848. The student demonstrators demanded a constitution and a constituent assembly elected by universal male suffrage.

Emperor Ferdinand and his chief adviser Metternich directed troops to crush the demonstration. When demonstrators moved to the streets near the palace, the troops fired on the students, killing several. The new working class of Vienna joined the student demonstrations, developing an armed insurrection. The Diet of Lower Austria demanded Metternich's resignation. With no forces rallying to Metternich's defense, Ferdinand reluctantly complied.
and dismissed him. The former chancellor went into exile in London.

In Prussia, in March 1848, crowds of people gathered in Berlin to present their demands in an “address to the king.” King Frederick William IV, taken by surprise, yielded verbally to all the demonstrators’ demands, including parliamentary elections, a constitution, and freedom of the press. He promised that “Prussia was to be merged forthwith into Germany.”

On March 13, the army charged people returning from a meeting in the Tiergarten; they left one person dead and many injured. On March 18, a large demonstration occurred; when two shots were fired, the people feared that some of the 20,000 soldiers would be used against them. They erected barricades, fighting started, and a battle took place until troops were ordered 13 hours later to retreat, leaving hundreds dead. Afterwards, Frederick William attempted to reassure the public that he would proceed with reorganizing his government. The king also approved arming the citizens.

Starting on May 18, 1848, the Frankfurt Assembly worked to find ways to unite the various German states and write a constitution. The Assembly was unable to pass resolutions and dissolved into endless debate. After long and controversial discussions, the assembly produced the so-called Frankfurt Constitution, which proclaimed a German Empire based on the principles of parliamentary democracy. This constitution fulfilled the main demands of the liberal and nationalist movements of the Vormärz and provided a foundation of basic rights, both of which stood in opposition to Metternich’s system of Restoration. The parliament also proposed a constitutional monarchy headed by a hereditary emperor (Kaiser).

King Frederick William IV of Prussia unilaterally imposed a monarchist constitution to undercut the democratic forces. This constitution took effect on December 5, 1848. On December 5, 1848, the revolutionary Assembly was dissolved and replaced with the bicameral legislature allowed under the monarchist Constitution.
Otto von Bismarck was elected to the first congress elected under the new monarchical constitution.

Other uprising occurred in Baden, the Palatinate, Saxony, the Rhineland, and Bavaria.

The achievements of the revolutionaries of March 1848 were reversed in all of the German states and by 1851, the Basic Rights from the Frankfurt Assembly had also been abolished nearly
everywhere. In the end, the revolution fizzled because of the
divisions between the various factions in Frankfurt, the calculating
cautions of the liberals, the failure of the left to marshal popular
support and the overwhelming superiority of the monarchist forces.

The Revolution of 1848 failed in its attempt to unify the German-
speaking states because the Frankfurt Assembly reflected the many
different interests of the German ruling classes. Its members were
unable to form coalitions and push for specific goals. The first
conflict arose over the goals of the assembly. The moderate liberals
wanted to draft a constitution to present to the monarchs, whereas
the smaller group of radical members wanted the assembly to
declare itself as a law-giving parliament. They were unable to
overcome this fundamental division, and did not take any definitive
action toward unification or the introduction of democratic rules.
The assembly declined into debate. While the French revolution
drew on an existing nation state, the democratic and liberal forces
in Germany of 1848 were confronted with the need to build a nation
state and a constitutional at the same time, which overtaxed them.

Attributions

• The German Revolutions of 1848
  - “German revolutions of 1848–49.”
    https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
    German_revolutions_of_1848-49. Wikipedia CC BY-SA
    3.0.
  - “Maerz1848_berlin.jpg.” https://commons.wikimedia.org/
    wiki/File:Maerz1848_berlin.jpg. Wikimedia Commons
    Public domain.
Otto von Bismarck and the Franco-Prussian War

24.4.4: Otto von Bismarck and the Franco-Prussian War

In the 1860s, Otto von Bismarck, then Minister President of Prussia, provoked three short, decisive wars against Denmark, Austria, and France, aligning the smaller German states behind Prussia in its defeat of France. In 1871 he unified Germany into a nation-state, forming the German Empire.

Learning Objective

Clarify Bismarck's intentions with respect to the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War

Key Points

- King William I appointed Otto von Bismarck as the new Minister President of Prussia in 1862.
- The Prussian victory in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 enabled him to create the North German
Confederation which excluded Austria from the federation's affairs and ended the previous German Confederation.

- After the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, the German princes proclaimed the founding of the German Empire in 1871 at Versailles, uniting all scattered parts of Germany except Austria.
- Victory in the Franco-Prussian War proved the capstone of the nationalist issue, rallying the other German states into unity.
- Some historians argue that Bismarck deliberately provoked a French attack to draw the southern German states—Baden, Württemberg, Bavaria, and Hesse-Darmstadt—into an alliance with the North German Confederation dominated by Prussia, while others contend that Bismarck did not plan anything and merely exploited the circumstances as they unfolded.
- Juggling a very complex interlocking series of conferences, negotiations, and alliances, Bismarck used his diplomatic skills to maintain Germany's position and used the balance of power to keep Europe at peace in the 1870s and 1880s.

**Key Terms**

**Kulturkampf**

Refers to power struggles between emerging...
constitutional and democratic nation states and the Roman Catholic Church over the place and role of religion in modern polity, usually in connection with secularization campaigns.

**Junker**

A noble honorific, meaning “young nobleman.” The term became popularly used as a reference for the landed nobility (particularly of the east) that controlled almost all of the land and government, or by extension the Prussian estate owners regardless of noble status. With the formation of the German Empire in 1871, this dominated the central German government and the Prussian military. The term is often contrasted with the elites of the western and southern states in Germany, such as the city-republic of Hamburg, which had no nobility.

**North German Confederation**

A confederation of 22 previously independent states of northern Germany with nearly 30 million inhabitants, formed after Prussia left the German Confederation with allies. It was the first modern German nation state and the basis for the later German Empire (1871–1918) when several south German states such as Bavaria joined.

**realpolitik**

Politics or diplomacy based primarily on considerations of given circumstances and factors, rather than explicit ideological notions or moral and ethical premises. In this respect, it shares aspects of its philosophical approach with those of realism and pragmatism. The term is sometimes used pejoratively...
to imply politics that are coercive, amoral, or Machiavellian.

Otto von Bismarck

Otto von Bismarck was a conservative Prussian statesman who dominated German and European affairs from the 1860s until 1890. In the 1860s he engineered a series of wars that unified the German states, significantly and deliberately excluding Austria, into a powerful German Empire under Prussian leadership. With that accomplished by 1871, he skillfully used balance of power diplomacy to maintain Germany's position in a Europe which, despite many disputes and war scares, remained at peace.

In 1862, King Wilhelm I appointed Bismarck as Minister President of Prussia, a position he would hold until 1890 (except for a short break in 1873). He provoked three short, decisive wars against Denmark, Austria, and France, aligning the smaller German states behind Prussia in its defeat of France. In 1871 he formed the German Empire with himself as Chancellor while retaining control of Prussia. His diplomacy of realpolitik and powerful rule at home gained him the nickname the “Iron Chancellor.” German unification and its rapid economic growth was the foundation to his foreign policy. He disliked colonialism but reluctantly built an overseas empire when it was demanded by both elite and mass opinion. Juggling a very complex interlocking series of conferences, negotiations, and alliances, he used his diplomatic skills to maintain Germany's position and used the balance of power to keep Europe at peace in the 1870s and 1880s.

A master of complex politics at home, Bismarck created the first welfare state in the modern world, with the goal of gaining working-
class support that might otherwise have gone to his Socialist enemies. In the 1870s he allied himself with the Liberals (who were low-tariff and anti-Catholic) and fought the Catholic Church in what was called the Kulturkampf (“culture struggle”). He lost that battle as the Catholics responded by forming a powerful Centre party and using universal male suffrage to gain a bloc of seats. Bismarck then reversed himself, ended the Kulturkampf, broke with the Liberals, imposed protective tariffs, and formed a political alliance with the Centre Party to fight the Socialists.

Bismarck—a Junker himself—was strong-willed, outspoken, and sometimes judged overbearing, but he could also be polite, charming, and witty. Occasionally he displayed a violent temper, and he kept his power by melodramatically threatening resignation time and again, which cowed Wilhelm I. He possessed not only a long-term national and international vision but also the short-term ability to juggle complex developments. As the leader of what historians call “revolutionary conservatism,” Bismarck became a hero to German nationalists; they built many monuments honoring the founder of the new Reich. Many historians praise him as a visionary who was instrumental in uniting Germany and, once that had been accomplished, kept the peace in Europe through adroit diplomacy.

Franco-Prussian War and Creation of the German Empire

Prussia’s victory over Austria in 1866, a war that ended the German Confederation and resulted in the creation of the North German Confederation, increased already existing tensions with France. The Emperor of France, Napoleon III, tried to gain territory for France (in Belgium and on the left bank of the Rhine) as compensation for
not joining the war against Prussia and was disappointed by the surprisingly quick outcome of the war. The conflict was caused by Prussian ambitions to extend German unification and French fears of the shift in the European balance of power that would result if the Prussians succeeded. Some historians argue that Bismarck deliberately provoked a French attack to draw the southern German states—Baden, Württemberg, Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt—into an alliance with the North German Confederation dominated by Prussia, while others contend that Bismarck did not plan anything and merely exploited the circumstances as they unfolded.

A suitable pretext for war arose in 1870 when the German Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was offered the Spanish throne, vacant since a revolution in 1868. France pressured Leopold into withdrawing his candidacy. Not content with this, Paris demanded that Wilhelm, as head of the House of Hohenzollern, assure that no Hohenzollern would ever seek the Spanish crown again. To provoke France into declaring war with Prussia, Bismarck published the Ems Dispatch, a carefully edited version of a conversation between King Wilhelm and the French ambassador to Prussia, Count Benedetti. This conversation had been edited so that each nation felt its ambassador had been slighted and ridiculed, thus inflaming popular sentiment on both sides in favor of war.

France mobilized and declared war on July 19. The German states saw France as the aggressor, and—swept up by nationalism and patriotic zeal—they rallied to Prussia's side and provided troops. A series of swift Prussian and German victories in eastern France, culminating in the Siege of Metz and the Battle of Sedan, saw Napoleon III captured and the army of the Second Empire decisively defeated. A Government of National Defense declared the Third Republic in Paris on September 4 and continued the war for another five months; the German forces fought and defeated new French armies in northern France. Following the Siege of Paris, the capital fell on January 28, 1871, and then a revolutionary uprising called the Paris Commune seized power in the capital and held it for two
months until it was bloodily suppressed by the regular French army at the end of May 1871.

Bismarck acted immediately to secure the unification of Germany. He negotiated with representatives of the southern German states, offering special concessions if they agreed to unification. The negotiations succeeded; patriotic sentiment overwhelmed what opposition remained. While the war was in its final phase, Wilhelm I of Prussia was proclaimed German Emperor on January 18, 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors in the Château de Versailles. The new German Empire was a federation; each of its 25 constituent states (kingdoms, grand duchies, duchies, principalities, and free cities) retained some autonomy. The King of Prussia, as German Emperor, was not sovereign over the entirety of Germany; he was only primus inter pares, or first among equals.

Victory in the Franco-Prussian War proved the capstone of the nationalist issue. In the first half of the 1860s, Austria and Prussia both contended to speak for the German states; both maintained they could support German interests abroad and protect German interests at home. After the victory over Austria in 1866, Prussia began internally asserting its authority to speak for the German states and defend German interests, while Austria began directing more of its attention to possessions in the Balkans. The victory over France in 1871 expanded Prussian hegemony in the German states to the international level. With the proclamation of Wilhelm as Kaiser, Prussia assumed the leadership of the new empire. The southern states became officially incorporated into a unified Germany at the Treaty of Versailles of 1871 (signed February 26, 1871; later ratified in the Treaty of Frankfurt of May 10, 1871), which formally ended the war.

Under the Treaty of Frankfurt, France relinquished most of its traditionally German regions (Alsace and the German-speaking part of Lorraine); paid an indemnity, calculated (on the basis of population) as the precise equivalent of the indemnity that Napoleon Bonaparte imposed on Prussia in 1807; and accepted German administration of Paris and most of northern France, with
“German troops to be withdrawn stage by stage with each installment of the indemnity payment.”
The Unification of Germany: The German Empire 18 January 1871: The proclamation of the German Empire in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles. Otto von Bismarck appears in white in the center. The Grand Duke of Baden stands beside Wilhelm I, proclaimed here as German Emperor, leading the cheers. Crown Prince Friedrich, later Friedrich III, stands on his father’s right. Painting by Anton von Werner. 18 January 1871: The proclamation of the German Empire in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles. A
large group of men, in formal military uniforms, gathered to proclaim the German Empire. Bismarck appears in white. The Grand Duke of Baden stands beside Wilhelm, leading the cheers. Crown Prince Friedrich, later Friedrich III, stands on his father’s right. Painting by Anton von Werner.

Attributions

Otto von Bismarck and the Franco-Prussian War


After the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, the German princes proclaimed the founding of the German Empire in 1871 at Versailles, uniting all scattered parts of Germany except Austria.

**Learning Objective**

Examine the structure of the newly formed German Empire and the role of the Kaiser

**Key Points**

- On December 10, 1870, the North German Confederation Reichstag renamed the Confederation as the German Empire and gave the title of German Emperor to William I, the King of Prussia.
- Following the unification of Germany, Bismarck’s foreign policy as Chancellor of Germany under Emperor William I secured Germany’s position as a great nation by forging alliances, isolating France by diplomatic means, and avoiding war.
• On the domestic front Bismarck tried to stem the rise of socialism by anti-socialist laws, combined with an introduction of health care and social security.
• In 1888, the young and ambitious Kaiser Wilhelm II became emperor and dismissed Bismarck as Chancellor, moving Germany on a different course.
• Under Wilhelm II, Germany, like other European powers, took an imperialistic course, leading to friction with neighboring countries.
• Wilhelm II promoted active colonization of Africa and Asia for those areas that were not already colonies of other European powers; his administration of the colonies was notoriously brutal.
• The Kaiser’s approach in Europe eventually led to the assassination of the Austrian-Hungarian crown prince, sparking World War I.

Key Terms

Reichstag
The Parliament of Germany from 1871 to 1918. It shared legislative powers with the Bundesrat, the Imperial Council of the reigning princes of the German States. It had no formal right to appoint or dismiss governments, but by contemporary standards it was considered a highly modern and progressive parliament. All German men over 25 years of age were eligible to vote, and members of were elected by
general, universal, and secret suffrage.

Kaiser Wilhelm II

The last German Emperor (Kaiser) and King of Prussia, ruling the German Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia from June 1888 to November 1918. He dismissed the Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, in 1890 and launched Germany on a bellicose “New Course” in foreign affairs that culminated in his support for Austria-Hungary in the crisis of July 1914 that led in a matter of days to the First World War.

Otto von Bismarck

A conservative Prussian statesman who dominated German and European affairs from the 1860s until 1890. In the 1860s he engineered a series of wars that unified the German states, significantly and deliberately excluding Austria, into a powerful German Empire under Prussian leadership. With that accomplished by 1871, he skillfully used balance of power diplomacy to maintain Germany’s position in a Europe which, despite many disputes and war scares, remained at peace.

The German Empire (officially Deutsches Reich) was the historical German nation state that existed from the unification of Germany in 1871 to the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II in November 1918, when Germany became a federal republic (the Weimar Republic).

The German Empire consisted of 26 constituent territories, most ruled by royal families. This included four kingdoms, six grand duchies, five duchies (six before 1876), seven principalities, three free Hanseatic cities, and one imperial territory. Although the Kingdom of Prussia contained most of the Empire’s population and territory, it eventually played a relatively lesser role in politics. As
Dwyer (2005) points out, Prussia’s “political and cultural influence had diminished considerably” by the 1890s, after the era of Bismarck’s leadership.

After Germany was united by Otto von Bismarck into the “German Reich,” he dominated German politics until 1890 as Chancellor. Bismarck tried to foster alliances in Europe to contain France and consolidate Germany’s influence in Europe. Bismarck’s post-1871 foreign policy was conservative and sought to preserve the balance of power in Europe. British historian Eric Hobsbawm concludes that he “remained undisputed world champion at the game of multilateral diplomatic chess for almost twenty years after 1871, [devoting] himself exclusively, and successfully, to maintaining peace between the powers.” His chief concern was that France would plot revenge after its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. As the French lacked the strength to defeat Germany by themselves, they sought an alliance with Russia that would trap Germany between the two in a war (as would ultimately happen in 1914). Bismarck wanted to prevent this at all costs and maintain friendly relations with the Russians, and thereby formed an alliance with them and Austria-Hungary. The League of Three Emperors was signed in 1872 by Russia, Austria, and Germany. It stated that republicanism and socialism were common enemies and that the three powers would discuss any matters concerning foreign policy.

Bismarck’s domestic policies played an important role in forging the authoritarian political culture of the new Empire. Less preoccupied by continental power politics following unification in 1871, Germany’s semi-parliamentary government carried out a relatively smooth economic and political revolution from above that pushed them along the way to becoming the world’s leading industrial power of the time.

Bismarck’s “revolutionary conservatism” was a conservative state-building strategy designed to make ordinary Germans—not just the Junker elite—more loyal to state and emperor. His strategy was to grant social rights to enhance the integration of a hierarchical society, forge a bond between workers and the state to strengthen
the latter, maintain traditional relations of authority between social and status groups, and provide a countervailing power against the modernist forces of liberalism and socialism. He created the modern welfare state in Germany in the 1880s, with an introduction of health care and social security, and enacted universal male suffrage in the new German Empire in 1871. He became a great hero to German conservatives, who erected many monuments to his memory and tried to emulate his policies.

At the same time Bismarck tried to reduce the political influence of the emancipated Catholic minority in the Kulturkampf, literally “culture struggle.” The Catholics only grew stronger, forming the Center (Zentrum) Party. Germany grew rapidly in industrial and economic power, matching Britain by 1900. Its highly professional army was the best in the world, but the navy could never catch up with Britain's Royal Navy.

In 1888, the young and ambitious Kaiser Wilhelm II became emperor. He could not abide advice, least of all from the most experienced politician and diplomat in Europe, so he fired Bismarck. The Kaiser opposed Bismarck's careful foreign policy and wanted Germany to pursue colonialist policies as Britain and France had been doing for decades, as well as build a navy that could match the British. The Kaiser promoted active colonization of Africa and Asia for those areas that were not already colonies of other European powers; his record was notoriously brutal and set the stage for genocide. In what became known as the “First Genocide of the Twentieth-Century,” between 1904 and 1907, the German colonial government in South-West Africa (present-day Namibia) ordered the annihilation of the local Herero and Namaqua peoples as a punitive measure for an uprising against German colonial rule, killing over 100,000 people. The Kaiser took a mostly unilateral approach in Europe with the Austro-Hungarian Empire as its main ally, and an arms race with Britain eventually led to the assassination of the Austrian-Hungarian crown prince sparked World War I.

After four years of warfare in which approximately two million German soldiers were killed, a general armistice ended the fighting
on November 11, and German troops returned home. In the German Revolution (November 1918), Emperor Wilhelm II and all German ruling princes abdicated their positions and responsibilities, marking the beginning of the Weimar Republic. Germany’s new political leadership signed the Treaty of Versailles in 1919.

**Political Structure**

On December 10, 1870, the North German Confederation Reichstag renamed the Confederation as the German Empire and gave the title of German Emperor to William I, the King of Prussia. The new constitution (Constitution of the German Confederation) and the title Emperor came into effect on January 1, 1871. During the Siege of Paris on January 18, 1871, William accepted to be proclaimed Emperor in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles.

The second German Constitution was adopted by the Reichstag on April 14, 1871, and proclaimed by the Emperor on April 16. It was substantially based upon Bismarck’s North German Constitution. The political system remained the same. The empire had a
parliament called the *Reichstag*, which was elected by universal male suffrage. However, the original constituencies drawn in 1871 were never redrawn to reflect the growth of urban areas. As a result, by the time of the great expansion of German cities in the 1890s and first decade of the 20th century, rural areas were grossly over-represented.

Legislation also required the consent of the *Bundesrat*, the federal council of deputies from the 27 states. Executive power was vested in the emperor, or *Kaiser*, who was assisted by a chancellor responsible only to him. The emperor was given extensive powers by the constitution. He alone appointed and dismissed the chancellor (which in practice was used by the emperor to rule the empire through him), was supreme commander-in-chief of the armed forces, final arbiter of all foreign affairs, and could disband the *Reichstag* to call for new elections. Officially, the chancellor was a one-man cabinet and was responsible for the conduct of all state affairs; in practice, the State Secretaries (bureaucratic top officials in charge of such fields as finance, war, foreign affairs, etc.) acted as unofficial portfolio ministers. The *Reichstag* had the power to pass, amend, or reject bills and initiate legislation. However, as mentioned above, in practice the real power was vested in the emperor, who exercised it through his chancellor.

Although nominally a federal empire and league of equals, in practice the empire was dominated by the largest and most powerful state, Prussia. It stretched across the northern two-thirds of the new *Reich*, and contained three-fifths of its population. The imperial crown was hereditary in the House of Hohenzollern, the ruling house of Prussia. With the exception of the years 1872–1873 and 1892–1894, the chancellor was always simultaneously the prime minister of Prussia. With 17 out of 58 votes in the *Bundesrat*, Berlin needed only a few votes from the small states to exercise effective control.

The other states retained their own governments, but had only limited aspects of sovereignty. For example, both postage stamps and currency were issued for the empire as a whole.
Attributions
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PART VI

CH. 25 THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION
109. The Agricultural Revolution

25.1: The Agricultural Revolution

25.1.1: New Agricultural Practices

The Agricultural Revolution, the unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries, was linked to such new agricultural practices as crop rotation, selective breeding, and a more productive use of arable land.

Learning Objective

Trace the development of new agricultural techniques

Key Points

• The Agricultural Revolution was the unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain due to
increases in labor and land productivity between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries. However, historians continue to dispute whether the developments leading to the unprecedented agricultural growth can be seen as “a revolution,” since the growth was, in fact, a result of a series of significant changes that took place over a long period of time.

- One of the most important innovations of the Agricultural Revolution was the development of the Norfolk four-course rotation, which greatly increased crop and livestock yields by improving soil fertility and reducing fallow. Crop rotation is the practice of growing a series of dissimilar types of crops in the same area in sequential seasons to help restore plant nutrients and mitigate the build-up of pathogens and pests that often occurs when one plant species is continuously cropped.
- Following a two-field crop rotation system common in the Middle Ages and a three-year three field crop rotation routine employed later, the regular planting of legumes such as peas and beans in the fields that were previously fallow became central and slowly restored the fertility of some croplands. In the end, it was the farmers in Flanders (in parts of France and current day Belgium) that discovered a still more effective four-field crop rotation system, using turnips and clover (a legume) as forage crops to replace the three-year crop rotation fallow year.
- The four-field rotation system allowed farmers to restore soil fertility and restore some of the plant nutrients removed with the crops. Turnips first show up in the probate records in England as early as 1638.
but were not widely used until about 1750. Fallow land was about 20% of the arable area in England in 1700 before turnips and clover were extensively grown. Guano and nitrates from South America were introduced in the mid-19th century and fallow steadily declined to reach only about 4% in 1900.

• In the mid-18th century, two British agriculturalists, Robert Bakewell and Thomas Coke, introduced selective breeding as a scientific practice and used inbreeding to stabilize certain qualities in order to reduce genetic diversity. Bakewell was also the first to breed cattle to be used primarily for beef.

• Certain practices that contributed to a more productive use of land intensified, such as converting some pasture land into arable land and recovering fen land and pastures. Other developments came from Flanders and the Netherlands, the region that became a pioneer in canal building, soil restoration and maintenance, soil drainage, and land reclamation technology. Finally, water-meadows were utilized in the late 16th to the 20th centuries and allowed earlier pasturing of livestock after they were wintered on hay.

Key Terms

**Industrial Revolution**

The transition to new manufacturing processes in
the period from about 1760 to sometime between 1820 and 1840. This transition included going from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, improved efficiency of water power, the increasing use of steam power, the development of machine tools, and the rise of the factory system.

crop rotation

The practice of growing a series of dissimilar or different types of crops in the same area in sequenced seasons so that the soil of farms is not used to only one type of nutrient. It helps in reducing soil erosion and increases soil fertility and crop yield.

common field system

A system of land ownership in which land is owned collectively by a number of persons, or by one person with others having certain traditional rights, such as to allow their livestock to graze upon it, collect firewood, or cut turf for fuel.

Agricultural Revolution

The unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain due to increases in labor and land productivity between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries. Agricultural output grew faster than the population over the century to 1770 and thereafter productivity remained among the highest in the world.
Agricultural Revolution

The Agricultural Revolution was the unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain due to increases in labor and land productivity between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries. Agricultural output grew faster than the population over the century to 1770 and thereafter productivity remained among the highest in the world. This increase in the food supply contributed to the rapid growth of population in England and Wales, from 5.5 million in 1700 to over 9 million by 1801, although domestic production gave way to food imports in the 19th century as population more than tripled to over 32 million. The rise in productivity accelerated the decline of the agricultural share of the labor force, adding to the urban workforce on which industrialization depended. The Agricultural Revolution has therefore been cited as a cause of the Industrial Revolution. However, historians also continue to dispute whether the developments leading to the unprecedented agricultural growth can be seen as “a revolution,” since the growth was, in fact, a result of a series of significant changes over a her long period of time. Consequently, the question of when exactly such a revolution took place and of what it consisted remains open.

Crop Rotation

One of the most important innovations of the Agricultural Revolution was the development of the Norfolk four-course rotation, which greatly increased crop and livestock yields by improving soil fertility and reducing fallow.

Crop rotation is the practice of growing a series of dissimilar types of crops in the same area in sequential seasons to help restore plant nutrients and mitigate the build-up of pathogens and pests.
that often occurs when one plant species is continuously cropped. Rotation can also improve soil structure and fertility by alternating deep-rooted and shallow-rooted plants. The Norfolk System, as it is now known, rotates crops so that different crops are planted with the result that different kinds and quantities of nutrients are taken from the soil as the plants grow. An important feature of the Norfolk four-field system was that it used labor at times when demand was not at peak levels. Planting cover crops such as turnips and clover was not permitted under the common field system because they interfered with access to the fields and other people’s livestock could graze the turnips.

During the Middle Ages, the open field system initially used a two-field crop rotation system where one field was left fallow or turned into pasture for a time to try to recover some of its plant nutrients. Later, a three-year three-field crop rotation routine was employed, with a different crop in each of two fields, e.g. oats, rye, wheat, and barley with the second field growing a legume like peas or beans, and the third field fallow. Usually from 10–30% of the arable land in a three-crop rotation system is fallow. Each field was rotated into a different crop nearly every year. Over the following two centuries, the regular planting of legumes such as peas and beans in the fields that were previously fallow slowly restored the fertility of some croplands. The planting of legumes helped to increase plant growth in the empty field due to the bacteria on legume roots’ ability to fix nitrogen from the air into the soil in a form that plants could use. Other crops that were occasionally grown were flax and members of the mustard family. The practice of convertible husbandry, or the alternation of a field between pasture and grain, introduced pasture into the rotation. Because nitrogen builds up slowly over time in pasture, plowing pasture and planting grains resulted in high yields for a few years. A big disadvantage of convertible husbandry, however, was the hard work that had to be put into breaking up pastures and difficulty in establishing them.

It was the farmers in Flanders (in parts of France and current-day Belgium) that discovered a still more effective four-field crop
rotation system, using turnips and clover (a legume) as forage crops to replace the three-year crop rotation fallow year. The four-field rotation system allowed farmers to restore soil fertility and restore some of the plant nutrients removed with the crops. Turnips first show up in the probate records in England as early as 1638 but were not widely used until about 1750. Fallow land was about 20% of the arable area in England in 1700 before turnips and clover were extensively grown. Guano and nitrates from South America were introduced in the mid-19th century and fallow steadily declined to reach only about 4% in 1900. Ideally, wheat, barley, turnips, and clover would be planted in that order in each field in successive years. The turnips helped keep the weeds down and were an excellent forage crop—ruminant animals could eat their tops and roots through a large part of the summer and winters. There was no need to let the soil lie fallow as clover would add nitrates (nitrogen-containing salts) back to the soil. The clover made excellent pasture and hay fields as well as green manure when it was plowed under after one or two years. The addition of clover and turnips allowed more animals to be kept through the winter, which in turn produced more milk, cheese, meat, and manure, which maintained soil fertility.
Charles ‘Turnip’ Townshend, agriculturalist who was a great enthusiast of four-field crop rotation and the cultivation of turnips. Townshend is often mentioned, together with Jethro Tull, Robert Bakewell, and others, as a major figure in England’s Agricultural Revolution, contributing to adoption of agricultural practices that supported the increase in Britain’s population between 1700 and 1850.

Other Practices

In the mid-18th century, two British agriculturalists, Robert Bakewell and Thomas Coke, introduced selective breeding as a scientific practice (mating together two animals with particularly
desirable characteristics) and using inbreeding (the mating of close relatives) to stabilize certain qualities in order to reduce genetic diversity. Arguably, Bakewell's most important breeding program was with sheep. Using native stock, he was able to quickly select for large, yet fine-boned sheep with long, lustrous wool. Bakewell was also the first to breed cattle to be used primarily for beef. Previously, cattle were first and foremost kept for pulling plows as oxen or for dairy uses, with beef from surplus males as an additional bonus. As more and more farmers followed Bakewell's lead, farm animals increased dramatically in size and quality.

Certain practices that contributed to a more productive use of land intensified, for example converting some pasture land into arable land and recovering fen land and some pastures. It is estimated that the amount of arable land in Britain grew by 10-30% through these land conversions. Other developments came from Flanders and and the Netherlands, where due to the large and dense population, farmers were forced to take maximum advantage of every bit of usable land. The region became a pioneer in canal building, soil restoration and maintenance, soil drainage, and land reclamation technology. Dutch experts like Cornelius Vermuyden brought some of this technology to Britain. Finally, water-meadows were utilized in the late 16th to the 20th centuries and allowed earlier pasturing of livestock after they were wintered on hay. This increased livestock yields, giving more hides, meat, milk, and manure as well as better hay crops.
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25.1.2: New Agricultural Tools

An important factor of the Agricultural Revolution was the invention of new tools and advancement of old ones, including the plough, seed drill, and threshing machine, to improve the efficiency of agricultural operations.

Learning Objective

Identify some of the new tools developed as part of the Agricultural Revolution

Key Points

- The mechanization and rationalization of agriculture was a key factor of the Agricultural Revolution. New tools were invented and old ones perfected to improve the efficiency of various agricultural operations.
- The Dutch plough was brought to Britain by Dutch contractors. In 1730, Joseph Foljambe in Rotherham, England, used new shapes as the basis for the
Rotherham plough, which also covered the moldboard with iron. By 1770, it was the cheapest and best plough available. It spread to Scotland, America, and France. It may have been the first plough to be widely built in factories and the first to be commercially successful.

- In 1789 Robert Ransome started casting ploughshares in a disused malting at St. Margaret’s Ditches. As a result of a mishap in his foundry, a broken mold caused molten metal to come into contact with cold metal, making the metal surface extremely hard — chilled casting — which he advertised as “self sharpening” ploughs and received patents for his discovery.

- James Small further advanced the design. Using mathematical methods, he experimented with various designs until he arrived at a shape cast from a single piece of iron, an improvement on the Scots plough of James Anderson of Hermiston.

- The seed drill was invented in China in the 2nd century BCE and introduced to Italy in the mid-16th century. First attributed to Camillo Torello, it was patented by the Venetian Senate in 1566. In England, it was further refined by Jethro Tull in 1701. Tull’s drill was a mechanical seeder that sowed efficiently at the correct depth and spacing and then covered the seed so that it could grow. However, seed drills of this and successive types were expensive, unreliable, and fragile.

- A threshing machine or thresher is a piece of farm equipment that threshes grain: removes the seeds from the stalks and husks. Mechanization of this
process removed a substantial amount of drudgery from farm labor. The first threshing machine was invented circa 1786 by the Scottish engineer Andrew Meikle, and the subsequent adoption of such machines was one of the earlier examples of the mechanization of agriculture.

**Key Terms**

**plough**
A tool or farm implement for initial cultivation of soil in preparation for sowing seed or planting. It has been a basic instrument for most of recorded history, although written references do not appear in English until c. 1100, after which it is referenced frequently. Its construction was highly advanced during the Agricultural Revolution.

**seed drill**
A device that sows the seeds for crops by metering out individual seeds, positioning them in the soil, and covering them to a certain average depth. It sows the seeds at equal distances and proper depth, ensuring they get covered with soil and are saved from being eaten by birds. Invented in China in the 2nd century BCE, it was advanced by Europeans in the 16th and 17th centuries, becoming an important development of the Agricultural Revolution.
Threshing Machine

A piece of farm equipment that threshes grain, that is, removes the seeds from the stalks and husks. It does so by beating the plant to make the seeds fall out. The first model was invented circa 1786 by the Scottish engineer Andrew Meikle, and the subsequent adoption of such machines was one of the earlier examples of the mechanization of agriculture.

Agricultural Revolution: Mechanization

The mechanization and rationalization of agriculture was a key factor of the Agricultural Revolution. New tools were invented and old ones perfected to improve the efficiency of various agricultural operations.

The basic plough with coulter, ploughshare, and moldboard remained in use for a millennium. Major changes in design did not become common until the Age of Enlightenment, when there was rapid progress. The Dutch acquired the iron tipped, curved moldboard, adjustable depth plough from the Chinese in the early 17th century. It had the ability to be pulled by one or two oxen compared to the six or eight needed by the heavy-wheeled northern European plough. The Dutch plough was brought to Britain by Dutch contractors hired to drain East Anglian fens and Somerset moors. The plough was extremely successful on wet, boggy soil, but soon was used on ordinary land. In 1730, Joseph Foljambe in Rotherham, England, used new shapes as the basis for the Rotherham plough, which also covered the moldboard with iron.
Unlike the heavy plough, the Rotherham (or Rotherham swing) plough consisted entirely of the coulter, moldboard, and handles. By the 1760s Foljambe was making large numbers of these ploughs in a factory outside of Rotherham, using standard patterns with interchangeable parts. The plough was easy for a blacksmith to make and by the end of the 18th century it was being made in rural foundries. By 1770, it was the cheapest and best plough available. It spread to Scotland, America, and France. It may have been the first plough to be widely built in factories and the first to be commercially successful.

In 1789 Robert Ransome, an iron founder in Ipswich, started casting ploughshares in a disused malting at St. Margaret’s Ditches. As a result of a mishap in his foundry, a broken mold caused molten metal to come into contact with cold metal, making the metal surface extremely hard — chilled casting — which he advertised as “self sharpening” ploughs and received patents for his discovery. In 1789, Ransomes, Sims & Jefferies was producing 86 plough models for different soils.

James Small further advanced the design. Using mathematical methods, he experimented with various designs until he arrived at a shape cast from a single piece of iron, an improvement on the Scots plough of James Anderson of Hermiston. A single-piece cast iron plough was also developed and patented by Charles Newbold in the United States. This was again improved on by Jethro Wood, a blacksmith of Scipio, New York, who made a three-part Scots Plough that allowed a broken piece to be replaced.

The seed drill was introduced from China, where it was invented in the 2nd century BCE, to Italy in the mid-16th century. First attributed to Camillo Torello, it was patented by the Venetian Senate in 1566. A seed drill was described in detail by Tadeo Cavalina of Bologna in 1602. In England, it was further refined by Jethro Tull in 1701. Before the introduction of the seed drill, the common practice was to plant seeds by broadcasting (evenly throwing) them across the ground by hand on the prepared soil and then lightly harrowing the soil to cover the seed. Seeds left on top of the ground
were eaten by birds, insects, and mice. There was no control over spacing and seeds were planted too close together and too far apart. Alternately seeds could be laboriously planted one by one using a hoe and/or a shovel. Cutting down on wasted seed was important because the yield of seeds harvested to seeds planted at that time was around four or five. Tull's drill was a mechanical seeder that sowed efficiently at the correct depth and spacing and then covered the seed so that it could grow. However, seed drills of this and successive types were both expensive and unreliable, as well as fragile. They would not come into widespread use in Europe until the mid-19th century. Early drills were small enough to be pulled by a single horse, and many of these remained in use into the 1930s.
In his 1731 publication, Tull described how the motivation for developing the seed-drill arose from conflict with his servants. He struggled to enforce his new methods upon them, in part because they resisted the threat to their position as laborers and skill with the plough. He also invented machinery for the purpose of carrying out his system of drill husbandry, about 1733. His first invention was
a drill-plough to sow wheat and turnip seed in drills, three rows at a
time.

A threshing machine or thresher is a piece of farm equipment that
threshes grain: removes the seeds from the stalks and husks by
beating the plant to make the seeds fall out. Before such machines
were developed, threshing was done by hand with flails and was
very laborious and time-consuming, taking about one-quarter of
agricultural labor by the 18th century. Mechanization of this process
removed a substantial amount of drudgery from farm labor. The first
threshing machine was invented circa 1786 by the Scottish engineer
Andrew Meikle and the subsequent adoption of such machines was
one of the earlier examples of the mechanization of agriculture.
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25.1.3: The Enclosure Act

Enclosure, or the process that ended traditional rights on common land formerly held in the open field system and restricted the use of land to the owner, is one of the causes of the Agricultural Revolution and a key factor behind the labor migration from rural areas to gradually industrializing cities.

---

**Learning Objective**

Interpret the consequences of enclosure

---

**Key Points**

- Common land is owned collectively by a number of persons or by one person with others holding certain traditional rights, such as to allow their livestock to graze upon it, collect firewood, or cut turf for fuel. A person who has a right in or over common land jointly with others is called a commoner.
- Most of the medieval common land of England was lost due to enclosure. In English social and economic
history, enclosure was the process that ended traditional rights on common land formerly held in the open field system. Once enclosed, these land uses were restricted to the owner, and the land ceased to be for the use of commoners.

- The process of enclosure became a widespread feature of the English agricultural landscape during the 16th century. By the 19th century, unenclosed commons became largely restricted to large rough pastures in mountainous areas and relatively small residual parcels of land in the lowlands.

- Enclosure could be accomplished by buying the ground rights and all common rights to accomplish exclusive rights of use, which increased the value of the land. The other method was by passing laws causing or forcing enclosure, such as parliamentary enclosures. The latter process was sometimes accompanied by force, resistance, and bloodshed, and remains among the most controversial areas of agricultural and economic history in England.

- Parliamentary enclosures consolidated strips in the open fields into more compact units and enclosed much of the remaining pasture commons or wastes. They usually provided commoners with some other land in compensation for the loss of common rights, although this was often of poor quality and limited extent. They were also used for the division and privatization of common “wastes” (in the original sense of uninhabited places). Voluntary enclosure was also frequent at that time.

- Enclosure faced a great deal of popular resistance because of its effects on the household economies of
smallholders and landless laborers, who were often pushed out of the rural areas. Enclosure is also considered one of the causes of the Agricultural Revolution. Enclosed land was under control of the farmer, who was free to adopt better farming practices. Following enclosure, crop yields and livestock output increased while at the same time productivity increased enough to create a surplus of labor. The increased labor supply is considered one of the factors facilitating the Industrial Revolution.

Key Terms

**Industrial Revolution**

The transition to new manufacturing processes in the period from about 1760 to between 1820 and 1840. This transition included going from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, improved efficiency of water power, the increasing use of steam power, the development of machine tools, and the rise of the factory system.

**common land**

A system of land ownership, known also as the common field system, in which land is owned collectively by a number of persons, or by one person with others holding certain traditional rights, such as
to allow their livestock to graze upon it, collect firewood, or cut turf for fuel.

**Agricultural Revolution**

The unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain due to increases in labor and land productivity between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries. Agricultural output grew faster than the population over the century to 1770 and thereafter productivity remained among the highest in the world.

**Enclosure Acts**

A series of United Kingdom Acts of Parliament which enclosed open fields and common land in the country, creating legal property rights to land that was previously considered common. Between 1604 and 1914, over 5,200 individual acts were put into place, enclosing 6.8 million acres.

**Enclosure**

The legal process in England during the 18th century of enclosing a number of small landholdings to create one larger farm. Once enclosed, use of the land became restricted to the owner and it ceased to be common land for communal use. In England and Wales, the term is also used for the process that ended the ancient system of arable farming in open fields.
Background: Common Land

Common land is owned collectively by a number of persons, or by one person with others holding certain traditional rights, such as to allow their livestock to graze upon it, to collect firewood, or to cut turf for fuel. A person who has a right in or over common land jointly with others is called a commoner. Originally in medieval England, the common was an integral part of the manor and thus part of the estate held by the lord of the manor under a feudal grant from the Crown or a superior peer, who in turn held his land from the Crown, which owned all land. This manorial system, founded on feudalism, granted rights of land use to different classes. These would be appurtenant rights, meaning the ownership of rights belonged to tenancies of particular plots of land held within a manor. A commoner would be the person who for the time being occupied a particular plot of land. Some rights of common were said to be in gross, or unconnected with tenure of land. This was more usual in regions where commons were extensive, such as in the high ground of Northern England or on the Fens, but also included many village greens across England and Wales.

Enclosure

Most of the medieval common land of England was lost due to enclosure. In English social and economic history, enclosure or inclosure was the process that ended traditional rights such as mowing meadows for hay or grazing livestock on common land formerly held in the open field system. Once enclosed, these uses of the land became restricted to the owner and the land cased to be for the use of commoners. In England and Wales, the term is also used for the process that ended the ancient system of arable farming in 1058 | The Enclosure Act
open fields. Under enclosure, such land was fenced (enclosed) and deeded or entitled to one or more owners. The process of enclosure became a widespread feature of the English agricultural landscape during the 16th century. By the 19th century, unenclosed commons were largely restricted to large areas of rough pasture in mountainous places and relatively small residual parcels of land in the lowlands.

Enclosure could be accomplished by buying the ground rights and all common rights to accomplish exclusive rights of use, which increased the value of the land. The other method was by passing laws causing or forcing enclosure, such as parliamentary enclosure. The latter process of enclosure was sometimes accompanied by force, resistance, and bloodshed, and remains among the most controversial areas of agricultural and economic history in England.

Implementation of the Acts

The more productive enclosed farms meant that fewer farmers were needed to work the same land, leaving many villagers without land and grazing rights. Many moved to the cities in search of work in the emerging factories of the Industrial Revolution. Others settled in the English colonies. English Poor Laws were enacted to help these newly poor. Some practices of enclosure were denounced by the Church and legislation was drawn up against it. However, the large, enclosed fields were needed for the gains in agricultural productivity from the 16th to 18th centuries. This controversy led to a series of government acts, culminating in the General Enclosure Act of 1801, which sanctioned large-scale land reform.

The Act of 1801 was one of many parliamentary enclosures that consolidated strips in the open fields into more compact units and enclosed much of the remaining pasture commons or wastes. Parliamentary enclosures usually provided commoners with some
other land in compensation for the loss of common rights, although often of poor quality and limited extent. They were also used for the division and privatization of common “wastes” (in the original sense of uninhabited places), such as fens, marshes, heathland, downland, and moors. Voluntary enclosure was also frequent at that time.

After 1529, the problem of untended farmland disappeared with the rising population. There was a desire for more arable land along with antagonism toward the tenant-graziers with their flocks and
herds. Increased demand along with a scarcity of tillable land caused rents to rise dramatically in the 1520s to mid-century. There were popular efforts to remove old enclosures and much legislation of the 1530s and 1540s concerns this shift. Angry tenants impatient to reclaim pastures for tillage were illegally destroying enclosures.

**Consequences**

The primary benefits to large land holders came from increased value of their own land, not from expropriation. Smaller holders could sell their land to larger ones for a higher price post enclosure. Protests against parliamentary enclosures continued, sometimes also in Parliament, frequently in the villages affected, and sometimes as organized mass revolts. Enclosed land was twice as valuable, a price that could be sustained by its higher productivity. While many villagers received plots in the newly enclosed manor, for small landholders this compensation was not always enough to offset the costs of enclosure and fencing. Many historians believe that enclosure was an important factor in the reduction of small landholders in England as compared to the Continent, although others believe that this process began earlier.

Enclosure faced a great deal of popular resistance because of its effects on the household economies of smallholders and landless laborers. Common rights had included not just the right of cattle or sheep grazing, but also the grazing of geese, foraging for pigs, gleaning, berrying, and fuel gathering. During the period of parliamentary enclosures, employment in agriculture did not fall, but failed to keep pace with the growing population. Consequently, large numbers of people left rural areas to move into the cities where they became laborers in the Industrial Revolution.

Enclosure is considered one of the causes of the British Agricultural Revolution. Enclosed land was under control of the farmer, who was free to adopt better farming practices. There was
widespread agreement in contemporary accounts that profit making opportunities were better with enclosed land. Following enclosure, crop yields and livestock output increased while at the same time productivity increased enough to create a surplus of labor. The increased labor supply is considered one of the factors facilitating the Industrial Revolution.
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25.1.4: Effects of the Agricultural Revolution

The increase in agricultural production and technological advancements during the Agricultural Revolution contributed to unprecedented population growth and new agricultural practices, triggering such phenomena as rural-to-urban migration, development of a coherent and loosely regulated agricultural market, and emergence of capitalist farmers.

**Learning Objective**

Infer some major social and economic outcomes of the Agricultural Revolution

**Key Points**

- The Agricultural Revolution in Britain proved to be a major turning point, allowing population to far exceed earlier peaks and sustain the country’s rise to industrial preeminence. It is estimated that total
agricultural output grew 2.7-fold between 1700 and 1870 and output per worker at a similar rate. The Agricultural Revolution gave Britain the most productive agriculture in Europe, with 19th-century yields as much as 80% higher than the Continental average.

- The increase in the food supply contributed to the rapid growth of population in England and Wales, from 5.5 million in 1700 to over 9 million by 1801, although domestic production gave way increasingly to food imports in the 19th century as population more than tripled to over 32 million.
- The rise in productivity accelerated the decline of the agricultural share of the labor force, adding to the urban workforce on which industrialization depended. The Agricultural Revolution has therefore been cited as a cause of the Industrial Revolution. As enclosure deprived many of access to land or left farmers with plots too small and of poor quality, increasing numbers of workers had no choice but migrate to the city. However, mass rural flight did not take place until the Industrial Revolution was already underway.
- The most important development between the 16th century and the mid-19th century was the development of private marketing. By the 19th century, marketing was nationwide and the vast majority of agricultural production was for market rather than for the farmer and his family.
- The next stage of development was trading between markets, requiring merchants, credit and forward sales, and knowledge of markets and pricing
as well as of supply and demand in different markets. Eventually the market evolved into a national one driven by London and other growing cities. Commerce was aided by the expansion of roads and inland waterways.

- With the development of regional markets and eventually a national market aided by improved transportation infrastructures, farmers were no longer dependent on their local markets. This freed them from having to lower prices in an oversupplied local market and the inability to sell surpluses to distant localities experiencing shortages. They also became less subject to price fixing regulations. Farming became a business rather than solely a means of subsistence.

**Key Terms**

**enclosure**

The legal process in England during the 18th century of enclosing a number of small landholdings to create one larger farm. Once enclosed, use of the land became restricted to the owner and ceased to be common land for communal use. In England and Wales, the term is also used for the process that ended the ancient system of arable farming in open fields.
rural flight
The migratory pattern of peoples from rural areas into urban areas. It is urbanization seen from the rural perspective.

Industrial Revolution
The transition to new manufacturing processes in the period from about 1760 to between 1820 and 1840. This transition included going from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, improved efficiency of water power, the increasing use of steam power, the development of machine tools and the rise of the factory system.

Agricultural Revolution
The unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain due to increases in labor and land productivity between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries. Agricultural output grew faster than the population over the century to 1770 and thereafter productivity remained among the highest in the world.

Significance of the Agricultural Revolution
The Agricultural Revolution in Britain proved to be a major turning point, allowing population to far exceed earlier peaks and sustain the country’s rise to industrial preeminence. Although evidence-
based advice on farming began to appear in England in the mid-17th century, the overall agricultural productivity of Britain grew significantly only later. It is estimated that total agricultural output grew 2.7-fold between 1700 and 1870 and output per worker at a similar rate. The Agricultural Revolution gave Britain at the time the most productive agriculture in Europe, with 19th-century yields as much as 80% higher than the Continental average. Even as late as 1900, British yields were rivaled only by Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium. But Britain’s lead eroded as European countries experienced their own agricultural revolutions, raising grain yields on average by 60% in the century preceding World War I. Interestingly, the Agricultural Revolution in Britain did not result in overall productivity per hectare of agriculture that would rival productivity in China, where intensive cultivation (including multiple annual cropping in many areas) had been practiced for many centuries. Towards the end of the 19th century, the substantial gains in British agricultural productivity were rapidly offset by competition from cheaper imports, made possible by the exploitation of colonies and advances in transportation, refrigeration, and other technologies.

Social Impact

The increase in the food supply contributed to the rapid growth of population in England and Wales, from 5.5 million in 1700 to over 9 million by 1801, although domestic production gave way increasingly to food imports in the 19th century as population more than tripled to over 32 million. The rise in productivity accelerated the decline of the agricultural share of the labor force, adding to the urban workforce on which industrialization depended. The Agricultural Revolution has therefore been cited as a cause of the Industrial Revolution. As enclosure deprived many of access to land or left
farmers with plots too small and of poor quality, increasing numbers of workers had no choice but migrate to the city. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, however, rural flight occurred in mostly localized regions. Pre-industrial societies did not experience large rural-urban migration flows, primarily due to the inability of cities to support large populations. Lack of large employment industries, high urban mortality, and low food supplies all served as checks keeping pre-industrial cities much smaller than their modern counterparts. While the improved agricultural productivity freed up workers to other sectors of the economy, it took decades of the Industrial Revolution and industrial development to trigger a truly mass rural-to-urban labor migration. As food supplies increased and stabilized and industrialized centers moved into place, cities began to support larger populations, sparking the beginning of rural flight on a massive scale. In England, the proportion of the population living in cities jumped from 17% in 1801 to 72% in 1891.

The development and advancement of tools and machines decreased the demand for rural labor. That together with increasingly restricted access to land forced many rural workers to migrate to cities, eventually supplying the labor demand created by the Industrial Revolution.
New Agricultural Market Trends

Markets were widespread by 1500. These were regulated and not free. The most important development between the 16th century and the mid-19th century was the development of private marketing. By the 19th century, marketing was nationwide and the vast majority of agricultural production was for market rather than for the farmer and his family. The 16th-century market radius was about 10 miles, which could support a town of 10,000. High wagon transportation costs made it uneconomical to ship commodities very far outside the market radius by road, generally limiting shipment to less than 20 or 30 miles to market or to a navigable waterway.

The next stage of development was trading between markets, requiring merchants, credit and forward sales, and knowledge of markets and pricing as well as of supply and demand in different markets. Eventually the market evolved into a national one driven by London and other growing cities. By 1700, there was a national market for wheat. Legislation regulating middlemen required registration, and addressed weights and measures, fixing of prices, and collection of tolls by the government. Market regulations were eased in 1663, when people were allowed some self-regulation to hold inventory, but it was forbidden to withhold commodities from the market in an effort to increase prices. In the late 18th century, the idea of “self regulation” was gaining acceptance. The lack of internal tariffs, customs barriers, and feudal tolls made Britain “the largest coherent market in Europe.”

Commerce was aided by the expansion of roads and inland waterways. Road transport capacity grew from threefold to fourfold from 1500 to 1700. By the early 19th century it cost as much to transport a ton of freight 32 miles by wagon over an unimproved road as it did to ship it 3,000 miles across the Atlantic.

With the development of regional markets and eventually a national market aided by improved transportation infrastructures,
farmers were no longer dependent on their local markets and were less subject to having to sell at low prices into an oversupplied local market and not being able to sell their surpluses to distant localities that were experiencing shortages. They also became less subject to price fixing regulations. Farming became a business rather than solely a means of subsistence. Under free market capitalism, farmers had to remain competitive. To be successful, they had to become effective managers who incorporated the latest farming innovations in order to be low-cost producers.
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113. Textile Manufacturing

25.2: Textile Manufacturing

25.2.1: The British Textile Industry

The British textile industry drove the Industrial Revolution, triggering advancements in technology, stimulating the coal and iron industries, boosting raw material imports, and improving transportation, which made Britain the global leader of industrialization, trade, and scientific innovation.

Learning Objective

Evaluate the British textile industry and its place in the global market before and after the Industrial Revolution

Key Points

• Before the 17th century, the manufacture of textiles was performed on a limited scale by individual workers, usually on their own premises. Goods were
transported around the country by clothiers who visited the village with their trains of packhorses. Some of the cloth was made into clothes for people living in the same area and a large amount of cloth was exported.

- In the early 18th century, the British government passed two Calico Acts to protect the domestic woolen industry from the increasing amounts of cotton fabric imported from competitors in India. On the eve of the Industrial Revolution, spinning and weaving were still done in households, for domestic consumption, and as a cottage industry under the putting-out system. Occasionally the work was done in the workshop of a master weaver.

- The key British industry at the beginning of the 18th century was the production of textiles made with wool from large sheep-farming areas. This was a labor-intensive activity providing employment throughout Britain. The export trade in woolen goods accounted for more than a quarter of British exports during most of the 18th century, doubling between 1701 and 1770. Exports by the cotton industry had grown tenfold during this time, but still accounted for only a tenth of the value of the wool trade.

- Starting in the later part of the 18th century, mechanization of the textile industries, the development of iron-making techniques, and the increased use of refined coal began. Trade expansion was enabled by the introduction of canals, improved roads, and railways. Factories pulled thousands from low-productivity work in agriculture to high-productivity urban jobs.
Textiles have been identified as the catalyst of technological changes and thus their importance during the Industrial Revolution cannot be overstated. The application of steam power stimulated the demand for coal. The demand for machinery and rails stimulated the iron industry. The demand for transportation to move raw material in and finished products out stimulated the growth of the canal system, and (after 1830) the railway system.

From 1815 to 1870 Britain reaped the benefits of being the world’s first modern industrialized nation. If political conditions in a particular overseas market were stable, Britain could dominate its economy through free trade alone without resorting to formal rule or mercantilism. By 1820, 30% of Britain’s exports went to its Empire, rising slowly to 35% by 1910. Apart from coal and iron, most raw materials had to be imported. By 1900, Britain’s global share soared to 22.8% of total imports. By 1922, its global share soared to 14.9% of total exports and 28.8% of manufactured exports.

**Key Terms**

**mercantilism**

An economic theory and practice dominant in Western Europe during the 16th to mid-19th centuries and a form of economic nationalism. Its goal was to
enrich and empower the nation and state to the maximum degree by acquiring and retaining as much economic activity as possible within the nation’s borders. Manufacturing and industry, particularly of goods with military applications, was prioritized.

**cottage industry**
A small-scale industry in which the creation of products and services is home-based rather than factory-based. It was a dominant form of production in prior to industrialization but continues to exist today. While products and services are often unique and distinctive, given that they are usually not mass-produced, producers in this sector often face numerous disadvantages when trying to compete with much larger factory-based companies.

**putting-out system**
A means of subcontracting work, historically known as the workshop system and the domestic system, in which work is contracted by a central agent to subcontractors who complete the work in off-site facilities, either in their own homes or in workshops with multiple craftsmen.

**Calico Acts**
Two legislative acts, one of 1700 and one of 1721, that banned the import of most cotton textiles into England, followed by the restriction of sale of most cotton textiles.
Pre-Industrial Textile Industry

Before the 17th century, the manufacture of goods was performed on a limited scale by individual workers, usually on their own premises. Goods were transported around the country by clothiers who visited the village with their trains of packhorses. Some was made into clothes for people living in the same area and a large amount was exported. In the early 18th century, artisans were inventing ways to become more productive. Silk, wool, fustian (a cloth with flax warp and cotton weft), and linen were eclipsed by cotton, which was becoming the most important textile. This set the foundation for the changes.

In the early 18th century, the British government passed two Calico Acts to protect the domestic wool industry from the increasing amounts of cotton fabric imported from its competitors in India. On the eve of the Industrial Revolution, spinning and weaving were still done in households, for domestic consumption, and as a cottage industry under the putting-out system. Occasionally the work was done in the workshop of a master weaver. Under the putting-out system, home-based workers produced under contract to merchant sellers, who often supplied the raw materials. In the off season the women, typically farmers' wives, did the spinning and the men did the weaving. Using the spinning wheel, it took anywhere from four to eight spinners to supply one hand loom weaver.

The key British industry at the beginning of the 18th century was the production of textiles made with wool from the large sheep-farming areas in the Midlands and across the country (created as a result of land-clearance and enclosure). This was a labor-intensive activity providing employment throughout Britain, with major centers in the West Country, Norwich and environs, and the West Riding of Yorkshire. The export trade in woolen goods accounted for more than a quarter of British exports during most of the 18th century, doubling between 1701 and 1770. Exports by the cotton
industry – centered in Lancashire – grew tenfold during this time, but still accounted for only a tenth of the value of the woolen trade.

Industrial Revolution and Textiles

Starting in the later part of the 18th century, there was a transition in parts of Great Britain’s previously manual labor and draft animal-based economy toward machine-based manufacturing. It started with the mechanization of the textile industries, the development of iron-making techniques, and the increased use of refined coal. Trade expansion was enabled by the introduction of canals, improved roads, and railways. Factories pulled thousands from low-productivity work in agriculture to high-productivity urban jobs.

Textiles have been identified as the catalyst of technological changes and thus their importance during the Industrial Revolution cannot be overstated. The application of steam power stimulated the demand for coal. The demand for machinery and rails stimulated the iron industry. The demand for transportation to move raw material in and finished products out stimulated the growth of the canal system, and (after 1830) the railway system. The introduction of steam power fueled primarily by coal, wider utilization of water wheels, and powered machinery in textile manufacturing underpinned the dramatic increases in production capacity. The development of all-metal machine tools in the first two decades of the 19th century facilitated the manufacture of more production machines for manufacturing in other industries. The effects spread throughout Western Europe and North America during the 19th century, eventually affecting most of the world.

The invention of the flying shuttle by John Kay enabled wider cloth to be woven faster, but also created a demand for yarn that could not be fulfilled. Thus, the major technological advances associated with the Industrial Revolution were concerned with
spinning. James Hargreaves created the spinning jenny, a device that could perform the work of a number of spinning wheels. However, while this invention could be operated by hand, the water frame, invented by Richard Arkwright, could be powered by a water wheel. Arkwright is credited with the widespread introduction of the factory system in Britain and is the first example of the successful mill owner and industrialist in British history. The water frame was, however, soon supplanted by the spinning mule (a cross between a water frame and a jenny) invented by Samuel Crompton. Mules were later constructed in iron.

In a period loosely dated from the 1770s to the 1820s, Britain experienced an accelerated process of economic change that transformed a largely agrarian economy into the world’s first industrial economy. The changes were far-reaching and permanent throughout many areas of Britain, eventually affecting the entire world.

The steam engine was invented and became a power supply that soon surpassed waterfalls and horsepower. The first practicable steam engine was invented by Thomas Newcomen and was used
for pumping water out of mines. A much more powerful steam engine was invented by James Watt. It had a reciprocating engine capable of powering machinery. The first steam-driven textile mills began to appear in the last quarter of the 18th century, greatly contributing to the appearance and rapid growth of industrial towns.

The progress of the textile trade soon outstripped the original supplies of raw materials. By the turn of the 19th century, imported American cotton had replaced wool in the North West of England, although wool remained the chief textile in Yorkshire.

Such an unprecedented degree of economic growth was not sustained by domestic demand alone. The application of technology and the factory system created the levels of mass production and cost efficiency that enabled British manufacturers to export inexpensive cloth and other items worldwide. Britain's position as the world's preeminent trader helped fund research and experimentation. Further, some have stressed the importance of natural or financial resources that Britain received from its many overseas colonies or that profits from the British slave trade between Africa and the Caribbean helped fuel industrial investment.

Global Leader

After 1840, Britain abandoned mercantilism and committed its economy to free trade with few barriers or tariffs. This was most evident in the repeal in 1846 of the Corn Laws, which imposed stiff tariffs on imported grain. The end of these laws opened the British market to unfettered competition, grain prices fell, and food became more plentiful.

From 1815 to 1870 Britain reaped the benefits of being the world's first modern, industrialized nation. The British readily described
their country as “the workshop of the world,” meaning that its finished goods were produced so efficiently and cheaply that they could often undersell comparable locally manufactured goods in almost any other market. If political conditions in a particular overseas market were stable enough, Britain could dominate its economy through free trade alone without resorting to formal rule or mercantilism. By 1820, 30% of Britain’s exports went to its Empire, rising slowly to 35% by 1910. Apart from coal and iron, most raw materials had to be imported so in the 1830s, the main imports were (in order): raw cotton (from the American South), sugar (from the West Indies), wool, silk, tea (from China), timber (from Canada), wine, flax, hides, and tallow. By 1900, Britain’s global share soared to 22.8% of total imports. By 1922, its global share soared to 14.9% of total exports and 28.8% of manufactured export.
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25.2.2: Technological Developments in Textiles

The British textile industry triggered tremendous scientific innovation, resulting in such key inventions as the flying shuttle, spinning jenny, water frame, and spinning mule. These greatly improved productivity and drove further technological advancements that turned textiles into a fully mechanized industry.

Learning Objective

Describe the technology that allowed the textile industry to move towards more automated processes

Key Points

- The exemption of raw cotton from the 1721 Calico Act saw two thousand bales of cotton imported annually from Asia and the Americas, forming the basis of a new indigenous industry. This triggered the development of a series of mechanized spinning and
weaving technologies to process the material. This production was concentrated in new cotton mills, which slowly expanded.

- The textile industry drove groundbreaking scientific innovations. The flying shuttle was patented in 1733 by John Kay. It became widely used around Lancashire after 1760 when John's son, Robert, designed what became known as the drop box. Lewis Paul patented the roller spinning frame and the flyer-and-bobbin system for drawing wool to an even thickness. The technology was developed with the help of John Wyatt of Birmingham. Paul's invention was advanced and improved by Richard Arkwright in his water frame and Samuel Crompton in his spinning mule.

- In 1764, James Hargreaves invented the spinning jenny, which he patented in 1770. It was the first practical spinning frame with multiple spindles. The spinning frame or water frame was developed by Richard Arkwright who along with two partners patented it in 1769. The design was partly based on a spinning machine built for Thomas High by clock maker John Kay, who was hired by Arkwright.

- Samuel Crompton’s spinning mule, introduced in 1779, was a combination of the spinning jenny and the water frame. Crompton’s mule spun thread was of suitable strength to be used as warp and finally allowed Britain to produce good-quality calico cloth. Edmund Cartwright developed a vertical power loom that he patented in 1785. Samuel Horrocks and Richard Roberts successively improved Crompton’s invention.
The textile industry was also to benefit from other developments of the period. In 1765, James Watt modified Thomas Newcomen's engine (based on Thomas Savery's earlier invention) to design an external condenser steam engine. Watt continued to make improvements on his design, producing a separate condenser engine in 1774 and a rotating separate condensing engine in 1781. Watt formed a partnership with a businessman Matthew Boulton and together they manufactured steam engines that could be used by industry.

With Cartwright's loom, the spinning mule, and Boulton and Watt's steam engine, the pieces were in place to build a mechanized textile industry. From this point there were no new inventions, but a continuous improvement in technology as the mill-owner strove to reduce cost and improve quality. Steam engines were improved, the problem of line-shafting was addressed by replacing the wooden turning shafts with wrought iron shafting. In addition, the first loom with a cast-iron frame, a semiautomatic power loom, and, finally a self-acting mule were introduced.
Key Terms

flying shuttle
One of the key developments in the industrialization of weaving during the early Industrial Revolution. It allowed a single weaver to weave much wider fabrics and could be mechanized, allowing for automatic machine looms. It was patented by John Kay in 1733.

spinning jenny
A multi-spindle spinning frame, one of the key developments in the industrialization of weaving during the early Industrial Revolution. It was invented in 1764 by James Hargreaves in Stanhill, Oswaldtwistle, Lancashire in England. The device reduced the amount of work needed to produce yarn, with a worker able to make eight or more spools at once.

water frame
An machine to create cotton thread first used in 1768. It was able to spin 128 threads at a time, making it an easier and faster method than ever before. It was developed by Richard Arkwright, who patented the technology in 1767. The design was partly based on a spinning machine built for Thomas Highs by clock maker John Kay, who was hired by Arkwright.

Calico Acts
Two legislative acts, one of 1700 and one of 1721, that banned the import of most cotton textiles into
England, followed by the restriction of sale of most cotton textiles.

**spinning mule**
A machine used to spin cotton and other fibers in the British mills, used extensively from the late 18th to the early 20th century. It was invented between 1775 and 1779 by Samuel Crompton. The machines were worked in pairs by a minder, with the help of two boys: the little piecer and the big or side piecer. The carriage carried up to 1,320 spindles and could be 150 feet (46 m) long; it could move forward and back a distance of 5 feet (1.5 m) four times a minute.

---

**Early Developments**

During the second half of the 17th century, the newly established factories of the East India Company in South Asia started to produce finished cotton goods in quantity for the UK market. The imported calico and chintz garments competed with and acted as a substitute for indigenous wool and linen produce. That resulted in local weavers, spinners, dyers, shepherds, and farmers petitioning the Parliament to request a ban on the import and later the sale of woven cotton goods. They eventually achieved their goal via the 1700 and 1721 Calico Acts. The acts banned the import and later the sale of finished pure cotton produce, but did not restrict the importation of raw cotton or the sale or production of fustian (a cloth with flax warp and cotton weft).
The exemption of raw cotton from the 1721 Calico Act saw 2,000 bales of cotton imported annually from Asia and the Americas and forming the basis of a new indigenous industry, initially producing fustian for the domestic market. More importantly, though, it triggered the development of a series of mechanized spinning and weaving technologies to process the material. This mechanized production was concentrated in new cotton mills, which slowly expanded. By the beginning of the 1770s, 7,000 bales of cotton were imported annually. The new mill owners put pressure on Parliament to remove the prohibition on the production and sale of pure cotton cloth as they could now compete with imported cotton.

Since much of the imported cotton came from New England, ports on the west coast of Britain such as Liverpool, Bristol, and Glasgow were crucial to determining the sites of the cotton industry. Lancashire became a center for the nascent cotton industry because the damp climate was better for spinning the yarn. As the cotton thread was not strong enough to use as warp, wool, linen, or fustian had to be used and Lancashire was an existing wool center.

Key Inventions

The textile industry drove groundbreaking scientific innovations. The flying shuttle was patented in 1733 by John Kay and saw a number of subsequent improvements including an important one in 1747 that doubled the output of a weaver. It became widely used around Lancashire after 1760 when John’s son, Robert, designed a method for deploying multiple shuttles simultaneously, enabling the use of wefts of more than one color and making it easier for the weaver to produce cross-striped material. These shuttles were housed at the side of the loom in what became known as the drop box. Lewis Paul patented the roller spinning frame and the flyer-
and-bobbin system for drawing wool to a more even thickness. The technology was developed with the help of John Wyatt of Birmingham. Paul and Wyatt opened a mill in Birmingham, which used their new rolling machine powered by a donkey. In 1743, a factory opened in Northampton with 50 spindles on each of five of Paul and Wyatt’s machines. It operated until about 1764. A similar mill was built by Daniel Bourn in Leominster, but it burnt down. Both Paul and Bourn patented carding machines in 1748. Based on two sets of rollers that traveled at different speeds, these were later used in the first cotton spinning mill. Lewis's invention was advanced and improved by Richard Arkwright in his water frame and Samuel Crompton in his spinning mule.

In 1764 in the village of Stanhill, Lancashire, James Hargreaves invented the spinning jenny, which he patented in 1770. It was the first practical spinning frame with multiple spindles. The jenny worked in a similar manner to the spinning wheel by first clamping down on the fibers then drawing them out, followed by twisting. It was a simple, wooden-framed machine that cost only about £6 for a 40-spindle model in 1792 and was used mainly by home spinners. The jenny produced a lightly twisted yarn only suitable for weft, not warp.
The device reduced the amount of work needed to produce yarn, with a worker able to work eight or more spools at once. This grew to 120 as technology advanced.

The spinning frame or water frame was developed by Richard Arkwright who along with two partners patented it in 1769. The design was partly based on a spinning machine built for Thomas High by clock maker John Kay, who was hired by Arkwright. For each spindle, the water frame used a series of four pairs of rollers, each operating at a successively higher rotating speed to draw out the fiber, which was then twisted by the spindle. The roller spacing was slightly longer than the fiber length. Closer spacing caused the fibers to break while further spacing caused uneven thread. The top rollers were leather-covered and loading on them was applied by a weight that kept the twist from backing up before the rollers. The bottom rollers were wood and metal, with fluting along the length. The water frame was able to produce a hard, medium count thread suitable for warp, finally allowing 100% cotton cloth to be made in Britain. A horse powered the first factory to use the spinning frame. Arkwright and his partners used water power at a factory in Cromford, Derbyshire in 1771, giving the invention its name.
Richard Arkwright is credited with a list of inventions, but these were actually developed by such people as Thomas Highs and John Kay. Arkwright nurtured the inventors, patented the ideas, financed the initiatives, and protected the machines. He created the cotton mill, which brought the production processes together in a factory, and he developed the use of power—first horse power and then water power—which made cotton manufacture a mechanized industry.
Samuel Crompton’s spinning mule, introduced in 1779, was a combination of the spinning jenny and the water frame. The spindles were placed on a carriage that went through an operational sequence during which the rollers stopped while the carriage moved away from the drawing roller to finish drawing out the fibers as the spindles started rotating. Crompton’s mule was able to produce finer thread than hand spinning at a lower cost. Mule spun thread was of suitable strength to be used as warp and finally allowed Britain to produce good-quality calico cloth.

Realizing that the expiration of the Arkwright patent would greatly increase the supply of spun cotton and lead to a shortage of weavers, Edmund Cartwright developed a vertical power loom which he patented in 1785. Cartwright’s loom design had several
flaws, including thread breakage. Samuel Horrocks patented a fairly successful loom in 1813; it was improved by Richard Roberts in 1822, and these were produced in large numbers by Roberts, Hill & Co.

The textile industry was also to benefit from other developments of the period. As early as 1691, Thomas Savery made a vacuum steam engine. His design, which was unsafe, was improved by Thomas Newcomen in 1698. In 1765, James Watt further modified Newcomen’s engine to design an external condenser steam engine. Watt continued to make improvements on his design, producing a separate condenser engine in 1774 and a rotating separate condensing engine in 1781. Watt formed a partnership with a businessman Matthew Boulton and together they manufactured steam engines that could be used by industry.

Mechanization of the Textile Industry

With Cartwright’s loom, the spinning mule, and Boulton and Watt’s steam engine, the pieces were in place to build a mechanized textile industry. From this point there were no new inventions, but a continuous improvement in technology as the mill-owner strove to reduce cost and improve quality. Developments in the transport infrastructure such as the canals and, after 1830, the railways, facilitated the import of raw materials and export of finished cloth.

The use of water power to drive mills was supplemented by steam-driven water pumps and then superseded completely by the steam engines. For example, Samuel Greg joined his uncle’s firm of textile merchants and on taking over the company in 1782, sought out a site to establish a mill. Quarry Bank Mill was built on the River Bollin at Styal in Cheshire. It was initially powered by a water wheel, but installed steam engines in 1810. In 1830, the average power of a mill engine was 48 horsepower (hp), but Quarry Bank mill installed an new 100 hp water wheel. This would change in 1836,
when Horrocks & Nuttall, Preston took delivery of 160 hp double engine. William Fairbairn addressed the problem of line-shafting and was responsible for improving the efficiency of the mill. In 1815, he replaced the wooden turning shafts that drove the machines to wrought iron shafting, which were a third of the weight and absorbed less power. The mill operated until 1959.

In 1830, using an 1822 patent, Richard Roberts manufactured the first loom with a cast-iron frame, the Roberts Loom. In 1842, James Bullough and William Kenworthy made a semiautomatic power loom known as the Lancashire Loom. Although it was self-acting, it had to be stopped to recharge empty shuttles. It was the mainstay of the Lancashire cotton industry for a century, when the Northrop Loom invented in 1894 with an automatic weft replenishment function gained ascendancy.

The 1824 Stalybridge mule spinners strike stimulated research into the problem of applying power to the winding stroke of the mule. In 1830, Richard Roberts patented the first self-acting mule. The draw while spinning had been assisted by power, but the push of the wind was done manually by the spinner. Before 1830, the spinner would operate a partially powered mule with a maximum of 400 spindles. After 1830, self-acting mules with up to 1,300 spindles could be built. The savings with this technology were considerable. A worker spinning cotton at a hand-powered spinning wheel in the 18th century would take more than 50,000 hours to spin 100 pounds of cotton. By the 1790s, the same quantity could be spun in 300 hours by mule, and with a self-acting mule it could be spun by one worker in just 135 hours.

Export Technology

While profiting from expertise arriving from overseas, Britain was very protective of home-grown technology. In particular, engineers with skills in constructing the textile mills and machinery were
not permitted to emigrate — particularly to the fledgling America. However, Samuel Slater, an engineer who had worked as an apprentice to Arkwright’s partner Jedediah Strutt, evaded the ban. In 1789, he took his skills in designing and constructing factories to New England and was soon engaged in reproducing the textile mills that helped America with its own industrial revolution. Local inventions followed. In 1793, Eli Whitney invented and patented the cotton gin, which sped up the processing of raw cotton by over 50 times. With a cotton gin a man could remove seed from as much upland cotton in one day as would have previously taken a woman working two months to process at one pound per day.
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The factory system was a new way of organizing labor made necessary by the development of machines, which were too large to house in a worker's cottage and too expensive to be owned by the worker, who now labored long hours and lived under hazardous conditions in fledgling cities.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the effects the advent of factories had on British society

**Key Points**

- The factory system was a new way of organizing labor made necessary by the development of machines, which were too large to house in a worker's cottage and much too expensive to be owned by the worker. One of the earliest factories was John Lombe's water-powered silk mill at Derby, operational by 1721. By 1746, an integrated brass mill
was working at Warmley near Bristol. However, Richard Arkwright is credited as the brains behind the growth of factories, specifically the Derwent Valley Mills.

• Between the 1760s and 1850, the nature of work transitioned from a craft production model to a factory-centric model. Textile factories organized workers’ lives much differently than did craft production. Handloom weavers worked at their own pace, with their own tools, within their own cottages. Factories set hours of work and the machinery within them shaped the pace of work. Factories brought workers together within one building to work on machinery that they did not own. They also increased the division of labor, narrowing the number and scope of tasks.

• The early textile factories employed many children. In England and Scotland in 1788, two-thirds of the workers in 143 water-powered cotton mills were children. By 1835, the share of the workforce under 18 years of age in cotton mills in England and Scotland had fallen to 43%. The eventual transition of child workforce into experienced adult factory workforce helps to account for the shift away from child labor in textile factories. While child labor was common on farms and under the putting-out system, historians agree that the impact of the factory system and the Industrial Revolution generally on children was damaging.

• Marriage during the Industrial Revolution became a sociable union between wife and husband in the laboring class. Women and men tended to marry
someone from the same job, geographical location, or social group. The traditional work sphere was still dictated by the father, who controlled the pace of work for his family. However, factories and mills undermined the old patriarchal authority. Factories put husbands, wives, and children under the same conditions and authority of the manufacturer masters.

- The factory system was partly responsible for the rise of urban living, as large numbers of workers migrated into the towns in search of employment in the factories. Until the late 19th century, it was common to work at least 12 hours a day, six days a week in most factories, but long hours were also common outside factories. The transition to industrialization was not without opposition from the workers who feared that machines would end the need for skilled labor.

- One of the best known accounts of factory worker’s tragic living conditions during the Industrial Revolution is Friedrich Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England* in 1844. Since then, the historical debate on the question of living conditions of factory workers has been very controversial. While some have pointed out that living conditions of the poor workers slowly improved thanks to industrialization, others have concluded that in many ways workers’ living standards declined under early capitalism and improved only much later.
Key Terms

putting-out system
A means of subcontracting work, historically known also as the workshop system and the domestic system. In it, work is contracted by a central agent to subcontractors who complete the work in off-site facilities, either in their own homes or in workshops with multiple craftsmen.

spinning jenny
A multi-spindle spinning frame, one of the key developments in the industrialization of weaving during the early Industrial Revolution. It was invented in 1764 by James Hargreaves in Stanhill, Oswaldtwistle, Lancashire in England. The device reduced the amount of work needed to produce yarn, with a worker able to work eight or more spools at once.

Luddites
A group of English textile workers and self-employed weavers in the 19th century that used the destruction of machinery as a form of protest. The group was protesting the use of machinery in a “fraudulent and deceitful manner” to get around standard labor practices. They were fearful that the years they had spent learning the craft would go to waste and unskilled machine operators would rob them of their livelihood.
factory system

A method of manufacturing using machinery and division of labor, first adopted in Britain at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century and later spread around the world. Use of machinery with the division of labor reduced the required skill level of workers and also increased the output per worker.

Rise of the Factory System

Prior to the Industrial Revolution, most of the workforce was employed in agriculture, either as self-employed farmers as landowners or tenants, or as landless agricultural laborers. By the time of the Industrial Revolution the putting-out system in which farmers and townspeople produced goods in their homes, often described as cottage industry, was the standard. Typical putting-out system goods included spinning and weaving. Merchant capitalists provided the raw materials, typically paid workers by the piece, and were responsible for the sale of the goods. Workers put long hours into low-productivity but labor-intensive tasks. The logistical effort in procuring and distributing raw materials and picking up finished goods were also limitations of the system.

Some early spinning and weaving machinery, such as a 40 spindle spinning jenny for about six pounds in 1792, was affordable to cottagers. Later machinery such as spinning frames, spinning mules, and power looms were expensive (especially if water-powered), giving rise to capitalist ownership of factories. Many
workers, who had nothing but their labor to sell, became factory workers in the absence of any other opportunities.

The factory system was a new way of organizing labor made necessary by the development of machines, which were too large to house in a worker’s cottage and much too expensive to be owned by the worker. One of the earliest factories was John Lombe’s water-powered silk mill at Derby, operational by 1721. By 1746, an integrated brass mill was working at Warmley near Bristol. Raw material went in at one end, then smelted into brass to become pans, pins, wire, and other goods. Housing was provided for workers on site. Josiah Wedgwood in Staffordshire and Matthew Boulton at his Soho Manufactory were other prominent early industrialists, who employed the factory system. However, Richard Arkwright is credited as the brains behind the growth of factories and, specifically, the Derwent Valley Mills. After he patented his water frame in 1769, he established Cromford Mill in Derbyshire, England.

The Soho Manufactory, J. Bissett’s Magnificent Directory, 1800.

This early factory was established by the toy manufacturer Matthew Boulton and his business partner John Fothergill. In 1761, they leased a site on Handsworth Heath, containing a cottage and a water-
driven metal-rolling mill. The mill was replaced by a new factory, designed and built by the Wyatt family of Lichfield, and completed in 1766. It produced a wide range of goods from buttons, buckles, and boxes to japanned ware (collectively called “toys”) and later luxury products such as silverware and ormolu (a type of gilded bronze).

**Working Practices**

Between the 1760s and 1850, the nature of work transitioned from a craft production model to a factory-centric model. Textile factories organized workers’ lives much differently than did craft production. Handloom weavers worked at their own pace, with their own tools, and within their own cottages. Factories set hours of work and the machinery within them shaped the pace of work. Factories brought workers together within one building to work on machinery that they did not own. They also increased the division of labor, narrowing the number and scope of tasks. The work-discipline was forcefully instilled upon the workforce by the factory owners.

The early textile factories employed many children. In England and Scotland in 1788, two-thirds of the workers in 143 water-powered cotton mills were children. Sir Robert Peel, a mill owner turned reformer, promoted the 1802 Health and Morals of Apprentices Act, which was intended to prevent pauper children from working more than 12 hours a day in mills. Children started in the mills at around the age of four, working as mule scavengers under the working machinery until they were eight. They progressed to working as little piecers until they were 15. During this time they worked 14 to 16 hours a day, often physically abused. By 1835, the share of the workforce under 18 years of age in cotton mills in England and Scotland had fallen to 43%. About half of workers in Manchester and Stockport cotton factories surveyed in 1818 and 1819 began work at under ten years of age. Most of the adult
workers in cotton factories in mid-19th-century Britain started as child laborers. The growth of this experienced adult factory workforce helps to account for the shift away from child labor in textile factories.

**Societal Impact**

While child labor was common on farms and under the putting-out system, historians agree that the impact of the factory system and the Industrial Revolution on children was damaging. In the industrial districts, children tended to enter the workforce at younger ages. Many of the new factory owners preferred to employ children as they viewed them as more docile and their wages were lower (10-20% of what was paid to male adult workers, while adult women made about 25% of an adult male salary). Although most families channeled their children's earnings into providing a better diet for them, the physical toll of working in the factories was too great and led to detrimental outcomes for children. Child laborers tended to be orphans, children of widows, or from the poorest families. Cruelty and torture was enacted on children by master-manufacturers to maintain high output or keep them awake. The children's bodies become crooked and deformed from the work in the mills and factories.

Prior to the development of the factory system, in the traditional marriage of the laboring class, women would marry men of the same social status and marriage outside this norm was unusual. Marriage during the Industrial Revolution shifted from this tradition to a more sociable union between wife and husband in the laboring class. Women and men tended to marry someone from the same job, geographical location, or social group. The traditional work sphere was still dictated by the father, who controlled the pace of work for his family. However, factories and mills undermined the old patriarchal authority. Factories put husbands, wives, and children
under the same conditions and authority of the manufacturer masters.

Factory workers typically lived within walking distance to work until the introduction of bicycles and electric street railways in the 1890s. Thus the factory system was partly responsible for the rise of urban living, as large numbers of workers migrated into the towns in search of employment in the factories. Until the late 19th century, it was common to work at least 12 hours a day, six days a week in most factories, but long hours were also common outside factories.

The transition to industrialization was not without opposition from the workers, who feared that machines would end the need for highly skilled labor. For example, a group of English workers known as Luddites formed to protest against industrialization and sometimes sabotaged factories. They continued an already established tradition of workers opposing labor-saving machinery. Numerous inventors in the textile industry, such as John Kay and Samuel Crompton, suffered harassment when developing their machines or devices. However, in other industries the transition to factory production was not so divisive.
Although the Luddites feared above all that machines would remove the need for highly skilled labor, one misconception about the group is that they protested against the machinery itself in a vain attempt to halt progress. As a result, the term has come to mean a person opposed to industrialization, automation, computerization, or new technologies in general.

The overall impact of the factory system and the Industrial
Revolution more on adults has been the subject of extensive debate among historians for over a century. Optimists have argued that industrialization brought higher wages and better living standards to most people. Pessimists have argued that these gains have been over-exaggerated, wages did not rise significantly during this period, and whatever economic gains were actually made must be offset against the worsening health and housing of the new urban sectors. Since the 1990s, many contributions to the standard of living debate has tilted towards the pessimist interpretation.

One of the best-known accounts of factory worker's living conditions during the Industrial Revolution is Friedrich Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. Engels described backstreet sections of Manchester and other mill towns, where people lived in crude shanties and shacks, some not completely enclosed, some with dirt floors. These shanty towns had narrow walkways between irregularly shaped lots and dwellings. There were no sanitary facilities. Population density was extremely high. Eight to ten unrelated mill workers often shared a room with no furniture, and slept on a pile of straw or sawdust. Disease spread through a contaminated water supply.

By the late 1880s, Engels noted that the extreme poverty and lack of sanitation he wrote about in 1844 had largely disappeared. Since then, the historical debate on the question of living conditions of factory workers has remained controversial. While some have pointed out that living conditions of the poor workers were tragic everywhere and industrialization slowly improved the living standards of a steadily increasing number of workers, others concluded that living standards for the majority of the population did not grow meaningfully until the late 19th and 20th centuries and that in many ways workers' living standards declined under early capitalism.
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116. Steam Power

25.3: Steam Power

25.3.1: Early Steam Engines

A steam engine, or a heat engine that performs mechanical work using steam, was first described in the 1st century CE. However, it was the designs of Savery’s engine in 1698 and Newcomen’s engine in 1712 that were first used commercially and inspired the further development of steam technology.

Learning Objective

List the early iterations of the steam engine

Key Points

- A steam engine is a heat engine that performs mechanical work using steam. The history of the steam engine stretches back as far as the 1st century CE. Greek mathematician Hero of Alexandria
described the first recorded rudimentary steam engine, known as the aeolipile. In the following centuries, the few early steam-powered engines were, like the aeolipile, experimental devices used by inventors to demonstrate the properties of steam.

- The first commercial steam-powered device was a water pump developed in 1698 by Thomas Savery, who demonstrated it to the Royal Society a year later. The patent has no illustrations or even description, but in 1702 Savery described the machine in his book *The Miner’s Friend, or, An Engine to Raise Water by Fire*, in which he claimed that it could pump water out of mines.

- Savery’s engine received some use in mines and pumping stations and for supplying water wheels used to power textile machinery. An attractive feature of the Savery engine was its low cost. Bento de Moura Portugal introduced an ingenious improvement of Savery’s construction “to render it capable of working itself,” as described by John Smeaton in 1751. It continued to be manufactured until the late 18th century.

- The first commercially successful engine that could generate power and transmit it to a machine was the atmospheric engine, invented by Thomas Newcomen around 1712. It was an improvement over Savery’s steam pump, using a piston as proposed by Papin. Newcomen replaced the receiving vessel (where the steam was condensed) with a cylinder containing a piston based on Papin’s design. Instead of the vacuum drawing in water, it drew down the piston.
• The engine was relatively inefficient and in most cases was used for pumping water. It was employed for draining mine workings at depths previously impossible and for providing a reusable water supply for driving waterwheels at factories sited away from a suitable “head.” Water that passed over the wheel was pumped back up into a storage reservoir above the wheel.

• Newcomen’s engine held its place without material change for about 75 years, spreading gradually to more areas of the UK and mainland Europe. Experience led to better construction and minor refinements in layout. Its mechanical details were much improved by John Smeaton, who built many large engines of this type in the early 1770s; his improvements were rapidly adopted. By 1775, about 600 Newcomen engines had been built.

**Key Terms**

**atmospheric engine**

An engine invented by Thomas Newcomen in 1712, often referred to simply as a Newcomen engine. The engine operated by condensing steam drawn into the cylinder, thereby creating a partial vacuum and allowing the atmospheric pressure to push the piston into the cylinder. It was the first practical device to harness steam to produce mechanical work.
Steam engine
A heat engine that performs mechanical work using steam as its working fluid.

aeolipile
A simple bladeless radial steam turbine, also known as a Heron's engine, that spins when the central water container is heated. Torque is produced by steam jets exiting the turbine, much like a tip jet or rocket engine. In the 1st century CE, Hero of Alexandria described the device, and many sources give him the credit for its invention.

beam engine
A type of steam engine in which a pivoted overhead beam is used to apply force from a vertical piston to a vertical connecting rod. This configuration, with the engine directly driving a pump, was first used by Thomas Newcomen around 1705 to remove water from mines in Cornwall.

Introduction of the Steam Engine

A steam engine is a heat engine that performs mechanical work using steam. The history of the steam engine stretches back as far as the 1st century CE. Greek mathematician Hero of Alexandria described the first recorded rudimentary steam engine, known as the aeolipile. In the following centuries, the few early steam-powered engines were, like the aeolipile, experimental devices used
by inventors to demonstrate the properties of steam. A rudimentary steam turbine device was described by Taqi al-Din in 1551 and by Giovanni Branca in 1629. Jerónimo de Ayanz y Beaumont received patents in 1606 for 50 steam-powered inventions, including a water pump for draining inundated mines. Denis Papin, a Huguenot refugee, advanced the construction of the steam digester in 1679 and first used a piston to raise weights in 1690.

Savery’s Engine

The first commercial steam-powered device was a water pump developed in 1698 by Thomas Savery, who demonstrated it to the Royal Society a year later. The patent has no illustrations or even description, but in 1702 Savery described the machine in his book *The Miner’s Friend, or, An Engine to Raise Water by Fire*, in which he claimed that it could pump water out of mines. Savery’s engine had no piston and no moving parts except the taps. It was operated by first raising steam in the boiler and then admitting it to one of the first working vessels, allowing it to blow out through a downpipe into the water to be raised. When the system was hot and therefore full of steam, the tap between the boiler and the working vessel was shut and, if necessary, the outside of the vessel was cooled. This made the steam inside it condense, creating a partial vacuum, and atmospheric pressure pushed water up the downpipe until the vessel was full. At this point, the tap below the vessel was closed and the tap between it and the up-pipe opened, and more steam was admitted from the boiler. As the steam pressure built up, it forced the water from the vessel up the up-pipe to the top of the mine.
Savery’s original patent of July 1698 gave 14 years’ protection. The next year, an Act of Parliament was passed, which extended his protection for a further 21 years. This Act became known as the Fire Engine Act. Savery’s patent covered all engines that raised water by fire and thus played an important role in shaping the early development of steam machinery in the British Isles.

Following Savery’s design, small engines were effective but larger models were problematic. They proved only to have a limited lift height and were prone to boiler explosions. The engine received some use in mines, pumping stations and for supplying water wheels used to power textile machinery. An attractive feature of...
the Savery engine was its low cost. Bento de Moura Portugal introduced an ingenious improvement of Savery's construction “to render it capable of working itself,” as described by John Smeaton in 1751. It continued to be manufactured until the late 18th century. One engine was still operating in 1820.

Newcomen’s Engine

The first commercially successful engine that it could generate power and transmit it to a machine was the atmospheric engine invented by Thomas Newcomen around 1712. It was an improvement over Savery’s steam pump, using a piston as proposed by Papin. Newcomen replaced the receiving vessel (where the steam was condensed) with a cylinder containing a piston based on Papin’s design. Instead of the vacuum drawing in water, it drew down the piston. This was used to work a beam engine, in which a large wooden beam rocked upon a central fulcrum. On the other side of the beam was a chain attached to a pump at the base of the mine. As the steam cylinder was refilled with steam, readying it for the next power stroke, water was drawn into the pump cylinder and expelled into a pipe to the surface by the weight of the machinery.

Newcomen and his partner John Calley built the first successful engine of this type at the Conygree Coalworks near Dudley in the West Midlands. The engine was relatively inefficient and in most cases was used for pumping water. It was employed for draining mine workings at depths previously impossible, and also for providing a reusable water supply for driving waterwheels at factories sited away from a suitable “head.” Water that had passed over the wheel was pumped back up into a storage reservoir above the wheel.
The Newcomen engine operated by condensing steam drawn into the cylinder, thereby creating a partial vacuum and allowing the atmospheric pressure to push the piston into the cylinder. It was the first practical device to harness steam to produce mechanical work.

Newcomen's engine held its place without material change for about 75 years, spreading gradually to more areas of the UK and mainland Europe. At first brass cylinders were used, but these were expensive and limited in size. New iron casting techniques pioneered by the Coalbrookdale Company in the 1720s allowed bigger cylinders to be used, up to about 6 feet (1.8 m) in diameter.
by the 1760s. Experience led to better construction and minor refinements in layout. Its mechanical details were much improved by John Smeaton, who built many large engines of this type in the early 1770s, and his improvements were rapidly adopted. By 1775, about 600 Newcomen engines had been built.

Attributions

- Early Steam Engines
The Boulton and Watt steam engine led to replacing the water wheel and horses as the main sources of power for British industry, thereby freeing it from geographical constraints and becoming one of the main drivers in the Industrial Revolution.

**Learning Objective**

Recognize why Boulton and Watt's steam engine achieved widespread success

**Key Points**

- In 1763, James Watt, an instrument maker at the University of Glasgow, was assigned the job of repairing a model Newcomen engine (based on an earlier design of the Savery engine) and noted how inefficient it was. In 1765, Watt conceived the idea of equipping the engine with a separate condensation chamber, which he called a condenser. Because the condenser and the working cylinder were separate,
condensation occurred without significant loss of heat from the cylinder. This invention dramatically improved the efficiency of the engine.

- Watt’s next improvement to the Newcomen design was to seal the top of the cylinder and surround the cylinder with a jacket. Steam was passed through the jacket before being admitted below the piston, keeping the piston and cylinder warm to prevent condensation within it. These improvements led to the fully developed version of 1776 that actually went into production.

- The separate condenser showed dramatic potential for improvements on the Newcomen engine, but Watt was still discouraged by seemingly insurmountable problems before a marketable engine could be perfected. It was only after entering into partnership with Matthew Boulton that this became reality. Boulton and Watt became an engineering company that was critical to the technological advancements of the Industrial Revolution.

- As fully developed, the Watt engine used about 75% less fuel than a similar Newcomen one. Boulton and Watt’s practice was to help mine owners and other customers build engines, supplying men to erect them and specialized parts. However, their main profit from their patent was derived from charging a licence fee to the engine owners based on the cost of the fuel they saved. The greater fuel efficiency of their engines meant that they were most attractive in areas where fuel was expensive.

- Later improvements introduced by Watt included an arrangement of valves that could alternately admit
low pressure steam to the cylinder and connect with the condenser (the double acting piston); parallel motion; transforming the action of the beam into a rotating motion (first by the epicyclic sun and planet gear system suggested by an employee William Murdoch and later by connecting the beam to a wheel by a crank after patent rights on the use of the crank expired), and linking a steam regulator valve to a centrifugal governor to keep a constant speed.

• These improvements allowed the steam engine to replace the water wheel and horses as the main sources of power for British industry, thereby freeing it from geographical constraints and allowing it to become one of the main drivers in the Industrial Revolution.

Key Terms

atmospheric engine

An engine invented by Thomas Newcomen in 1712, often referred to simply as a Newcomen engine. The engine operated by condensing steam drawn into the cylinder, thereby creating a partial vacuum and allowing the atmospheric pressure to push the piston into the cylinder. It was the first practical device to harness steam to produce mechanical work.
condenser
A device or unit used to condense a substance from its gaseous to its liquid state by cooling it, which transfers the latent heat from the substance to the condenser coolant. These devices are typically heat exchangers, which have various designs and come in many sizes ranging from rather small (hand-held) to very large industrial-scale units used in plant processes.

Boulton and Watt
An early British engineering and manufacturing firm in the business of designing and making marine and stationary steam engines. Founded in the English West Midlands around Birmingham in 1775 as a partnership between the English manufacturer Matthew Boulton and the Scottish engineer James Watt, the firm had a major role in the Industrial Revolution and grew to be a major producer of steam engines in the 19th century.

parallel motion
A mechanical linkage invented by the Scottish engineer James Watt in 1784 for the double-acting Watt steam engine. It allows a rod moving straight up and down to transmit motion to a beam moving in an arc, without putting sideways strain on the rod.

reciprocating engine
A heat engine also known as a piston engine that uses one or more reciprocating pistons to convert pressure into a rotating motion. The main types are the internal combustion engine, used extensively in motor
vehicles; the steam engine, the mainstay of the Industrial Revolution; and the niche application Stirling engine.

James Watt: Improving the Newcomen Engine

In 1698, English mechanical designer Thomas Savery invented a pumping appliance that used steam to draw water directly from a well by means of a vacuum created by condensing steam. The appliance was also proposed for draining mines, but could only draw fluid up approximately 25 feet, meaning it had to be located within this distance of the mine floor. As mines became deeper, this was often impractical. The solution to draining deep mines was found by Thomas Newcomen, who developed an atmospheric engine that also worked on the vacuum principle. The Newcomen engine was more powerful than the Savery engine. For the first time, water could be raised from a depth of over 150 feet. However, while Newcomen engines brought practical benefits, they were inefficient in terms of energy use. The system of alternately sending jets of steam then cold water into the cylinder meant that the walls of the cylinder were alternately heated then cooled with each stroke. Each charge of steam introduced would continue condensing until the cylinder approached working temperature again, so at each stroke part of the potential of the steam was lost.

In 1763, James Watt was working as instrument maker at the University of Glasgow when he was assigned the job of repairing a model Newcomen engine and noted how inefficient it was. In 1765,
Watt conceived the idea of equipping the engine with a separate condensation chamber, which he called a condenser. Because the condenser and the working cylinder were separate, condensation occurred without significant loss of heat from the cylinder. The condenser remained cold and below atmospheric pressure at all times, while the cylinder remained hot at all times. Steam was drawn from the boiler to the cylinder under the piston. When the piston reached the top of the cylinder, the steam inlet valve closed and the valve controlling the passage to the condenser opened. The lower pressure of the condenser, drew the steam into the cylinder where it cooled and condensed from water vapor to liquid water, maintaining a partial vacuum in the condenser that was communicated to the space of the cylinder by the connecting passage. External atmospheric pressure then pushed the piston down the cylinder.

The separation of the cylinder and condenser eliminated the loss of heat that occurred when steam was condensed in the working cylinder of a Newcomen engine. This gave the Watt engine greater efficiency than the Newcomen engine, reducing the amount of coal consumed while doing the same amount of work. In Watt’s design, the cold water was injected only into the condensation chamber. This type of condenser is known as a jet condenser.

Watt’s next improvement to the Newcomen design was to seal the top of the cylinder and surround it with a jacket. Steam was passed through the jacket before being admitted below the piston, keeping the piston and cylinder warm to prevent condensation within it. Watt did not use high-pressure steam because of safety concerns, although he was aware of its potential and included expansive working knowledge in his patent of 1782. These improvements led to the fully developed version of 1776 that actually went into production.
Boulton and Watt Join Forces

The separate condenser showed dramatic potential for improvements on the Newcomen engine but Watt was still discouraged by seemingly insurmountable problems before a marketable engine could be perfected. It was only after entering into partnership with Matthew Boulton that this became reality. Watt told Boulton about his ideas on improving the engine and Boulton, an avid entrepreneur, agreed to fund development of a test engine at Soho, near Birmingham. At last Watt had access to facilities and the practical experience of craftsmen who were soon able to get the first engine working. As fully developed, it used about 75% less fuel than a similar Newcomen model.

The Boulton and Watt steam engine (known also as the Watt engine), developed sporadically from 1763 to 1775, was an

improvement on the design of the Newcomen engine and was a key point in the Industrial Revolution. The schematic shows the parts of the watt steam pumping engine, including: pump, hot feed water delivery to boiler, plug rod, transfer pipe, hot well, cold water tank, vacuum pump, condenser, vacuum end of cylinder, steam jacket, piston, and low pressure steam end of cylinder.

In 1775, Watt designed two large engines: one for the Bloomfield Colliery at Tipton and one for John Wilkinson’s ironworks at Willey, Shropshire, both completed in 1776. A third engine, at Stratford-le-Bow in east London, was also working that year. Boulton and Watt’s practice was to help mine owners and other customers build engines, supplying men to erect them and specialized parts. However, the main profit from their patent was derived from charging a license fee to the engine owners, based on the cost of the fuel they saved. The greater fuel efficiency of their engines meant that they were most attractive in areas where fuel was expensive, particularly Cornwall, for which three engines were ordered in 1777.

Later Improvements

The first Watt engines were atmospheric pressure engines, like the Newcomen engine but with the condensation separated from the cylinder. Driving the engines using both low pressure steam and a partial vacuum raised the possibility of reciprocating engine development. An arrangement of valves could alternately admit low-pressure steam to the cylinder and connect with the condenser. Consequently, the direction of the power stroke might be reversed, making it easier to obtain rotary motion. Additional benefits of the double-acting engine were increased efficiency, higher speed (greater power), and more regular motion.
Before the development of the double-acting piston, e to the beam and the piston rod were linked by a chain, which meant that power could only be applied in one direction, by pulling. This was effective in engines used for pumping water, but the double action of the piston meant that it could push as well as pull. Further, it was not possible to connect the piston rod of the sealed cylinder directly to the beam, because while the rod moved vertically in a straight line, the beam was pivoted at its center with each side inscribing an arc. To bridge the conflicting actions of the beam and the piston, Watt developed his parallel motion. This masterpiece of engineering uses a four-bar linkage coupled with a pantograph (a type of current collector) to produce the required straight-line motion much more cheaply than if he had used a slider type of linkage. He was very proud of his solution.

In a letter to his son in 1808, James Watt wrote, “I am more proud of the parallel motion than of any other invention I have ever made.” The sketch he included actually shows what is now known as Watt’s linkage, which was described in Watt’s 1784 patent but was immediately superseded by the parallel motion. The parallel motion
differed from Watt’s linkage by having an additional pantograph linkage incorporated in the design. This did not affect the fundamental principle but it allowed the engine room to be smaller because the linkage was more compact.

Having the beam connected to the piston shaft by a means that applied force alternately in both directions also meant that the motion of the beam could be used to turn a wheel. The simplest solution to transforming the action of the beam into a rotating motion was to connect the beam to a wheel by a crank, but because another party had patent rights on the use of the crank, Watt was obliged to come up with another solution. He adopted the epicyclic sun and planet gear system suggested by employee William Murdoch, only later reverting, once the patent rights had expired, to the more familiar crank seen on most engines today. The main wheel attached to the crank was large and heavy, serving as a flywheel that once set in motion, by its momentum maintained a constant power and smoothed the action of the alternating strokes. To its rotating central shaft, belts and gears could be attached to drive a great variety of machinery. Because factory machinery needed to operate at a constant speed, Watt linked a steam regulator valve to a centrifugal governor, which he adapted from those used to automatically control the speed of windmills.

These improvements allowed the steam engine to replace the water wheel and horses as the main sources of power for British industry, thereby freeing it from geographical constraints and becoming one of the main drivers in the Industrial Revolution. Watt was also concerned with fundamental research on the functioning of the steam engine. His most notable measuring device, still in use today, is the Watt indicator, incorporating a manometer to measure steam pressure within the cylinder according to the position of the piston. This enabled a diagram to be produced representing the pressure of the steam as a function of its volume throughout the cycle.
Attributes

- Boulton and Watt
Steam engines found many uses in a variety of industries, most notably mining and transportation, but its popularization shaped nearly every aspect of the industrial society, including where people could live, labor, and travel; how goods were produced, marketed, and sold; and what technological innovations followed.

Learning Objective
Give examples of the industries powered by steam

Key Points

- The steam engine was one of the most important technologies of the Industrial Revolution, inspiring other innovations and initiating further technological advancements. In 1775, James Watt formed an engine-building and engineering partnership with manufacturer Matthew Boulton. This served as a kind
of creative technical center for much of the British economy. They supported talents and other companies, creating a culture where firms often shared information that they could use to create new techniques or products.

- From mines to mills, steam engines found many uses in a variety of industries. The introduction of steam engines improved productivity and technology and allowed the creation of smaller and better engines. Around the start of the 19th century, Cornish engineer Richard Trevithick and American Oliver Evans began to construct higher-pressure non-condensing steam engines, exhausting against the atmosphere. After Trevithick's development, transport applications became possible and steam engines found their way into boats, railways, farms, and road vehicles.

- The steam engine was originally invented and perfected to be used in mines. The introduction of the steam pump by Savery in 1698 and the Newcomen steam engine in 1712 greatly facilitated the removal of water and enabled shafts to be made deeper, enabling more coal to be extracted. The adoption of John Smeaton's improvements to the Newcomen engine followed by James Watt's more efficient steam engines from the 1770s reduced the fuel costs of engines, making mines more profitable.

- Steam locomotives were invented after the introduction of high pressure steam engines when the Boulton and Watt patent expired in 1800. Steam-hauled public railways began with the Stockton and Darlington Railway in 1825. The use of steam engines
on railroads proved extraordinary since large amounts of goods and raw materials could now be delivered to cities and factories alike at a fraction of the cost traveling by wagon.

- Following the advent of the steamboat, the United States saw an incredible growth in the transportation of goods and people, which was key in westward expansion. The steamboat dramatically reduced time used to transport goods and allowed for increased specialization. The steamboat was also critical to facilitating the internal slave trade. With the steamboat came the need for an improved river system and infrastructure along the rivers.

- Steam engines are a particularly illustrative example of how changes brought by industrialization led to even more changes in other areas. While many consider the potential for an increase in power generated the dominant benefit, others favor the potential for agglomeration. Steam engines made it possible to easily work, live, produce, market, specialize, and viably expand without having to worry about the less abundant presence of waterways.

**Key Terms**

**Boulton and Watt**

An early British engineering and manufacturing firm
in the business of designing and making marine and stationary steam engines. Founded in the English West Midlands around Birmingham in 1775 as a partnership between the English manufacturer Matthew Boulton and the Scottish engineer James Watt, the firm had a major role in the Industrial Revolution and grew to be a major producer of steam engines in the 19th century.

**beam engine**
A type of steam engine where a pivoted overhead beam is used to apply the force from a vertical piston to a vertical connecting rod. This configuration, with the engine directly driving a pump, was first used by Thomas Newcomen around 1705 to remove water from mines in Cornwall.

**steam engine**
A heat engine that performs mechanical work using steam as its working fluid.

**Steam Engine Revolution**

The steam engine was one of the most important technologies of the Industrial Revolution, although steam did not replace water power in importance in Britain until after the Industrial Revolution. From Englishmen Thomas Savery's first practical, atmospheric pressure engine (1698) and Thomas Newcomen's atmospheric
engine (1712) through major developments by Scottish inventor and mechanical engineer James Watt, the steam engine became used in many industrial settings. In 1775, Watt formed an engine-building and engineering partnership with manufacturer Matthew Boulton that became one of the most important businesses of the Industrial Revolution and served as a creative technical center for much of the British economy. The partners solved technical problems and spread the solutions to other companies. Similar firms did the same thing in other industries and were especially important in the machine tool industry. These interactions between companies reduced the amount of research time and expense that each business had to spend working with its own resources. The technological advances of the Industrial Revolution happened more quickly because firms often shared information they could use to create new techniques or products.
Watt’s rotative engine at the Henry Ford Museum The Henry Ford Museum in Dearborn, Michigan houses a Watt rotative engine manufactured in 1788 by Charles Summerfield. This is a full-scale working Boulton-Watt engine. The American industrialist Henry Ford moved the engine to Dearborn around 1930.

Major Applications

From mines to mills, steam engines found many uses in a variety of industries. The introduction of steam engines improved productivity and technology and allowed the creation of smaller and better engines. Until about 1800, the most common type of steam engine was the beam engine, built as an integral part of
a stone or brick engine-house, but soon various patterns of self-
contained rotative engines (readily removable, but not on wheels)
were developed, such as the table engine. Around the start of the
19th century, the Cornish engineer Richard Trevithick and American
Oliver Evans began to construct higher-pressure non-condensing
steam engines, exhausting against the atmosphere. After
Trevithick’s development, transport applications became possible
and steam engines found their way into boats, railways, farms, and
road vehicles.

The steam engine was originally invented and perfected to be
used in mines. Before the steam engine, shallow bell pits followed
a seam of coal along the surface and were abandoned as the coal
was extracted. In other cases, if the geology was favorable, the coal
was mined by a drift mine driven into the side of a hill. Shaft mining
was done in some areas, but the limiting factor was the problem
of removing water. It could be done by hauling buckets of water
up the shaft or to a tunnel driven into a hill. In either case, the
water had to be discharged into a stream or ditch at a level where
it could flow away by gravity. The introduction of the steam pump
by Savery in 1698 and the Newcomen steam engine in 1712 greatly
facilitated the removal of water and enabled shafts to be made
deeper, enabling more coal to be extracted. These developments
began before the Industrial Revolution, but the adoption of John
Smeaton’s improvements to the Newcomen engine followed by
James Watt’s more efficient steam engines from the 1770s reduced
the fuel costs of engines, making mines more profitable.

At the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, inland transport
was by navigable rivers and roads, with coastal vessels employed
to move heavy goods by sea. Wagon ways were used for conveying
coal to rivers for further shipment, but canals had not yet been
widely constructed. Animals supplied all of the motive power on
land, with sails providing the motive power on the sea. The first
horse railways were introduced toward the end of the 18th century,
with steam locomotives introduced in the early decades of the 19th
century. Steam locomotives were invented after the introduction
of high-pressure steam engines when the Boulton and Watt patent expired in 1800. High-pressure engines exhausted used steam to the atmosphere, doing away with the condenser and cooling water. A few of these early locomotives were used in mines. Steam-hauled public railways began with the Stockton and Darlington Railway in 1825. The use of steam engines on railroads proved extraordinary in the fact that now you could have large amounts of goods and raw materials delivered to cities and factories alike. Trains could deliver these to places far away at a fraction of the cost traveling by wagon.

 Particularly in the United States, the introduction and development of the steamboat resulted in vast changes. Prior to the steamboat, rivers were generally only used in transporting goods from east to west, and from north to south as fighting the current was very difficult and often impossible. Non-powered boats and rafts were assembled upstream to carry cargo downstream, and would often be disassembled at the end of their journey and the remains used to construct homes and commercial buildings. Following the advent of the steamboat, the U.S. saw incredible growth in the transportation of goods and people, which was key in westward expansion. The steamboat dramatically reduced time used to transport goods and allowed for increased specialization. It was also critical to facilitating the internal slave trade.

 With the steamboat came the need for an improved river system. The natural river system produced such obstacles as rapids, sand bars, shallow waters, and waterfalls. To overcome these natural obstacles, a network of canals, locks, and dams was constructed. This increased demand for labor along the rivers, resulting in tremendous job growth. The popularization of the steamboat also led directly to growth in the coal and insurance industries and demand for repair facilities along the rivers. Additionally, the demand for goods in general increased as the steamboat made transport to new destinations both wide-reaching and efficient.
Prior to the steamboat, it could take between three and four months to make the passage from New Orleans to Louisville, averaging twenty miles a day. With the steamboat this time was reduced drastically with trips ranging from twenty-five to thirty-five days. This was especially beneficial to farmers as their crops could now be transported elsewhere to be sold.
Steam Engine and Societal Progress

Steam engines are a particularly illustrative example of how changes brought by industrialization led to even more changes in other area. Water power, the world’s preceding supply of power, continued to be an essential source even during the height of steam engine popularity. The steam engine, however, provided many novel benefits. While many consider the potential for an increase in power generated to be the dominant benefit (with the average horsepower of steam powered mills producing four times the power of water powered mills), others favor the potential for agglomeration. Steam engines made it possible to easily work, live, produce, market, specialize, and viably expand without having to worry about the less abundant presence of waterways. Cities and towns were now built around factories, where steam engines served as the foundation for the livelihood of many of the citizens. By promoting the agglomeration of individuals, successful local markets were established. Cities quickly grew and the quality of living eventually increased as infrastructure was put in place. Finer goods could be produced as acquisition of materials became less difficult and expensive. Direct local competition led to higher degrees of specialization and labor and capital were in rich supply. The steam-powered towns encouraged growth both locally and on the national scale.
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25.4: Iron Making

25.4.1: The Shift to Coal

The advancement of the steam engine dramatically improved the efficiency of coal mining during the Industrial Revolution, making coal a cheaper, more abundant, and easily available source of energy. This resulted in labor conditions that triggered influential unions and in pollution that sparked the environmental movement.

Learning Objective

Evaluate the effect the rising use of coal had on development and industry

Key Points

- Coal is a combustible black or brownish-black sedimentary rock occurring in layers or veins called coal beds or coal seams. It is composed primarily of
carbon, along with variable quantities of other elements, chiefly hydrogen, sulfur, oxygen, and nitrogen. A fossil fuel, coal forms from dead plant matter.

- Early coal extraction was small-scale, with coal lying either on the surface or very close to it. The early coal mining techniques left considerable amount of usable coal behind. Although some deep mining in Britain took place as early as the 1500s, deep shaft mining began to develop extensively in the late 18th century, with rapid expansion throughout the 19th century and early 20th century when the industry peaked. Coalfields helped to make the regions where they were located prosperous. Coal was so abundant in Britain that the supply could be stepped up to meet the rapidly rising demand.

- Coal was central to the development of the steam engine and, in turn, the steam engine dramatically increased the efficiency of coal mining. The introduction of the steam pump by Thomas Savery in 1698 and the Newcomen steam engine in 1712 greatly facilitated the removal of water from mines and enabled shafts to be made deeper, enabling more coal to be extracted. The next major step occurred when James Watt developed an improved version of Newcomen's engine. Watt's ten-horsepower engines enabled a wide range of manufacturing machinery to be powered.

- Coal mining remained very dangerous due to the presence of firedamp in many coal seams. Conditions of work were very poor, with a high casualty rate from rock falls. Coal mining has also been historically
linked to bonded labor long after slavery was formally abolished in many parts of the world. Some of the worst abuses of child labor continued in coal mines. The miners, less affected by imported labor or machines than were the cotton mill workers, began to form trade unions and fight their grim battle for wages against the coal owners and royalty-lessees.

- The replacement of wood and other bio-fuels with coal was also a major change in the metal industries during the Industrial Revolution. For a given amount of heat, coal required much less labor than cutting wood and converting it to charcoal. Coal was also more abundant than wood. The reverberatory furnace technology, which keeps impurities in the coal from migrating into the metal, was highly advanced during the period. Coal was also central to the gas lighting industry.

- The origins of the environmental movement lay in the response to increasing levels of smoke pollution in the atmosphere during the Industrial Revolution. The emergence of large factories and corresponding immense growth in coal consumption gave rise to an unprecedented level of air pollution in industrial centers. The first non-governmental organizations and environment protection policies were a result of the development of coal-based industries during the Industrial Revolution.
Key Terms

**reverberatory furnace**
A metallurgical or process furnace that isolates the material being processed from contact with the fuel, but not from contact with combustion gases. The term *reverberation* is used here in a generic sense of *rebounding* or *reflecting*, not in the acoustic sense of *echoing*.

**coke**
A fuel with few impurities and a high carbon content, the solid carbonaceous material derived from destructive distillation of low-ash, low-sulfur bituminous coal. While it can form naturally, the common form is man-made.

**steam engine**
A heat engine that performs mechanical work using steam.

Coal and Coal Mining in Britain

Coal is a combustible black or brownish-black sedimentary rock occurring in layers or veins called coal beds or coal seams. Coal is composed primarily of carbon, along with variable quantities of other elements, chiefly hydrogen, sulfur, oxygen, and nitrogen. A fossil fuel, coal forms when dead plant matter is converted into peat,
which in turn is converted into lignite, then sub-bituminous coal, bituminous coal, and lastly anthracite. This involves biological and geological processes that take place over time.

The history of coal mining goes back thousands of years. Early coal extraction was small-scale, with coal lying either on the surface or very close to it. The early coal mining techniques left considerable amount of usable coal behind. Although some deep mining in Britain took place as early as the 1500s, deep shaft mining began to develop extensively in the late 18th century, with rapid expansion throughout the 19th century and early 20th century when the industry peaked. The location of the coalfields helped to make the prosperity of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and South Wales. Northumberland and Durham were the leading coal producers and the sites of the first deep pits. In much of Britain, coal was worked from drift mines or scraped off when it outcropped on the surface. Small groups of part-time miners used shovels and primitive equipment. As a result of these limited methods, in the deep Tyneside pits (300 to 1,000 ft deep) for example, only about 40 percent of the coal could be extracted.

Coal was so abundant in Britain that the supply could be increased to meet the rapidly rising demand. In 1700, the annual output of coal was just under 3 million tons. Between 1770 and 1780, the annual output of coal was some 6.25 million long tons (or about the output of a week and a half in the 20th century). After 1790 output soared, reaching 16 million long tons by 1815. By 1830 this rose to over 30 million tons.

Use of Coal During the Industrial Revolution

The development of the Industrial Revolution led to the large-scale
use of coal as the steam engine took over from the water wheel. In 1700, five-sixths of the world's coal was mined in Britain.

Steam Engine and Coal Mining

Coal was central to the development of the steam engine and in turn, the steam engine dramatically increased the efficiency of coal mining. Before the steam engine, shallow bell pits followed a seam of coal along the surface, which were abandoned as the coal was extracted. In other cases, if the geology was favorable, the coal was mined by means of an adit or drift mine driven into the side of a hill. Shaft mining was done in some areas, but the limiting factor was the problem of removing water. It could be done by hauling buckets of water up the shaft or to a sough (a tunnel driven into a hill to drain a mine). In either case, the water had to be discharged into a stream or ditch at a level where it could flow away by gravity.

The introduction of the steam pump by Thomas Savery in 1698 and the Newcomen steam engine in 1712 facilitated the removal of water and enabled shafts to be made deeper so more coal could be extracted. A number of Newcomen engines were successfully put to use in Britain for draining hitherto unworkable deep mines, with the engine on the surface. These large machines, requiring a lot of capital to build, were extremely inefficient by modern standards, but greatly increased the scope of coal mining when located where coal was cheap at pit heads.

Despite their disadvantages, Newcomen engines were reliable and easy to maintain, and continued to be used in the coalfields until the early decades of the 19th century. The next major step occurred when James Watt developed (1763–1775) an improved version of Newcomen's engine. Boulton and Watt's early engines used half as much coal as John Smeaton's improved version of Newcomen's. Watt's ten-horsepower engines could power a wide
range of manufacturing machinery and be sited anywhere that water and coal or wood fuel could be obtained.

Coal mining remained very dangerous due to the presence of firedamp in many coal seams. Some degree of safety was provided by the safety lamp invented in 1816 by Sir Humphry Davy and independently by George Stephenson. However, the lamps proved a false dawn because they became unsafe very quickly and provided a weak light. Firedamp explosions continued, often setting off coal dust explosions, so casualties grew during the entire 19th century. Conditions of work were very poor, with a high casualty rate from rock falls.

Coal mining has also been historically linked to bonded labor long after slavery was formally abolished in many parts of the world. For example, Scottish miners had been bonded to their “masters” by a 1606 Act “Anent Coalyers and Salters.” A Colliers and Salters (Scotland) Act 1775, recognized this to be “a state of slavery and bondage” and formally abolished it. This decision was made effective by a further law in 1799. Some of the worst abuses of child labor continued in coal mines throughout the Industrial Revolution. The miners, less affected by imported labor or machines than were the cotton mill workers, began to form trade unions and fight their grim battle for wages against the coal owners and royalty-lessees. In South Wales, the miners showed a high degree of solidarity. They lived in isolated villages where they comprised the great majority of workers. There was a high degree of equality in lifestyle. Combined with an evangelical religious style based on Methodism, this led to forging a “community of solidarity” under the leadership of the Miners Federation.
Mining has always been dangerous because of methane gas explosions, roof cave-ins, and the difficulty of mine rescue. The worst single disaster in British coal mining history was at Senghenydd in the South Wales coalfield. In 1913 an explosion and subsequent fire killed 436 men and boys. The Courrières mine disaster, Europe's worst mining accident, caused the death of 1,099 miners in Northern France in 1906.

Wagonways for moving coal in the mining areas started in the 17th century and were often associated with canal or river systems for the further movement of coal. These were all horse-drawn or relied on gravity, with a stationary steam engine to haul the wagons back
to the top of the incline. The first applications of the steam locomotive were on wagon or plate ways (as they were then often called from the cast-iron plates used). Horse-drawn public railways did not begin until the early years of the 19th century when improvements to pig and wrought iron production lowered costs. The development of the steam locomotive by Trevithick early in the 19th century gave added impetus and coal consumption grew rapidly as the railway network expanded through the Victorian period.

Metallurgy

The replacement of wood and other bio-fuels with coal was also a major change in the metal industries during the Industrial Revolution. For a given amount of heat, coal required much less labor to mine than cutting wood and converting it to charcoal, and coal was more abundant than wood. Use of coal in smelting started somewhat before the Industrial Revolution, based on innovations by Sir Clement Clerke and others from 1678, using coal reverberatory furnaces known as cupolas. These were operated by the flames playing on the ore and charcoal or coke mixture, reducing the oxide to metal. This means that impurities (such as sulfur ash) in the coal do not migrate into the metal. This technology was applied to lead from 1678 and to copper from 1687. It was also applied to iron foundry work in the 1690s, but in this case the reverberatory furnace was known as an air furnace. This was followed by Abraham Darby, who made great strides using coke to fuel his blast furnaces at Coalbrookdale in 1709. Coke pig iron was hardly used to produce wrought iron in forges until the mid-1750s, when Abraham’s son, Abraham Darby II, built Horsehay and Ketley furnaces (not far from Coalbrookdale). By then, coke pig iron was cheaper than charcoal pig iron.
Gas Lighting

Another major industry of the later Industrial Revolution where coal was central was gas lighting. Although others made a similar innovation elsewhere, its large-scale introduction was the work of William Murdoch, an employee of Boulton & Watt, the steam engine pioneers. The process consisted of the large-scale gasification of coal in furnaces, the purification of the gas (removal of sulfur, ammonia, and heavy hydrocarbons), and its storage and distribution. The first gas lighting utilities were established in London between 1812 and 1820. They soon became one of the major consumers of coal in Britain. Gas lighting affected social and industrial organization because it allowed factories and stores to remain open longer than with tallow candles or oil. Its introduction allowed nightlife to flourish in cities and towns as interiors, and streets could be lighted on a larger scale than before.

Industrial Revolution, Coal, and Environmental Movement

The origins of the environmental movement lay in the response to increasing levels of smoke pollution in the atmosphere during the Industrial Revolution. The emergence of great factories and the concomitant immense growth in coal consumption gave rise to an unprecedented level of air pollution in industrial centers. After 1900 the large volume of industrial chemical discharges added to the growing load of untreated human waste. The first large-scale, modern environmental laws came in the form of Britain's Alkali Acts,
passed in 1863, to regulate the deleterious air pollution given off by the Leblanc process used to produce soda ash.

Levels of air pollution rose during the Industrial Revolution, sparking the first modern environmental laws to be passed in the mid-19th century.

In industrial cities, local experts and reformers, especially after 1890, took the lead in identifying environmental degradation and pollution and initiating grass-roots movements to demand and achieve reforms. Typically the highest priority was water and air pollution. The Coal Smoke Abatement Society was formed in Britain in 1898 making it one of the oldest environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs). It was founded by artist Sir William Blake Richmond, who was frustrated with the pall cast by coal smoke. Although there were earlier pieces of legislation, the Public Health Act of 1875 required all furnaces and fireplaces to consume their own smoke. It also provided for sanctions against factories that emitted large amounts of black smoke.
Attributions
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25.4.2: Changes to Iron Production

Technological advancements in metallurgy, most notably smelting with coal or coke, increased the supply and decreased the price of iron, aiding a number of industries and making iron common in the rapidly growing machinery and engine sectors.

Learning Objective

Break down how iron production changed during the Industrial Revolution

Key Points

- Early iron smelting used charcoal as both the heat source and the reducing agent. By the 18th century, the availability of wood for making charcoal limited the expansion of iron production, so England became increasingly dependent on imports from Sweden and Russia. Smelting with coal (or its derivative coke) was
a long-sought objective, with some early advancements achieved throughout the 17th century. Britain’s demand for iron and steel, combined with ample capital and energetic entrepreneurs, rapidly made it the world leader of metallurgy.

• A major change in the metal industries during the era of the Industrial Revolution was the replacement of wood and other bio-fuels with coal. Use of coal in smelting started somewhat before the Industrial Revolution, based on innovations by Sir Clement Clerke and others from 1678, using coal reverberatory furnaces known as cupolas. With cupolas, impurities in the coal did not migrate into the metal.

• Abraham Darby made great strides using coke to fuel his blast furnaces at Coalbrookdale in 1709. However, coke pig iron was hardly used to produce wrought iron in forges until the mid-1750s, when his son Abraham Darby II built Horsehay and Ketley furnaces. Since cast iron was becoming cheaper and more plentiful, it became a structural material following the building of the innovative Iron Bridge in 1778 by Abraham Darby III.

• Wrought iron for smiths to forge into consumer goods was still made in finery forges, as it long had been. However, new processes were adopted in the ensuing years. The first is referred to today as potting and stamping, but this was superseded by Henry Cort’s puddling process. Cort developed two significant iron manufacturing processes: rolling in 1783 and puddling in 1784. Rolling replaced hammering for consolidating wrought iron and expelling some of the dross. Rolling was 15 times
faster than hammering with a trip hammer.

- Hot blast, patented by James Beaumont Neilson in 1828, was the most important development of the 19th century for saving energy in making pig iron. By using waste exhaust heat to preheat combustion air, the amount of fuel to make a unit of pig iron was reduced.

- The supply of cheaper iron aided a number of industries. The development of machine tools allowed better working of iron, increasing its use in the rapidly growing machinery and engine industries. Prices of many goods decreased, making them more available and common.

Key Terms

reverberatory furnaces
A metallurgical or process furnace that isolates the material being processed from contact with the fuel, but not from contact with combustion gases. The term reverberation is used here in a generic sense of rebounding or reflecting, not in the acoustic sense of echoing.

Iron Bridge
A bridge that crosses the River Severn in Shropshire, England. Opened in 1781, it was the first arch bridge in the world to be made of cast iron and was greatly
celebrated after construction.

**pig iron**
An intermediate product of the iron industry. It has a very high carbon content, typically 3.5–4.5%, along with silica and other constituents of dross, which makes it very brittle and not useful as a material except in limited applications. It is made by smelting iron ore into a transportable ingot of impure high carbon-content iron as an ingredient for further processing steps. It is the molten iron from the blast furnace, a large cylinder-shaped furnace charged with iron ore, coke, and limestone.

**coke**
A fuel with few impurities and a high carbon content, usually made from coal. It is the solid carbonaceous material derived from destructive distillation of low-ash, low-sulfur bituminous coal. While it can be formed naturally, the commonly used form is man-made.

---

**Iron and Industrial Revolution in Britain**

Early iron smelting used charcoal as both the heat source and the reducing agent. By the 18th century, the availability of wood for making charcoal had limited the expansion of iron production, so England became increasingly dependent on Sweden (from the mid-17th century) and then from about 1725 on Russia for the iron
required for industry. Smelting with coal (or its derivative coke) was a long-sought objective. The production of pig iron with coke was probably achieved by Dud Dudley in the 1620s, and with a mixed fuel made from coal and wood again in the 1670s. However this was only a technological rather than a commercial success. Shadrach Fox may have smelted iron with coke at Coalbrookdale in Shropshire in the 1690s, but only to make cannonballs and other cast iron products such as shells. In the time of peace, they did not enjoy much demand.

Britain’s demand for iron and steel, combined with ample capital and energetic entrepreneurs, rapidly made it the world leader of the metallurgy. In 1875, Britain accounted for 47% of world production of pig iron and almost 40% of steel. Forty percent of British output was exported to the U.S., which was rapidly building its rail and industrial infrastructure. The growth of pig iron output was dramatic. Britain went from 1.3 million tons in 1840 to 6.7 million in 1870 and 10.4 in 1913.

### Technological Advancements

A major change in the metal industries during the era of the Industrial Revolution was the replacement of wood and other bio-fuels with coal. For a given amount of heat, coal required much less labor to mine than cutting wood and converting it to charcoal, and coal was more abundant than wood. Use of coal in smelting started before the Industrial Revolution based on innovations by Sir Clement Clerke and others from 1678, using coal reverberatory furnaces known as cupolas. These were operated by the flames playing on the ore and charcoal or coke mixture, reducing the oxide to metal. This has the advantage that impurities such as sulfur ash in the coal do not migrate into the metal. This technology was applied to lead from 1678 and to copper from 1687. It was also
applied to iron foundry work in the 1690s, but in this case the reverberatory furnace was known as an air furnace. The foundry cupola is a different (and later) innovation.

Abraham Darby made great strides using coke to fuel his blast furnaces at Coalbrookdale in 1709. However, the coke pig iron he made was used mostly for the production of cast iron goods, such as pots and kettles. He had the advantage over his rivals in that his pots, cast by his patented process, were thinner and cheaper than theirs. Coke pig iron was hardly used to produce wrought iron in forges until the mid-1750s, when his son Abraham Darby II built Horsehay and Ketley furnaces. By then, coke pig iron was cheaper than charcoal pig iron. Since cast iron was becoming cheaper and more plentiful, it became a structural material following the building of the innovative Iron Bridge in 1778 by Abraham Darby III.
The Iron Bridge crosses the River Severn in Shropshire, England, and is the first bridge in the world to be made of cast iron. During the winter of 1773–74, local newspapers advertised a proposal to petition Parliament for leave to construct an iron bridge with a single 120 feet (37 m) span. In 1775, Abraham Darby III, the grandson of Abraham Darby I and an ironmaster working at Coalbrookdale, was appointed treasurer to the project.

Wrought iron for smiths to forge into consumer goods was still made in finery forges, as it long had been. However, new processes were adopted in the ensuing years. The first is referred to today as potting and stamping, but this was superseded by Henry Cort’s puddling process. Cort developed two significant iron manufacturing processes: rolling in 1783 and puddling in 1784. Rolling replaced hammering for consolidating wrought iron and expelling some of the dross. Rolling was 15 times faster than hammering with a trip hammer. Roller mills were first used for making sheets, but also rolled structural shapes such as angles and rails.

Puddling produced structural-grade iron at a relatively low cost. It was a means of decarburizing pig iron by slow oxidation, with iron ore as the oxygen source, as the iron was manually stirred.
using a long rod. Puddling was done in a reverberatory furnace, allowing coal or coke to be used as fuel. The decarburized iron, having a higher melting point than cast iron, was raked into globs by the puddler. When the glob was large enough, the puddler would remove it. Puddling was backbreaking and extremely hot work. Few puddlers lived to age 40. The process continued until the late 19th century when iron was displaced by steel. Because puddling required human skill in sensing the iron globs, it was never successfully mechanized.

Hot blast, patented by James Beaumont Neilson in 1828, was the most important development of the 19th century for saving energy in making pig iron. By using waste exhaust heat to preheat combustion air, the amount of fuel to make a unit of pig iron was reduced at first by between one-third using coal or two-thirds using coke. However, the efficiency gains continued as the technology improved. Hot blast also raised the operating temperature of furnaces, increasing their capacity. Using less coal or coke meant introducing fewer impurities into the pig iron. This meant that lower quality coal or anthracite could be used in areas where coking coal was unavailable or too expensive.

The supply of cheaper iron aided a number of industries, such as those making nails, hinges, wire, and other hardware items. The development of machine tools allowed better working of iron, leading to increased use in the rapidly growing machinery and engine industries. Iron was used in agricultural machines, making farm labor more effective. The new technological advancements were also critical to the development of the rail. Prices of many goods, such as iron cooking utensils, decreased, making them more available and commonly used.

Attribution
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Steel Production

25.4.3: Steel Production

Before 1860, steel was expensive and produced in small quantities, but the development of crucible steel technique by Benjamin Huntsman in the 1740s, the Bessemer process in the 1850s, and the Siemens-Martin process in the 1850s-1860s resulted in the mass production of steel, one of the key advancements behind the Second Industrial Revolution.

Learning Objective

Postulate the effects of improved steel production on the progression of industry.

Key Points

- Steel is an alloy of iron and other elements, primarily carbon, that is widely used in construction and other applications because of its high tensile strength and low cost. Steel's base metal is iron. It was first produced in antiquity, but two decades before the Industrial Revolution an improvement was
made in the production of steel, which at the time was an expensive commodity used only where iron would not do.

- Benjamin Huntsman developed his crucible steel technique in the 1740s. He was able to make satisfactory cast steel in clay pot crucibles, each holding about 34 pounds of blister steel. A flux was added, and they were covered and heated by coke for about three hours. The molten steel was then poured into molds and the crucibles reused. For a long time Huntsman exported his whole output to France as local producers refused to work with steel harder than they were already using.

- Steel is often cited as the first of several new areas for industrial mass-production that characterize the Second Industrial Revolution. Before about 1860, steel was still an expensive product. The problem of mass-producing cheap steel was solved in 1855 by Henry Bessemer with the introduction of the Bessemer converter at his steelworks in Sheffield, England. Further experiments by Göran Fredrik Göransson and Robert Forester Mushet allowed Bessemer to perfect what would be known as the Bessemer process.

- Although initially Bessemer met with rebuffs and was forced to undertake the exploitation of his process himself, eventually licences were applied for in such numbers that Bessemer received royalties exceeding a million pounds sterling. By 1870, Bessemer steel was widely used for ship plate. The Bessemer process also made steel railways competitive in price. Experience quickly proved steel had much greater strength and durability and could
handle the heavier and faster engines and cars.

• After 1890, the Bessemer process was gradually supplanted by open-hearth steel making. Carl Wilhelm Siemens developed the Siemens regenerative furnace in the 1850s. This furnace operated at a high temperature by using regenerative preheating of fuel and air for combustion. In 1865, Pierre-Émile Martin took out a license from Siemens and applied his regenerative furnace for making steel. The Siemens-Martin process was slower and thus easier to control. It also permitted the melting and refining of large amounts of scrap steel, further lowering steel production costs and recycling an otherwise troublesome waste material.

• The Siemens-Martin process became the leading steel-making process by the early 20th century. The availability of cheap steel allowed larger bridges, railroads, skyscrapers, and ships. Other important steel products were steel cable, steel rod, and sheet steel, which enabled large, high-pressure boilers and high-tensile strength steel for machinery. Military equipment also improved significantly.

**Key Terms**

**Second Industrial Revolution**
A phase of rapid industrialization in the final third of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, also
known as the Technological Revolution. Although a number of its characteristic events can be traced to earlier innovations in manufacturing, such as the establishment of a machine tool industry, the development of methods for manufacturing interchangeable parts, and the invention of the Bessemer Process, it is generally dated between 1870 and 1914 up to the start of World War I.

**Bessemer process**

The first inexpensive industrial process for the mass production of steel from molten pig iron before the development of the open hearth furnace. The key principle is removal of impurities from the iron by oxidation with air blown through the molten iron. The oxidation also raises the temperature of the iron mass and keeps it molten.

**crucible steel**

A term that applies to steel made by two different methods in the modern era and produced in varying locales throughout history. It is made by melting iron and other materials. It was produced in South and Central Asia during the medieval era but techniques for production of high-quality steel were developed by Benjamin Huntsman in England in the 18th century. However, Huntsman’s process used iron and steel as raw materials rather than direct conversion from cast iron as in the later Bessemer process. The homogeneous crystal structure of this cast steel improved its strength and hardness compared to preceding forms of steel.
cementation

An obsolete technology for making steel by carburization of iron. Unlike modern steel making, it increased the amount of carbon in the iron. It was apparently developed before the 17th century. Derwentcote Steel Furnace, built in 1720, is the earliest surviving example of a furnace using this technology.

carburization

A heat treatment process in which iron or steel absorbs carbon while the metal is heated in the presence of a carbon-bearing material, such as charcoal or carbon monoxide. The intent is to make the metal harder. Unlike modern steel making, the process increased the amount of carbon in the iron.

Steel and the Industrial Revolution

Steel is an alloy of iron and other elements, primarily carbon, that is widely used in construction and other applications because of its high tensile strength and low cost. Steel's base metal is iron, which is able to take on two crystalline forms, body-centered cubic (BCC) and face-centered cubic (FCC), depending on its temperature. It is the interaction of those allotropes with the alloying elements, primarily carbon, that gives steel and cast iron their range of unique properties. In the BCC arrangement, there is an iron atom in the center of each cube, and in the FCC, there is one at the center
of each of the six faces of the cube. Carbon, other elements, and inclusions within iron act as hardening agents that prevent the movement of dislocations that otherwise occur in the crystal lattices of iron atoms.

Steel (with lower carbon content than pig iron but higher than wrought iron) was first produced in antiquity, but two decades before the Industrial Revolution an improvement was made in the production of steel, which at the time was an expensive commodity used only where iron would not do, such as for cutting-edge tools and for springs. Benjamin Huntsman developed his crucible steel technique in the 1740s. After many experiments, Huntsman was able to make satisfactory cast steel in clay pot crucibles, each holding about 34 pounds of blister steel. A flux was added, and they were covered and heated by coke for about three hours. The molten steel was then poured into molds and the crucibles reused. The local cutlery manufacturers refused to buy Huntsman’s cast steel, as it was harder than the German steel they were accustomed to using. For a long time Huntsman exported his whole output to France. Blister steel used by Huntsman as raw material was made by the cementation process or by carburization of iron. Carburization is a heat treatment process, in which iron or steel absorbs carbon while the metal is heated in the presence of a carbon-bearing material, such as charcoal or carbon monoxide. The intent is to make the metal harder. Unlike modern steel making, the process increased the amount of carbon in the iron.

Second Industrial Revolution

Steel is often cited as the first of several new areas for industrial mass-production that characterize the Second Industrial Revolution beginning around 1850, although a method for mass manufacture of steel was not invented until the 1860s and became
widely available in the 1870s after the process was modified to produce more uniform quality.

Before about 1860, steel was an expensive product, made in small quantities and used mostly for swords, tools, and cutlery. All large metal structures were made of wrought or cast iron. The problem of mass-producing cheap steel was solved in 1855 by Henry Bessemer with the introduction of the Bessemer converter at his steelworks in Sheffield, England. In the Bessemer process, molten pig iron from the blast furnace was charged into a large crucible, and air was blown through the molten iron from below, igniting the dissolved carbon from the coke. As the carbon burned off, the melting point of the mixture increased, but the heat from the burning carbon provided the extra energy needed to keep the mixture molten. After the carbon content in the melt dropped to the desired level, the air draft was cut off. A typical Bessemer converter could convert a 25-ton batch of pig iron to steel in half an hour. Bessemer demonstrated the process in 1856 and had a successful operation going by 1864.

Bessemer converter, print published in 1867 in Great Britain.
Although the Bessemer process is no longer commercially used, at the time of its invention it was of enormous industrial importance because it lowered the cost of production steel, leading to steel being widely substituted for cast iron. Bessemer’s attention was drawn to the problem of steel manufacture in an attempt to improve the construction of guns.

Bessemer licensed the patent for his process to five ironmasters, but from the outset, the companies had great difficulty producing good quality steel. Göran Fredrik Göransson, a Swedish ironmaster, using the purer charcoal pig iron of that country, was the first to make good steel by the process, but only after many attempts. His results prompted Bessemer to try a purer iron obtained from Cumberland hematite, but had only limited success because the quantity of carbon was difficult to control. Robert Forester Mushet, after thousands of experiments at Darkhill Ironworks, had shown that the quantity of carbon could be controlled by removing almost all of it from the iron and then adding an exact amount of carbon and manganese in the form of spiegeleisen (a ferromanganese alloy). This improved the quality of the finished product and increased its malleability.

When Bessemer tried to induce makers to take up his improved system, he met with general rebuffs and was eventually driven to undertake the exploitation of the process himself. He erected steelworks in Sheffield in a business partnership with others, such as W & J Galloway & Sons, and began to manufacture steel. At first the output was insignificant, but gradually the magnitude of the operation was enlarged until the competition became effective and steel traders became aware that the firm of Henry Bessemer & Co. was underselling them to the extent of UK£10-£15 a ton. This argument to the pocket quickly had its effect, and licenses were
applied for in such numbers that, in royalties for the use of his process, Bessemer received a sum considerably exceeding a million pounds sterling. By 1870, Bessemer steel was widely used for ship plate. By the 1850s, the speed, weight, and quantity of railway traffic was limited by the strength of the wrought-iron rails in use. The solution was to turn to steel rails, which the Bessemer process made competitive in price. Experience quickly proved steel had much greater strength and durability and could handle the heavier and faster engines and cars.

However, Mushet received nothing and by 1866 was destitute and in ill health. In that year his 16-year-old daughter, Mary, traveled to London alone to confront Bessemer at his offices, arguing that his success was based on the results of her father's work. Bessemer decided to pay Mushet an annual pension of £300, a very considerable sum, which he did for over 20 years, possibly to keep the Mushets from legal action.

After 1890, the Bessemer process was gradually supplanted by open-hearth steel making. Sir Carl Wilhelm Siemens developed the Siemens regenerative furnace in the 1850s and claimed in 1857 to be recovering enough heat to save 70–80% of the fuel. This furnace operated at a high temperature by using regenerative preheating of fuel and air for combustion. In regenerative preheating, the exhaust gases from the furnace are pumped into a chamber containing bricks, where heat is transferred from the gases to the bricks. The flow of the furnace is then reversed so that fuel and air pass through the chamber and are heated by the bricks. Through this method, an open-hearth furnace can reach temperatures high enough to melt steel, but Siemens did not initially use it for that. In 1865, the French engineer Pierre-Émile Martin took out a license from Siemens and first applied his regenerative furnace for making steel. The most appealing characteristic of the Siemens regenerative furnace is the rapid production of large quantities of basic steel, used for example to construct high-rise buildings.
The most appealing characteristic of the Siemens regenerative furnace was the rapid production of large quantities of basic steel, used for example to construct high-rise buildings. Through Siemens’ method, an open-hearth furnace could reach temperatures high enough to melt steel, but Siemens did not initially use it for that. It was Martin who first applied the regenerative furnace for making steel.

The Siemens-Martin process complemented rather than replaced the Bessemer process. It was slower and thus easier to control. It also permitted the melting and refining of large amounts of scrap steel, further lowering steel production costs and recycling an otherwise troublesome waste material. Its worst drawback was and remains the fact that melting and refining a charge takes several
hours. Furthermore, the work environment around an open hearth furnace was and remains extremely dangerous.

The Siemens–Martin process became the leading steel making process by the early 20th century. The availability of cheap steel allowed larger bridges, railroads, skyscrapers, and ships. Other important steel products—also made using the open hearth process—were steel cable, steel rod, and sheet steel which enabled large, high-pressure boilers and high-tensile strength steel for machinery, creating much more powerful engines, gears, and axles than were previously possible. With large amounts of steel, it also became possible to build much more powerful guns and carriages, tanks, armored fighting vehicles, and naval ships.

Attributions

• Steel Production
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25.5: Innovations in Transportation

25.5.1: Canals

The modern canal network in Britain emerged because the Industrial Revolution demanded an economic and reliable way to transport goods and commodities in large quantities, simultaneously responding to the needs of the Industrial Revolution and fueling its further advancement.

Learning Objective

Demonstrate the importance of canals to commerce.

Key Points

• The British canal system played a vital role in the Industrial Revolution at a time when roads were only
just emerging from the medieval mud and long trains of packhorses were the only means of more easily accessible transport. In Britain, the modern canal network came into being because the Industrial Revolution demanded an economic and reliable way to transport goods and commodities in large quantities. Some important river navigation improvements took place in the 16th and 17th centuries.

- Big canals began to be built in the 18th century to link the major manufacturing centers across the country. Known for its huge commercial success, the Bridgewater Canal in North West England opened in 1761. It connected Worsley with the rapidly growing town of Manchester and was a huge financial success. This success helped inspire a period of intense canal building, known as Canal Mania. An embryonic national canal network came into being and a dramatic rise in the number of schemes and money invested emerged. New canals were hastily built in the aim of replicating the commercial success of the Bridgewater Canal.

- By the 1820s a national network – first in the world – was in existence. The new canals proved highly successful. The boats on the canals were horse-drawn with a towpath alongside the canal for the horse to walk along. This horse-drawn system was highly economical and became standard across the British canal network.

- This success proved the viability of canal transport and soon industrialists in many other parts of the country wanted canals. As people saw the high
incomes achieved from canal tolls, canal proposals came to be put forward by investors. In a further development, there was often out-and-out speculation, in which people would try to buy shares in a newly floated company simply to sell them on for an immediate profit, regardless of whether the canal was ever profitable or even built. Many rival canal companies were formed and competition was rampant.

- On the majority of British canals the canal-owning companies did not own or run a fleet of boats. Instead, they charged private operators tolls to use the canal. In the period of the most rapid development of the canal system, crews were all male and their families lived in cottages on the bank. Wives and children came aboard as extra labor and to save rental costs during the latter part of the 19th century. During this period, whole families lived aboard the boats. They were often marginalized from land-based society and perceived as strange outsiders living a nomadic lifestyle.

- From about 1840, railways began to threaten canals. Although they could not only carry more than the canals, they could transport people and goods far more quickly than the walking pace of the canal boats. Most of the investment that had previously gone into canal building was diverted into railway building.
Key Terms

**flyboat**
A European light vessel, developed primarily as a mercantile cargo carrier, although many served as warships in an auxiliary role, used in the late 16th and early 17th century. The name was subsequently applied to a number of disparate vessels, which achieved high speeds or endurance, including those that worked day and night on British canals to compete with the rapidly developing railway.

**Bridgwater Canal**
A canal that connects Runcorn, Manchester and Leigh, in North West England. It was commissioned by Francis Egerton, 3rd Duke of Bridgewater, to transport coal from his mines in Worsley to Manchester. It was opened in 1761 from Worsley to Manchester, and later extended from Manchester to Runcorn, and then from Worsley to Leigh. Its immense economic success triggered the development of a national canal system.

**Canal Mania**
The period of intense canal building in Britain between the 1790s and 1810s and the speculative frenzy that accompanied it in the early 1790s.
Canal Mania

The British canal system of water transport played a vital role in the Industrial Revolution at a time when roads were only just emerging from the medieval mud and long trains of packhorses were the only means of more easily accessible transit of raw materials and finished products. Building of canals dates to ancient times but in Britain, the modern canal network came into being because the Industrial Revolution demanded an economic and reliable way to transport goods and commodities in large quantities. Some 29 river navigation improvements took place in the 16th and 17th centuries, starting with the Thames locks and the River Wey Navigation. The biggest growth was in the so-called narrow canals, which extended water transport to the emerging industrial areas of the Staffordshire potteries and Birmingham as well as a network of canals joining Yorkshire and Lancashire and extending to London.

Big canals began to be built in the 18th century to link the major manufacturing centers across the country. Known for its huge commercial success, the Bridgewater Canal in North West England opened in 1761. It connected Worsley with the rapidly growing town of Manchester and its construction cost £168,000 (equivalent of over £22 million in 2013), but its advantages over land and river transport meant that within a year of its opening, the price of coal in Manchester fell by about half. The Bridgewater Canal was a huge financial success: it repaid the cost of its construction within just a few years. This success helped inspire a period of intense canal building, known as Canal Mania. Within just a few years of the Bridgewater’s opening, an embryonic national canal network came into being, with the construction of canals such as the Oxford Canal and the Trent & Mersey Canal. There was a dramatic rise in the number of schemes promoted. Only one canal was authorized by Act of Parliament in 1790, but by 1793 it was twenty. The capital authorized in 1790 was £90,000 but rose to nearly £3 million by 1793. New canals were hastily built in the aim of replicating the
commercial success of the Bridgewater Canal, the most notable being the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the Thames and Severn Canal which opened in 1774 and 1789 respectively.

The Bridgewater Canal is often considered to be the first “true” canal in England. It required the construction of an aqueduct to cross the River Irwell, one of the first of its kind. Its success helped inspire a period of intense canal building in Britain, known as Canal Mania.

By the 1820s a national network – first in the world – was in existence. The new canals proved highly successful. The boats on the canals were horse-drawn with a towpath alongside the canal for the horse to walk along. This horse-drawn system was highly economical and became standard across the British canal network. The canal boats could carry thirty tons at a time with only one horse pulling – more than ten times the amount of cargo per horse that was possible with a cart. It was this huge increase in supply that contributed to the reduction of the price of coal.
Speculative Frenzy

This success proved the viability of canal transport and soon industrialists in many other parts of the country wanted canals. After the Bridgewater Canal, the early canals were built by groups of private individuals with an interest in improving communications. In Staffordshire the famous potter Josiah Wedgwood saw an opportunity to bring bulky cargoes of clay to his factory doors and to transport his fragile finished goods to market in Manchester, Birmingham, or further afield by water, minimizing breakages. The new canal system was both cause and effect of the rapid industrialization of the Midlands and the north. The period between the 1770s and the 1830s is often referred to as the Golden Age of British canals.

For each canal, an Act of Parliament was necessary to authorize construction, and as people saw the high incomes achieved from canal tolls, canal proposals came to be put forward by investors interested in profiting from dividends, at least as much as by people whose businesses would profit from cheaper transport of raw materials and finished goods. In a further development, there was often out-and-out speculation, in which people would try to buy shares in a newly floated company simply to sell them on for an immediate profit, regardless of whether the canal was ever profitable or even built. During this period of Canal Mania, huge sums were invested in canal building and although many schemes came to nothing, the canal system rapidly expanded to nearly 4,000 miles (over 6,400 kilometers) in length.

Many rival canal companies were formed and competition was rampant. Perhaps the best example was Worcester Bar in Birmingham, a point where the Worcester and Birmingham Canal and the Birmingham Canal Navigations Main Line were only 7 feet (2.1 m) apart. For many years, a dispute about tolls meant that goods travelling through Birmingham had to be portaged from boats in one canal to boats in the other.
Operation

On the majority of British canals the canal-owning companies did not own or run a fleet of boats, since this was usually prohibited by the Acts of Parliament setting them up to prevent monopolies. Instead, they charged private operators tolls to use the canal. These tolls were also usually regulated by the Acts. From these tolls they would try, with varying degrees of success, to maintain the canal, pay back initial loans, and pay dividends to their shareholders.

In winter special icebreaker boats with reinforced hulls would be used to break the ice. Packet boats carried packages up to 112 pounds (51 kg) in weight as well as passengers at relatively high speed day and night. To compete with railways, the flyboat was introduced, cargo-carrying boats working day and night. These boats were crewed by three men, who operated a watch system whereby two men worked while the other slept. Horses were changed regularly. When steam boats were introduced in the late 19th century, crews were enlarged to four. The boats were owned and operated by individual carriers, or by carrying companies who would pay the captain a wage depending on the distance traveled and the amount of cargo.
The canal system grew rapidly at first, and became an almost completely connected network covering the South, Midlands, and parts of the North of England and Wales. There were canals in Scotland, but they were not connected to the English canals or, generally, to each other (with some exceptions).

In the period of the most rapid development of the canal system, crews were all male and their families lived in cottages on the bank. The practice of all male crews for steamers continued until after the First World War. Wives and children came aboard as extra labor and to save rental costs during the latter part of the 19th century. During this period, whole families lived aboard the boats. They were often marginalized from land-based society and perceived as strange outsiders living a nomadic lifestyle.

Decline

The last major canal to be built in Britain was the Manchester Ship Canal, which upon opening in 1894 was the largest ship canal in the world and opened Manchester as a port. However, it never achieved the commercial success its sponsors had hoped for and signaled that canals were a dying mode of transport. From about 1840, railways began to threaten canals. Although they could not only carry more than the canals, they could transport people and goods far more quickly than the walking pace of the canal boats. Most of the investment that had previously gone into canal building was diverted into railway building.

Canal companies were unable to compete against the speed of the new railways and in order to survive they had to slash their prices. This put an end to the huge profits that canal companies had enjoyed and also had an effect on the boatmen who faced a drop in wages. Flyboat working virtually ceased, as it could not compete
with the railways on speed and the boatmen found they could only afford to keep their families by taking them with them on the boats.

By the 1850s, the railway system had become well established and the amount of cargo carried on the canals had fallen by nearly two-thirds. In many cases struggling canal companies were bought out by railway companies. Sometimes this was a tactical move by railway companies to close the canal company down and remove competition or to build a railway on the line of the canal. Larger canal companies survived independently and were able to continue to make profits. The canals survived through the 19th century largely by occupying the niches in the transport market that the railways had missed, or by supplying local markets such as the coal-hungry factories and mills of the big cities.

During the 19th century, in much of continental Europe the canal systems of many countries, including France, Germany and the Netherlands, were drastically modernized and widened to take much larger boats, often able to transport up to two thousand tonnes, compared to the thirty to one hundred tonnes that was possible on the much narrower British canals. As it is economic to transport freight by canal only if this is done in bulk, the widening ensured that in many of these countries, canal freight transport is still economically viable. This canal modernization never occurred on a large scale in Britain, mainly because of the power of the railway companies who owned most of the canals and saw no reason to invest in a competing and from their point of view obsolete form of transport. The only significant exception to this was the modernization carried out on the Grand Union Canal in the 1930s.
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The First Locomotives

25.5.2: The First Locomotives

As a result of advancements in metallurgy and steam power technology during the Industrial Revolution, horse-drawn wagonways were replaced by steam locomotives, making Britain the first country in the world with modern railways.

Learning Objective

Characterize the first trains and their utilities

Key Points

- The first recorded use of rail transport in Great Britain is Sir Francis Willoughby’s Wollaton Wagonway in Nottinghamshire, built between 1603 and 1604 to carry coal. As early as 1671, railed roads were in use in Durham to ease the conveyance of coal. The primitive rails were superseded in 1793 when Benjamin Outram constructed a tramway with L-shaped flanged cast-iron plate rails (plateways). Outram’s rails were superseded by William Jessop’s
cast iron edge rails. Cast iron rails had a propensity to break easily, and the short lengths soon became uneven. In 1820, John Birkenshaw introduced a method of rolling rails in greater lengths using wrought iron, which was used from then onward.

- The earliest railways were built and paid for by the owners of the mines they served. As railway technology developed, longer lines became possible, connecting mines with more distant transshipment points and promising lower costs. These longer lines often required public subscription to build and crossed over land not owned by the mine owners. As a result, they needed an Act of Parliament to build. The first line to obtain such an act, in 1758, was the Middleton Railway in Leeds. The first for public use and on cast iron rails was the Surrey Iron Railway, incorporated in 1799. The first passenger-carrying public railway was the Oystermouth Railway, authorized in 1807.

- The first steam railway locomotive was introduced by Richard Trevithick in 1804. Trevithick's designs proved that steam traction was a viable proposition, although the use of his locomotives was quickly abandoned as they were too heavy for the existing track. The first commercially successful steam locomotive was the twin cylinder Salamanca, designed by in 1812 by Matthew Murray using John Blenkinsop's patented design for rack propulsion for the Middleton Railway.

- The proprietors of Wylam Colliery wanted to abolish horse-drawn trains in favor of steam. Two models, Puffing Billy and Blücher, were among the
first successful designs. In 1821 an Act of Parliament was approved for a tramway between Stockton and Darlington. Traffic on the Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR) was originally intended to be horse-drawn, but the Act was subsequently amended to allow the usage of steam locomotives. The railway was also empowered to carry passengers in addition to coal and general merchandise.

- The first public steam railway in Scotland was the Monkland and Kirkintilloch Railway. The Liverpool and Manchester Railway (L&MR), founded as a company in 1823 but opened in 1830, was the world’s first intercity passenger railway in which all the trains were timetabled and operated by steam locomotives. Further, horse-drawn traffic could use the Stockton and Darlington upon payment of a toll.

- To determine which locomotives would be suitable, the L&MR directors organized the Rainhill Trials. These were arranged as an open contest that would let them see all the locomotive candidates in action, with the choice to follow. The trials were won by Rocket, built by George Stephenson and Robert Stephenson. The Stephensons were accordingly given the contract to produce locomotives for the L&MR. The line opened in 1830 with termini at Liverpool Road, Manchester and Edge Hill, Liverpool.
rack and pinion railway
A steep grade railway with a toothed rack rail, usually between the running rails. The trains are fitted with one or more cog wheels or pinions that mesh with this rack rail. The first railway of this kind was the Middleton Railway between Middleton and Leeds in West Yorkshire, England, UK, where the first commercially successful steam locomotive, *Salamanca*, ran in 1812. This used a system designed and patented in 1811 by John Blenkinsop.

**Stockton and Darlington Railway**
A railway company that operated in northeast England from 1825 to 1863. It was the world's first public railway to use steam locomotives. Its first line connected collieries near Shildon with Stockton-on-Tees and Darlington and was officially opened on September 27, 1825.

**Liverpool and Manchester Railway**
A railway that opened in 1830 between the Lancashire towns of Liverpool and Manchester in the United Kingdom. It was the first railway to rely exclusively on steam power, with no horse-drawn traffic permitted at any time; the first to be entirely double-track throughout its length; the first to have a signalling system; the first to be fully timetabled; the first to be powered entirely by its own motive power; and the first to carry mail.
Rainhill Trials

An important competition in the early days of steam locomotive railways, run in October 1829 for the nearly completed Liverpool and Manchester Railway. Five engines competed, running back and forth along a mile length of level track at Rainhill in Lancashire (now Merseyside). Stephenson's Rocket was the only locomotive to complete the trials and was declared the winner. The Stephensons were accordingly given the contract to produce locomotives for the railway.

plateway

An early kind of railway or tramway or wagonway with a cast iron rail. They were mainly used for about 50 years up to 1830, though some continued later. They consisted of L-shaped rails where a flange on the rail guided the wheels in contrast to edgeways, where flanges on the wheels guide it along the track. They were originally horse-drawn, but cable haulage and locomotives were sometimes used later.

Salamanca

The first commercially successful steam locomotive, built in 1812 by Matthew Murray of Holbeck using John Blenkinsop's patented design for rack propulsion, for the edge-railed Middleton Railway between Middleton and Leeds. It was the first to have two cylinders. It was named after the Duke of Wellington's victory at the battle of Salamanca which was fought that same year.
Early Rails

The first recorded use of rail transport in Great Britain is Sir Francis Willoughby’s Wollaton Wagonway in Nottinghamshire, built between 1603 and 1604 to carry coal. As early as 1671 railed roads were used in Durham to ease the conveyance of coal. The first of these was the Tanfield Wagon Way. Many of these tramroads or wagon ways were built in the 17th and 18th centuries. They used straight and parallel rails of timber on which carts with simple flanged iron wheels were drawn by horses, enabling several wagons to be moved simultaneously.

These primitive rails were superseded in 1793 when the then-superintendent of the Cromford Canal, Benjamin Outram, constructed a tramway with L-shaped flanged cast-iron plate rails (plateways) from the quarry at Crich. Wagons fitted with simple flangeless wheels were kept on the track by vertical ledges or plates. Cast-iron rails were a significant improvement over wooden rails as they could support a greater weight and the friction between wheel and rail was lower, allowing longer trains to be moved by horses. Outram’s rails were superseded by William Jessop’s cast iron edge rails where flanged wheels ran on the top edge of simple bar-shaped rails without the guiding ledges of Outram’s flanged plate rails. The rails were first employed in 1789 at Nanpantan at the Loughborough Charnwood Forest Canal.

Cast iron rails had a propensity to break easily, and the short lengths soon became uneven. In 1820, John Birkenshaw introduced a method of rolling rails in greater lengths using wrought iron which was used from then onward.

Early Railways

The earliest railways were built and paid for by the owners of the
mines they served. As railway technology developed, longer lines became possible, connecting mines with more distant transshipment points and promising lower costs. These longer lines often required public subscription to build and crossed over land not owned by the mine owners. As a result, they needed an Act of Parliament to build. The Acts also protected investors from unrealistic or downright fraudulent schemes. The first line to obtain such an act, in 1758, was a private coal-owner's wagonway, the Middleton Railway in Leeds. The first for public use and on cast iron rails was the Surrey Iron Railway incorporated in 1799. It obtained an Act of Parliament in 1801 to build a tramroad between Wandsworth and Croydon in what is now south London. The engineer was William Jessop. Meanwhile, the first passenger-carrying public railway was the Oystermouth Railway, authorized in 1807. All three of these railways were initially worked by horses. The Surrey Iron Railway remained horse-drawn throughout its life. The Kilmarnock and Troon Railway, the first line in Scotland to carry passengers, was authorized by Act of Parliament in 1808 and was also built by Jessop.

Introduction of Steam Locomotives

The first steam railway locomotive was introduced by Richard Trevithick in 1804. He was the first engineer to build a successful high-pressure stationary steam engine in 1799. He followed this with a road-going steam carriage in 1801. Although that experiment ended in failure, in 1804 he built a successful unnamed rail-going steam locomotive for the narrow-gauge Merthyr Tramroad in South Wales (sometimes incorrectly called the Penydarren Tramroad). Amid great interest from the public, in 1804 it successfully carried 10 tons of iron, 5 wagons and 70 men a distance of 9.75 miles (15.69 km) from Penydarren to Abercynon in 4 hours and 5 minutes, an average speed of nearly 5 mph (8.0 km/h). This locomotive proved that
steam traction was a viable proposition, although the use of the locomotive was quickly abandoned as it was too heavy for the primitive plateway track. A second locomotive, built for the Wylam colliery, also broke the track. Trevithick built another locomotive in 1808, *Catch Me Who Can*, which ran on a temporary demonstration railway in Bloomsbury, London. Members of the public were able to ride behind at speeds up to 12 mph (19 km/h). However, it again broke the rails and Trevithick was forced to abandon the demonstration after just two months.

The first commercially successful steam locomotive was the twin cylinder *Salamanca*, designed by in 1812 by Matthew Murray using John Blenkinsop's patented design for rack propulsion for the Middleton Railway. Blenkinsop believed that a locomotive light enough to move under its own power would be too light to generate sufficient adhesion, so he designed a rack-and-pinion railway for the line. This was despite the fact that Trevithick demonstrated successful adhesion locomotives a decade before. The single rack ran outside the narrow-gauge edge-rail tracks and was engaged by a cog-wheel on the left side of the locomotive. The cog-wheel was driven by two cylinders embedded into the top of the center-flue boiler. Four such locomotives were built for the railway and they worked until the early 1830s.

Salamanca was the first commercially successful steam locomotive, built in 1812.

First Successful Railways

The proprietors of Wylam Colliery wanted to abolish horse-drawn trains in favor of steam. In 1804, William Hedley, a manager at the colliery, employed Trevithick to build a steam locomotive. However, it proved too heavy for the wooden track. William Hedley and Timothy Hackworth (another colliery employee) designed a locomotive in 1813 that became known as Puffing Billy. A year later George Stephenson, another of Wylam’s employees, improved the design with Blücher, the first locomotive to use flanged wheels keeping the locomotive on the track and had cylinder rods directly connected to the wheels in the manner of Catch Me Who Can.

In 1821 an Act of Parliament was approved for a tramway between
Stockton and Darlington. Stephenson's design convinced the backers of the proposed tramway to appoint Stephenson, who had recently built the Hetton colliery railway, as engineer. Traffic on the Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR) was originally intended to be horse-drawn, but Stephenson carried out a fresh survey of the route to allow steam haulage and the Act was subsequently amended to allow the usage of steam locomotives. The railway was also empowered to carry passengers in addition to coal and general merchandise. The line was 25 miles (40 km) in length and had 100 passing loops along its single track and four branch lines to collieries. It opened in 1825. The first train was hauled by Stephenson's Locomotion No 1 at speeds of 12 to 15 miles per hour (19 to 24 km/h). Four locomotives named Locomotion were constructed and were effectively beam engines on wheels with vertical cylinders.
Opening of the Stockton and Darlington Railway, a watercolor painted in the 1880s by John Dobbin, the National Railway Museum, York. In the painting, crowds are watching the inaugural train cross the Skerne Bridge in Darlington. The movement of coal to ships rapidly became a lucrative business and the line was soon extended to a new port and town at Middlesbrough. While coal wagons were hauled by steam locomotives from the start, passengers were carried in coaches drawn by horses until carriages hauled by steam locomotives
were introduced in 1833. The first public steam railway in Scotland was the Monkland and Kirkintilloch Railway. An Act of Parliament authorizing the railway was passed in 1824 and it opened in 1826.

The Liverpool and Manchester Railway (L&MR), founded as company in 1823 but opened in 1830, was the world’s first intercity passenger railway, in which all the trains were timetabled and operated by steam locomotives. Further, horse-drawn traffic could use the Stockton and Darlington upon payment of a toll. The passenger-carrying Canterbury and Whitstable Railway opened three months before the L&MR. However, it used cable haulage by stationary steam engines over much of its length, with steam locomotives restricted to the level stretch. The L&MR was primarily built to provide faster transport of raw materials and finished goods between the port of Liverpool and mills in Manchester in northwest England.

To determine which locomotives would be suitable, the L&MR directors organized the Rainhill Trials. These were arranged as an open contest that would let them see all the locomotive candidates in action, with the choice to follow. The trials were won by Rocket, built by George Stephenson and Robert Stephenson. Rocket was the first locomotive to use a multi-tubular boiler, which allowed more effective heat transfer from the exhaust gases to the water. It was also the first to use a blastpipe, where used steam from the cylinders discharges into the smokebox beneath the chimney to increase the draft of the fire. With these innovations, Rocket averaged 12 miles per hour (19 km/h) achieving a top speed of 30 miles per hour (48 km/h) hauling 13 tons, and was declared the winner of the trials. The Stephensons were accordingly given the contract to produce locomotives for the Liverpool & Manchester Railway. The line opened in 1830 with termini at Liverpool Road, Manchester and Edge Hill, Liverpool.
Stephenson's Rocket was the only locomotive to complete the Rainhill Trials and was declared the winner. The Stephenson brothers were accordingly given the contract to produce locomotives for the railway.
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25.5.3: Railways

The development of the railways, starting in the 1830s, transformed the economy and society by creating powerful railway companies, attracting massive investments, advancing industries, transforming human migration patterns, and even changing people’s daily diet.

Learning Objective

Describe how railways spread and became common across the globe

Key Points

- The opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway (L&MR) in 1830, the first to rely exclusively on steam power, revolutionized transportation and paved the way for the development of railways that would soon take over the world. A number of lines were approved in the Leeds area the same year. An unexpected enthusiasm for passenger travel resulted in opening the London and Birmingham Railway
(L&BR) and the Grand Junction, linking the existing L&MIR and the new L&BR in 1837.

• A new railway always needed an Act of Parliament, which typically cost over £200,000 to obtain, but opposition could effectively prevent its construction. The canal companies, unable or unwilling to upgrade their facilities to compete with railways, used political power to try to stop them. The railways responded by purchasing about a fourth of the canal system, in part to get the right of way and in part to buy off critics. Once an Act was obtained, there was little government regulation, as laissez faire and private ownership had become accepted practices.

• The railways largely had exclusive territory, but given the compact size of Britain, this meant that two or more competing lines could connect major cities. Between the mid-1830s and the mid-1940s, Parliament authorized 8,000 miles of lines at a projected cost of £200 million. The incredible profitability of the railways attracted many investors together with massive financial speculation known as the Railway Mania.

• The financial success of the early railways was phenomenal, as they had no real competition. Less than 20 years after the Liverpool line opened, it was possible to travel from London to Scotland by train in a small fraction of the former time by road. Towards the end of the 19th century, competition became so fierce between companies on the east and west coast routes to Scotland that it led to what the press called the Race to the North.

• The railways changed British society in numerous
and complex ways, including a substantial impact in many spheres of economic activity. The building of railways and locomotives provided a significant stimulus to the coal-mining, iron-production, engineering, and construction industries. The railways also helped to reduce transaction costs, which in turn lowered the costs of goods, bringing positive changes to people’s diet. The railways were also a significant force for the changing patterns of human mobility.

- The Government began to pay attention to safety matters with the 1840 Act for Regulating Railways, which empowered the Board of Trade to appoint railway inspectors. The Railway Inspectorate was established in 1840 to inquire into the causes of accidents and recommend ways of avoiding them. In 1844, minimum standards that would require railway companies to offer services to the poorer passengers on each railway route at least once a day were introduced.

**Key Terms**

**Liverpool and Manchester Railway**

A railway that opened in 1830 between the Lancashire towns of Liverpool and Manchester in the United Kingdom. It was the first railway to rely exclusively on steam power, with no horse-
drawn traffic permitted at any time; the first to be entirely double-track throughout its length; the first to have a signaling system; the first to be fully timetabled; the first to be powered entirely by its own motive power; and the first to carry mail.

**Parliamentary carriages**
Passenger services required by an Act of Parliament passed in 1844 to allow inexpensive and basic railway travel for less affluent passengers. The legislation required that at least one such service per day be run on every railway route in the United Kingdom.

**Race to the North**
Name given by the press to the phenomenon that occurred during two summers of the late 19th century, when British passenger trains belonging to different companies would literally race each other from London to Scotland over the two principal rail trunk routes connecting the English capital city to Scotland: the West Coast Main Line and the East Coast Main Line.

**Railway Mania**
Speculative frenzy in Britain in the 1840s caused by the phenomenal profitability of the early railways.

**Railway Clearing House**
An organization set up in 1842 to manage the allocation of revenue collected by pre-grouping railway companies of fares and charges paid for passengers and goods travelling over the lines of other companies.
Railways: The Revolution of Transportation

The Liverpool and Manchester Railway (L&MR), opened in 1830 between the Lancashire towns of Liverpool and Manchester, was not the first railway, but it was the first one to rely exclusively on steam power, with no horse-drawn traffic permitted at any time; the first to be entirely double track throughout its length; the first to have a signaling system; the first to be fully timetabled; the first to be powered entirely by its own motive power; and the first to carry mail. As such, it revolutionized transportation and paved the way for the phenomenal development of railways that would soon take over the world.

As Manchester had grown on cotton spinning, Leeds had a growing trade in weaving. The Pennines restricted canal development, so the railway provided a realistic alternative, especially with the growth in coal usage from the mines in the North East and Yorkshire. A number of lines were approved in the area, such as the Leeds and Selby Railway in 1830, which linked the former to the port of Hull via the River Ouse.

While the L&MR had not ousted the Lancashire canal system from the transport of goods, there was an unexpected enthusiasm for passenger travel. The financial success of the railway was beyond all expectations. Soon companies in London and Birmingham planned to build lines linking these cities together and with Liverpool and Manchester via the L&MR. These two lines were the London and Birmingham (L&BR), designed by Robert Stephenson, and the Grand Junction, engineered by Joseph Locke. The Grand Junction was designed to link the existing L&MR and the new L&BR. It opened in July 1837, with the L&BR following a few months later.

Although Acts of Parliament allowed railway companies compulsory purchase of wayleave, some powerful landowners
objected to railways being built across their land and raised objections in Parliament to prevent bills from being passed. Some land owners charged excessive amounts, so early lines did not always follow the optimal routes. In addition, steep gradients were avoided as they would require more powerful locomotives.

**Railway Mania**

It was legally required that each line be authorized by a separate Act of Parliament. While there were entrepreneurs with the vision of an intercity network of lines, it was much easier to find investors to back shorter stretches that were clearly defined in purpose, where rapid returns on investment could be predicted. A new railway needed an Act of Parliament, which typically cost over £200,000 to obtain, but opposition could effectively prevent its construction. The canal companies, unable or unwilling to upgrade their facilities to compete with railways, used political power to try to stop them. The railways responded by purchasing about a fourth of the canal system, in part to get the right of way and in part to buy off critics. Once an Act was obtained, there was little government regulation, as *laissez faire* and private ownership had become accepted practices. The railways largely had exclusive territory, but given the compact size of Britain, this meant that two or more competing lines could connect major cities. Between the mid-1830s and the mid-1940s, the period of the railway boom, Parliament authorized 8,000 miles of lines at a projected cost of £200 million, which was about the same value as the country’s annual gross domestic product (GDP) at that time.

George Hudson became the most important railway promoter of his time. Called the “railway king” of Britain, Hudson amalgamated numerous short lines and established the Railway Clearing House in 1842, an organization that provided uniform paperwork and
standardized methods for apportioning fares while transferring passengers and freight between lines and loaning out freight cars. Hudson's ability to design complex company and line amalgamations helped bring about the beginnings of a more modern railway network. In 1849, he exercised effective control over nearly 30% of the rail track operating in Britain, most of it owned by four railway groups: the Eastern Counties Railway, the Midland, the York, Newcastle and Berwick, and the York and North Midland. Hudson remains an important figure in railway history also because of a series of scandalous revelations that forced him out of office. The financial reporting malpractices of the Eastern Counties Railway while Hudson was its chairman eventually led to the collapse of his system.
A railway junction diagram. When coaches or wagons owned by a different company were used, that company would be entitled to a proportion of the fare or fee. If the commencement and terminus of the journey were on different railways, a more complicated situation arose. If the two companies involved did not provide through ticketing, the passenger or goods needed to be re-booked at a junction station. If through booking was provided, the receipts collected by the first company needed to be divided between them, usually
All the railways were promoted by commercial interests. As those opened by the year 1836 were paying good dividends, it prompted financiers to invest and by 1845 over 1,000 projected schemes had been put forward. This led to a speculative frenzy, following a common pattern: as the price of railway shares increased, more and more money was poured in by speculators, until the inevitable collapse in price. The Railway Mania, as it was called, reached its zenith in 1846, when no fewer than 272 Acts of Parliament setting up new railway companies were passed. Unlike most stock market bubbles, there was a net tangible result from all the investment in the form of a vast expansion of the British railway system, although perhaps at an inflated cost. When the government stepped in and announced closure for depositing schemes, the Railway Mania was brought to an end.

The legacy of Railway Mania can still be seen today, with duplication of some routes and cities possessing several stations on the same or different lines, sometimes with no direct connection between them (however, a significant amount of this duplication was removed by the Beeching Axe in the 1960s). The best example of this is London, which has no fewer than twelve main line terminal stations, serving its dense and complex suburban network. It is basically the result of the many railway companies during the Mania that were competing to run their routes in the capital.

**Economic and Social Impact**

The railway directors often had important political and social connections and used them to their companies’ advantages. Furthermore, landed aristocrats with established connections in London were especially welcome on the corporate boards. The
aristocrats saw railway directorships as a socially acceptable form of contact with the world of commerce and industry. They leveraged the business acumen and connections gained through railways to join corporate boardrooms in other industries.

The financial success of the early railways was phenomenal as they had no real competition. The roads were still very slow and in poor condition. Prices of fuel and food fell in cities connected to railways in accordance with the fall in the cost of transport. The layout of lines with gentle gradients and curves, originating from the need to help the relatively weak engines and brakes, was a boon when speeds increased, avoiding for the most part the need to re-survey the course of a line. Less than 20 years after the Liverpool line opened, it was possible to travel from London to Scotland by train in a small fraction of the former time by road. Towards the end of the 19th century, competition became so fierce between companies on the east and west coast routes to Scotland that it led to what the press called the Race to the North. In two summers of the late 19th century, passenger trains belonging to different companies would literally race each other from London to Scotland over the two principal rail trunk routes connecting the English capital city to Scotland. The races were never official and publicly the companies denied that what happened was racing at all. Results were not announced officially and the outcomes have since been hotly debated.

The railways changed British society in numerous and complex ways. Although recent attempts to measure the economic significance of the railways have suggested that their overall contribution to the growth of GDP was more modest than an earlier generation of historians argued, it is nonetheless clear that the railways had a sizable impact in many spheres of economic activity. The building of railways and locomotives, for example, called for large quantities of heavy materials and thus provided significant stimulus to the coal-mining, iron-production, engineering, and construction industries. The railways also helped reduce transaction costs, which in turn lowered the costs of goods. The
distribution and sale of perishable goods such as meat, milk, fish, and vegetables was transformed, giving rise not only to cheaper produce in the stores but also to far greater variety in people’s diets.

The railways were also a significant force for the changing patterns of human mobility. Rail transport had originally been conceived as a way of moving coal and industrial goods but the railway operators quickly realized the potential for market for railway travel, leading to an extremely rapid expansion in passenger services. The number of railway passengers tripled in just eight years between 1842 and 1850. Traffic volumes roughly doubled in the 1850s and then doubled again in the 1860s. In the words of historian Derek Aldcroft, “In terms of mobility and choice [the railways] added a new dimension to everyday life.”

Government Involvement

While it had been necessary to obtain an Act of Parliament to build a new railway, the government initially took a laissez faire approach to their construction and operation. The state began to pay attention to safety matters with the 1840 Act for Regulating Railways, which empowered the Board of Trade to appoint railway inspectors. The Railway Inspectorate was established in 1840 to inquire into the causes of accidents and recommend ways of avoiding them. Colonel Frederic Smith conducted the first investigation into five deaths caused by a large casting falling from a moving train in 1840 (Howden rail crash). He also conducted an inquiry into the derailment on the GWR when a mixed goods and passenger train derailed on Christmas Eve, 1841. As early as 1844 a bill had been put before Parliament suggesting the state purchase the railways, but it was not adopted. It did, however, lead to the introduction of minimum standards that would require railway companies to offer...
services available to the poorer passengers on each railway route at least once a day (so-called Parliamentary carriages or trains).

In the earliest days of passenger railways in Britain, the poor were encouraged to travel to find employment in the growing industrial centers, but trains were generally unaffordable to them except in the most basic of open wagons, in many cases attached to goods trains. The Railway Regulation Act, which took effect in 1844, compelled “the provision of at least one train a day each way at a speed of not less than 12 miles an hour including stops, which were to be made at all stations, and of carriages protected from the weather and provided with seats; for all which luxuries not more than a penny a mile might be charged.”

The commercial interests of the early railway industry were often of a local nature and there was never a nationwide plan to develop a logical network of railways. Some railways, however, began to grow faster than others, often taking over smaller lines to expand their own. The L&MR success led to the idea of linking Liverpool to London, and from that the seeds of the London and North Western Railway (L&NWR), an amalgamation of four hitherto separate enterprises, including the L&MR, were sown.
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25.6: Social Change

25.6.1: The Factory System

The factory system, fueled by technological progress, made production much faster, cheaper, and more uniform, but also disconnected the workers from the means of production and placed them under the control of powerful industrialists.

Learning Objective

Describe the factory system and how it functioned

Key Points

- One of the earliest factories was John Lombe’s water-powered silk mill at Derby, operational by 1721. By 1746, an integrated brass mill was working at Warmley near Bristol. Matthew Boulton at his Soho Manufactory, which started operating in 1766, was
among the pioneers of mass production on the assembly line principle, while Josiah Wedgwood in Staffordshire opened the first true ceramics factory in 1769.

- The factory system began to grow rapidly when cotton spinning was mechanized. Richard Arkwright, the founder of the first successful cotton spinning factory in the world, is credited with inventing the prototype of the modern factory. Other industrialists and industries followed, introducing novel practices that advanced the factory system, including mass production using interchangeable parts or modern materials such as cranes and rail tracks through the buildings for handling heavy items.

- The major characteristics of factory system are that it is a capitalist form of production, where the labor does not own a significant share of the enterprise; the capitalist owners provide the means of production and are responsible for the sale; production relies on unskilled labor; products are produced on a much larger scale than in either the putting-out or crafts systems; the location of production is more flexible; precisely uniform components are produced thanks to machinery; workers are paid either daily wages or for piece work, either in the form of money or a combination of money, goods, and services.

- The factory system was a new way of organizing labor made necessary by the development of machines, which were too large to house in a worker’s cottage. Working hours were as long as they had been for the farmer: from dawn to dusk, six days
per week. Factories also essentially reduced skilled and unskilled workers to replaceable commodities. Debate arose concerning the morality of the factory system, as workers complained about unfair working conditions.

- The transition to industrialization was not without difficulty. For example, a group of English textile workers known as Luddites protested against industrialization and sometimes sabotaged factories. They feared that the years workers spent learning a craft would go to waste and unskilled machine operators would rob them of their livelihood. However, in many industries the transition to factory production was not so divisive.

- One of the best-known accounts of factory worker's living conditions during the Industrial Revolution is Friedrich Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. Since then, the historical debate on the question of living conditions of factory workers has been very controversial. While some have pointed out that industrialization slowly improved the living standards of workers, others have concluded that living standards for the majority of the population did not grow meaningfully until much later.
**Key Terms**

**Luddites**
A group of English textile workers and self-employed weavers in the 19th century that used the destruction of machinery as a form of protest. The group was protesting the use of machinery in a “fraudulent and deceitful manner” to get around standard labor practices. They were fearful that the years they spent learning the craft would go to waste and unskilled machine operators would rob them of their livelihoods.

**putting-out system**
A means of subcontracting work, historically known also as the workshop system and the domestic system. Work is contracted by a central agent to subcontractors who complete the work in off-site facilities, either in their own homes or in workshops with multiple craftsmen.

**factory system**
A method of manufacturing using machinery and division of labor, first adopted in Britain at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century and later spread around the world. Use of machinery with the division of labor reduced the required skill level of workers and increased the output per worker.

**truck system**
An arrangement in which employees are paid in commodities or some currency substitute (such as
vouchers or token coins, called in some dialects scrip or chit) rather than with standard currency.

Growth of Factories

One of the earliest factories was John Lombe's water-powered silk mill at Derby, operational by 1721. By 1746, an integrated brass mill was working at Warmley near Bristol. Raw material went in at one end, was smelted into brass, then turned into pans, pins, wire, and other goods. Housing was provided for workers on site. Matthew Boulton at his Soho Manufactory, which started operating in 1766, was among the pioneers of mass production on the assembly line principle while Josiah Wedgwood in Staffordshire opened the first true ceramics factory in 1769.

The factory system began to grow rapidly when cotton spinning was mechanized. Richard Arkwright, the founder of the first successful cotton spinning factory in the world, is credited with inventing the prototype of the modern factory. After he patented his water frame in 1769, he established Cromford Mill in Derbyshire, England, significantly expanding the village of Cromford to accommodate the migrant workers new to the area. Mass production using interchangeable parts was first achieved in 1803 by Marc Isambard Brunel in cooperation with Henry Maudslay and Simon Goodrich, for the British Royal Navy during the Napoleonic War. This method did not catch on in general manufacturing in Britain for many decades; when it did, it was imported from the United States, becoming known as the American system of manufacturing. The Nasmyth, Gaskell and Company's Bridgewater
Foundry, which began operation in 1836, was one of the earliest factories to use modern materials handling, such as cranes and rail tracks through the buildings for heavy items.

Between 1820 and 1850, mechanized factories supplant traditional artisan shops as the predominant form of manufacturing institution, because the larger-scale factories enjoyed a significant technological advantage over the small artisan shops. The earliest factories under the factory system developed in the cotton and wool textiles industry. Later generations of factories included mechanized shoe production and manufacturing of machinery, including machine tools. Factories that supplied the railroad industry included rolling mills, foundries, and locomotive works. Agricultural-equipment factories produced cast-steel plows and reapers. Bicycles were mass-produced beginning in the 1880s.
The Cromford Mill (opened in 1771) today: Richard Arkwright is the person credited with inventing the prototype of the modern factory. After he patented his water frame in 1769, he established Cromford Mill, in Derbyshire, England, significantly expanding the village of Cromford to accommodate the migrant workers new to the area. It laid the foundation of Arkwright’s fortune and was quickly copied by mills in Lancashire, Germany and the United States.
Characteristics of Factory System

The factory system, considered a capitalist form of production, differs dramatically from the earlier systems of production. First, the labor generally does not own a significant share of the enterprise. The capitalist owners provide all machinery, buildings, management and administration, and raw or semi-finished materials, and are responsible for the sale of all production as well as any resulting losses. The cost and complexity of machinery, especially that powered by water or steam, was more than cottage industry workers could afford or had the skills to maintain. Second, production relies on unskilled labor. Before the factory system, skilled craftsmen would usually custom-make an entire article. In contrast, factories practiced division of labor, in which most workers were either lowskilled laborers who tended or operated machinery, or unskilled laborers who moved materials and semi-finished and finished goods. Third, factories produced products on a much larger scale than in either the putting-out or crafts systems.

The factory system also made the location of production much more flexible. Before the widespread use of steam engines and railroads, most factories were located at water power sites and near water transportation. When railroads became widespread, factories could be located away from water power sites but nearer railroads. Workers and machines were brought together in a central factory complex. Although the earliest factories were usually all under one roof, different operations were sometimes on different floors. Further, machinery made it possible to produce precisely uniform components.

Workers were paid either daily wages or for piece work, either in the form of money or some combination of money, housing, meals, and goods from a company store (the truck system). Piece work presented accounting difficulties, especially as volumes increased and workers did a narrower scope of work on each piece. Piece work went out of favor with the advent of the production line, which was
designed on standard times for each operation in the sequence and workers had to keep up with the work flow.

Factory System and Society

The factory system was a new way of organizing labor made necessary by the development of machines, which were too large to house in a worker's cottage. Working hours were as long as they had been for the farmer: from dawn to dusk, six days per week. Factories also essentially reduced skilled and unskilled workers to replaceable commodities. At the farm or in the cottage industry, each family member and worker was indispensable to a given operation and workers had to possess knowledge and often advanced skills that resulted from years of learning through practice. Conversely, under the factory system, workers were easily replaceable as skills required to operate machines could be acquired very quickly. Factory workers typically lived within walking distance to work until the introduction of bicycles and electric street railways in the 1890s. Thus, the factory system was partly responsible for the rise of urban living, as large numbers of workers migrated into the towns in search of employment in the factories. Many mills had to provide dormitories for workers, especially for girls and women.

Much manufacturing in the 18th century was carried out in homes under the domestic or putting-out system, especially the weaving of cloth and spinning of thread and yarn, often with just a single loom or spinning wheel. As these devices were mechanized, machine-made goods were able to underprice the cottagers, leaving them unable to earn enough to make their efforts worthwhile.

The transition to industrialization was not without difficulty. For example, a group of English textile workers known as Luddites protested against industrialization and sometimes sabotaged factories. They continued an already established tradition of
workers opposing labor-saving machinery. Numerous inventors in the textile industry suffered harassment when developing their machines or devices. Despite the common stereotype of Luddites as opponents of progress, the group was in fact protesting the use of machinery in a “fraudulent and deceitful manner” to get around standard labor practices. They feared that the years workers had spent learning a craft would go to waste and unskilled machine operators would rob them of their livelihoods. However, in many industries the transition to factory production was not so divisive.

Machine-breaking was criminalized by the Parliament of the United Kingdom as early as 1721. Parliament subsequently made “machine breaking” (i.e. industrial sabotage) a capital crime with the Frame Breaking Act of 1812 and the Malicious Damage Act of 1861. Lord Byron opposed this legislation, becoming one of the few prominent defenders of the Luddites.

Debate arose concerning the morality of the factory system, as workers complained about unfair working conditions. One of the
problems concerned women’s labor. Women were always paid less than men and in many cases, as little as a quarter of what men made. Child labor was also a major part of the system. However, in the early 19th century, education was not compulsory and in working families, children's wages were seen as a necessary contribution to the family budget. Automation in the late 19th century is credited with ending child labor and according to many historians, it was more effective than gradually changing child labor laws. Years of schooling began to increase sharply from the end of the 19th century, when elementary state-provided education for all became a viable concept (with the Prussian and Austrian empires as pioneers of obligatory education laws). Some industrialists themselves tried to improve factory and living conditions for their workers. One of the earliest such reformers was Robert Owen, known for his pioneering efforts in improving conditions for workers at the New Lanark mills and often regarded as one of the key thinkers of the early socialist movement.

One of the best-known accounts of factory worker's living conditions during the Industrial Revolution is Friedrich Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England* in 1844. In it, Engels described backstreet sections of Manchester and other mill towns where people lived in crude shanties and shacks, some not completely enclosed, some with dirt floors. These shanty towns had narrow walkways between irregularly shaped lots and dwellings. There were no sanitary facilities. Population density was extremely high. Eight to ten unrelated mill workers often shared a room with no furniture and slept on a pile of straw or sawdust. Disease spread through a contaminated water supply. By the late 1880s, Engels noted that the extreme poverty and lack of sanitation he wrote about in 1844 had largely disappeared. Since then, the historical debate on the question of living conditions of factory workers has been very controversial. While some have pointed out that living conditions of the poor workers were tragic everywhere and industrialization, in fact, slowly improved the living standards of a steadily increasing number of workers, others have concluded that
living standards for the majority of the population did not grow meaningfully until the late 19th and 20th centuries and that in many ways workers' living standards declined under early capitalism.
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25.6.2: Urbanization

Industrialization and emergence of the factory system triggered rural-to-urban migration and thus led to a rapid growth of cities, where during the Industrial Revolution workers faced the challenge of dire conditions and developed new ways of living.

**Learning Objective**

Connect the development of factories to urbanization

**Key Points**

- Industrialization led to the creation of the factory, and the factory system contributed to the growth of urban areas as large numbers of workers migrated into the cities in search of work in the factories. In England and Wales, the proportion of the population living in cities jumped from 17% in 1801 to 72% in 1891.
- In 1844, Friedrich Engels published *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, arguably the most important record of how workers lived during the
early era of industrialization in British cities. He described backstreet sections of Manchester and other mill towns where people lived in crude shanties and overcrowded shacks, constantly exposed to contagious diseases. These conditions improved over the course of the 19th century.

• Before the Industrial Revolution, advances in agriculture or technology led to an increase in population, which again strained food and other resources, limiting increases in per capita income. This condition is called the Malthusian trap and according to some economists, it was overcome by the Industrial Revolution. Transportation advancements lowered transaction and food costs, improved distribution, and made more varied foods available in cities.

• The historical debate on the question of living conditions of factory workers has been very controversial. While some have pointed out that industrialization slowly improved the living standards of workers, others have concluded that living standards for the majority of the population did not grow meaningfully until much later.

• Not everyone lived in poor conditions and struggled with the challenges of rapid industrialization. The Industrial Revolution also created a middle class of industrialists and professionals who lived in much better conditions. In fact, one of the earlier definitions of the middle class equated the middle class to the original meaning of capitalist: someone with so much capital that they could rival nobles.
During the Industrial Revolution, the family structure changed. Marriage shifted to a more sociable union between wife and husband in the laboring class. Women and men tended to marry someone from the same job, geographical location, or social group. Factories and mills also undermined the old patriarchal authority to a certain extent. Women working in factories faced many new challenges, including limited child-raising opportunities.

Key Terms

**Agricultural Revolution**

The unprecedented increase in agricultural production in Britain due to increases in labor and land productivity between the mid-17th and late 19th centuries. Agricultural output grew faster than the population over the century to 1770, and thereafter productivity remained among the highest in the world. This increase in the food supply contributed to the rapid growth of population in England and Wales.

**Malthusian trap**

The putative unsustainability of improvements in a society’s standard of living because of population growth. It is named for Thomas Robert Malthus, who suggested that while technological advances could increase a society’s supply of resources such as food
and thereby improve the standard of living, the resource abundance would encourage population growth, which would eventually bring the per capita supply of resources back to its original level. Some economists contend that since the Industrial Revolution, mankind has broken out of the trap. Others argue that the continuation of extreme poverty indicates that the Malthusian trap continues to operate.

**Cottonopolis**

A metropolis centered on cotton trading servicing the cotton mills in its hinterland. It was originally applied to Manchester, England, because of its status as the international center of the cotton and textile trade during the Industrial Revolution.

---

**Factories and Urbanization**

Industrialization led to the creation of the factory and the factory system contributed to the growth of urban areas as large numbers of workers migrated into the cities in search of work in the factories. Nowhere was this better illustrated than in Manchester, the world’s first industrial city, nicknamed Cottonopolis because of its mills and associated industries that made it the global center of the textile industry. Manchester experienced a six-times increase in its population between 1771 and 1831. It had a population of 10,000 in 1717, but by 1911 it had burgeoned to 2.3 million. Bradford grew by 50% every ten years between 1811 and 1851 and by 1851 only 50% of
the population of Bradford was actually born there. In England and Wales, the proportion of the population living in cities jumped from 17% in 1801 to 72% in 1891.

Although initially inefficient, the arrival of steam power signified the beginning of the mechanization that would enhance the burgeoning textile industries in Manchester into the world’s first center of mass production. As textile manufacture switched from the home to factories, Manchester and towns in south and east Lancashire became the largest and most productive cotton spinning center in the world in 1871, with 32% of global cotton production.
Standards of Living

Friedrich Engels’ *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844* is arguably the most important record of how workers lived during the early era of industrialization in British cities. Engels, who remains one of the most important philosophers of the 19th century but also came from a family of wealthy industrialists, described backstreet sections of Manchester and other mill towns where people lived in crude shanties and shacks, some not completely enclosed, some with dirt floors. These towns had narrow walkways between irregularly shaped lots and dwellings. There were no sanitary facilities. Population density was extremely high. Eight to ten unrelated mill workers often shared a room with no furniture and slept on a pile of straw or sawdust. Toilet facilities were shared if they existed. Disease spread through a contaminated water supply. New urbanites—especially small children—died
due to diseases spreading because of the cramped living conditions. Tuberculosis, lung diseases from the mines, cholera from polluted water, and typhoid were all common.

The original title page of The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1944, published in German in Leipzig in 1845. Engels’ interpretation proved to be
extremely influential with British historians of the Industrial Revolution. He focused on both the workers’ wages and their living conditions. He argued that the industrial workers had lower incomes than their pre-industrial peers and lived in more unhealthy environments. This proved to be a wide-ranging critique of industrialization and one that was echoed by many of the Marxist historians who studied the industrial revolution in the 20th century. Conditions improved over the course of the 19th century due to new public health acts regulating things like sewage, hygiene, and home construction. In the introduction of his 1892 edition, Engels notes that most of the conditions he wrote about in 1844 had been greatly improved.

Chronic hunger and malnutrition were the norm for the majority of the population of the world, including Britain and France, until the late 19th century. Until about 1750, in part due to malnutrition, life expectancy in France was about 35 years, and only slightly higher in Britain. In Britain and the
Netherlands, food supply had been increasing and prices falling before the Industrial Revolution due to better agricultural practices (Agricultural Revolution). However, population grew as well. Before the Industrial Revolution, advances in agriculture or technology led to an increase in population, which again strained food and other resources, limiting increases in per capita income. This condition is called the Malthusian trap and according to some economists, it was overcome by the Industrial Revolution. Transportation improvements, such as canals and improved roads, also lowered food costs. The post-1830 rapid development of railway further reduced transaction costs, which in turn lowered the costs of goods, including food. The distribution and sale of perishable goods such as meat, milk, fish, and vegetables was transformed by the emergence of the railways, giving rise not only to cheaper produce in the shops but also to far greater variety in people’s diets. The question of
how living conditions changed in the newly industrialized urban environment has been very controversial. A series of 1950s essays by Henry Phelps Brown and Sheila V. Hopkins set the academic consensus that the bulk of the population at the bottom of the social ladder suffered severe reductions in their living standards. Conversely, economist Robert E. Lucas, Jr., argues that the real impact of the Industrial Revolution was that the standards of living of the poorest segments of the society gradually, if slowly, improved. Others, however, have noted that while growth of the economy’s overall productive powers was unprecedented during the Industrial Revolution, living standards for the majority of the population did not grow meaningfully until the late 19th and 20th centuries and that in many ways workers’ living standards declined under early capitalism. For instance, studies have shown that real wages in Britain increased only 15% between the 1780s and 1850s and that life expectancy in Britain did not begin to
dramatically increase until the 1870s. Not everyone lived in poor conditions and struggled with the challenges of rapid industrialization. The Industrial Revolution also created a middle class of industrialists and professionals who lived in much better conditions. In fact, one of the earlier definitions of the middle class equated it to the original meaning of capitalist: someone with so much capital that they could rival nobles. To be a capital-owning millionaire was an important criterion of the middle class during the Industrial Revolution although the period witnessed also a growth of a class of professionals (e.g., lawyers, doctors, small business owners) who did not share the fate of the early industrial working class and enjoyed a comfortable standard of living in growing cities.

Changes in Family Structure

In the laboring class at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, women traditionally married men of the same social status (e.g., a shoemaker’s daughter would marry a shoemaker’s son). Marriage outside this norm was not common. During the Industrial Revolution, marriage shifted from this tradition to a more sociable union between wife and husband in the laboring class.
Women and men tended to marry someone from the same job, geographical location, or social group. Miners remained an exception to this trend and a coal miner's daughter still tended to marry a coal miner's son.

The rural pre-industrial work sphere was usually shaped by the father, who controlled the pace of work for his family. However, factories and mills undermined the old patriarchal authority to a certain extent. Factories put husbands, wives, and children under the same conditions and authority of the manufacturer masters. In the latter half of the Industrial Revolution, women who worked in factories or mills tended not to have children or had children that were old enough to take care of themselves, as life in the city made it impossible to take a child to work (unlike in the case of farm labor or cottage industry where women were more flexible to combine domestic and work spheres) and deprived women of a traditional network of support established in rural communities.

Attributions

- Urbanization
During the Industrial Revolution, laborers in factories, mills, and mines worked long hours under very dangerous conditions, though historians continue to debate the extent to which those conditions worsened the fate of the worker in pre-industrial society.

**Learning Objective**

Review the conditions workers labored under in the early factories

**Key Points**

- As a result of industrialization, ordinary working people found increased opportunities for employment in the new mills and factories, but these were often under strict working conditions with long hours of labor dominated by a pace set by machines. The nature of work changed from a craft production model to a factory-centric model.
- In the textile industry, factories set hours of work
and the machinery within them shaped the pace of work. Factories brought workers together within one building and increased the division of labor, narrowing the number and scope of tasks and including children and women within a common production process. Maltreatment, industrial accidents, and ill health from overwork and contagious diseases were common in the enclosed conditions of cotton mills. Children were particularly vulnerable.

- Work discipline was forcefully instilled upon the workforce by the factory owners, and the working conditions were dangerous and even deadly. Early industrial factories and mines created numerous health risks, and injury compensation for the workers did not exist. Machinery accidents could lead to burns, arm and leg injuries, amputation of fingers and limbs, and death. However, diseases were the most common health issues that had long-term effects.

- Mining has always been especially dangerous, and at the beginning of the 19th century, methods of coal extraction exposed men, women, and children to very risky conditions. In 1841, about 216,000 people were employed in the mines. Women and children worked underground for 11-12 hours a day. The public became aware of conditions in the country’s collieries in 1838 after an accident at Huskar Colliery in Silkstone. The disaster came to the attention of Queen Victoria who ordered an inquiry.

- Lord Ashley headed the royal commission of inquiry, which investigated the conditions of workers, especially children, in the coal mines in 1840.
Commissioners visited collieries and mining communities gathering information, sometimes against the mine owners’ wishes. The report, illustrated by engraved illustrations and the personal accounts of mine workers, was published in 1842. The investigation led to passing one of the earlier pieces of labor legislation: the Mines and Collieries Act of 1842. It prohibited all girls and boys under ten years old from working underground in coal mines.

- Over time, more men than women would find that industrial employment and industrial wages provided a higher level of material security than agricultural employment. Consequently, women would be left behind in less-profitable agriculture. By the late 1860s, very low wages in agricultural work turned women to industrial employment on assembly lines, providing industrial laundry services, and in the textile mills. Women were never paid the same wage as a man for the same work.

**Key Terms**

**Mines and Collieries Act**

An 1842 act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, which prohibited all girls and boys under ten years old from working underground in coal mines. It was a response to the working conditions of children revealed in the Children's Employment Commission.
A child or woman employed by a collier to transport the coal that they had mined. Women would normally get the children to help them because of the difficulty of carrying the coal. Common particularly in the early 19th century, they pulled a corf (basket or small wagon) full of coal along roadways as small as 16 inches in height. They would often work 12-hour shifts, making several runs down to the coal face and back to the surface again.

Industrial Working Practices

As a result of industrialization, ordinary working people found increased opportunities for employment in the new mills and factories, but these were often under strict working conditions with long hours of labor dominated by a pace set by machines. The nature of work changed from a craft production model to a factory-centric model. Between the 1760s and 1850, factories organized workers’ lives much differently than did craft production. The textile industry, central to the Industrial Revolution, serves as an illustrative example of these changes. Prior to industrialization, handloom weavers worked at their own pace, with their own tools, within their own cottages. Now, factories set hours of work and the machinery within them shaped the pace. Factories brought workers together within one building to work on machinery that they did not own. They also increased the division of labor, narrowing the
number and scope of tasks and including children and women within a common production process. The early textile factories employed a large share of children and women. In 1800, there were 20,000 apprentices (usually pauper children) working in cotton mills. The apprentices were particularly vulnerable to maltreatment, industrial accidents, and ill health from overwork and widespread contagious diseases such as smallpox, typhoid, and typhus. The enclosed conditions (to reduce the frequency of thread breakage, cotton mills were usually very warm and as draft-free as possible) and close contact within mills and factories allowed contagious diseases to spread rapidly. Typhoid was spread through poor sanitation in mills and the settlements around them. In all industries, women and children made significantly lower wages than men for the same work.

In reference to the growing number of women in the textile industry, Friedrich Engels argued the family structure was “turned upside down” as women’s wages undercut men’s, forcing men to “sit at home” and care for children while the wife worked long hours. Historical records have shown, however, that women working the same long hours under the same dangerous conditions as men
never made the same wages as men and the patriarchal model of the family was hardly undermined.

Work discipline was forcefully instilled upon the workforce by the factory owners and the working conditions were dangerous and even deadly. Early industrial factories and mines created numerous health risks, and injury compensation for the workers did not exist. Machinery accidents could lead to burns, arm and leg injuries, amputation of fingers and limbs, and death. However, diseases were the most common health issues that had long-term effects. Cotton mills, coal mines, iron-works, and brick factories all had bad air, which caused chest diseases, coughs, blood-spitting, hard breathing, pains in chest, and insomnia. Workers usually toiled extremely long hours, six days a week. However, it is important to note that historians continue to debate the question of to what extent early industrialization worsened and to what extent it improved the fate of the workers, as working practices and conditions in the pre-industrial society were similarly difficult. Child labor, dangerous working conditions, and long hours were just as prevalent before the Industrial Revolution.

Mining has always been especially dangerous and at the beginning of the 19th century, methods of coal extraction exposed men, women, and children to very risky conditions. In 1841, about 216,000 people were employed in the mines. Women and children worked underground for 11-12 hours a day. The public became aware of conditions in the country’s collieries in 1838 after an accident at Huskar Colliery in Silkstone, near Barnsley. A stream overflowed into the ventilation drift after violent thunderstorms, causing the death of 26 children, 11 girls ages 8 to 16 and 15 boys between 9 and 12 years of age. The disaster came to the attention of Queen Victoria, who ordered an inquiry. Lord Ashley headed the royal commission of inquiry, which investigated the conditions of workers, especially children, in the coal mines in 1840. Commissioners visited collieries and mining communities gathering information, sometimes against the mine owners' wishes. The
report, illustrated by engraved illustrations and the personal accounts of mine workers, was published in 1842. The middle class and elites were shocked to learn that children as young as five or six worked as trappers, opening and shutting ventilation doors down the mine before becoming hurriers, pushing and pulling coal tubs and corfs. The investigation led to one of the earlier pieces of labor legislation: the Mines and Collieries Act of 1842. It prohibited all girls and boys under ten years old from working underground in coal mines.

Working-Class Women

Before the Mines and Collieries Act 1842, women (and children) worked underground as hurriers who carted tubs of coal up through the narrow mine shafts. In Wolverhampton, the law did not have much of an impact on women’s mining employment because they mainly worked above-ground at the coal mines, sorting coal, loading canal boats, and other surface tasks. Over time, more men than women would find industrial employment, and industrial wages provided a higher level of material security than agricultural employment. Consequently, women, who were traditionally involved in all agricultural labor, would be left behind in less-profitable agriculture. By the late 1860s, very low wages in agricultural work turned women to industrial employment.

In industrialized areas, women could find employment on assembly lines, providing industrial laundry services, and in the textile mills that sprang up during the Industrial Revolution in such cities as Manchester, Leeds, and Birmingham. Spinning and winding wool, silk, and other types of piecework were a common way of earning income by working from home, but wages were very low and hours long. Often 14 hours per day were needed to earn enough to survive. Needlework was the single highest-paid occupation for
women working from home, but the work paid little and women often had to rent sewing machines that they could not afford to buy. These home manufacturing industries became known as “sweated industries” (think of today’s sweat shops). The Select Committee of the House of Commons defined sweated industries in 1890 as “work carried on for inadequate wages and for excessive hours in unsanitary conditions.” By 1906, such workers earned about a penny an hour. Women were never paid the same wage as a man for the same work, despite the fact that they were as likely as men to be married and supporting children.

Attributions

- Labor Conditions
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Although child labor was widespread prior to industrialization, the exploitation of child workforce intensified during the Industrial Revolution.

**Learning Objective**

Indicate the circumstances leading to the use of industrial child labor

**Key Points**

- With the onset of the Industrial Revolution in Britain in the late 18th century, there was a rapid increase in the industrial exploitation of labor, including child labor. Child labor became the labor of choice for manufacturing in the early phases of the Industrial Revolution because children were paid much less while being as productive as adults and were more vulnerable. Their smaller size was also perceived as an advantage.
• Children as young as four were employed in production factories and mines working long hours in dangerous, often fatal conditions. In coal mines, children would crawl through tunnels too narrow and low for adults. They also worked as errand boys, crossing sweepers, shoe blacks, or selling matches, flowers, and other cheap goods.

• Many children were forced to work in very poor conditions for much lower pay than their elders, usually 10–20% of an adult male’s wage. Beatings and long hours were common, with some child coal miners and hurriers working from 4 a.m. until 5 p.m. Many children developed lung cancer and other diseases. Death before age 25 was common for child workers.

• Workhouses would sell orphans and abandoned children as “pauper apprentices,” working without wages for board and lodging. In 1800, there were 20,000 apprentices working in cotton mills. The apprentices were particularly vulnerable to maltreatment, industrial accidents, and ill health from overwork, and contagious diseases such as smallpox, typhoid, and typhus.

• The first legislation in response to the abuses experienced by child laborers did not even attempt to ban child labor, but merely improve working conditions for some child workers. The Health and Morals of Apprentices Act 1802 was designed to improve conditions for apprentices working in cotton mills. It was not until 1819 that an Act to limit the hours of work and set a minimum age for free children working in cotton mills was piloted through
Parliament.

- A series of acts limiting provisions under which children could be employed followed the two largely ineffective Acts of 1802 and 1819, including the Mines and Collieries Act 1842, the Factories Act 1844, and the Factories Act 1847. The last two major factory acts of the Industrial Revolution were introduced in 1850 and 1856. Factories could no longer dictate work hours for women and children.

**Key Terms**

**Cotton Mills and Factories Act of 1819**

An 1819 Act of Parliament in the United Kingdom that stated that no children under 9 were to be employed and that children aged 9–16 years were limited to 12 hours’ work per day. It applied to the cotton industry only, but covered all children, whether apprentices or not. It was seen through Parliament by Sir Robert Peel but had its origins in a draft prepared by Robert Owen in 1815. The Act that emerged in 1819 was watered down from Owen’s draft.

**Mines and Collieries Act 1842**

An 1842 act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom that prohibited all girls and boys younger than age 10 from working underground in coal mines. It was a response to the working conditions of children.
revealed in the Children’s Employment Commission (Mines) 1842 report.

**Second Industrial Revolution**

A phase of rapid industrialization in the final third of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. Although a number of its characteristic events can be traced to earlier innovations in manufacturing, such as the establishment of a machine tool industry, the development of methods for manufacturing interchangeable parts, and the invention of the Bessemer Process, it is generally dated between 1870 and 1914.

**hurrier**

A child or woman employed by a collier to transport the coal that they had mined. Women would normally get the children to help them because of the difficulty of carrying the coal. Common particularly in the early 19th century, they pulled a corf (basket or small wagon) full of coal along roadways as small as 16 inches in height. They would often work 12-hour shifts, making several runs down to the coal face and back to the surface again.

**Health and Morals of Apprentices Act 1802**

An 1802 Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, sometimes known as the Factory Act 1802, was designed to improve conditions for apprentices working in cotton mills. The Act was introduced by Sir Robert Peel, who became concerned with the issue after an 1784 outbreak of a “malignant fever” at one of his cotton mills, which he later blamed on “gross mismanagement” by his subordinates.
The Industrial Child Workforce

With the onset of the Industrial Revolution in Britain in the late 18th century, there was a rapid increase in the industrial exploitation of labor, including child labor. The population grew and although chances of surviving childhood did not improve, infant mortality rates decreased markedly. Education opportunities for working-class families were limited and children were expected to contribute to family budgets just like adult family members. Child labor became the labor of choice for manufacturing in the early phases of the Industrial Revolution in the 18th and 19th centuries. In England and Scotland in 1788, two-thirds of the workers in 143 water-powered cotton mills were described as children. Employers paid a child less than an adult even though their productivity was comparable. There was no need for strength to operate an industrial machine and since the industrial system was completely new, there were no experienced adult laborers. Factory and mine owners preferred child labor also because they perceived the child workers' smaller size as an advantage. In textile factories, children were desired because of their supposed “nimble fingers,” while low and narrow mine galleries made children particularly effective mine workers.

The Victorian era (overlapping with approximately the last decade of the Industrial Revolution and largely with what is known as the Second Industrial Revolution) in particular became notorious for the conditions, under which children were employed. Children as young as four worked long hours in production factories and mines in dangerous, often fatal conditions. In coal mines, children would crawl through tunnels too narrow and low for adults. They also worked as errand boys, crossing sweepers, shoe blacks, or selling matches, flowers, and other cheap goods. Some children undertook
work as apprentices to trades considered respectable, such as building or as domestic servants (there were over 120,000 domestic servants in London in the mid-18th century). Working hours were long: builders worked 64 hours a week in summer and 52 in winter, while domestic servants worked 80-hour weeks.

Agile boys were employed by the chimney sweeps. Small children were employed to scramble under machinery to retrieve cotton bobbins and in coal mines, crawling through tunnels too narrow and low for adults. Many young people worked as prostitutes (the majority of prostitutes in London were between 15 and 22 years of age).

**Labor Conditions**

Child labor existed long before the Industrial Revolution, but with the increase in population and education, it became more visible. Furthermore, unlike in agriculture and cottage industries where children often contributed to the family operation, children in the industrial employment were independent workers with no protective mechanisms in place. Many children were forced to work
in very poor conditions for much lower pay than their elders, usually 10–20% of an adult male's wage. Children as young as four were employed. Beatings and long hours were common, with some child coal miners and hurriers working from 4 a.m. until 5 p.m. Conditions were dangerous, with some children killed when they dozed off and fell into the path of the carts, while others died from gas explosions. Many children developed lung cancer and other diseases. Death before the age of 25 was common for child workers.

Those child laborers who ran away would be whipped and returned to their masters, with some masters shackling them to prevent escape. Children employed as mule scavengers by cotton mills would crawl under machinery to pick up cotton, working 14 hours a day, six days a week. Some lost hands or limbs, others were crushed under the machines, and some were decapitated. Young girls worked at match factories, where phosphorus fumes would cause many to develop phossy jaw, an extremely painful condition that disfigured the patient and eventually caused brain damage, with dying bone tissue accompanied by a foul-smelling discharge. Children employed at glassworks were regularly burned and blinded, and those working at potteries were vulnerable to poisonous clay dust.

Workhouses would sell orphans and abandoned children as “pauper apprentices,” working without wages for board and lodging. In 1800, there were 20,000 apprentices working in cotton mills. The apprentices were particularly vulnerable to maltreatment, industrial accidents, and ill health from overwork and contagious diseases such as smallpox, typhoid, and typhus. The enclosed conditions (to reduce the frequency of thread breakage, cotton mills were usually very warm and as draft-free as possible) and close contact within mills and factories allowed contagious diseases such as typhus and smallpox to spread rapidly, especially because sanitation in mills and the settlements around them was often poor. Around 1780, a water-powered cotton mill was built for Robert Peel on the River Irwell near Radcliffe. The mill employed children bought from workhouses in Birmingham and London. They were unpaid and bound
apprentices until they were 21, which in practice made them enslaved labor. They boarded on an upper floor of the building and were locked inside. Shifts were typically 10–10.5 hours in length (i.e. 12 hours after allowing for meal breaks) and the apprentices “hot bunked,” meaning a child who had just finished his shift would sleep in a bed just vacated by a child now starting his shift.

Children as young as 4 were put to work. In coal mines, children began work at the age of 5 and generally died before the age of 25. Many children (and adults) worked 16-hour days.

Early Attempts to Ban Child Labor

The first legislation in response to the abuses experienced by child laborers did not even attempt to ban child labor but merely to improve working conditions for some child workers. The Health and Morals of Apprentices Act 1802, sometimes known as the Factory
Act 1802, was designed to improve conditions for apprentices working in cotton mills. The Act was introduced by Sir Robert Peel, who became concerned after a 1784 outbreak of a “malignant fever” at one of his cotton mills, which he later blamed on “gross mismanagement” by his subordinates. The Act required that cotton mills and factories be properly ventilated and basic requirements on cleanliness be met. Apprentices in these premises were to be given a basic education and attend a religious service at least once a month. They were to be provided with clothing and their working hours were limited to no more than twelve hours a day (excluding meal breaks). They were not to work at night.

Despite its modest provisions, the 1802 Act was not effectively enforced and did not address the working conditions of free children, who were not apprentices and who rapidly came to heavily outnumber the apprentices in mills. Regulating the way masters treated their apprentices was a recognized responsibility of Parliament and hence the Act itself was non-contentious, but coming between employer and employee to specify on what terms a person might sell their labor (or that of their children) was highly contentious. Hence it was not until 1819 that an Act to limit the hours of work (and set a minimum age) for free children working in cotton mills was piloted through Parliament by Peel and his son Robert (the future Prime Minister). Strictly speaking, Peel’s Cotton Mills and Factories Act of 1819 paved the way for subsequent Factory Acts and set up effective means of industry regulation.

These 1802 and 1819 Acts were largely ineffective and after radical agitation by child labor opponents, a Royal Commission recommended in 1833 that children aged 11–18 should work a maximum of 12 hours per day, children aged 9–11 a maximum of eight hours, and children under the age of nine were no longer permitted to work. This act, however, only applied to the textile industry, and further agitation led to another act in 1847 limiting both adults and children to 10-hour working days.

In 1841, about 216,000 people were employed in the mines. Women and children worked underground for 11 or 12 hours a day
for smaller wages than men. The public became aware of conditions in the country’s collieries in 1838 after an accident at Huskar Colliery in Silkstone, near Barnsley. A stream overflowed into the ventilation drift after violent thunderstorms causing the death of 26 children, 11 girls ages 8 to 16 and 15 boys between 9 and 12 years of age. The disaster came to the attention of Queen Victoria, who ordered an inquiry. Lord Ashley headed the royal commission of inquiry that investigated the conditions of workers, especially children, in the coal mines in 1840. Commissioners visited collieries and mining communities gathering information, sometimes against the mine owners’ wishes. The report, illustrated by engraved illustrations and the personal accounts of mine workers, was published in 1842. Victorian society was shocked to discover that children as young as five or six worked as trappers, opening and shutting ventilation doors down the mine before becoming hurriers, pushing and pulling coal tubs and corfs. As a result, the Mines and Collieries Act 1842, commonly known as the Mines Act of 1842, was passed. It prohibited all girls and boys under ten years old from working underground in coal mines.

The Factories Act 1844 banned women and young adults from working more than 12-hour days and children from the ages 9 to 13 from working 9-hour days. The Factories Act 1847, also known as the Ten Hours Act, made it illegal for women and young people (13–18) to work more than 10 hours and maximum 63 hours a week in textile mills. The last two major factory acts of the Industrial Revolution were introduced in 1850 and 1856. Factories could no longer dictate work hours for women and children, who were to work from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. in the summer and 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. in the winter. These acts deprived the manufacturers of a significant amount of power and authority.
Attributions

- Child Labor
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25.6.5: Organized Labor

The concentration of workers in factories, mines, and mills facilitated the development of trade unions during the Industrial Revolution. After the initial decades of political hostility towards organized labor, skilled male workers emerged as the early beneficiaries of the labor movement.

Learning Objective

Describe the grievances that gave rise to organized labor

Key Points

- The rapid expansion of industrial society during the Industrial Revolution drew women, children, rural workers, and immigrants into the industrial workforce in large numbers and in new roles. This pool of unskilled and semi-skilled labor spontaneously organized in fits and starts throughout the early phases of industrialization and would later be an important arena for the development of trade unions.
As collective bargaining and early worker unions grew with the onset of the Industrial Revolution, the government began to clamp down on what it saw as the danger of popular unrest at the time of the Napoleonic Wars. In 1799, the Combination Act was passed, which banned trade unions and collective bargaining by British workers. Although the unions were subject to often severe repression until 1824, they were already widespread in some cities and workplace militancy manifested itself in many different ways.

By the 1810s, the first labor organizations to bring together workers of divergent occupations were formed. Possibly the first such union was the General Union of Trades, also known as the Philanthropic Society, founded in 1818 in Manchester. Under the pressure of both workers and the middle and upper-class activists sympathetic of the workers’ repeal, the law banning unions was repealed in 1824. However, the Combinations of Workmen Act 1825 severely restricted their activity.

The first attempts at a national general union were made in the 1820s and 1830s. The National Association for the Protection of Labor was established in 1830 by John Doherty. The Association quickly enrolled approximately 150 unions, consisting mostly of textile workers but also mechanics, blacksmiths, and various others. In 1834, Welsh socialist Robert Owen established the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. The organization attracted a range of socialists from Owenites to revolutionaries and played a part in the protests after
the Tolpuddle Martyrs’ case.

• In the later 1830s and 1840s, trade unionism was overshadowed by political activity. Of particular importance was Chartism, a working-class movement for political reform in Britain that existed from 1838 to 1858. The strategy employed the large-scale support to put pressure on politicians to concede manhood suffrage. Chartism thus relied on constitutional methods to secure its aims.

• More permanent trade unions followed from the 1850s. They were usually better resourced but often less radical. In some trades, unions were led and controlled by skilled workers, which essentially excluded the interests of the unskilled labor. Women were largely excluded from trade union formation, membership, and hierarchies until the late 20th century. Unions were eventually legalized in 1871 with the adoption of the Trade Union Act 1871.

Key Terms

Tolpuddle Martyrs
A group of 19th century Dorset agricultural laborers who were convicted of swearing a secret oath as members of the Friendly Society of Agricultural Laborers. At the time, friendly societies had strong elements of what are now considered to be the predominant role of trade unions. The group were
subsequently sentenced to penal transportation to Australia.

**Chartism**

A working-class movement for political reform in Britain that existed from 1838 to 1857. It took its name from the People’s Charter of 1838 and was a national protest movement. The strategy employed was to use the large scale of support for numerous petitions and the accompanying mass meetings to put pressure on politicians to concede manhood suffrage.

**Radical War**

A week of strikes and unrest, also known as the Scottish Insurrection of 1820, that was a culmination of Radical demands for reform in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland which became prominent in the early years of the French Revolution, but were then repressed during the long Napoleonic Wars.

**Luddites**

A group of English textile workers and self-employed weavers in the 19th century who used the destruction of machinery as a form of protest. The group was protesting the use of machinery in a “fraudulent and deceitful manner” to get around standard labor practices. They were fearful that the years they had spent learning the craft would go to waste and unskilled machine operators would rob them of their livelihood.

**Combination Act**

A 1799 Act of Parliament that prohibited trade unions and collective bargaining by British workers.
Combinations of Workmen Act 1825

An 1825 Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom, which prohibited trade unions from attempting to collectively bargain for better terms and conditions at work and suppressed the right to strike.

Industrialization and Labor Organization

The rapid expansion of industrial society during the Industrial Revolution drew women, children, rural workers, and immigrants into the industrial work force in large numbers and in new roles. This pool of unskilled and semi-skilled labor spontaneously organized in fits and starts throughout the early phases of industrialization and would later be an important arena for the development of trade unions. Trade unions have sometimes been seen as successors to the guilds of medieval Europe, although the relationship between the two is disputed as the masters of the guilds employed workers (apprentices and journeymen) who were not allowed to organize. The concentration of labor in mills, factories, and mines facilitated the organization of workers to help advance the interests of working people. A union could demand better terms by withdrawing all labor and causing a consequent cessation of production. Employers had to decide between giving in to the union demands at a cost to themselves or suffering the cost of the lost production. Skilled workers were hard to replace and these were the first groups to successfully advance their conditions through this kind of bargaining.

Trade unions and collective bargaining were outlawed from no
later than the middle of the 14th century when the Ordinance of Laborers was enacted in the Kingdom of England. As collective bargaining and early worker unions grew with the onset of the Industrial Revolution, the government began to clamp down on what it saw as the danger of popular unrest at the time of the Napoleonic Wars. In 1799, the Combination Act was passed, which banned trade unions and collective bargaining by British workers. Although the unions were subject to often severe repression until 1824, they were already widespread in some cities.

Workplace militancy manifested itself in many different ways. For example, Luddites were a group of English textile workers and self-employed weavers who in the 19th century destroyed weaving machinery as a form of protest. The group was protesting the use of machinery to get around standard labor practices, fearing that the years they had spent learning the craft would go to waste and unskilled machine operators would rob them of their livelihoods. One of the first mass work strikes emerged in 1820 in Scotland, an event known today as the Radical War. 60,000 workers went on a general strike. Their demands went far beyond labor regulations and included a general call for reforms. The strike was quickly crushed.

Early Trade Unions

By the 1810s, the first labor organizations to bring together workers of divergent occupations were formed. Possibly the first such union was the General Union of Trades, also known as the Philanthropic Society, founded in 1818 in Manchester. The latter name was to hide the organization's real purpose in a time when trade unions were still illegal.

Under the pressure of both workers and the middle and upper class activists sympathetic of the workers' repeal, the law banning unions was repealed in 1824. However, the Combinations of
Workmen Act 1825 severely restricted their activity. It prohibited trade unions from attempting to collectively bargain for better terms and conditions at work and suppressed the right to strike. That did not stop the fledgling labor movements and unions began forming rapidly.

The first attempts at setting up a national general union were made in the 1820s and 1830s. The National Association for the Protection of Labor was established in 1830 by John Doherty, after an apparently unsuccessful attempt to create a similar national presence with the National Union of Cotton Spinners. The Association quickly enrolled approximately 150 unions, consisting mostly of textile workers, but also including mechanics, blacksmiths, and various others. Membership rose to between 10,000 and 20,000 individuals spread across the five counties of Lancashire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, and Leicestershire within a year. To establish awareness and legitimacy, the union started the weekly Voice of the People publication, with the declared intention “to unite the productive classes of the community in one common bond of union.”
In England, the members of the Friendly Society of Agricultural laborers became popular heroes and 800,000 signatures were collected for their release. Their supporters organized a political march, one of the first successful marches in the UK, and all were pardoned on condition of good conduct in 1836.

In 1834, Welsh socialist Robert Owen established the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. The organization attracted a range of socialists from Owenites to revolutionaries and played a part in the protests after the Tolpuddle Martyrs’ case. In 1833, six men from Tolpuddle in Dorset founded the Friendly Society of Agricultural Laborers to protest against the gradual lowering of agricultural wages. The Tolpuddle laborers refused to work for less than 10 shillings a week, although by this time wages had been reduced to seven shillings and would be further reduced to six. In 1834, James Frampton, a local landowner and magistrate, wrote to Home Secretary Lord Melbourne to complain about the union. As a result of obscure law that prohibited the swearing of secret oaths, six men were arrested, tried, found guilty, and transported to Australia. Owen’s union collapsed shortly afterwards.

**Chartism**

In the later 1830s and 1840s, trade unionism was overshadowed by political activity. Of particular importance was Chartism, a working-class movement for political reform in Britain that existed from 1838 to 1858. It took its name from the People’s Charter of 1838 and was a national protest movement, with particular strongholds of support in Northern England, the East Midlands, the Staffordshire Potteries, the Black Country, and the South Wales Valleys. Support for the movement was at its highest in 1839, 1842, and 1848, when petitions signed by millions of working people were presented to
Parliament. The strategy used the scale of support demonstrated these petitions and the accompanying mass meetings to put pressure on politicians to concede manhood suffrage. Chartism thus relied on constitutional methods to secure its aims, although there were some who became involved in radical activities, notably in south Wales and Yorkshire. The government did not yield to any of the demands and suffrage had to wait another two decades. Chartism was popular among some trade unions, especially London's tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, and masons. One reason was the fear of the influx of unskilled labor, especially in tailoring and shoe making. In Manchester and Glasgow, engineers were deeply involved in Chartist activities. Many trade unions were active in the general strike of 1842, which spread to 15 counties in England and Wales and eight in Scotland. Chartism taught techniques and political skills that inspired trade union leadership.

Chartists saw themselves fighting against political corruption and for democracy in an industrial society, but attracted support beyond the radical political groups for economic reasons, such as opposing wage cuts and unemployment.
Full Legalization

After the Chartist movement of 1848 fragmented, efforts were made to form a labor coalition. The Miners’ and Seamen’s United Association in the North-East operated 1851–1854 before it too collapsed because of outside hostility and internal disputes over goals. The leaders sought working-class solidarity as a long-term aim. More permanent trade unions followed from the 1850s. They were usually better resourced but often less radical. The London Trades Council was founded in 1860 and the Sheffield Outrages spurred the establishment of the Trades Union Congress in 1868. By this time, the existence and the demands of the trade unions were becoming accepted by liberal middle-class opinion. Further, in some trades, unions were led and controlled by skilled workers, which essentially excluded the interests of the unskilled labor. For example, in textiles and engineering, union activity from the 1850s to as late as the mid-20th century was largely in the hands of the skilled workers. They supported differentials in pay and status as opposed to the unskilled. They focused on control over machine production and were aided by competition among firms in the local labor market.

The legal status of trade unions in the United Kingdom was eventually established by a Royal Commission on Trade Unions in 1867, which agreed that the establishment of the organizations was to the advantage of both employers and employees. Unions were legalized with the adoption of the Trade Union Act 1871.

Exclusion of Women

Women were largely excluded from trade union formation, membership, and hierarchies until the late 20th century. When
women did succeed in challenging male hegemony and made inroads into the representation of labor and combination, it was originally not working-class women but middle-class reformers such as the Women’s Protective and Provident League (WPPL), which sought to amiably discuss conditions with employers in the 1870s. It became the Women’s Trade Union League, members of which were largely upper-middle-class men and women interested in social reform, who wanted to educate women in trade unionism and fund the establishment of trade unions. Militant socialists broke away from the WPPL and formed the Women's Trade Union Association, but they had little impact. However, there were a few cases in the 19th century where women trade union members took initiative. For example, women played a central role in the 1875 West Yorkshire weavers’ strike.

Attractions

- Organized Labor
Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.


◦ “Combinations of Workmen Act 1825.”


◦ “Meeting_of_the_trade_unionists_in_Copenhagen_Fields_April_21_1834_for_the_purpose_of_carrying_a_petition_to_the_King_for_a_remission_of_the_sentence_passed_on_the_Dorchester_labourers_1293402.jpg.”
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Meeting_of_the_trade_unionists_in_Copenhagen_Fields_April_21_1834_for_the_purpose_of_carrying_a_petition_to_the_King_for_a_remission_of_the_sentence_passed_on_the_Dorchester_labourers_(1293402).jpg. Wikimedia Commons CC0 1.0 Universal.

◦ “1024px-William_Edward_Kilburn_-_View_of_the_Great_Chartist_Meeting_on_Kennington_Common_-_Google_Art_Project.jpg.”
PART VII
CH. 26 WORLD WAR I
29.1: The Century of Peace

29.1.1: The European Continent After Vienna

Post-Napoleonic Europe was characterized by a general lack of major conflict between the great powers, with Great Britain as the major hegemonic power bringing relative balance to European politics.

Learning Objective

Compare post-Napoleonic Europe to the pre-French Revolution continent

Key Points

- At the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the European powers came together at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to reorganize the political map of Europe and develop a system of conflict resolution aiming at
preserving peace and balance of power, termed the Concert of Europe.

- From this point until the outbreak of World War I, there was relative peace and a lack of major conflict between the major powers, with wars generally localized and short-lived.
- The British and Russian empires expanded significantly and became the world’s leading powers. Britain’s navy had supremacy for most of the century, leading to the period often called the Pax Britannica (British Peace).
- From the 1870s onward, many nations experienced a sort of “golden age,” known as the Belle Époque, which coincided with the Gilded Age in the U.S.
- European politics saw very few regime changes during this period; however, tensions between working-class socialist parties, bourgeois liberal parties, and landed or aristocratic conservative parties increased in many countries. Some historians claim that profound political instability belied the calm surface of European politics in the era.

**Key Terms**

**hegemonic**

The political, economic, or military predominance or control of one state over others.
Concert of Europe

Also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, a system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It is suggested that it operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s, while some see it as lasting until the outbreak of the Crimean War, 1853-1856.

Belle Époque

A period of Western European history conventionally dated from the end of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871 to the outbreak of World War I around 1914. Occurring during the era of the French Third Republic (beginning 1870), it was characterized by optimism, regional peace, economic prosperity and technological, scientific and cultural innovations. In the climate of the period, especially in Paris, the arts flourished.

Pax Britannica

The period of relative peace in Europe (1815–1914) during which the British Empire became the global hegemonic power and adopted the role of a global police force.

The 19th century was the century marked by the collapse of the Spanish, Napoleonic, Holy Roman, and Mughal empires. This paved the way for the growing influence of the British Empire, the Russian Empire, the United States, the German Empire, the French colonial empire, and Meiji Japan, with the British boasting unchallenged
dominance after 1815. After the defeat of the French Empire and its allies in the Napoleonic Wars, the European powers came together at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to reorganize the political map of Europe to preserve peace and balance of power, termed the Concert of Europe.

The British and Russian empires expanded significantly and became the world’s leading powers. The Russian Empire expanded in central and far eastern Asia. The British Empire grew rapidly in the first half of the century, especially with the expansion of vast territories in Canada, Australia, South Africa, and heavily populated India, and in the last two decades of the century in Africa. By the end of the century, the British Empire controlled a fifth of the world’s land and one-quarter of the world’s population. During the post-Napoleonic era, it enforced what became known as the Pax Britannica, which had ushered in unprecedented globalization, industrialization, and economic integration on a massive scale.

At the beginning of this period, there was an informal convention recognizing five Great Powers in Europe: the French Empire, the British Empire, the Russian Empire, the Austrian Empire (later Austria-Hungary), and the Kingdom of Prussia (later the German Empire). In the late 19th century, the newly united Italy was added to this group. By the early 20th century, two non-European states, Japan and the United States, would come to be respected as fellow Great Powers.

The entire era lacked major conflict between these powers, with most skirmishes taking place between belligerents within the borders of individual countries. In Europe, wars were much smaller, shorter, and less frequent than ever before. The quiet century was shattered by World War I (1914–18), which was unexpected in its timing, duration, casualties, and long-term impact.
Pax Britannica

Pax Britannica (Latin for “British Peace,” modeled after Pax Romana) was the period of relative peace in Europe (1815–1914) during which the British Empire became the global hegemonic power and adopted the role of a global police force.

Between 1815 and 1914, a period referred to as Britain’s “imperial century,” around 10 million square miles of territory and roughly 400 million people were added to the British Empire. Victory over Napoleonic France left the British without any serious international rival, other than perhaps Russia in central Asia. When Russia tried expanding its influence in the Balkans, the British and French defeated it in the Crimean War (1854–56), thereby protecting the by-then feeble Ottoman Empire.

Britain’s Royal Navy controlled most of the key maritime trade routes and enjoyed unchallenged sea power. Alongside the formal control it exerted over its own colonies, Britain’s dominant position in world trade meant that it effectively controlled access to many regions, such as Asia and Latin America. British merchants, shippers, and bankers had such an overwhelming advantage over everyone else that in addition to its colonies it had an informal empire.

The global superiority of British military and commerce was aided by a divided and relatively weak continental Europe and the presence of the Royal Navy on all of the world’s oceans and seas. Even outside its formal empire, Britain controlled trade with countries such as China, Siam, and Argentina. Following the Congress of Vienna, the British Empire’s economic strength continued to develop through naval dominance and diplomatic efforts to maintain a balance of power in continental Europe.

In this era, the Royal Navy provided services around the world that benefited other nations, such as the suppression of piracy and blocking the slave trade. The Slave Trade Act 1807 banned the trade across the British Empire, after which the Royal Navy established
the West Africa Squadron and the government negotiated international treaties under which they could enforce the ban. Sea power, however, did not project on land. Land wars fought between the major powers include the Crimean War, the Franco-Austrian War, the Austro-Prussian War, and the Franco-Prussian War, as well as numerous conflicts between lesser powers. The Royal Navy prosecuted the First Opium War (1839–1842) and Second Opium War (1856–1860) against Imperial China. The Royal Navy was superior to any other two navies in the world, combined. Between 1815 and the passage of the German naval laws of 1890 and 1898, only France was a potential naval threat.

The *Pax Britannica* was weakened by the breakdown of the continental order established by the Congress of Vienna. Relations between the Great Powers of Europe were strained to breaking by issues such as the decline of the Ottoman Empire, which led to the Crimean War, and later the emergence of new nation states of Italy and Germany after the Franco-Prussian War. Both wars involved Europe’s largest states and armies. The industrialization of Germany, the Empire of Japan, and the United States contributed to the relative decline of British industrial supremacy in the early 20th century.
The British Empire (marked in pink) was the superpower of the 19th century. Belle Époque The Belle Époque (French for “Beautiful Era”) was a period of Western European history conventionally dated from the end of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871 to the outbreak of World War I in around 1914. Occurring during the era of the French Third Republic (beginning 1870), it was a period characterized by optimism, regional peace, economic prosperity, and technological, scientific and cultural innovations. In the climate of the period, especially in Paris, the arts flourished. Many masterpieces of literature, music, theater, and visual art gained recognition. The Belle Époque was named, in retrospect, when it began to be considered a
“Golden Age” in contrast to the horrors of World War I. In the United Kingdom, the *Belle Époque* overlapped with the late Victorian era and the Edwardian era. In Germany, the *Belle Époque* coincided with the Wilhelminism; in Russia with the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II. In the newly rich United States emerging from the Panic of 1873, the comparable epoch was dubbed the Gilded Age. In Brazil it started with the end of the Paraguayan War, and in Mexico the period was known as the Porfiriato. The years between the Franco-Prussian War and World War I were characterized by unusual political stability in western and central Europe. Although tensions between the French and German governments persisted as a result of the French loss of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany in 1871, diplomatic conferences, including the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the Berlin Congo Conference in 1884, and the Algeciras Conference in 1906, mediated disputes that threatened the general European peace. For many Europeans in the *Belle Époque* period, transnational, class-based affiliations were as important as national identities, particularly among aristocrats. An upper-class gentleman could travel through much of Western Europe without a passport and even reside abroad with minimal bureaucratic regulation. World War I,
mass transportation, the spread of literacy, and various citizenship concerns changed this. European politics saw very few regime changes, the major exception being Portugal, which experienced a republican revolution in 1910. However, tensions between working-class socialist parties, bourgeois liberal parties, and landed or aristocratic conservative parties increased in many countries, and some historians claim that profound political instability belied the calm surface of European politics in the era. In fact, militarism and international tensions grew considerably between 1897 and 1914, and the immediate prewar years were marked by a general armaments competition in Europe. Additionally, this era was one of massive overseas colonialism known as the New Imperialism. The most famous portion of this imperial expansion was the Scramble for Africa. Attributions The European Continent After Vienna “Belle Époque.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belle_Epoque. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “History of Europe.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Europe. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “Pax Britannica.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pax_Britannica. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “19th century.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/19th_century. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

The Congress of Vienna established many of the diplomatic norms of the 19th century and created an informal system of diplomatic conflict resolution aimed at maintaining a balance of power among nations, which contributed to the relative peace of the century.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the role diplomacy played on the European continent after Napoleon

**Key Points**

- Although the notion of diplomacy has existed since ancient times, the forms and practices of modern diplomacy were established at the Congress of Vienna in 1815.
- The Congress of Vienna was a meeting of the major powers of Europe aimed at providing a long-term
peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars.

- The goal was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other and remain at peace. Another goal was to develop a system of diplomatic conflict resolution called the Concert of Europe, whereby at times of crisis any of the member countries could propose a conference.

- Meetings of the Great Powers during this period included: Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Carlsbad (1819), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), Verona (1822), London (1832), and Berlin (1878).

- The Concert’s effectiveness ended with the rise of nationalism, the 1848 Revolutions, the Crimean War, the unification of Germany, and the Eastern Question, among other factors.

- Later in the century, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, through juggling a complex interlocking series of conferences, negotiations, and alliances, used his diplomatic skills to maintain the balance of power in Europe to keep it at peace in the 1870s and 1880s.
**Key Terms**

**Concert of Europe**
A system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It is suggested that it operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s, while some see it as lasting until the outbreak of the Crimean War, 1853-1856.

**Congress of Vienna**
A conference of ambassadors of European states chaired by Austrian statesman Klemens von Metternich and held in Vienna from November 1814 to June 1815, though the delegates had arrived and were already negotiating by late September 1814. The objective was to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars. The goal was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other and remain at peace.

**Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord**
A French bishop, politician, and diplomat. He worked at the highest levels of successive French governments, most commonly as foreign minister or in some other diplomatic capacity. His career spanned the regimes of Louis XVI, the years of the French Revolution, Napoleon, Louis XVIII, and Louis-Philippe.
Development of Modern Diplomacy

In Europe, early modern diplomacy’s origins are often traced to the states of Northern Italy in the early Renaissance, where the first embassies were established in the 13th century. Milan played a leading role especially under Francesco Sforza, who established permanent embassies to the other city states of Northern Italy. Tuscany and Venice were also flourishing centers of diplomacy from the 14th century onward. It was in the Italian Peninsula that many of the traditions of modern diplomacy began, such as the presentation of an ambassador’s credentials to the head of state. From Italy, the practice spread across Europe.

The elements of modern diplomacy arrived in Eastern Europe and Russia by the early 18th century. The entire edifice would be greatly disrupted by the French Revolution and the subsequent years of warfare. The revolution would see commoners take over the diplomacy of the French state and of those conquered by revolutionary armies. Ranks of precedence were abolished. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France.

After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 established an international system of diplomatic rank with ambassadors at the top, as they were considered personal representatives of their sovereign. Disputes on precedence among nations (and therefore the appropriate diplomatic ranks used) were first addressed at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, but persisted for over a century until after World War II, when the rank of ambassador became the norm. In between, figures such as the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck were renowned for international diplomacy.
The Congress of Vienna of 1815 established many of the diplomatic norms for the 19th century. The objective of the Congress was to provide a long-term peace plan for Europe by settling critical issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars. The goal was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other and remain at peace. The Concert of Europe, also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, was a system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It is suggested that it operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s, while some see it as lasting until the outbreak of the Crimean War, 1853-1856.

At first, the leading personalities of the system were British foreign secretary Lord Castlereagh, Austrian Chancellor Klemens von Metternich, and Tsar Alexander I of Russia. Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord played a major role at the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815, where he negotiated a favorable settlement for France while undoing Napoleon's conquests. Talleyrand polarizes scholarly opinion. Some regard him as one of the most versatile, skilled, and influential diplomats in European history, and some believe that he was a traitor, betraying in turn the Ancien Régime, the French Revolution, Napoleon, and the Restoration. Talleyrand worked at the highest levels of successive French governments, most commonly as foreign minister or in some other diplomatic capacity. His career spanned the regimes of Louis XVI, the years of the French Revolution, Napoleon, Louis XVIII, and Louis-Philippe. Those he served often distrusted Talleyrand but like Napoleon, found him extremely useful. The name “Talleyrand” has become a byword for crafty, cynical diplomacy.
Talleyrand: French diplomat Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord is considered one of the most skilled diplomats of all time. The Concert of Europe had no written rules or permanent institutions, but at times of crisis any of the member countries could propose a conference. Diplomatic meetings of the Great Powers during this period included: Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Carlsbad (1819), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), Verona (1822), London (1832), and Berlin (1878). The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818) resolved
the issues of Allied occupation of France and restored that country to equal status with Britain, Prussia, Austria, and Russia. The congress, which broke up at the end of November, is of historical importance mainly as marking the highest point reached during the 19th century in the attempt to govern Europe by an international committee of the powers. The detailed study of its proceedings is highly instructive in revealing the almost insurmountable obstacles to any truly effective international diplomatic system prior to the creation of the League of Nations after the First World War. The territorial boundaries laid down at the Congress of Vienna were maintained; even more importantly, there was an acceptance of the theme of balance with no major aggression. Otherwise, the Congress system, says historian Roy Bridge, “failed” by 1823. In 1818, the British decided not to become involved in continental issues that did not directly affect them. They rejected the plan of Alexander I to suppress future revolutions. The Concert system fell apart as the common goals of the Great Powers were replaced by growing political and economic rivalries. There was no Congress called to restore the old system during the great revolutionary upheavals of 1848 with their demands for revision of the Congress of Vienna’s frontiers along
national lines. The Congress of Vienna was frequently criticized by 19th-century and more recent historians for ignoring national and liberal impulses and imposing a stifling reaction on the Continent. It was an integral part of what became known as the Conservative Order, in which the liberties and civil rights associated with the American and French Revolutions were de-emphasized so that a fair balance of power, peace and stability might be achieved. In the 20th century, however, many historians came to admire the statesmen at the Congress, whose work prevented another widespread European war for nearly a hundred years (1815–1914). Historian Mark Jarrett argues that the Congress of Vienna and the Congress System marked “the true beginning of our modern era.” He says the Congress System was deliberate conflict management and the first genuine attempt to create an international order based upon consensus rather than conflict. “Europe was ready,” Jarrett states, “to accept an unprecedented degree of international cooperation in response to the French Revolution.” It served as a model for later organizations such as the League of Nations in 1919 and the United Nations in 1945. Prior to the opening of the Paris peace conference of 1918, the British Foreign Office
commissioned a history of the Congress of Vienna to serve as an example to its own delegates of how to achieve an equally successful peace. Otto von Bismarck: Balance of Power Diplomacy Otto von Bismarck was a conservative Prussian statesman and diplomat who dominated German and European affairs from the 1860s until 1890. He skillfully used balance of power diplomacy to maintain Germany’s position in a Europe which, despite many disputes and war scares, remained at peace. For historian Eric Hobsbawm, it was Bismarck who “remained undisputed world champion at the game of multilateral diplomatic chess for almost twenty years after 1871, [and] devoted himself exclusively, and successfully, to maintaining peace between the powers.” In 1862, King Wilhelm I appointed Bismarck as Minister President of Prussia, a position he would hold until 1890 (except for a short break in 1873). He provoked three short, decisive wars against Denmark, Austria, and France, aligning the smaller German states behind Prussia in its defeat of France. In 1871, he formed the German Empire with himself as Chancellor while retaining control of Prussia. His diplomacy of pragmatic realpolitik and powerful rule at home gained him the nickname the “Iron Chancellor.” German unification and its rapid
economic growth was the foundation to his foreign policy. He disliked colonialism but reluctantly built an overseas empire when demanded by both elite and mass opinion. Juggling a very complex interlocking series of conferences, negotiations and alliances, he used his diplomatic skills to maintain Germany’s position and used the balance of power to keep Europe at peace in the 1870s and 1880s.

Attributions
- “Talleyrand-perigord.jpg.”
29.1.3: The World Fairs

World fairs during the late 19th century and early 20th centuries showcased the technological, industrial, and cultural achievements of nations around the world, sometimes displaying cultural superiority over colonized nations through human exhibits.

Learning Objective
Assess the World Fairs and their purpose in the late 19th and early 20th centuries

Key Points

- World fairs are international exhibits displaying the achievements of nations, largely focused on technological and industrial developments.
- World fairs originated in the French tradition of national exhibitions that culminated with the French Industrial Exposition of 1844 held in Paris.
- The Great Exhibition held in London in 1851 established many of the familiar components of world
fairs and is usually considered to be the first international exhibition of manufactured products.

- Since their inception, the character of world expositions has evolved and is sometimes categorized into three eras: industrialization, cultural exchange, and nation branding.
- Also present in many world fairs at the time as well as in smaller local fairs were exhibits of people from the colonized world in their native environments, often with an explicit narrative of European superiority.

---

### Key Terms

#### The Great Exhibition

An international exhibition that took place in Hyde Park, London, from May 1 to October 11, 1851. It was the first in a series of world fairs, exhibitions of culture and industry that became popular in the 19th century, and was a much anticipated event. It was organized by Henry Cole and Prince Albert, husband of the reigning monarch Queen Victoria. It was attended by numerous notable figures of the time, including Charles Darwin, Samuel Colt, members of the Orléanist Royal Family, and the writers Charlotte Brontë, Charles Dickens, Lewis Carroll, George Eliot, and Alfred Tennyson.
human zoos

Public exhibitions of humans, usually in a so-called natural or primitive state. The displays often emphasized the cultural differences between Europeans of Western civilization and non-European peoples or other Europeans with a lifestyle deemed primitive. Some placed indigenous Africans in a continuum somewhere between the great apes and the white man.

A world's fair, world fair, world exposition, or universal exposition (sometimes expo for short), is a large international exhibition designed to showcase achievements of nations. These exhibitions vary in character and are held in various parts of the world.

World fairs originated in the French tradition of national exhibitions that culminated with the French Industrial Exposition of 1844 held in Paris. This fair was followed by other national exhibitions in continental Europe and the United Kingdom.

The best-known “first World Expo” was held in The Crystal Palace in Hyde Park, London, United Kingdom, in 1851, under the title “Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations.” The Great Exhibition, as it is often called, was an idea of Prince Albert, Queen Victoria's husband, and is usually considered to be the first international exhibition of manufactured products. It was arguably a response to the highly successful French Industrial Exposition of 1844; indeed, its prime motive was for Britain to display itself as an industrial leader. It influenced the development of several aspects of society, including art-and-design education, international trade and relations, and tourism. This expo was the most obvious precedent for the many international exhibitions considered world fairs.

Since their inception in 1851, the character of world expositions
has evolved. Three eras can be distinguished: industrialization, cultural exchange, and nation branding.

The first era could be called the era of “industrialization” and covered roughly the period from 1800 to 1938. In these days, world expositions were especially focused on trade and were famous for the display of technological inventions and advancements. World expositions were the platforms where the state-of-the-art in science and technology from around the world were brought together. The world expositions of 1851 London, 1853 New York, 1862 London, 1876 Philadelphia, 1889 Paris, 1893 Chicago, 1897 Brussels, 1900 Paris, 1901 Buffalo, 1904 St. Louis, 1915 San Francisco, and 1933–34 Chicago were landmarks in this respect. Inventions such as the telephone were first presented during this era.

The 1939–40 New York World’s Fair diverged from the original focus of the world fair expositions. From then on, world fairs adopted specific cultural themes forecasting a better future for society. Technological innovations were no longer the primary exhibits at fairs.

From Expo ’88 in Brisbane onward, countries such as Finland, Japan, Canada, France, and Spain started to use world expositions as platforms to improve their national images.
World Fairs: A poster advertising the Brussels International Exposition. Colonialism on Display Human zoos,
also called ethnological expositions, were 19th-, 20th-, and 21st-century public exhibitions of humans, usually in a so-called natural or primitive state. The displays often emphasized the cultural differences between Europeans of Western civilization and non-European peoples or other Europeans with a lifestyle deemed primitive. Some of them placed indigenous Africans in a continuum somewhere between the great apes and the white man. Ethnological expositions have since been criticized as highly degrading and racist. The notion of human curiosity and exhibition has a history at least as long as colonialism. In the 1870s, exhibitions of exotic populations became popular in various countries. Human zoos could be found in Paris, Hamburg, Antwerp, Barcelona, London, Milan, and New York City. Carl Hagenbeck, a merchant in wild animals and future entrepreneur of many European zoos, decided in 1874 to exhibit Samoan and Sami people as “purely natural” populations. In 1876, he sent a collaborator to the Egyptian Sudan to bring back some wild beasts and Nubians. The Nubian exhibit was very successful in Europe and toured Paris, London, and Berlin. Both the 1878 and the 1889 Parisian World’s Fair presented a Negro Village (village nègre). Visited by 28 million people, the 1889
World’s Fair displayed 400 indigenous people as the major attraction. The 1900 World’s Fair presented the famous diorama living in Madagascar, while the Colonial Exhibitions in Marseilles (1906 and 1922) and in Paris (1907 and 1931) also displayed humans in cages, often nude or semi-nude. The 1931 exhibition in Paris was so successful that 34 million people attended it in six months, while a smaller counter-exhibition entitled *The Truth on the Colonies*, organized by the Communist Party, attracted very few visitors—in the first room, it recalled Albert Londres and André Gide’s critiques of forced labor in the colonies. Nomadic Senegalese Villages were also presented. In 1904, Apaches and Igorots (from the Philippines) were displayed at the Saint Louis World Fair in association with the 1904 Summer Olympics. The U.S. had just acquired, following the Spanish–American War, new territories such as Guam, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico, allowing them to “display” some of the native inhabitants. According to the Rev. Sequoyah Ade: To further illustrate the indignities heaped upon the Philippine people following their eventual loss to the Americans, the United States made the Philippine campaign the centrepoint of the 1904 World’s Fair held that year in St. Louis, MI [sic]. In what was
enthusiastically termed a “parade of evolutionary progress,” visitors could inspect the “primitives” that represented the counterbalance to “Civilisation” justifying Kipling’s poem “The White Man’s Burden.” Pygmies from New Guinea and Africa, who were later displayed in the Primate section of the Bronx Zoo, were paraded next to American Indians such as Apache warrior Geronimo, who sold his autograph. But the main draw was the Philippine exhibition complete with full size replicas of Indigenous living quarters erected to exhibit the inherent backwardness of the Philippine people. The purpose was to highlight both the “civilising” influence of American rule and the economic potential of the island chains’ natural resources on the heels of the Philippine–American War. It was, reportedly, the largest specific Aboriginal exhibition displayed in the exposition. As one pleased visitor commented, the human zoo exhibition displayed “the race narrative of odd peoples who mark time while the world advances, and of savages made, by American methods, into civilized workers.”
Ota Benga at the Bronx Zoo: From a sign outside the primate house at the Bronx Zoo, September 1906: “Ota Benga, a human exhibit, in 1906. Age, 23 years. Height, 4 feet 11 inches (150 cm). Weight, 103 pounds (47 kg). Brought from the Kasai River, Congo Free State, South Central Africa, by Dr. Samuel P. Verner. Exhibited each afternoon during September.”

29.2: The Coming of War

29.2.1: The Sick Man of Europe

The “Eastern Question” refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability of the Ottoman Empire, named the “Sick Man of Europe.”

Learning Objective

Evaluate the claim that the Ottoman Empire was the “Sick Man of Europe”

Key Points

• Throughout the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire underwent major changes, first through a series of modernizing efforts that strengthened its power, but ultimately to its decline in terms of military prestige,
The Ottoman state, which took on debt with the Crimean War, was forced to declare bankruptcy in 1875.

By 1881, the Ottoman Empire agreed to have its debt controlled by an institution known as the Ottoman Public Debt Administration, a council of European men with presidency alternating between France and Britain.

In response to these changes and crises in the Ottoman Empire, the Major Powers of Europe, especially Russia and Britain, began referring to the Empire as the “Sick Man of Europe,” with various ideas as to how best serve their own interests as this major empire began to collapse.

In diplomatic history, this issue is referred to as the “Eastern Question” and encompasses the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire, which in part led to outbreak of World War I.

Key Terms

Concert of Europe

Also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, a system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers to resolve international disputes.
powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It is suggested that it operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s, while some see it as lasting until the outbreak of the Crimean War, 1853–1856.

sick man of Europe

A label given to a European country experiencing a time of economic difficulty or impoverishment. The term was first used in the mid-19th century to describe the Ottoman Empire, but has since been applied at one time or another to nearly every other major country in Europe.

Eastern Question

In diplomatic history, this refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries.

The Eastern Question

In diplomatic history, the “Eastern Question” refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries. Characterized as the “sick man of Europe,” the relative weakening of the empire’s military strength in the second half of the 18th century
threatened to undermine the fragile balance of power system largely shaped by the Concert of Europe. The Eastern Question encompassed myriad interrelated elements: Ottoman military defeats, Ottoman institutional insolvency, the ongoing Ottoman political and economic modernization programs, the rise of ethno-religious nationalism in its provinces, and Great Power rivalries.

The Eastern Question is normally dated to 1774, when the Russo-Turkish War (1768–74) ended in defeat for the Ottomans. As the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire was believed to be imminent, the European powers engaged in a power struggle to safeguard their military, strategic, and commercial interests in the Ottoman domains. Imperial Russia stood to benefit from the decline of the Ottoman Empire; on the other hand, Austria-Hungary and Great Britain deemed the preservation of the Empire to be in their best interests. The Eastern Question was put to rest after World War I, one of the outcomes of which was the collapse and division of the Ottoman holdings.

A book by Harold Temperley quotes Nicholas I of Russia as saying in 1853, “Turkey seems to be falling to pieces, the fall will be a great misfortune. It is very important that England and Russia should come to a perfectly good understanding... and that neither should take any decisive step of which the other is not apprized...We have a sick man on our hands, a man gravely ill, it will be a great misfortune if one of these days he slips through our hands, especially before the necessary arrangements are made.”

In the 1870s the “Eastern Question” focused on the mistreatment of Christians in the Balkans by the Ottoman Empire and what the European great powers ought to do about it.

In 1876 Serbia and Montenegro declared war on Turkey and were badly defeated, notably at the battle of Alexinatz (Sept. 1, 1876). Gladstone published an angry pamphlet on “The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East,” which aroused enormous agitation in Britain against Turkish misrule and complicated the Disraeli government’s policy of supporting Turkey against Russia. Russia, which supported Serbia, threatened war against Turkey. In August
1877, Russia declared war on Turkey and steadily defeated its armies. In early January 1878 Turkey asked for an armistice, but the British fleet arrived at Constantinople too late. Russia and Turkey on March 3 signed the Treaty of San Stefano, which was highly advantageous to Russia, Serbia, and Montenegro as well as Romania and Bulgaria.

Britain, France, and Austria opposed the Treaty of San Stefano because it gave Russia too much influence in the Balkans, where insurrections were frequent. War threatened. After numerous attempts, a grand diplomatic settlement was reached at the Congress of Berlin (June–July 1878). The new Treaty of Berlin revised the earlier treaty. Germany’s Otto von Bismarck (1815–98) presided over the congress and brokered the compromises. One result was that Austria took control of the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, intending to eventually merge them into the Austro-Hungarian Empire. When they finally tried to do that in 1914, local Serbs assassinated Austria’s Archduke and the result was the First World War.
“Sick Man of Europe”: Caricature from Punch magazine dated November 28, 1896. It shows Sultan Abdul Hamid II in front of a poster that announces the reorganization of the Ottoman Empire. The empire’s value is estimated at 5 million pounds. Russia, France, and England are listed as the directors of the reorganization. The caricature refers to the Ottoman Empire, which was increasingly falling under the financial control of the European powers and had lost territory.
Ottoman Decline Up to World War I

Beginning from the late 18th century, the Ottoman Empire faced challenges defending itself against foreign invasion and occupation. In response to foreign threats, the empire initiated a period of tremendous internal reform that came to be known as the Tanzimat, which succeeded in significantly strengthening the Ottoman central state despite the empire's precarious international position. Over the course of the 19th century, the Ottoman state became increasingly powerful and rationalized, exercising a greater degree of influence over its population than in any previous era.

As the Ottoman state attempted to modernize its infrastructure and army in response to threats from the outside, it also opened itself up to a different kind of threat: that of creditors. Indeed, as the historian Eugene Rogan has written, “the single greatest threat to the independence of the Middle East” in the 19th century “was not the armies of Europe but its banks.” The Ottoman state, which had begun taking on debt with the Crimean War, was forced to declare bankruptcy in 1875. By 1881, the Ottoman Empire agreed to have its debt controlled by an institution known as the Ottoman Public Debt Administration, a council of European men with presidency alternating between France and Britain. The body controlled swaths of the Ottoman economy and used its position to insure that European capital continued to penetrate the empire, often to the detriment of local Ottoman interests.

The defeat and dissolution of the Ottoman Empire (1908–1922) began with the Second Constitutional Era, a moment of hope and promise established with the Young Turk Revolution. It restored the Ottoman constitution of 1876 and brought in multi-party politics with a two-stage electoral system (electoral law) under the Ottoman parliament. The constitution offered hope by freeing the empire’s citizens to modernize the state’s institutions, rejuvenate its strength, and enable it to hold its own against outside powers.
Its guarantee of liberties promised to dissolve inter-communal tensions and transform the empire into a more harmonious place.

Instead, this period became the story of the twilight struggle of the Empire. A proliferation of conflicting political parties created discord and confusion. Profiting from the civil strife, Austria-Hungary officially annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908. Ottoman military reforms resulted in a modern army which engaged in the Italo-Turkish War (1911) that ended in the loss of the North African territories and the Dodecanese, the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) that ended in the loss of almost all of the Empire's European territories. In addition, the Empire faced continuous civil and political unrest with several military coups leading up to World War I.

Attributions

- The Sick Man of Europe
  - “International relations of the Great Powers (1814–1919).”
  - “Defeat and dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.”
  - “Decline and modernization of the Ottoman Empire.”
“Punch_magazine_-_Turkey_Ltd_-_1896.jpg”
Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
29.2.2: Militarism and Jingoism

During the 1870s and 1880s, all major powers were preparing for a large-scale war by increasing the sizes of their armies and navies. This led to increased political tensions that many historians consider a major factor in the outbreak of World War I.

**Learning Objective**

Assess the rise of militarism in the years preceding WWI

**Key Points**

- During the second half of the 19th century, all major world powers began increasing the sizes and scopes of their military forces, although a conflict on the scale of WWI was not expected by anyone.
- Germany, France, Austria, Italy, Russia, and some smaller countries set up conscription systems whereby young men served from one to three years in the army, then spent the next 20 years in the reserves with annual summer training.
• Germany struggled to achieve parity with the British navy in a tense arms race, but in the end fell short with Britain remaining the dominant naval power.
• Many historians point to this increased military preparedness as the major factor that led to the outbreak of WWI, contending that had the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand happened a decade before, war would probably have been avoided.
• Jingoism is nationalism in the form of aggressive foreign policy, whereby a nation advocates for the use of threats or actual force as opposed to peaceful relations to safeguard what it perceives as its national interests.

**Key Terms**

**militarism**

The belief or the desire of a government or people that a country should maintain a strong military capability and be prepared to use it aggressively to defend or promote national interests. It may also imply the glorification of the military, the ideals of a professional military class, and the “predominance of the armed forces in the administration or policy of the state.”
**conscription**

The compulsory enlistment of people in a national service, most often military service. The practice dates back to antiquity and continues in some countries to the present day under various names. The modern system dates to the French Revolution in the 1790s, where it became the basis of a very large and powerful military. Most European nations later copied the system in peacetime so that men at a certain age would serve one to eight years on active duty and then transfer to the reserve force.

**jingoism**

A form of nationalism characterized by aggressive foreign policy. It refers to a country’s advocacy for the use of threats or actual force as opposed to peaceful relations to safeguard what it perceives as its national interests.

---

**Rise of Militarism Prior to World War I**

The main causes of World War I, which broke out unexpectedly in central Europe in summer 1914, comprised all the conflicts and hostility of the four decades leading up to the war. Militarism, alliances, imperialism, and ethnic nationalism played major roles.

During the 1870s and 1880s, all major world powers were preparing for a large-scale war, although none expected one. Britain focused on building up its Royal Navy, already stronger than the next two navies combined. Germany, France, Austria, Italy, Russia, and some smaller countries set up conscription systems whereby
young men would serve from one to three years in the army, then spend the next 20 years or so in the reserves with annual summer training. Men from higher social classes became officers. Each country devised a mobilization system so the reserves could be called up quickly and sent to key points by rail. Every year the plans were updated and expanded in terms of complexity. Each country stockpiled arms and supplies for an army that ran into the millions.

Germany in 1874 had a regular professional army of 420,000 with an additional 1.3 million reserves. By 1897 the regular army was 545,000 strong and the reserves 3.4 million. The French in 1897 had 3.4 million reservists, Austria 2.6 million, and Russia 4.0 million. The various national war plans had been perfected by 1914, albeit with Russia and Austria trailing in effectiveness. Recent wars (since 1865) had typically been short—a matter of months. All the war plans called for a decisive opening and assumed victory would come after a short war; no one planned for or was ready for the food and munitions needs of a long stalemate as actually happened in 1914–18.

As David Stevenson has put it, “A self-reinforcing cycle of heightened military preparedness … was an essential element in the conjuncture that led to disaster … The armaments race … was a necessary precondition for the outbreak of hostilities.” If Archduke Franz Ferdinand had been assassinated in 1904 or even in 1911, Herrmann speculates, there might have been no war. It was “… the armaments race … and the speculation about imminent or preventive wars” that made his death in 1914 the trigger for war.

This increase in militarism coincided with the rise of jingoism, a term for nationalism in the form of aggressive foreign policy. Jingoism also refers to a country’s advocacy for the use of threats or actual force, as opposed to peaceful relations, to safeguard what it perceives as its national interests. Colloquially, it refers to excessive bias in judging one’s own country as superior to others—an extreme type of nationalism. The term originated in reference to the United Kingdom’s pugnacious attitude toward Russia in the 1870s, and appeared in the American press by 1893.

Probably the first uses of the term in the U.S. press occurred
in connection with the proposed annexation of Hawaii in 1893. A coup led by foreign residents, mostly Americans, and assisted by the U.S. Minister in Hawaii, overthrew the Hawaiian constitutional monarchy and declared a Republic. Republican president Benjamin Harrison and Republicans in the Senate were frequently accused of jingoism in the Democratic press for supporting annexation.

The term was also used in connection with the foreign policy of Theodore Roosevelt. In an October 1895 New York Times article, Roosevelt stated, “There is much talk about ‘jingoism’. If by ‘jingoism’ they mean a policy in pursuance of which Americans will with resolution and common sense insist upon our rights being respected by foreign powers, then we are ‘jingoes’.”

One of the aims of the First Hague Conference of 1899, held at the suggestion of Emperor Nicholas II, was to discuss disarmament. The Second Hague Conference was held in 1907. All signatories except for Germany supported disarmament. Germany also did not want to agree to binding arbitration and mediation. The Kaiser was concerned that the United States would propose disarmament measures, which he opposed. All parties tried to revise international law to their own advantage.

**Anglo-German Naval Race**

Historians have debated the role of the German naval build-up as the principal cause of deteriorating Anglo-German relations. In any case, Germany never came close to catching up with Britain.

Supported by Wilhelm II’s enthusiasm for an expanded German navy, Grand Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz championed four Fleet Acts from 1898 to 1912, and from 1902 to 1910, the Royal Navy embarked on its own massive expansion to keep ahead of the Germans. This competition came to focus on the revolutionary new ships based on the Dreadnought, launched in 1906, which gave Britain a battleship that far outclassed any other in Europe.
The overwhelming British response proved to Germany that its efforts were unlikely to equal those of the Royal Navy. In 1900, the British had a 3.7:1 tonnage advantage over Germany; in 1910 the ratio was 2.3:1 and in 1914, 2.1:1. Ferguson argues that, “So decisive was the British victory in the naval arms race that it is hard to regard it as in any meaningful sense a cause of the First World War.” This ignores the fact that the Kaiserliche Marine had narrowed the gap by nearly half, and that the Royal Navy had long intended to be stronger than any two potential opponents; the United States Navy was in a period of growth, making the German gains very ominous.

In Britain in 1913, there was intense internal debate about new ships due to the growing influence of John Fisher’s ideas and increasing financial constraints. In early to mid-1914 Germany adopted a policy of building submarines instead of new dreadnoughts and destroyers, effectively abandoning the race, but kept this new policy secret to delay other powers following suit.

The Germans abandoned the naval race before the war broke out. The extent to which the naval race was one of the chief factors in Britain’s decision to join the Triple Entente remains a key controversy. Historians such as Christopher Clark believe it was not significant, with Margaret Moran taking the opposite view.
Naval arms race: 1909 cartoon in *Puck* shows the United States, Germany, Britain, France, and Japan engaged in naval race in a “no limit” game.

Attributions

- Militarism and Jingoism
The Balkan Powder Keg

29.2.3: The Balkan Powder Keg

The continuing collapse of the Ottoman Empire coincided with the rise of nationalism in the Balkans, which led to increased tensions and conflicts in the region. This “powder keg” was thus a major catalyst for the outbreak of World War I.

Learning Objective

Define the Balkan Powder Keg

Key Points

- By the early 20th century, Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, and Serbia had achieved independence from the Ottoman Empire, but large elements of their ethnic populations remained under Ottoman rule. In 1912 these countries formed the Balkan League and declared war on the Ottomans to reclaim territory.
- Four Balkan states defeated the Ottoman Empire in the first war; one of the four, Bulgaria, suffered defeat in the second war.
• The tensions and conflicts in this are often referred to as the “Balkan powder keg” and had implications beyond the region.
• There were a number of overlapping claims to territories and spheres of influence between the major European powers, such as the Russian Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the German Empire and, to a lesser degree, the Ottoman Empire, the United Kingdom, and Kingdom of Italy.
• Relations between Austria and Serbia became increasingly bitter and Russia felt humiliated after Austria and Germany prevented it from helping Serbia.
• The powder keg eventually “exploded” causing the First World War, which began with a conflict between imperial Austria-Hungary and Pan-Slavic Serbia.

Key Terms

irredentism

Any political or popular movement intended to reclaim and reoccupy a “lost” or “unredeemed” area; territorial claims are justified on the basis of real or imagined national and historic (an area formerly part of that state) or ethnic (an area inhabited by that nation or ethnic group) affiliations. It is often advocated by nationalist and pan-nationalist movements and has been a feature of identity politics and cultural and
political geography.

**Balkans**

A peninsula and a cultural area in Southeastern Europe with various and disputed borders. The region takes its name from the Balkan Mountains that stretch from the Serbia–Bulgaria border to the Black Sea. Conflicts here were a major contributing factor to the outbreak of WWI.

**Pan-Slavism**

A movement which crystallized in the mid-19th century concerned with the advancement of integrity and unity for the Slavic people. Its main impact occurred in the Balkans, where non-Slavic empires—the Byzantine Empire, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and Venice—had ruled the South Slavs for centuries.

The “Balkan powder keg,” also termed the “powder keg of Europe,” refers to the Balkans in the early part of the 20th century preceding World War I. There were a number of overlapping claims to territories and spheres of influence between the major European powers, such as the Russian Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the German Empire and, to a lesser degree, the Ottoman Empire, the United Kingdom, and Kingdom of Italy.

In addition to the imperialistic ambitions and interests in this region, there was a growth in nationalism among the indigenous peoples, leading to the formation of the independent states of Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania.

Within these nations, there were movements to create “greater” nations: to enlarge the boundaries of the state beyond those areas where the national ethnic group was in the majority (termed irredentism). This led to conflict between the newly independent
nations and the empire from which they split, the Ottoman Empire. Additionally, it led to differences between the Balkan nations who wished to gain territory at the expense of their neighbors. Both the conflict with the Ottoman Empire and between the Balkan nations led to the Balkan Wars, discussed below.

In a different vein, the ideology of Pan-Slavism in Balkans gained popularity; the movement built around it in the region sought to unite all of the Slavs of the Balkans into one nation, Yugoslavia. This, however, would require the union of several Balkan states and territory that was part of Austria-Hungary. For this reason, Pan-Slavism was strongly opposed by Austria-Hungary, while it was supported by Russia which viewed itself as leader of all Slavic nations.

To complicate matters, in the years preceding World War I, there existed a tangle of Great Power alliances, both formal and informal, public and secret. Following the Napoleonic Wars, there existed a “balance of power” to prevent major wars. This theory held that opposing combinations of powers in Europe would be evenly matched, entailing that any general war would be far too costly to risk entering. This system began to fall apart as the Ottoman Empire, seen as a check on Russian power, began to crumble, and as Germany, a loose confederation of minor states, was united into a major power. Not only did these changes lead to a realignment of power, but of interests as well.

All these factors and many others conspired to bring about the First World War. As is insinuated by the name “the powder keg of Europe,” the Balkans were not the major issue at stake in the war, but were the catalyst that led to the conflagration. The Chancellor of Germany in the late 19th century, Otto von Bismarck, correctly predicted it would be the source of major conflict in Europe.

The powder keg “exploded” causing the First World War, which began with a conflict between imperial Austria-Hungary and Pan-Slavic Serbia.
Balkan Troubles: Germany, France, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Britain attempting to keep the lid on the simmering cauldron of imperialist and nationalist tensions in the Balkans to prevent a general European war. They were successful in 1912 and 1913 but did not succeed in 1914, resulting in the outbreak of World War I.

Balkan Wars

The continuing collapse of the Ottoman Empire led to two wars in
the Balkans, in 1912 and 1913, which was a prelude to world war. By 1900 nation states had formed in Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro and Serbia. Nevertheless, many of their ethnic compatriots lived under the control of the Ottoman Empire. In 1912, these countries formed the Balkan League. There were three main causes of the First Balkan War. The Ottoman Empire was unable to reform itself, govern satisfactorily, or deal with the rising ethnic nationalism of its diverse peoples. Secondly, the Great Powers quarreled among themselves and failed to ensure that the Ottomans would carry out the needed reforms. This led the Balkan states to impose their own solution. Most importantly, the members of the Balkan League were confident that it could defeat the Turks, which would prove to be the case.

The First Balkan War broke out when the League attacked the Ottoman Empire on October 8, 1912, and was ended seven months later by the Treaty of London. After five centuries, the Ottoman Empire lost virtually all of its possessions in the Balkans. The Treaty had been imposed by the Great Powers, dissatisfying the victorious Balkan states. Bulgaria was dissatisfied over the division of the spoils in Macedonia, made in secret by its former allies, Serbia and Greece, and attacked to force them out of Macedonia, starting the Second Balkan War. The Serbian and Greek armies repulsed the Bulgarian offensive and counter-attacked into Bulgaria, while Romania and the Ottoman Empire also attacked Bulgaria and gained (or regained) territory. In the resulting Treaty of Bucharest, Bulgaria lost most of the territories it had gained in the First Balkan War.

The long-term result was heightened tension in the Balkans. Relations between Austria and Serbia became increasingly bitter. Russia felt humiliated after Austria and Germany prevented it from helping Serbia. Bulgaria and Turkey were also dissatisfied, and eventually joined Austria and Germany in the First World War.
Attributions

- The Balkan Powder Keg
On June 28, 1914, Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria was shot dead in Sarajevo by Gavrilo Princip, one of a group of six assassins coordinated by Danilo Ilić, a Bosnian Serb and a member of the Black Hand secret society. This event led to a diplomatic crisis and the outbreak of World War I.

**Learning Objective**

Discuss Archduke Franz Ferdinand

**Key Points**

- Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, a member of the Austrian royal family and heir presumptive to the Austrian throne, was assassinated by Gavrilo Princip, a member of the Young Bosnia movement connected to the Blank Hand secret society.
- The political objective of the assassination was to
break off Austria-Hungary’s South Slav provinces so they could be combined into Yugoslavia. 
• The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand sent deep shock waves through Austrian elites. The murder was described by Christopher Clark as “a terrorist event charged with historic meaning, transforming the political chemistry in Vienna.”
• The assassination triggered the July Crisis, a series of tense diplomatic maneuverings that led to an ultimatum from Austria-Hungary to the Kingdom of Serbia, who rejected some of these conditions as a violation of their sovereignty. This led to Austria-Hungary invading Serbia.
• The system of European alliances led to a series of escalating Austrian and Russian mobilizations. Eventually, Britain and France were also obliged to mobilize and declare war, beginning World War I.

Key Terms

Black Hand
A secret military society formed on May 9, 1911, by officers in the Army of the Kingdom of Serbia, originating in the conspiracy group that assassinated the Serbian royal couple (1903) led by captain Dragutin Dimitrijević “Apis.”
irredentism

Any political or popular movement intended to reclaim and reoccupy a “lost” or “unredeemed” area; territorial claims are justified on the basis of real or imagined national and historic (an area formerly part of that state) or ethnic (an area inhabited by that nation or ethnic group) affiliations. It is often advocated by nationalist and pan-nationalist movements and has been a feature of identity politics and cultural and political geography.

July Crisis

A diplomatic crisis among the major powers of Europe in the summer of 1914 that led to World War I. Immediately after Gavrilo Princip, a Yugoslav nationalist, assassinated Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir presumptive to the Austro-Hungarian throne, in Sarajevo, a series of diplomatic maneuverings led to an ultimatum from Austria-Hungary to the Kingdom of Serbia and eventually to war.

Young Bosnia

A revolutionary movement active in the Condominium of Bosnia and Herzegovina before World War I. The members were predominantly school students, primarily Serbs but also Bosniaks and Croats. There were two key ideologies promoted among the members of the group: the Yugoslavist (unification into a Yugoslavia) and the Pan-Serb (unification into Serbia).

Franz Ferdinand was an Archduke of Austria-Este, Austro-Hungarian and Royal Prince of Hungary and of Bohemia and, from 1896 until his death, heir presumptive to the Austro-Hungarian
throne. His assassination in Sarajevo precipitated Austria-Hungary's declaration of war against Serbia. This caused the Central Powers (including Germany and Austria-Hungary) and Serbia's allies to declare war on each other, starting World War I.

Franz Ferdinand was born in Graz, Austria, the eldest son of Archduke Karl Ludwig of Austria (younger brother of Franz Joseph and Maximilian) and his second wife, Princess Maria Annunciata of Bourbon-Two Sicilies. In 1875, when he was only 11 years old, his cousin Duke Francis V of Modena died, naming Franz Ferdinand his heir on condition that he add the name Este to his own. Franz Ferdinand thus became one of the wealthiest men in Austria.

In 1889, Franz Ferdinand's life changed dramatically. His cousin Crown Prince Rudolf committed suicide at his hunting lodge in Mayerling. This left Franz Ferdinand's father, Karl Ludwig, first in line to the throne. Ludwig died of typhoid fever in 1896. Henceforth, Franz Ferdinand was groomed to succeed him.

Assassination of Archduke Ferdinand

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, heir presumptive to the Austro-Hungarian throne, and his wife Sophie, Duchess of Hohenberg, occurred on June 28, 1914, in Sarajevo when they were shot dead by Gavrilo Princip. Princip was one of a group of six assassins (five Serbs and one Bosniak) coordinated by Danilo Ilić, a Bosnian Serb and a member of the Black Hand secret society. The political objective of the assassination was to break off Austria-Hungary's South Slav provinces so they could be combined into Yugoslavia. The Black Hand, formally Unification or Death, was a secret military society formed on May 9, 1911, by officers in the Army of the Kingdom of Serbia. with the aim of uniting all of the territories with a South Slavic majority not ruled by either Serbia or Montenegro. Its inspiration was primarily the unification of Italy in 1859–70, but also that of Germany in 1871.
The assassins’ motives were consistent with Young Bosnia, a revolutionary movement active in the Condominium of Bosnia and Herzegovina (ruled by Austria-Hungary) before World War I. The members were predominantly school students, primarily Serbs but also Bosniaks and Croats. There were two key ideologies promoted among the members of the group: the Yugoslavist (unification into a Yugoslavia), and the Pan-Serb (unification into Serbia). Young Bosnia was inspired from a variety of ideas, movements, and events, such as German romanticism, anarchism, Russian revolutionary socialism, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Friedrich Nietzsche, and the Battle of Kosovo.

In 1913, Emperor Franz Joseph commanded Archduke Franz Ferdinand to observe the military maneuvers in Bosnia scheduled for June 1914. Following the maneuvers, Ferdinand and his wife planned to visit Sarajevo to open the state museum in its new premises there. Duchess Sophie, according to their oldest son, Duke Maximilian, accompanied her husband out of fear for his safety.

Franz Ferdinand was an advocate of increased federalism and widely believed to favor trialism, under which Austria-Hungary would be reorganized by combining the Slavic lands within the Austro-Hungarian empire into a third crown. A Slavic kingdom could have been a bulwark against Serb irredentism, and Ferdinand was therefore perceived as a threat by those same irredentists. Princip later stated to the court that preventing Ferdinand’s planned reforms was one of his motivations.

The day of the assassination, June 28, is the feast of St. Vitus. In Serbia, it is called Vidovdan and commemorates the 1389 Battle of Kosovo against the Ottomans, at which the Sultan was assassinated in his tent by a Serb.

The assassination of Ferdinand led directly to the First World War when Austria-Hungary subsequently issued an ultimatum to the Kingdom of Serbia, which was partially rejected. Austria-Hungary then declared war.

The assassins, the key members of the clandestine network, and the key Serbian military conspirators who were still alive were arrested, tried, convicted, and punished. Those who were arrested.
in Bosnia were tried in Sarajevo in October 1914. The other conspirators were arrested and tried before a Serbian court on the French-controlled Salonika Front in 1916–1917 on unrelated false charges; Serbia executed three of the top military conspirators. Much of what is known about the assassinations comes from these two trials and related records.
Consequences

The murder of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian Empire and his wife produced widespread shock across Europe, and there was initially much sympathy for the Austrian position. Within two days of the assassination, Austria-Hungary and Germany advised Serbia that it should open an investigation, but Secretary General to the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Slavko Gruic, replied “Nothing had been done so far and the matter did not concern the Serbian Government.” An angry exchange followed between the Austrian Chargé d’Affaires at Belgrade and Gruic.

After conducting a criminal investigation, verifying that Germany would honor its military alliance, and persuading the skeptical Hungarian Count Tisza, Austria-Hungary issued a formal letter to the government of Serbia. The letter reminded Serbia of its commitment to respect the Great Powers’ decision regarding Bosnia-Herzegovina and maintain good relations with Austria-Hungary. The letter contained specific demands aimed at preventing the publication of propaganda advocating the violent destruction of Austria-Hungary, removing the people behind this propaganda from the Serbian Military, arresting the people on Serbian soil who were involved in the assassination plot, and preventing the clandestine shipment of arms and explosives from Serbia to Austria-Hungary.

This letter became known as the July Ultimatum, and Austria-Hungary stated that if Serbia did not accept all of the demands in total within 48 hours, it would recall its ambassador from Serbia. After receiving a telegram of support from Russia, Serbia mobilized its army and responded to the letter by completely accepting point #8 demanding an end to the smuggling of weapons and punishment of the frontier officers who had assisted the assassins, and completely accepting point #10 which demanded Serbia report the execution of the required measures as they were completed. Serbia partially accepted, finessed, disingenuously answered, or politely
rejected elements of the preamble and enumerated demands #1–7 and #9. The shortcomings of Serbia's response were published by Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary responded by breaking diplomatic relations. This diplomatic crisis is known as the July Crisis.

The next day, Serbian reservists transported on tramp steamers on the Danube crossed onto the Austro-Hungarian side of the river at Temes-Kubin and Austro-Hungarian soldiers fired into the air to warn them off. The report of this incident was initially sketchy and reported to Emperor Franz-Joseph as “a considerable skirmish.” Austria-Hungary then declared war and mobilized the portion of its army that would face the (already mobilized) Serbian Army on July 28, 1914. Under the Secret Treaty of 1892 Russia and France were obliged to mobilize their armies if any of the Triple Alliance mobilized. Russia's mobilization set off full Austro-Hungarian and German mobilizations. Soon all the Great Powers except Italy had chosen sides and gone to war.

Serbia Must Die!: Serbien muss sterbien! (“Serbia must die!”) This political cartoon shows an Austrian hand crushing a Serb.
Attributions

- Archduke Franz Ferdinand
29.3: Events of World War I

29.3.1: The Alliances

During the 19th century, the major European powers went to great lengths to maintain a balance of power throughout Europe, resulting in the existence of a complex network of political and military alliances throughout the continent leading up to World War I. According to some historians, this caused a localized conflict to escalate into a global war.

Learning Objective

Name the members of the two alliances that clashed in WWI

Key Points

• Starting directly after the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Great Powers of Europe began to forge
complex alliances to maintain a balance of power and peace.

- This process began with the Holy Alliance between Prussia, Russia, and Austria and the Quadruple Alliance signed by United Kingdom, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, both formed in 1815 and aimed at maintaining a stable and conservative vision for Europe.

- Throughout the rest of the 19th century, various treaties and alliances were formed, including the German-Austrian treaty (1879) or Dual Alliance; the addition of Italy to the Germany and Austrian alliance in 1882, forming the “Triple Alliance”; the Franco-Russian Alliance (1894); and the “Entente Cordiale” between Britain and France (1904), which eventually included Russia and formed the Triple Entente.

- The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, which were renewed several times leading up to World War I, formed the two opposing sides of the war, with Italy moving over to ally with the Triple Entente after the start of the war and other nations pulled in over time.

- Historians debate how much these complex alliances contributed to the outbreak of the World War I, as the crisis between Austria-Hungary and Serbia could have been localized but quickly escalated into a global conflict despite the fact that some of the alliances, notably the Triple Entente, did not stipulate mutual defense in the case of an attack.
**Key Terms**

**Central Powers**
Consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and Bulgaria, this was one of the two main factions during World War I (1914–18). It faced and was defeated by the Allied Powers that formed around the Triple Entente, after which it was dissolved.

**Triple Entente**
The informal understanding linking the Russian Empire, the French Third Republic, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland after the signing of the Anglo-Russian Entente on August 31, 1907. The understanding between the three powers, supplemented by agreements with Japan and Portugal, constituted a powerful counterweight to the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Kingdom of Italy.

**Triple Alliance**
A secret agreement between Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy formed on May 20, 1882, and renewed periodically until World War I. Germany and Austria-Hungary had been closely allied since 1879. Italy sought support against France shortly after it lost North African ambitions to the French. Each member promised mutual support in the event of an attack by any other great power.

During the 19th century, the major European powers went to great lengths to maintain a balance of power throughout Europe,
resulting in the existence of a complex network of political and military alliances throughout the continent by 1900. These began in 1815 with the Holy Alliance between Prussia, Russia, and Austria. When Germany was united in 1871, Prussia became part of the new German nation. In October 1873, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck negotiated the League of the Three Emperors between the monarchs of Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Germany. This agreement failed because Austria-Hungary and Russia could not agree over Balkan policy, leaving Germany and Austria-Hungary in an alliance formed in 1879 called the Dual Alliance. This was a method of countering Russian influence in the Balkans as the Ottoman Empire continued to weaken. This alliance expanded in 1882 to include Italy, in what became the Triple Alliance.

Bismarck held Russia at Germany’s side to avoid a two-front war with France and Russia. When Wilhelm II ascended to the throne as German Emperor (Kaiser), Bismarck was compelled to retire and his system of alliances was gradually de-emphasized. For example, the Kaiser refused in 1890 to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia. Two years later, the Franco-Russian Alliance was signed to counteract the force of the Triple Alliance. In 1904, Britain signed a series of agreements with France, the Entente Cordiale, and in 1907, Britain and Russia signed the Anglo-Russian Convention. While these agreements did not formally ally Britain with France or Russia, they made British entry into any future conflict involving France or Russia a possibility, and the system of interlocking bilateral agreements became known as the Triple Entente.

Interestingly, family connections pervaded these alliances, some crossing the boundaries of opposition. Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, King George V of England, and Tsar Nicholas II of Russia were cousins.
Central Powers

The Central Powers, consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and Bulgaria – hence also known as the Quadruple Alliance – was one of the two main factions during World War I (1914–18). It faced and was defeated by the Allied Powers that formed around the Triple Entente, after which it was dissolved.

The Central Powers consisted of the German Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the beginning of the war. The Ottoman Empire joined the Central Powers later in 1914. In 1915, the Kingdom of Bulgaria joined the alliance. The name “Central Powers” is derived from the location of these countries; all four (including the other groups that supported them except for Finland and Lithuania) were located between the Russian Empire in the east and France and the United Kingdom in the west. Finland, Azerbaijan, and Lithuania joined them in 1918 before the war ended and after the Russian Empire collapsed.

The Central Powers’ origin was the Triple Alliance. Also known as the Triplice, this was a secret agreement between Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy formed on May 20, 1882, and renewed periodically until World War I. Germany and Austria-Hungary had been closely allied since 1879. Italy sought support against France shortly after it lost North African ambitions to the French. Each member promised mutual support in the event of an attack by any other great power. The treaty provided that Germany and Austria-Hungary would assist Italy if it was attacked by France without provocation. In turn, Italy would assist Germany if attacked by France. In the event of a war between Austria-Hungary and Russia, Italy promised to remain neutral.

Shortly after renewing the Alliance in June 1902, Italy secretly extended a similar guarantee to France. By a particular agreement, neither Austria-Hungary nor Italy would change the status quo in the Balkans without previous consultation. On November 1, 1902, five months after the Triple Alliance was renewed, Italy reached an
understanding with France that each would remain neutral in the event of an attack on the other.

When Austria-Hungary found itself at war in August 1914 with the rival Triple Entente, Italy proclaimed its neutrality, considering Austria-Hungary the aggressor and defaulting on the obligation to consult and agree compensations before changing the status quo in the Balkans as agreed in 1912 renewal of the Triple Alliance. Following parallel negotiation with both Triple Alliance, aimed to keep Italy neutral, and the Triple Entente, aimed to make Italy enter the conflict, Italy declared war on Austria-Hungary. Carol I of Romania, through his Prime Minister Ion I. C. Brătianu, also secretly pledged to support the Triple Alliance, but he remained neutral since Austria-Hungary started the war.

**Allies of WWI**

The Allies of World War I were the countries that opposed the Central Powers in the First World War.

The members of the original Entente Alliance of 1907 were the French Republic, the British Empire, and the Russian Empire. Italy ended its alliance with the Central Powers, arguing that Germany and Austria-Hungary started the war and that the alliance was only defensive in nature; it entered the war on the side of the Entente in 1915. Japan was another important member. Belgium, Serbia, Greece, Montenegro, and Romania were affiliated members of the Entente.

The 1920 Treaty of Sèvres defines the Principal Allied Powers as the British Empire, French Republic, Italy, and Japan. The Allied Powers comprised, together with the Principal Allied Powers, Armenia, Belgium, Greece, Hejaz, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serb-Croat-Slovene state, and Czechoslovakia.

The U.S. declaration of war on Germany in April 1917 was on the grounds that Germany had violated its neutrality by attacking
international shipping and the Zimmermann Telegram sent to Mexico. It declared war on Austria-Hungary in December 1917. The U.S. entered the war as an “associated power,” rather than as a formal ally of France and the United Kingdom to avoid “foreign entanglements.” Although the Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria severed relations with the United States, neither declared war.

Web of Alliances: European diplomatic alignments shortly before the outbreak of WWI.

Attributions

• The Alliances
World_War_I. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
The Schlieffen Plan

29.3.2: The Schlieffen Plan

The Schlieffen Plan was a deployment plan and operational guide for a decisive initial offensive campaign in a one-front war against the French Third Republic. In 1914 it was deployed against two fronts with major changes by Commander-in-Chief Moltke the Younger, resulting in a failure to achieve the decisive victory Schlieffen had planned.

Learning Objective

Describe the Schlieffen Plan

Key Points

• Alfred von Schlieffen was a German field marshal and strategist who served as Chief of the Imperial German General Staff from 1891 to 1906.
• Throughout his career, he developed several war plans for defensive, offensive, and counter-offensive campaigns, particularly with the French.
• The offensive campaign against France developed
in 1905-06, later termed the “Schleiffen Plan,” focused on a brute force attack with sufficient soldiers.

- When Schlieffen retired, Helmuth von Moltke the Younger took over as Commander-in-Chief of the German army and at the outbreak of WWI, deployed a modified version of Schlieffen’s plan against the latter’s advice, which failed to achieve the decisive victory it promised.

- Various historians have contended that Moltke the Younger’s failure to follow the blueprint rather than German strategic miscalculation condemned the belligerents to four years of attrition warfare.

Key Terms

**counter-offensive**

A term used by the military to describe large-scale, usually strategic offensive operations by forces that successfully halt the enemy’s offensive while occupying defensive positions. It is executed after exhausting the enemy’s front line troops when their reserves are committed to combat and incapable of breaching defenses, but before the enemy has had the opportunity to assume new defensive positions.

**Alfred von Schlieffen**

A German field marshal and strategist who served as Chief of the Imperial German General Staff from 1891 to 1344.
1906. His name lived on in the 1905-06 Schlieffen Plan, then *Aufmarsch I*, a deployment plan and operational guide for a decisive initial offensive campaign in a one-front war against the French Third Republic.

The Schlieffen Plan was the strategy for the German invasion of France and Belgium in August 1914. Field Marshal Alfred von Schlieffen was the Chief of the Imperial Army German General Staff from 1891 to 1906 and in 1905-06 devised a deployment plan for a winning offensive in a one-front war against the French Third Republic. After the war, German historians and other writers described the plan as a blueprint for victory. Some claimed the plan was ruined by Colonel-General Helmuth von Moltke the Younger, the Commander-in-Chief of the German army after Schlieffen retired in 1906 who was dismissed after the First Battle of the Marne (September 5-12, 1914).

**Alfred von Schlieffen’s War Planning**

The cornerstone of Schlieffen's war planning was undoubtedly the strategic counter-offensive. Schlieffen was a great believer in the power of the attack in the context of the defensive operation. Germany's smaller forces relative to the Franco-Russian Entente meant that an offensive posture against one or both was basically suicidal. On the other hand, Schlieffen placed great faith in Germany's ability to use railways to launch a counter-offensive against a hypothetical French or Russian invasion force, defeat it, then quickly regroup and launch a counter-offensive.

Schlieffen also recognized the need for offensive planning, as failing to do so would limit the German Army’s capabilities. In 1897,
Schlieffen developed a tactical plan that – acknowledging the German army’s limited offensive power and capacity for strategic maneuvers – basically amounted to using brute force to advance beyond the French defenses on the Franco-German border.

In 1905, Schlieffen developed what was truly his first plan for a strategic offensive operation, the Schlieffen plan Denkschrift (Schlieffen plan memorandum). This was designed for an isolated Franco-German war that would not involve Russia, calling for Germany to attack France.

However, the bulk of Schlieffen’s planning followed his personal preferences for the counter-offensive. Schlieffen’s war plans by the name of Aufmarsch II and Aufmarsch Ost continued to stress that Germany’s best hope for survival in a war with the Franco-Russian entente was a defensive strategy. This was reconciled with a very offensive tactical posture as Schlieffen held that the destruction of an attacking force required that it be surrounded and attacked from all sides until surrender, not merely repulsed as in a passive defense.

In August 1905 Schlieffen was kicked by a companion’s horse, rendering him incapable of battle at age 72. He began planning his retirement, but his successor was undetermined. A favourite of the Emperor was Helmuth von Moltke the Younger, who became Chief of Staff after Schlieffen retired.

Moltke went on to devise Aufmarsch II Ost, a variant on Schlieffen’s Aufmarsch Ost designed for an isolated Russo-German war. Schlieffen seemingly tried to impress upon Moltke that an offensive strategy against France could only work in the event of an isolated Franco-German war, as German forces would otherwise be too weak to implement it. Knowing this, Moltke still attempted to apply the offensive strategy of Aufmarsch I West to the two-front war Germany faced in 1914 and Schlieffen’s defensive plan Aufmarsch II West. With too few troops to cross west of Paris let alone attempt a crossing of the Seine, Moltke’s campaign failed to breach the French “second defensive sector” and his troops were pushed back in the Battle of the Marne.

Post-war writing by senior German officers like Hermann von
Kuhl, Gerhard Tappen, Wilhelm Groener, and official historians led by the former Lieutenant-Colonel Wolfgang Förster established a commonly accepted narrative that it was Moltke the Younger's failure to follow the blueprint rather than German strategic miscalculation that condemned the belligerents to four years of attrition warfare instead of the quick, decisive conflict it could have been.

Deployment of the Schlieffen Plan

At the outbreak of World War I, 80% of the German army was deployed as seven field armies in the west according to the plan Aufmarsch II West. However, they were then assigned to execute the retired deployment plan Aufmarsch I West, from the Schlieffen Plan. This would march German armies through northern Belgium and into France in an attempt to encircle the French army and breach the “second defensive area” of the fortresses of Verdun and Paris and the Marne river.

Aufmarsch I West was one of four deployment plans available to the German General Staff in 1914. Each favored certain operations but did not specify exactly how those operations would be carried out, leaving the commanding officers to do so at their own initiative with minimal oversight. Aufmarsch I West, designed for a one-front war with France, was retired once it became clear it was irrelevant to the wars Germany could expect to face. Both Russia and Britain were expected to help France with no possibility of assistance from Italian or Austro-Hungarian troops. But despite its unsuitability and the availability of more sensible and decisive options, it retained a certain allure due to its offensive nature and the pessimism of pre-war thinking, which expected offensive operations to be short-lived, costly in casualties, and unlikely to be decisive. Accordingly, the Aufmarsch II West deployment was changed for the offensive of 1914, despite its unrealistic goals and the insufficient forces Germany
had available for decisive success. Moltke took Schlieffen’s plan and modified the deployment of forces on the western front by reducing the right wing, the one to advance through Belgium, from 85% to 70%. In the end, the Schlieffen plan was so radically modified by Moltke that it could be more properly called the Moltke Plan.

Germany attacked Luxembourg on August 2 and on August 3 declared war on France. On August 4, after Belgium refused to permit German troops to cross its borders into France, Germany declared war on Belgium as well. Britain declared war on Germany on the same day following an “unsatisfactory reply” to the British ultimatum that Belgium must be kept neutral.

In the end, Germany failed to avoid a long, two-front war, but had fought its way into a good defensive position inside France and effectively halved France’s supply of coal. It had also killed or permanently crippled 230,000 more French and British troops than it itself had lost. Despite this, communications problems and questionable command decisions cost Germany the chance of a more decisive outcome.
Attributions

- The Schlieffen Plan
139. Early Battles

29.3.3: Early Battles

Following the outbreak of war in August 1914, the German Army opened the Western Front by invading Luxembourg and Belgium, but were forced back with the Battle of the Marne.

Learning Objective

Summarize the general trends of the early battles of World War I

Key Points

- The Western Front was the main theatre of war during World War I.
- Following the outbreak of war in August 1914, the German Army opened the Western Front by invading Luxembourg and Belgium, then gained military control of important industrial regions in France.
- These early German offensives include the Battle of Liège and the Battle of the Frontiers at the border of France.
• The tide of the advance was dramatically turned with the Battle of the Marne, in which French and British troops were able to force a German retreat by exploiting a gap between the 1st and 2nd Armies, ending the German advance into France.

• The resulting “Race to the Sea” had both sides establishing a meandering line of fortified trenches stretching from the North Sea to the Swiss frontier with France in an attempt to outflank the opposition.

• This line remained essentially unchanged for most of the war.

Key Terms

Battle of the Frontiers

A series of battles along the eastern frontier of France and in southern Belgium shortly after the outbreak of World War I. The battles resolved the military strategies of the French Chief of Staff General Joseph Joffre with Plan XVII and an offensive interpretation of the German Aufmarsch II deployment plan by Helmuth von Moltke the Younger. The Franco-British forces were driven back by the Germans, who were able to invade northern France. French and British rearguard actions delayed the German advance and thus allowed the French time to transfer their forces to the west to defend Paris, resulting in the First Battle of the Marne.
First Battle of the Marne

Also known as the Miracle of the Marne, this World War I battle fought in September 1914 resulted in an Allied victory against the German Army. The battle was the culmination of the German advance into France and pursuit of the Allied armies that followed the Battle of the Frontiers in August and reached the eastern outskirts of Paris. A counter-attack by six French field armies and the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) along the Marne River forced the Imperial German Army to retreat northwest, leading to the Battle of the Aisne and the “Race to the Sea.” The battle was a victory for the Allies, but also set the stage for four years of trench warfare stalemate on the Western Front.

Siege of Liège

The opening engagement of the German invasion of Belgium and the first battle of World War I. The attack on Liège city began on August 5, 1914, and lasted until August 16 when the last fort surrendered. The length of the siege of Liège may have delayed the German invasion of France by 4–5 days.

Battle of Liège

At the outbreak of the First World War, the German Army (consisting in the west of seven field armies) executed a modified version of the Schlieffen Plan, designed to quickly attack France through neutral Belgium before turning southwards to encircle the French Army on the German border. Belgium’s neutrality was guaranteed by Britain
under the 1839 Treaty of London; this caused Britain to join the war at the expiration of its ultimatum at 11 p.m. GMT on August 4, 1914, when armies under German generals Alexander von Kluck and Karl von Bülow attacked Belgium. Luxembourg had been occupied without opposition on August 2. The first battle in Belgium was the Siege of Liège, which lasted from August 5-16. Liège was well-fortified and surprised the German Army under von Bülow with its level of resistance. Nonetheless, German heavy artillery was able to demolish the main forts within a few days. Following the fall of Liège, most of the Belgian field army retreated to Antwerp, leaving the garrison of Namur isolated, with the Belgian capital, Brussels, falling to the Germans on August 20. Although the German army bypassed Antwerp, it remained a threat to their flank. Another siege followed at Namur, lasting from about August 20-23.

For their part, the French had five armies deployed on their borders. The pre-war French offensive plan, Plan XVII, intended to capture Alsace-Lorraine following the outbreak of hostilities. On August 7 the VII Corps attacked Alsace with the objective to capture Mulhouse and Colmar. The main offensive was launched on August 14 with 1st and 2nd Armies attacking toward Sarrebourg-Morhange in Lorraine. In keeping with the Schlieffen Plan, the Germans withdrew slowly while inflicting severe losses upon the French. The French advanced the 3rd and 4th Armies toward the Saar River and attempted to capture Saarburg, attacking Briey and Neufchateau, before being driven back. The French VII Corps captured Mulhouse after a brief engagement on August 7, but German reserve forces engaged them in the Battle of Mulhouse and forced a French retreat.

**Battle of the Frontiers**

The German Army swept through Belgium, executing civilians and razing villages. The application of “collective responsibility” against a civilian population further galvanized the allies, and newspapers
condemned the German invasion and the army’s violence against civilians and property, together called the “Rape of Belgium.” After marching through Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Ardennes, the German Army advanced in the latter half of August into northern France, where they met the French Army under Joseph Joffre and the initial six divisions of the British Expeditionary Force under Sir John French. A series of engagements known as the Battle of the Frontiers ensued, which included the Battle of Charleroi and the Battle of Mons. In the former battle the French Fifth Army was almost destroyed by the German 2nd and 3rd Armies and the latter delayed the German advance by a day. A general Allied retreat followed, resulting in more clashes at the Battle of Le Cateau, the Siege of Maubeuge, and the Battle of St. Quentin (also called the First Battle of Guise).

First Battle of the Marne

The German Army came within 43 miles of Paris but at the First Battle of the Marne (September 6-12), French and British troops were able to force a German retreat by exploiting a gap that appeared between the 1st and 2nd Armies, ending the German advance into France. The German Army retreated north of the Aisne River, establishing the beginnings of a static western front that would last for the next three years. Following this German retirement, the opposing forces made reciprocal outflanking maneuvers known as the Race for the Sea and quickly extended their trench systems from the Swiss frontier to the North Sea. The territory occupied by Germany held 64 percent of French pig-iron production, 24 percent of its steel manufacturing, and 40 percent of the coal industry, dealing a serious blow to French industry.
Laying Trenches and the First Battle of Ypres

On the Entente side (those countries opposing the German alliance), the final lines were occupied by the armies of the Allied countries, with each nation defending a part of the front. From the coast in the north, the primary forces were from Belgium, the British Empire, and France. Following the Battle of the Yser in October, the Belgian army controlled a 22-mile length of West Flanders along the coast known as the Yser Front, along the Yser river and the Yperlee canal from Nieuwpoort to Boesinghe. Stationed to the south was the sector of the British Expeditionary Force (BEF).

From October 19 until November 22, the German forces made their final breakthrough attempt of 1914 during the First Battle of Ypres. Heavy casualties were suffered on both sides but no breakthrough occurred. After the battle, Erich von Falkenhayn judged that it was no longer possible for Germany to win the war and on November 18 called for a diplomatic solution, but Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, Paul von Hindenburg and Erich Ludendorff disagreed.
Stabilization of the Western Front WWI: Map of the Western Front and the Race to the Sea, 1914

Attributions  
After the German march on Paris was halted at the First Battle of the Marne, both sides dug in along a meandering line of fortified trenches stretching from the North Sea to the Swiss frontier with France. The Western Front settled into a battle of attrition, with a trench line that changed little until 1917.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze why trench warfare became such a defining feature of World War I

**Key Points**

- Trench warfare is a type of land warfare with occupied fighting lines consisting largely of trenches in which troops are significantly protected from the enemy's small arms fire and sheltered from artillery. The most famous use of trench warfare is the Western Front in World War I.
- Trench warfare occurs when a revolution in
firepower is not matched by similar advances in mobility, as in the first two decades of the 20th century when advances allowed the creation of strong defensive systems that out-of-date military tactics could not break through for most of the war.

- Barbed wire was a significant hindrance to massed infantry advances. Artillery vastly more lethal than in the 1870s, coupled with machine guns, made crossing open ground extremely difficult.
- Commanders on both sides failed to develop tactics for breaching entrenched positions without heavy casualties, resulting in such major battles as the Battle of the Somme, which cost the British Army some 420,000 casualties, the French an estimated 200,000 casualties, and the Germans an estimated 500,000.
- In time, however, technology began to produce new offensive weapons, such as gas warfare and the tank, but it was only after the adoption of improved tactics that some degree of mobility was restored.

Key Terms

**Race to the Sea**

The term described reciprocal attempts by the Franco-British and German armies to envelop the northern flank of the opposing army through Picardy, Artois, and Flanders, rather than an attempt to advance.
northwards to the sea. The “race” ended on the North Sea coast of Belgium around October 19, when the last open area from Dixmude to the North Sea was occupied by Belgian troops who had been withdrawn from the Siege of Antwerp (September 28 – October 10). The outflanking attempts resulted in a number of encounter battles, but neither side was able to gain a decisive victory.

**Battle of the Somme**

A battle of the First World War fought by the armies of the British and French empires against the German Empire. It took place between July 1 and November 18, 1916, on both sides of the upper reaches of the River Somme in France. The battle was intended to hasten a victory for the Allies and was the largest battle of the First World War on the Western Front. More than one million were wounded or killed, making it one of the bloodiest battles in human history.

**Trench warfare**

A type of land warfare using occupied fighting lines consisting largely of trenches, in which troops are significantly protected from the enemy's small arms fire and sheltered from artillery.

---

**Trench Warfare in World War I**

Trench warfare occurs when a revolution in firepower is not matched by similar advances in mobility, resulting in a grueling form of warfare in which the defender holds the advantage. Military
tactics developed before World War I failed to keep pace with advances in technology and became obsolete. These advances had allowed the creation of strong defensive systems, which out-of-date military tactics could not break through for most of the war. Barbed wire was a significant hindrance to massed infantry advances, while artillery vastly more lethal than in the 1870s, coupled with machine guns, made crossing open ground extremely difficult. Commanders on both sides failed to develop tactics for breaching entrenched positions without heavy casualties. In time, however, technology began to produce new offensive weapons, such as gas warfare and the tank.

On the Western Front in 1914–18, both sides constructed elaborate trench and dugout systems opposing each other along a front, protected from assault by barbed wire, mines, and other obstacles. The area between opposing trench lines (known as “no man’s land”) was fully exposed to artillery fire from both sides. Attacks, even if successful, often sustained severe casualties.

Just after the First Battle of the Marne (September 5-12, 1914), Entente and German forces repeatedly attempted maneuvering to the north in an effort to outflank each other, a strategy that became known as the “Race to the Sea.” When these outflanking efforts failed, the opposing forces soon found themselves facing an uninterrupted line of entrenched positions from Lorraine to Belgium’s coast Britain. France sought to take the offensive while Germany defended the occupied territories. Consequently, German trenches were much better constructed than those of their enemy; Anglo-French trenches were only intended to be “temporary” before their forces broke through the German defenses.

Trench warfare prevailed on the Western Front from late 1914 until the Germans launched their Spring Offensive on March 21, 1918. After the buildup of forces in 1915, the Western Front became a stalemated struggle between equals to be decided by attrition. The small, improvised trenches of the first few months grew deeper and more complex, gradually becoming vast areas of interlocking defensive works. They resisted both artillery bombardment and
mass infantry assault. Shell-proof dugouts became a high priority. Frontal assaults and their associated casualties became inevitable because the continuous trench lines had no open flanks. Casualties of the defenders matched those of the attackers, as vast reserves were expended in costly counter-attacks or exposed to the attacker's massed artillery. There were periods in which rigid trench warfare broke down, such as during the Battle of the Somme, but the lines never moved very far. The war would be won by the side able to commit the last reserves to the Western Front.

Neither side delivered a decisive blow for the next two years. Throughout 1915–17, the British Empire and France suffered more casualties than Germany because of the strategic and tactical stances chosen by the sides. Strategically, while the Germans only mounted one major offensive, the Allies made several attempts to break through the German lines.

In February 1916 the Germans attacked the French defensive positions at Verdun. Lasting until December 1916, the battle saw initial German gains before French counter-attacks returned them near their starting point. Casualties were greater for the French, but the Germans bled heavily as well, with anywhere from 700,000 to 975,000 casualties suffered between the two combatants. Verdun became a symbol of French determination and self-sacrifice.

The Battle of the Somme was an Anglo-French offensive of July to November 1916. The opening of this offensive (July 1, 1916) saw the British Army endure the bloodiest day in its history, suffering 57,470 casualties, including 19,240 dead, on the first day alone. The entire Somme offensive cost the British Army some 420,000 casualties. The French suffered another estimated 200,000 casualties and the Germans an estimated 500,000.

The last large-scale offensive of this period was a British attack (with French support) at Passchendaele (July–November 1917). This offensive opened with great promise for the Allies before bogging down in the October mud. Casualties, though disputed, were roughly equal at some 200,000–400,000 per side.

These years of trench warfare in the West saw no major
exchanges of territory and, as a result, are often thought of as static and unchanging. However, throughout this period, British, French, and German tactics constantly evolved to meet new battlefield challenges.

Trench Warfare: Trenches of the 11th Cheshire Regiment at Ovillers-la-Boisselle, on the Somme, July 1916. One sentry keeps watch while the others sleep. Photo by Ernest Brooks.

Development of Advanced Weaponry Both sides tried to break the trench stalemate using scientific and technological advances. On April 22, 1915, at the Second Battle of Ypres, the Germans (violating the Hague Convention) used chlorine gas for the first time on the Western Front. After a two-day bombardment, the Germans released a cloud of 171 tons of chlorine
gas onto the battlefield. Though primarily a powerful irritant, it can asphyxiate in high concentrations or prolonged exposure. The gas crept across no man’s land and drifted into the French trenches. The green-yellow cloud killed some defenders and those in the rear fled in panic, creating an undefended 3.7 mile gap in the Allied line. The Germans were unprepared for the level of their success and lacked sufficient reserves to exploit the opening. Canadian troops on the right drew back their left flank and repelled the German advance. The success of this attack would not be repeated, as the Allies countered by introducing gas masks and other countermeasures. The British retaliated, developing their own chlorine gas and using it at the Battle of Loos in September 1915. Fickle winds and inexperience led to more British casualties from the gas than German. Several types of gas soon became widely used by both sides, and though it never proved a decisive, battle-winning weapon, poison gas became one of the most-feared and best-remembered horrors of the war. French, British, and German forces all escalated the use of gas attacks through the rest of the war, developing the more deadly phosgene gas in 1915, then the infamous mustard gas in 1917, which could linger for days and kill slowly and
painfully. Countermeasures also improved and the stalemate continued. Tanks were developed by Britain and France, and were first used in combat by the British during the Battle of Flers–Courcelette (part of the Battle of the Somme) on September 15, 1916, with only partial success. However, their effectiveness would grow as the war progressed; the Allies built tanks in large numbers, whilst the Germans employed only a few of their own design supplemented by captured Allied tanks. Attributions Trench Warfare “Trench Warfare.”
“Cheshire_Regiment_trench_Somme_1916.jpg.”
The American entry into World War I came in April 1917, after two and a half years of efforts by President Woodrow Wilson to keep the United States neutral.

Learning Objective

Explain why the United States entered WWI

Key Points

- After World War I began in 1914, the United States proclaimed a policy of strict neutrality, with President Wilson trying to broker peace.
- American public opinion was strongly divided, with most Americans until early 1917 supporting the United States staying out of the war.
• When the German U-boat U-20 sank the British liner *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, with 128 U.S. citizens aboard, Wilson demanded an end to attacks on passenger ships as they were in violation of international law and of human rights; Germany complied.

• Wilson came under pressure from war hawks led by former president Theodore Roosevelt, who denounced German acts as “piracy.” Public opinion, angry over the sinking of the *Lusitania*, began to sway in favor of entering the war.

• In January 1917, Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare against their 1915 agreement with the U.S.

• The German Foreign minister, Arthur Zimmermann, invited revolution-torn Mexico to join the war as Germany’s ally against the United States in the Zimmermann Telegram. This was intercepted by the British and given to the Americans, who saw it as a cause for war.

• The United States declared war on the German Empire on April 6, 1917, and immediately began sending troops to France.

---

**Key Terms**

**casus belli**

A Latin expression meaning “an act or event that
provokes or is used to justify war” (literally, “a case of war”). It involves direct offenses or threats against the nation declaring the war, whereas a casus foederis involves offenses or threats against its ally—usually one bound by a mutual defense pact. Either may be considered an act of war.

**Zimmermann Telegram**

A secret diplomatic communication issued from the German Foreign Office in January 1917 that proposed a military alliance between Germany and Mexico in the event of the United States entering World War I against Germany. The proposal was intercepted and decoded by British intelligence. Revelation of the contents enraged American public opinion, especially after the German Foreign Secretary Arthur Zimmermann publicly admitted the telegram was genuine on March 3, and helped generate support for the United States declaration of war on Germany in April.

**sinking of the Lusitania**

On May 7, 1915, during the First World War, as Germany waged submarine warfare against the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Lusitania was identified and torpedoed by the German U-boat U-20 and sank in 18 minutes. The vessel went down 11 miles off the Old Head of Kinsale, Ireland, killing 1,198 and leaving 761 survivors. The sinking turned public opinion in many countries against Germany, contributed to the American entry into World War I, and became an iconic symbol in military recruiting campaigns.
At the outbreak of World War I, the United States pursued a policy of non-intervention, avoiding conflict while trying to broker a peace. When the German U-boat U-20 sank the British liner RMS *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, with 128 Americans among the dead, President Woodrow Wilson insisted that “America is too proud to fight” but demanded an end to attacks on passenger ships. Germany complied, and Wilson unsuccessfully tried to mediate a settlement. However, he also repeatedly warned that the United States would not tolerate unrestricted submarine warfare, which was in violation of international law. Former president Theodore Roosevelt denounced German acts as “piracy.” Wilson was narrowly reelected in 1916 as his supporters emphasized “he kept us out of war.”

American public opinion was divided, with most before early 1917 strongly of the opinion that the United States should stay out of the war. Opinion changed gradually, partly in response to German actions in Belgium and the sinking of the *Lusitania*, partly as German Americans lost influence, and partly in response to Wilson’s position that America had to play a role in making the world safe for democracy.

The general public showed little support for entering the war on the side of Germany. The great majority of German Americans and Scandinavian Americans, wanted the United States to remain neutral; however, at the outbreak of war, thousands of U.S. citizens tried to enlist in the German army. The Irish Catholic community, based in the large cities and often in control of the Democratic Party apparatus, was strongly hostile to helping Britain in any way, especially after the Easter uprising of 1916 in Ireland. Most Protestant church leaders in the United States, regardless of their theology, favored pacificistic solutions. Most of the leaders of the women’s movement, typified by Jane Addams, likewise sought brokerage of peace. The most prominent opponent of war was industrialist Henry Ford, who personally financed and led a peace
ship to Europe to try to negotiate among the belligerents; no negotiations resulted.

Sinking of the Lusitania: A 1915 painting of the sinking of the passenger ship Lusitania, an event which shifted American public opinion toward entering WWI and became a symbol for the fight against Germany.

The Zimmermann Telegram and Declaration of War

In January 1917, Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare, realizing it would mean American entry. The German Foreign Minister, in the Zimmermann Telegram, invited Mexico to join the war as Germany’s ally against the United States. In return, the Germans would finance Mexico’s war and help it recover the territories of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. The United Kingdom intercepted the message and presented it to the U.S. embassy in the UK. From there it made its way to President Wilson, who released it to the public. Americans considered the Zimmermann Telegram casus belli.
Popular sentiment in the United States at that time was anti-Mexican as well as anti-German, while in Mexico there was considerable anti-American sentiment. General John J. Pershing had long been chasing the revolutionary Pancho Villa and carried out several cross-border raids. News of the telegram further inflamed tensions between the United States and Mexico.

Wilson asked Congress for “a war to end all wars” that would “make the world safe for democracy” and eliminate militarism from the globe. He argued that the war was important and the U.S. thus must have a voice in the peace conference. After the sinking of seven U.S. merchant ships by submarines and the publication of the Zimmermann telegram, Wilson called for war on Germany, which the U.S. Congress declared on April 6, 1917.

The United States was never formally a member of the Allies but became a self-styled “Associated Power.” It initially had a small army, but after the passage of the Selective Service Act drafted 2.8 million men, and by summer 1918 was sending 10,000 fresh soldiers to France every day. In 1917, the U.S. Congress gave citizenship to Puerto Ricans drafted to participate in World War I as part of the Jones Act. If Germany believed it would be many more months before American soldiers would arrive and that their arrival could be stopped by U-boats, it had miscalculated.

The United States Navy sent a battleship group to Scapa Flow to join the British Grand Fleet, destroyers to Queenstown, Ireland, and submarines to help guard convoys. Several regiments of U.S. Marines were also dispatched to France. The British and French wanted American units to reinforce their troops already on the battle lines and not waste scarce shipping on supplies. General John J. Pershing, American Expeditionary Forces (AEF) commander, refused to break up American units to be used as filler material. As an exception, he did allow African-American combat regiments to be used in French divisions. The Harlem Hellfighters fought as part of the French 16th Division and earned a unit Croix de Guerre for their actions at Château-Thierry, Belleau Wood, and Sechault. AEF doctrine called for the use of frontal assaults, which had long since
been discarded by British Empire and French commanders due to the large loss of life that resulted.

America Enters WWI: President Wilson before Congress, announcing the break in official relations with the German Empire on February 3, 1917. Two months later, the U.S. declared war on Germany.

Attributions

• American Entry into WWI
  ◦ “American entry into World War I.”
Zimmermann Telegram. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk

The Russian government collapsed in March 1917. The subsequent October Revolution followed by a further military defeat brought the Russians to terms with the Central Powers via the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which granted the Germans a significant victory and resulted in Russia exiting the war and breaking ties with the Allied Powers.

Learning Objective

State the consequences of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk

Key Points

- In March 1917, demonstrations in Russia culminated in the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II and the appointment of a weak provisional government that shared power with the Petrograd Soviet socialists.
- This arrangement led to confusion and chaos both
at the front and at home, with the Russian army becoming increasingly ineffective.

• Discontent and the weaknesses of the provisional government led to a rise in the popularity of the Bolshevik Party led by Vladimir Lenin, which demanded an immediate end to the war.

• The October Revolution, which put the Bolsheviks into power, was followed in December by an armistice and negotiations with Germany.

• At first, the Bolsheviks refused the German terms, but when German troops began marching across Ukraine unopposed, the new government acceded to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on March 3, 1918.

• The treaty ceded vast territories, including Finland, the Baltic provinces, parts of Poland, and Ukraine, to the Central Powers.

• The treaty was effectively terminated in November 1918 when Germany surrendered to the Allies.

Key Terms

**Eastern Front of World War I**

A theater of operations that encompassed at its greatest extent the entire frontier between the Russian Empire and Romania on one side and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Bulgaria, the Ottoman Empire, and the German Empire on the other. It stretched from the Baltic Sea in the north to the Black Sea in the south,
included most of Eastern Europe, and stretched deep into Central Europe as well. The term contrasts with “Western Front,” which was fought in Belgium and France.

**October Revolution**
A seizure of state power instrumental in the larger Russian Revolution of 1917. It took place with an armed insurrection in Petrograd on October 25, 1917, and followed and capitalized on the February Revolution of the same year, which overthrew the Tsarist autocracy and resulted in a provisional government. During this time, urban workers began to organize into councils (Russian: soviet) wherein revolutionaries criticized the provisional government and its actions. This uprising overthrew the provisional government and gave the power to the local soviets.

**Russian Civil War**
A multi-party war in the former Russian Empire immediately after the Russian Revolutions of 1917, as many factions vied to determine Russia's political future. The two largest combatant groups were the Red Army, fighting for the Bolshevik form of socialism, and the loosely allied forces known as the White Army, which included diverse interests favoring monarchism, capitalism, and alternative forms of socialism, each with democratic and antidemocratic variants. In addition, rival militant socialists and non-ideological Green armies fought against both the Bolsheviks and the Whites. The Red Army defeated the White Armed Forces of South Russia in Ukraine and the army led by Admiral Aleksandr Kolchak in Siberia in 1919. The remains of the White forces commanded by Pyotr...
Nikolayevich Wrangel were beaten in Crimea and evacuated in late 1920. Lesser battles continued on the periphery for two more years, and minor skirmishes with the remnants of the White forces in the Far East continued well into 1923.

**Treaty of Brest-Litovsk**

A peace treaty signed on March 3, 1918, between the new Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire), that ended Russia’s participation in World War I.

The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was a peace treaty signed on March 3, 1918, between the new Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire), that ended Russia’s participation in World War I. The treaty was signed at Brest-Litovsk after two months of negotiations and was forced on the Bolshevik government by the threat of further advances by German and Austrian forces. According to the treaty, Soviet Russia defaulted on all of Imperial Russia’s commitments to the Triple Entente alliance.

The treaty was effectively terminated in November 1918 when Germany surrendered to the Allies. However, in the meantime it provided some relief to the Bolsheviks, already fighting the Russian Civil War, by the renouncement of Russia’s claims on Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, and Lithuania.

**Background**

By 1917, Germany and Imperial Russia were in a stalemate on the
Eastern Front of World War I. At the time, the Russian economy nearly collapsed under the strain of the war effort. The large numbers of war casualties and persistent food shortages in the major urban centers brought about civil unrest, known as the February Revolution, that forced Tsar Nicholas II to abdicate. The Russian provisional government that replaced the Tsar (initially presided by prince Georgy Lvov, later by Alexander Kerensky), decided to continue the war on the Entente side. Foreign Minister Pavel Milyukov sent the Entente Powers a telegram, known as the Milyukov note, affirming that the provisional government would continue the war with the same aims as Imperial Russia.

The pro-war provisional government was opposed by the self-proclaimed Petrograd Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, dominated by leftist parties. Its Order No. 1 called for an overriding mandate to soldier committees rather than army officers. The Soviet started to form its own paramilitary power, the Red Guards, in March 1917.

The position of the provisional government led the Germans to offer support to the Russian opposition, the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in particular, who were proponents of Russia’s withdrawal from the war. In April 1917, Germany allowed Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin to return to Russia from his exile in Switzerland and offered him financial help. Upon his arrival in Petrograd, Lenin proclaimed his April Theses, which included a call to turn all political power over to workers’ and soldiers’ soviets (councils) and an immediate withdrawal of Russia from the war. Throughout 1917, Bolsheviks spread defeatist and revolutionary propaganda calling for the overthrow of the provisional government and an end to the war. Following the disastrous failure of the Kerensky Offensive, discipline in the Russian army deteriorated completely. Soldiers would disobey orders, often under the influence of Bolshevik agitation, and allowed soldiers’ committees to take control of their units after deposing the officers. Russian and German soldiers occasionally left their positions and fraternized.

The defeat and ongoing hardships of war led to anti-government
riots in Petrograd headed by the Bolsheviks, the “July Days” of 1917. Several months later on November 7, Red Guards seized the Winter Palace and arrested the provisional government in what is known as the October Revolution.

The newly established Soviet government decided to end Russia’s participation in the war with Germany and its allies. On October 26, 1917, Vladimir Lenin signed the Decree on Peace, which was approved by the Second Congress of the Soviet of Workers’, Soldiers’, and Peasants’ Deputies. The Decree called “upon all the belligerent nations and their governments to start immediate negotiations for peace” and proposed an immediate withdrawal of Russia from World War I. Leon Trotsky was appointed Commissar of Foreign Affairs in the new Bolshevik government. In preparation for peace talks with the representatives of the German government and other Central Powers, Leon Trotsky appointed his good friend Adolph Joffe to represent the Bolsheviks at the peace conference.

Terms of the Treaty and its Effects

On December 15, 1917, an armistice between Soviet Russia and the Central Powers was concluded and fighting stopped. On December 22, peace negotiations began at Brest-Litovsk. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed on March 3, 1918. The signatories were Bolshevik Russia signed by Grigori Yakovlovich Sokolnikov on the one side and the German Empire, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Ottoman Empire on the other. The treaty marked Russia’s final withdrawal from World War I as an enemy of her co-signatories, on unexpectedly humiliating terms.
Treaty of Brest-Litovsk: A photo of the signing of armistice between Russia and Germany on March 3, 1918. The treaty marked Russia’s final withdrawal from World War I and resulted in Russia losing major territorial holdings.

In the treaty, Bolshevik Russia ceded the Baltic States to Germany; they were meant to become German vassal states under German princelings. Russia ceded its province of Kars Oblast in the South Caucasus to the Ottoman Empire and recognized the independence of Ukraine. Further, Russia agreed to pay six billion German gold marks in reparations. Historian Spencer Tucker says, “The German General Staff had formulated extraordinarily harsh terms that shocked even the German negotiator.” Congress Poland was not mentioned in the treaty, as Germans refused to recognize the existence of any Polish representatives, which in turn led to Polish protests. When Germans later complained that the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 was too harsh, the Allies (and historians favorable to the Allies) responded that it was more benign than Brest-Litovsk.

With the adoption of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the Entente no longer existed. Despite this enormous apparent German success, the manpower required for German occupation of former Russian territory may have contributed to the failure of the Spring Offensive.
and secured relatively little food or other material for the Central Powers war effort. The Allied powers led a small-scale invasion of Russia, partly to stop Germany from exploiting Russian resources, and to a lesser extent, to support the “Whites” (as opposed to the “Reds”) in the Russian Civil War. Allied troops landed in Arkhangelsk and in Vladivostok as part of the North Russia Intervention.

The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk lasted just over eight months. Germany renounced the treaty and broke diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia on November 5. The Ottoman Empire broke the treaty after just two months by invading the newly created First Republic of Armenia in May 1918. In the Armistice of November 11, 1918, that ended World War I, one of the first conditions was the complete abrogation of the Brest-Litovsk treaty. Following the German capitulation, the Bolshevik legislature annulled the treaty on November 13, 1918. In the year after the armistice, the German Army withdrew its occupying forces from the lands gained in Brest-Litovsk, leaving behind a power vacuum that various forces subsequently attempted to fill. In the Treaty of Rapallo, concluded in April 1922, Germany accepted the Treaty's nullification, and the two powers agreed to abandon all war-related territorial and financial claims against each other.

The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk marked a significant contraction of the territory controlled by the Bolsheviks or that they could lay claim to as effective successors of the Russian Empire. While the independence of Finland and Poland was already accepted in principle, the loss of Ukraine and the Baltics created, from the Bolshevik perspective, dangerous bases of anti-Bolshevik military activity in the subsequent Russian Civil War (1918–1922). Indeed, many Russian nationalists and some revolutionaries were furious at the Bolsheviks’ acceptance of the treaty and joined forces to fight them. Non-Russians who inhabited the lands lost by Bolshevik Russia in the treaty saw the changes as an opportunity to set up independent states not under Bolshevik rule. Immediately after the signing of the treaty, Lenin moved the Soviet Russian government from Petrograd to Moscow.
The fate of the region and the location of the eventual western border of the Soviet Union was settled in violent and chaotic struggles over the course of the next three-and-a-half years.

Attributions

- The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk
Soon after the outbreak of hostilities, Britain began a naval blockade of Germany. This strategy proved effective, cutting off vital military and civilian supplies and helping the Allies to eventually win the war.

**Learning Objective**

Evaluate the effectiveness of the British Naval Blockade

**Key Points**

- Naval warfare in World War I was mainly characterized by the efforts of the Allied Powers, with their larger fleets and surrounding position, to blockade the Central Powers by sea. The Central Powers used submarines and radars to try to break that blockade or establish their own blockade of the United Kingdom and France.
- Shortly after the outbreak of the war, the British
navy, the largest and most powerful in the world at that time, began a naval blockade of Germany, cutting off vital military and civilian supplies.

- Britain mined international waters to prevent any ships from entering entire sections of ocean, causing danger to even neutral ships.
- The German Board of Public Health in December 1918 claimed that 763,000 German civilians died from starvation and disease caused by the blockade through December 1918.
- The blockade also had a detrimental effect on the U.S. economy and the U.S. government protested the blockade vigorously.
- It is considered one of the key elements in the eventual Allied victory in the war, although historians have argued about its importance.

**Key Terms**

**German Revolution of 1918–19**

Civil conflict in the German Empire at the end of the First World War resulted in the replacement of Germany’s Imperial government with a republic. The revolutionary period lasted from November 1918 until the establishment in August 1919 of a republic that later became known as the Weimar Republic.
Blockade of Germany

A prolonged naval operation conducted by the Allied Powers, especially Great Britain, during and after World War I to restrict the maritime supply of goods to the Central Powers, which included Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey.

The Blockade of Germany, or the Blockade of Europe, occurred from 1914 to 1919. It was a prolonged naval operation conducted by the Allied Powers, especially Great Britain, during and after World War I to restrict the maritime supply of goods to the Central Powers, which included Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey. It is considered one of the key elements in the eventual Allied victory in the war. The German Board of Public Health claimed that 763,000 German civilians died from starvation and disease caused by the blockade through December 1918. An academic study done in 1928 put the death toll at 424,000.

Both the German Empire and the United Kingdom relied heavily on imports to feed their population and supply their war industry. Imports of foodstuffs and war material of all European belligerents came primarily from the Americas and had to be shipped across the Atlantic Ocean, so Britain and Germany both aimed to blockade each other. The British had the Royal Navy, which was superior in numbers and could operate throughout the British Empire, while the German Kaiserliche Marine surface fleet was mainly restricted to the German Bight and used commerce raiders and unrestricted submarine warfare to operate elsewhere.

The British—with their overwhelming sea power—established a naval blockade of Germany immediately on the outbreak of war in August 1914, issuing a comprehensive list of contraband that all but prohibited American trade with the Central powers. In early November 1914 they declared the North Sea a war zone, with any
ships entering at their own risk. The blockade was unusually restrictive in that even foodstuffs were considered “contraband of war.” There were complaints about breaches of international law; however, most neutral merchant vessels agreed to dock at British ports to be inspected and then escorted—less any “illegal” cargo destined for Germany—through the British minefields to their destinations.

Did the Blockade Win the War?

The first official accounts of the blockade, written by Professor A. C. Bell and Brigadier-General Sir James E. Edmonds, differed in their accounts of its effects upon German food supplies. Bell—who employed German data—argued that the blockade led to revolutionary uprisings in Germany and caused the collapse of the Kaiser’s administration. Edmonds, supported by Colonel Irwin L. Hunt (who was in charge of civil affairs in the American occupied zone of the Rhineland), held that food shortages were a post-armistice phenomenon caused solely by the disruptions of the German Revolution of 1918–19.

More recent studies also disagree on the severity of the blockade’s impact on the affected populations at the time of the revolution and the armistice. Some hold that the blockade starved Germany and the Central Powers into defeat in 1918, but others maintain that while the German population did indeed go hungry as a result of the blockade, Germany’s rationing system kept all but a few from actually starving to death. German success against the Russians on the Eastern Front culminating in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk gave Germany access to the resources of Poland and other eastern territories, which did much to counter the effects of the blockade. The armistice on November 11 was forced by events on the Western Front rather than any actions of the civilian population. Germany’s largest ally, Austria-Hungary, had already signed an
armistice on November 3, exposing Germany to an invasion from the south.

Nevertheless, it is accepted that the blockade made a large contribution to the outcome of the war; by 1915, Germany’s imports had already fallen by 55% from their prewar levels and the exports were 53% of what they were in 1914. Apart from leading to shortages in vital raw materials such as coal and metals, the blockade also deprived Germany of supplies of fertilizer that were vital to agriculture. This latter led to staples such as grain, potatoes, meat, and dairy products becoming so scarce by the end of 1916 that many people were obliged to instead consume ersatz products including Kriegsbrot (“war bread”) and powdered milk. The food shortages caused looting and riots not only in Germany, but also in Vienna and Budapest. Austria-Hungary even hijacked ships on the Danube that were meant to deliver food to Germany.

The German government made strong attempts to counter the effects of the blockade; the Hindenburg Programme of German economic mobilization launched in August 1916 was designed to raise productivity by the compulsory employment of all men between the ages of 17 and 60. A complicated rationing system introduced in January 1915 aimed to ensure that a minimum nutritional need was met, with “war kitchens” providing cheap mass meals to impoverished civilians in larger cities. All these schemes enjoyed only limited success, and the average daily diet of 1,000 calories was insufficient to maintain a good standard of health, resulting by 1917 in widespread disorders caused by malnutrition such as scurvy, tuberculosis, and dysentery.

The blockade also had a detrimental effect on the U.S. economy. Under pressure especially from commercial interests wishing to profit from wartime trade with both sides, the U.S. government protested vigorously. Britain did not wish to antagonize the U.S., but cutting off trade to the enemy seemed a more pressing goal. Eventually, Germany’s submarine campaign and the subsequent sinking of the RMS Lusitania and other civilian vessels with
Americans on board did far more to antagonize U.S. opinion than the blockade had.

The British Naval Blockade
29.4.4: The Hundred Days Offensive

The Hundred Days Offensive was the final period of World War I, during which the Allies launched a series of offensive attacks against the Central Powers that pushed the Germans out of France and led to their defeat.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the events of the Hundred Days Offensive and how they led to the end of the war

**Key Points**

- After a stunning German offensive along the Western Front in the spring of 1918, the Allies rallied and drove back the Germans in a series of successful offensives, known collectively as the Hundred Days Offensives.
- The Hundred Days Offensives began with the Battle
of Amiens in August 1918, with an attack by more than 10 Allied divisions—Australian, Canadian, British and French forces—with more than 500 tanks.

- Total German losses were estimated at 30,000 men, while the Allies suffered about 6,500 killed, wounded and missing; the resulting collapse in German morale led German General Erich Ludendorff to dub it “the Black Day of the German Army.”

- The allies continued offensives on several points on the Western Front, eventually forcing the Germans behind the Hindenburg Line, which had been a stable defensive line for the Germans.

- With the military faltering and widespread loss of confidence in the Kaiser, Germany moved towards surrender.

- On November 4, 1918, the Austro-Hungarian empire agreed to an armistice, and Germany, which had its own trouble with revolutionaries, agreed to an armistice on November 11, 1918, ending the war in victory for the Allies.

**Key Terms**

**Weimar Republic**

An unofficial historical designation for the German state between 1919 and 1933. The name derives from the city of Weimar, where its constitutional assembly first took place. In its 14 years, it faced numerous
problems, including hyperinflation, political extremism (with paramilitaries – both left- and right-wing); and contentious relationships with the victors of the First World War. Hitler's seizure of power brought the republic to an end; as democracy collapsed, a single-party state founded the Nazi era.

Hundred Days Offensive

The final period of the First World War, during which the Allies launched a series of offensives against the Central Powers on the Western Front from August 8 to November 11, 1918, beginning with the Battle of Amiens.

Hindenburg Line

A German defensive position of World War I, built during the winter of 1916–1917 on the Western Front from Arras to Laffaux, near Soissons on the Aisne. Construction of this position in France was begun by the Germans in September 1916, to make retirement from the Somme front possible and counter an anticipated increase in the power of Anglo-French attacks in 1917.

Spring Offensive

A series of German attacks along the Western Front during the First World War, beginning on March 21, 1918, that marked the deepest advances by either side since 1914. The Germans realized that their only remaining chance of victory was to defeat the Allies before the overwhelming human and matériel resources of the United States could be fully deployed. They also had the temporary advantage in numbers afforded by the nearly 50 divisions freed by the Russian surrender.
The Hundred Days Offensive was the final period of the First World War, during which the Allies launched a series of offensives against the Central Powers on the Western Front from August 8 to November 11, 1918, beginning with the Battle of Amiens. The offensive essentially pushed the Germans out of France, forcing them to retreat beyond the Hindenburg Line, and was followed by an armistice. The term “Hundred Days Offensive” does not refer to a specific battle or unified strategy, but rather the rapid series of Allied victories starting with the Battle of Amiens.

**Background**

The Spring Offensive of the German Army on the Western Front began in March 1918 with Operation Michael and had petered out by July. The Germans advanced to the river Marne but failed to achieve a decisive breakthrough. When Operation Marne-Rheims ended in July, the Allied supreme commander Ferdinand Foch, ordered a counter-offensive which became known as the Second Battle of the Marne. The Germans, recognizing their untenable position, withdrew from the Marne towards the north. For this victory, Foch was granted the title Marshal of France.

Foch thought the time had arrived for the Allies to return to the offensive. The American Expeditionary Force (AEF, General John J. Pershing), was present in France in large numbers and invigorated the Allied armies. Pershing was keen to use his army in an independent role. The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) had also been reinforced by large numbers of troops returned from the Sinai and Palestine Campaign and the Italian Front, as well as replacements held back in Britain by the Prime Minister, David Lloyd George.

A number of proposals were considered and finally, Foch agreed on a proposal by Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig, Commander-in-Chief (C-in-C) of the BEF, to strike on the River Somme, east of
Amiens and south-west of the site of the 1916 Battle of the Somme, with the intention of forcing the Germans away from the vital Amiens-Paris railway. The Somme was chosen as a suitable site for several reasons. As in 1916, it marked the boundary between the BEF and the French armies, in this case defined by the Amiens-Roye road, allowing the two armies to cooperate. Also, the Picardy countryside provided a good surface for tanks, which was not the case in Flanders. Finally, the German defenses, manned by the German 2nd Army (General Georg von der Marwitz), were relatively weak, having been subjected to continual raiding by the Australians in a process termed peaceful penetration.

**Final Battles of WWI**

The Hundred Days Offensive began on August 8, 1918, with the Battle of Amiens. The battle involved over 400 tanks and 120,000 British, Dominion, and French troops, and by the end of its first day a gap 15 miles long had been created in the German lines. The defenders displayed a marked collapse in morale, causing German General Erich Ludendorff to refer to this day as the “Black Day of the German army.” After an advance as far as 14 miles, German resistance stiffened, and the battle was concluded on August 12.

Rather than continuing the Amiens battle past the point of initial success, as had been done so many times in the past, the Allies shifted their attention elsewhere. Allied leaders had now realized that to continue an attack after resistance had hardened was a waste of lives, and it was better to turn a line than to try to roll over it. They began to undertake attacks in quick order to take advantage of successful advances on the flanks, then broke them off when the initial impetus was lost.

British and Dominion forces launched the next phase of the campaign with the Battle of Albert on August 21. The assault was widened by French and further British forces in the following days.
During the last week of August, the Allied pressure along a 68-mile front against the enemy was heavy and unrelenting. From German accounts, “Each day was spent in bloody fighting against an ever and again on-storming enemy, and nights passed without sleep in retirements to new lines.”

Faced with these advances, on September 2 the German Supreme Army Command issued orders to withdraw to the Hindenburg Line in the south.

September saw the Allies advance to the Hindenburg Line in the north and center. The Germans continued to fight strong rear-guard actions and launched numerous counterattacks on lost positions, but only a few succeeded, and those only temporarily. Contested towns, villages, heights, and trenches in the screening positions and outposts of the Hindenburg Line continued to fall to the Allies, with the BEF alone taking 30,441 prisoners in the last week of September. The Germans retreated to positions along or behind the Hindenburg Line.

In nearly four weeks of fighting beginning August 8, over 100,000 German prisoners were taken. The German High Command realized that the war was lost and made attempts to reach a satisfactory end. The day after that battle, Ludendorff said: “We cannot win the war any more, but we must not lose it either.”
The Hundred Days Offensive: September 1, 1918, Péronne (Somme). A machine gun position established by the Australian 54th Battalion during its attack on German forces in the town. The final assault on the Hindenburg Line began with the Meuse-Argonne Offensive, launched by French and American troops on September 27. The following week, cooperating French and American units broke through in Champagne at the Battle of Blanc Mont Ridge, forcing the Germans off the commanding heights and closing toward the Belgian frontier. On October 8, the line was pierced again by British and Dominion troops at the Battle of Cambrai. With the military faltering and widespread loss of confidence in the Kaiser, Germany moved towards surrender. Prince Maximilian of Baden took charge of a new government as Chancellor.
of Germany to negotiate with the Allies. Negotiations with President Wilson began immediately in the hope that he would offer better terms than the British and French. Wilson demanded a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary control over the German military. There was no resistance when the Social Democrat Philipp Scheidemann declared Germany a republic on November 9. The Kaiser, kings, and other hereditary rulers were removed from power and Wilhelm fled to exile in the Netherlands. Imperial Germany was dead; a new Germany had been born as the Weimar Republic. Soon after, the Germans signed the Armistice of Compiègne, which ended the fighting on the Western Front. It went into effect at 11 a.m. Paris time on November 11, 1918 (“the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month”), and marked a victory for the Allies and a complete defeat for Germany, although not formally a surrender. Although the armistice ended the actual fighting, it took six months of negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference to conclude the peace treaty, the Treaty of Versailles.
145. The Treaty of Versailles

29.5: The Treaty of Versailles

29.5.1: Diplomatic Goals at the Paris Peace Conference

The “Big Four” (United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy) made all the major decisions of the Paris Peace Conference, although they disagreed on several points.

Learning Objective

Identify the key goals of the parties present at the Paris Peace Conference

Key Points

- World War I was settled by the victors at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.
- Two dozen nations sent delegations and there were many nongovernmental groups, but the defeated
powers were not invited.

- The “Big Four,” who made all the major decisions, were President Woodrow Wilson of the United States, Prime Minister David Lloyd George of Great Britain, George Clemenceau of France, and of least importance, Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando.
- Each major power had its own agenda coming to the Conference and not every aim was represented in the final treaties.
- The Americans’ vision was set out in Wilson’s Fourteen Points, which emphasized free trade, self-determination, and the founding of a League of Nations to support territorial and political independence of member nations.
- British aims at the conference were focused on securing France, settling territorial disputes, and maintaining their colonial holdings.
- Having witnessed two German attacks on French soil in the last 40 years, France’s main concern was to ensure Germany would not be able to attack them again, so they pushed to weaken Germany militarily, strategically, and economically.
- Italy was motivated by gaining the territories promised by the Allies in the secret Treaty of London.
Key Terms

George Clemenceau
A French politician, physician, and journalist who served as Prime Minister of France during the First World War. A leader of the Radical Party, he played a central role in the politics of the French Third Republic. He was one of the principal architects of the Treaty of Versailles at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. Nicknamed “Père la Victoire” (Father Victory) or “Le Tigre” (The Tiger), he took a harsh position against defeated Germany, though not quite as much as the President Raymond Poincaré, and won agreement on Germany’s payment of large sums for reparations.

David Lloyd George
British Liberal politician and statesman. As Chancellor of the Exchequer (1908–1915), he was a key figure in the introduction of many reforms that laid the foundations of the modern welfare state. His most important role came as the highly energetic Prime Minister of the Wartime Coalition Government (1916–22), during and immediately after the First World War. He was a major player at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 that reordered Europe after the defeat of the Central Powers.

Woodrow Wilson
An American politician and academic who served as the 28th President of the United States from 1913 to 1921. Leading a Congress in Democratic hands, he oversaw the passage of progressive legislative policies
unparalleled until the New Deal in 1933. The Federal Reserve Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Clayton Antitrust Act, and Federal Farm Loan Act were some of these new policies. His second term was dominated by American entry into World War I.

**Vittorio Orlando**

An Italian statesman known for representing Italy in the 1919 Paris Peace Conference with his foreign minister Sidney Sonnino. He was also known as “Premier of Victory” for defeating the Central Powers along with the Entente in World War I. He was a member and president of the Constitutional Assembly that changed the Italian form of government into a republic.

---

**Paris Peace Conference**

The Paris Peace Conference, also known as Versailles Peace Conference, was the meeting of the Allied victors after the end of World War I to set the peace terms for the defeated Central Powers following the armistices of 1918. It took place in Paris during 1919 and involved diplomats from more than 32 countries and nationalities, including some non-governmental groups, but the defeated powers were not invited.

The “Big Four” were President Woodrow Wilson of the United States, Prime Minister David Lloyd George of Great Britain, George Clemenceau of France, and of least importance, Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando. They met informally 145 times and made all the major decisions, which in turn were ratified by the others.

The conference opened on January 18, 1919. This date was
symbolic, the anniversary of the proclamation of William I as German Emperor in 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles, shortly before the end of the Siege of Paris. This date was also imbued with significance in Germany as the anniversary of the establishment of the Kingdom of Prussia in 1701. Delegates from 27 nations were assigned to 52 commissions that held 1,646 sessions to prepare reports with the help of many experts on topics ranging from prisoners of war to undersea cables to international aviation to responsibility for the war. Key recommendations were folded into the Treaty of Versailles with Germany, which had 15 chapters and 440 clauses, as well as treaties for the other defeated nations.

The Big Four: “The Big Four” made all the major decisions at the Paris Peace Conference (from left to right, David Lloyd George of Britain, Vittorio Emanuele Orlando of Italy, Georges Clemenceau of France, Woodrow Wilson of the U.S.)

American Approach

Wilson's diplomacy and his Fourteen Points essentially established
the conditions for the armistices that brought an end to World War I. Wilson felt it was his duty and obligation to the people of the world to be a prominent figure at the peace negotiations. High hopes and expectations were placed on him to deliver what he had promised for the post-war era. In doing so, Wilson ultimately began to lead the foreign policy of the United States toward interventionism, a move strongly resisted in some domestic circles. Wilson took many domestic progressive ideas and translated them into foreign policy (free trade, open agreements, democracy, and self-determination). One of his major aims was to found a League of Nations “for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.”

Once Wilson arrived, however, he found “rivalries, and conflicting claims previously submerged.” He mostly tried to sway the direction that the French (Georges Clemenceau) and British (Lloyd George) delegations were taking towards Germany and its allies in Europe, as well as the former Ottoman lands in the Middle East. Wilson’s attempts to gain acceptance of his Fourteen Points ultimately failed after France and Britain refused to adopt some specific points and its core principles.

In Europe, several of his Fourteen Points conflicted with the other powers. The United States did not encourage or believe that the responsibility for the war that Article 231 placed on Germany was fair or warranted. It would not be until 1921 that the United States finally signed separate peace treaties with Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

In the Middle East, negotiations were complicated by competing aims, claims, and the new mandate system. The United States hoped to establish a more liberal and diplomatic world, as stated in the Fourteen Points, where democracy, sovereignty, liberty, and self-determination would be respected. France and Britain, on the other hand, already controlled empires, wielded power over their subjects around the world, and still aspired to be dominant colonial powers.
British Approach

Maintenance of the British Empire’s unity, holdings, and interests was an overarching concern for the British delegates to the conference, with more specific goals of:

- Ensuring the security of France
- Removing the threat of the German High Seas Fleet
- Settling territorial contentions
- Supporting the League of Nations with that order of priority

Convinced that Canada had become a nation on the battlefields of Europe, its Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, demanded that it have a separate seat at the conference. This was initially opposed not only by Britain but also by the United States, which saw a dominion delegation as an extra British vote. Borden responded by pointing out that since Canada had lost nearly 60,000 men, a far larger proportion of its men compared to the 50,000 American losses, at least had the right to the representation of a “minor” power. The British Prime Minister, David Lloyd George, eventually relented, and convinced the reluctant Americans to accept the presence of delegations from Canada, India, Australia, Newfoundland, New Zealand, and South Africa. They also received their own seats in the League of Nations.

David Lloyd George commented that he did “not do badly” at the peace conference, “considering I was seated between Jesus Christ and Napoleon.” This was a reference to the very idealistic views of Wilson on the one hand and the stark realism of Clemenceau, who was determined to see Germany punished.

French Approach

The French Prime Minister, Georges Clemenceau, controlled his
delegation. His chief goal was to weaken Germany militarily, strategically, and economically. Having personally witnessed two German attacks on French soil in the last 40 years, he was adamant that Germany should not be permitted to attack France again. In particular, Clemenceau sought an American and British guarantee of French security in the event of another German attack.

Clemenceau also expressed skepticism and frustration with Wilson's Fourteen Points: "Mr. Wilson bores me with his fourteen points," complained Clemenceau. "Why, God Almighty has only ten!" Wilson won a few points by signing a mutual defense treaty with France, but back in Washington he did not present it to the Senate for ratification and it never took effect.

Another alternative French policy was to seek a resumption of harmonious relations with Germany. In May 1919 the diplomat René Massigli was sent on several secret missions to Berlin. During his visits, Massigli offered on behalf of his government to revise the territorial and economic clauses of the upcoming peace treaty.

The Germans rejected the French offers because they considered the French overtures to be a trap to trick them into accepting the Versailles treaty "as is," and because the German foreign minister, Count Ulrich von Brockdorff-Rantzau, thought that the United States was more likely to reduce the severity of the peace terms than France. It proved to be Lloyd George who pushed for more favorable terms for Germany.

Italian Approach

In 1914 Italy remained neutral despite its alliances with Germany and Austria. In 1915 it joined the Allies, motivated by gaining the territories promised by the Allies in the secret Treaty of London: the Trentino, the Tyrol as far as Brenner, Trieste and Istria, most of the Dalmatian coast except Fiume, Valona and a protectorate over Albania, Antalya in Turkey, and possibly colonies in Africa or Asia.
In the meetings of the “Big Four,” in which Orlando’s powers of diplomacy were inhibited by his lack of English, the others were only willing to offer Trentino to the Brenner, the Dalmatian port of Zara and some of the Dalmatian islands. All other territories were promised to other nations and the great powers were worried about Italy’s imperial ambitions. Even though Italy did get most of its demands, Orlando was refused Fiume, most of Dalmatia, and any colonial gain, so he left the conference in a rage.

There was a general disappointment in Italy, which the nationalist and fascist parties used to build the idea that Italy was betrayed by the Allies and refused what was due. This led to the general rise of Italian fascism.

Japanese Approach

The Empire of Japan sent a large delegation headed by former Prime Minister, Marquess Saionji Kinmochi. It was originally one of the “big five” but relinquished that role because of its slight interest in European affairs. Instead it focused on two demands: the inclusion of their racial equality proposal in the League’s Covenant and Japanese territorial claims with respect to former German colonies, namely Shantung (including Kiaochow) and the Pacific islands north of the Equator (the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, the Mariana Islands, and the Carolines). The Japanese delegation became unhappy after receiving only half of the rights of Germany, and walked out of the conference.

Attributions
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29.5.2: Wilson’s Fourteen Points

The Fourteen Points was a statement of principles used for peace negotiations following the end World War I, outlined in a January 8, 1918, speech to the United States Congress by President Woodrow Wilson.

Learning Objective

Summarize the key themes of the Fourteen Points

Key Points

• U.S. President Woodrow Wilson initiated a secret series of studies named The Inquiry, primarily focused on Europe and carried out by a group in New York that included geographers, historians, and political scientists. This group researched topics likely to arise in the anticipated peace conference.
• The studies culminated in a speech by Wilson to Congress on January 8, 1918, in which he articulated America’s long-term war objectives.
The speech, known as the Fourteen Points, was authored mainly by Walter Lippmann and projected Wilson’s progressive domestic policies into the international arena.

It was the clearest expression of intention made by any of the belligerent nations and was generally supported by the European nations.

The first six points dealt with diplomacy, freedom of the seas, and settlement of colonial claims; pragmatic territorial issues were addressed as well, and the final point regarded the establishment of an association of nations to guarantee the independence and territorial integrity of all nations—a League of Nations.

The actual agreements reached at the Paris Peace Conference were quite different than Wilson’s plan, most notably in the harsh economic reparations required from Germany. This provision angered Germans and may have contributed to the rise of Nazism in the subsequent decades.

**Key Terms**

**idealism**

In foreign policy, the belief that a state should make its internal political philosophy the goal of its foreign policy. For example, an idealist might believe that ending poverty at home should be coupled with
tackling poverty abroad. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson was an early advocate of this philosophy.

**Stab-in-the-back myth**

The notion, widely believed in right-wing circles in Germany after 1918, that the German Army did not lose World War I on the battlefield but was instead betrayed by the civilians on the home front, especially the republicans who overthrew the monarchy in the German Revolution of 1918–19. Advocates denounced the German government leaders who signed the Armistice on November 11, 1918, as the “November Criminals.”

**the Inquiry**

A study group established in September 1917 by Woodrow Wilson to prepare materials for the peace negotiations following World War I. The group, composed of around 150 academics, was directed by presidential adviser Edward House and supervised directly by philosopher Sidney Mezes.

**Fourteen Points**

A statement of principles used for peace negotiations to end World War I. The principles were outlined in a January 8, 1918, speech on war aims and peace terms to the United States Congress by President Woodrow Wilson.

The Fourteen Points was a statement of principles used for peace negotiations to end World War I. The principles were outlined in a January 8, 1918, speech on war aims and peace terms to the United States Congress by President Woodrow Wilson. Europeans generally welcomed Wilson's points, but his main Allied colleagues
(Georges Clemenceau of France, David Lloyd George of the United Kingdom, and Vittorio Orlando of Italy) were skeptical of the applicability of Wilsonian idealism.

The United States joined the Allied Powers in fighting the Central Powers on April 6, 1917. Its entry into the war had in part been due to Germany's resumption of submarine warfare against merchant ships trading with France and Britain. However, Wilson wanted to avoid the United States' involvement in the long-standing European tensions between the great powers; if America was going to fight, he wanted to unlink the war from nationalistic disputes or ambitions. The need for moral aims was highlighted when after the fall of the Russian government, the Bolsheviks disclosed secret treaties made between the Allies. Wilson's speech also responded to Vladimir Lenin's Decree on Peace of November 1917 immediately after the October Revolution, which proposed an immediate withdrawal of Russia from the war, called for a just and democratic peace that was not compromised by territorial annexations, and led to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on March 3, 1918.

The speech made by Wilson took many domestic progressive ideas and translated them into foreign policy (free trade, open agreements, democracy, and self-determination). The Fourteen Points speech was the only explicit statement of war aims by any of the nations fighting in World War I. Some belligerents gave general indications of their aims, but most kept their post-war goals private.

**Background and Research**

The immediate cause of the United States' entry into World War I in April 1917 was the German announcement of renewed unrestricted submarine warfare and the subsequent sinking of ships with Americans on board. But President Wilson's war aims went beyond the defense of maritime interests. In his War Message to Congress, Wilson declared that the United States' objective was "to vindicate
the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world.” In several speeches earlier in the year, Wilson sketched out his vision of an end to the war that would bring a “just and secure peace,” not merely “a new balance of power.”

President Wilson subsequently initiated a secret series of studies named the Inquiry, primarily focused on Europe and carried out by a group in New York that included geographers, historians, and political scientists; the group was directed by Colonel Edward House. Their job was to study Allied and American policy in virtually every region of the globe and analyze economic, social, and political facts likely to come up in discussions during the peace conference. The group produced and collected nearly 2,000 separate reports and documents plus at least 1,200 maps. The studies culminated in a speech by Wilson to Congress on January 8, 1918, in which he articulated America’s long-term war objectives. The speech was the clearest expression of intention made by any of the belligerent nations and projected Wilson’s progressive domestic policies into the international arena.

The Speech to Congress

The speech, known as the Fourteen Points, was developed from a set of diplomatic points by Wilson and territorial points drafted by the Inquiry’s general secretary, Walter Lippmann, and his colleagues, Isaiah Bowman, Sidney Mezes, and David Hunter Miller. Lippmann’s draft territorial points were a direct response to the secret treaties of the European Allies, which Lippman was shown by Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. Lippman’s task according to House was “to take the secret treaties, analyze the parts which were tolerable, and separate them from those which we regarded as intolerable, and then develop a position which conceded as much to the Allies as it could, but took away the poison...It was all keyed upon the secret treaties.”
In the speech, Wilson directly addressed what he perceived as the causes for the world war by calling for the abolition of secret treaties, a reduction in armaments, an adjustment in colonial claims in the interests of both native peoples and colonists, and freedom of the seas. Wilson also made proposals that would ensure world peace in the future. For example, he proposed the removal of economic barriers between nations, the promise of self-determination for national minorities, and a world organization that would guarantee the “political independence and territorial integrity [of] great and small states alike”—a League of Nations.

Though Wilson’s idealism pervades the Fourteen Points, he also had more practical objectives in mind. He hoped to keep Russia in the war by convincing the Bolsheviks that they would receive a better peace from the Allies, to bolster Allied morale, and to undermine German war support. The address was well received in the United States and Allied nations and even by Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin as a landmark of enlightenment in international relations. Wilson subsequently used the Fourteen Points as the basis for negotiating the Treaty of Versailles that ended the war.

Fourteen Points vs. the Versailles Treaty

President Wilson became physically ill at the beginning of the Paris Peace Conference, allowing French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau to advance demands substantially different from Wilson’s Fourteen Points. Clemenceau viewed Germany as having unfairly attained an economic victory over France, due to the heavy damage their forces dealt to France’s industries even during retreat, and expressed dissatisfaction with France’s allies at the peace conference.

Notably, Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles, which would become known as the War Guilt Clause, was seen by the Germans as assigning full responsibility for the war and its damages on
Germany; however, the same clause was included in all peace treaties and historian Sally Marks has noted that only German diplomats saw it as assigning responsibility for the war.

The text of the Fourteen Points had been widely distributed in Germany as propaganda prior to the end of the war and was thus well-known by the Germans. The differences between this document and the final Treaty of Versailles fueled great anger. German outrage over reparations and the War Guilt Clause is viewed as a likely contributing factor to the rise of national socialism. At the end of World War I, foreign armies had only entered Germany’s prewar borders twice: the advance of Russian troops into the Eastern border of Prussia, and following the Battle of Mulhouse, the settlement of the French army in the Thann valley. This lack of important Allied incursions contributed to the popularization of the Stab-in-the-back myth in Germany after the war.
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After the war, the Paris Peace Conference imposed a series of peace treaties on the Central Powers, officially ending the war. The 1919 Treaty of Versailles dealt with Germany and, building on Wilson’s Fourteen Points, created the League of Nations in June 1919.

Learning Objective

Describe the final treaty signed by the belligerants

Key Points

- The major decisions at the Paris Peace Conference were the creation of the League of Nations; the five peace treaties with defeated enemies; the awarding of German and Ottoman overseas possessions as “mandates,” chiefly to Britain and France; and the drawing of new national boundaries to better reflect the forces of nationalism.
- The Central Powers had to acknowledge responsibility for “all the loss and damage to which
the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by” their aggression.

- In the Treaty of Versailles, this statement was Article 231, which became known as War Guilt clause because of the resentment and humiliation it caused many Germans.
- The Treaty of Versailles also forced Germany to disarm, make substantial territorial concessions, and pay reparations to certain countries that formed the Entente powers.
- The redrawing of the world map at these conferences created many critical conflict-prone international contradictions; these became one of the causes of World War II.

Key Terms

**Carthaginian peace**

The imposition of a brutal “peace” achieved by completely crushing the enemy. The term derives from the peace imposed on Carthage by Rome. After the Second Punic War, Carthage lost all its colonies, was forced to demilitarize and pay a constant tribute to Rome, and could enter war only with Rome’s permission. At the end of the Third Punic War, the Romans systematically burned Carthage to the ground and enslaved its population.
**White Russia**

A loose confederation of Anti-Communist forces that fought the Bolsheviks, also known as the Reds, in the Russian Civil War (1917–1923) and to a lesser extent, continued operating as militarized associations both outside and within Russian borders until roughly the Second World War.

**Treaty of Versailles**

The most important of the peace treaties that ended World War I. It was signed on June 28, 1919, exactly five years after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand.

---

**Final Treaties of the Paris Peace Conference**

Five major peace treaties were prepared at the Paris Peace Conference (with the affected countries in parentheses):

- The Treaty of Versailles, June 28, 1919, (Germany)
- The Treaty of Saint-Germain, September 10, 1919, (Austria)
- The Treaty of Neuilly, November 27, 1919, (Bulgaria)
- The Treaty of Trianon, June 4, 1920, (Hungary)
- The Treaty of Sèvres, August 10, 1920; subsequently revised by the Treaty of Lausanne, July 24, 1923, (Ottoman Empire/Republic of Turkey).

The major decisions were the establishment of the League of Nations; the five peace treaties with defeated enemies; the awarding of German and Ottoman overseas possessions as “mandates,” chiefly
to members of the British Empire and to France; reparations imposed on Germany, and the drawing of new national boundaries (sometimes with plebiscites) to better reflect the forces of nationalism. The main result was the Treaty of Versailles, with Germany, which in section 231 laid the guilt for the war on “the aggression of Germany and her allies.” This provision proved humiliating for Germans and set the stage for very high reparations, though Germany paid only a small portion before reparations ended in 1931.

As the conference’s decisions were enacted unilaterally and largely on the whims of the Big Four, for the duration of the Conference Paris was effectively the center of a world government that deliberated over and implemented sweeping changes to the political geography of Europe. Most famously, the Treaty of Versailles itself weakened Germany’s military and placed full blame for the war and costly reparations on Germany’s shoulders. The humiliation and resentment this caused is sometimes considered responsible for Nazi electoral successes and indirectly, World War II.

The League of Nations proved controversial in the United States as critics said it subverted the powers of Congress to declare war. The U.S. Senate did not ratify any of the peace treaties and the U.S. never joined the League – instead, the Harding administration of 1921-1923 concluded new treaties with Germany, Austria, and Hungary. Germany was not invited to attend the conference at Versailles. Representatives of White Russia (but not Communist Russia) were present. Numerous other nations sent delegations to appeal for various unsuccessful additions to the treaties; parties lobbied for causes ranging from independence for the countries of the South Caucasus to Japan’s demand for racial equality among the other Great Powers.

Austria-Hungary was partitioned into several successor states, including Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, largely but not entirely along ethnic lines. Transylvania was shifted from Hungary to Greater Romania. The details were contained in the
Treaty of Saint-Germain and the Treaty of Trianon. As a result of the Treaty of Trianon, 3.3 million Hungarians came under foreign rule. Although the Hungarians made up 54% of the population of the pre-war Kingdom of Hungary, only 32% of its territory was left to Hungary. Between 1920 and 1924, 354,000 Hungarians fled former Hungarian territories attached to Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia.

The Russian Empire, which had withdrawn from the war in 1917 after the October Revolution, lost much of its western frontier as the newly independent nations of Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland were carved from it. Romania took control of Bessarabia in April 1918.

The Ottoman Empire disintegrated, with much of its Levant territory awarded to various Allied powers as protectorates, including Palestine. The Turkish core in Anatolia was reorganized as the Republic of Turkey. The Ottoman Empire was to be partitioned by the Treaty of Sèvres of 1920. This treaty was never ratified by the Sultan and was rejected by the Turkish National Movement, leading to the victorious Turkish War of Independence and the much less stringent 1923 Treaty of Lausanne.

**Treaty of Versailles**

The Treaty of Versailles was the most important of the peace treaties that brought World War I to an end. It was signed on June 28, 1919, exactly five years after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The other Central Powers on the German side of World War I signed separate treaties. Although the armistice signed on November 11, 1918, ended the actual fighting, it took six months of Allied negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference to conclude the peace treaty. The treaty was registered by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on October 21, 1919.

Of the many provisions in the treaty, one of the most important
and controversial required “Germany accept the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage” during the war (the other members of the Central Powers signed treaties containing similar articles). This article, Article 231, later became known as the War Guilt clause. The treaty forced Germany to disarm, make substantial territorial concessions, and pay reparations to certain countries that had formed the Entente powers. In 1921 the total cost of these reparations was assessed at 132 billion marks (then $31.4 billion, roughly equivalent to USD $442 billion in 2017). At the time economists, notably John Maynard Keynes, predicted that the treaty was too harsh—a “Carthaginian peace”—and said the reparations figure was excessive and counter-productive, views that have since been the subject of ongoing debate by historians and economists from several countries. On the other hand, prominent figures on the Allied side such as French Marshal Ferdinand Foch criticized the treaty for treating Germany too leniently.

The result of these competing and sometimes conflicting goals among the victors was a compromise that left no one content: Germany was neither pacified nor conciliated, nor was it permanently weakened. The problems that arose from the treaty would lead to the Locarno Treaties, which improved relations between Germany and the other European Powers, and the renegotiation of the reparation system resulting in the Dawes Plan, the Young Plan, and the indefinite postponement of reparations at the Lausanne Conference of 1932.

Historical Assessment

The remaking of the world map at these conferences gave birth to a number of critical conflict-prone international contradictions, which would become one of the causes of World War II. The British historian Eric Hobsbawm claimed that

no equally systematic attempt has been made before or since, in Europe or anywhere else, to redraw the political map on national lines. [...] The logical implication of trying to create a continent neatly divided into coherent territorial states each inhabited by separate ethnically and linguistically homogeneous population, was the mass expulsion or extermination of minorities. Such was and is the reductio ad absurdum of nationalism in its territorial version, although this was not fully demonstrated until the 1940s.

It has long been argued that Wilson’s Fourteen Points, in particular the principle of national self-determination, were primarily anti-Left measures designed to tame the revolutionary fever sweeping
across Europe in the wake of the October Revolution and the end of the war by playing the nationalist card.

Attributions

- The Final Treaty
The League of Nations was formed to prevent a repetition of the First World War, but within two decades this effort failed. Economic depression, renewed nationalism, weakened successor states, and feelings of humiliation (particularly in Germany) eventually contributed to World War II.

Learning Objective

Explain the ideals that underpinned the forming of the League of Nations

Key Points

- The League of Nations was formed at the Paris Peace Conference to prevent another global conflict like World War I and maintain world peace. It was the first organization of its kind.
- Its primary goals, as stated in its Covenant, included preventing wars through collective security and disarmament and settling international disputes.
through negotiation and arbitration.

- Unlike former efforts at world peace such as the Concert of Europe, the League was an independent organization without an army of its own, and thus depended on the Great Powers to enforce its resolutions.
- The members were often hesitant to do so, leaving the League powerless to intervene in disputes and conflicts.
- The U.S. Congress, mainly led by Henry Cabot Lodge, was resistant to joining the League, as doing so would legally bind the U.S. to intervene in European conflicts. In the end, the U.S. did not join the League, despite being its main architects.
- The League failed to intervene in many conflicts leading up to World War II, including the Italian invasion of Abyssinia, the Spanish Civil War, and the Second Sino-Japanese War.

Key Terms

**Henry Cabot Lodge**

An American Republican Senator and historian from Massachusetts best known for his positions on foreign policy, especially his battle with President Woodrow Wilson in 1919 over the Treaty of Versailles. He demanded Congressional control of declarations of war; Wilson refused and blocked his move to ratify the
treaty with reservations. As a result, the United States never joined the League of Nations.

**League of Nations**

An intergovernmental organization founded on January 10, 1920, as a result of the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War. It was the first international organization whose principal mission was to maintain world peace. Its primary goals as stated in its Covenant included preventing wars through collective security and disarmament and settling international disputes through negotiation and arbitration.

The League of Nations was an intergovernmental organization founded on January 10, 1920, as a result of the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War. It was the first international organization whose principal mission was to maintain world peace. Its primary goals, as stated in its Covenant, included preventing wars through collective security and disarmament and settling international disputes through negotiation and arbitration. Other issues in this and related treaties included labor conditions, just treatment of native inhabitants, human and drug trafficking, the arms trade, global health, prisoners of war, and protection of minorities in Europe. At its greatest extent from September 28, 1934, to February 23, 1935, it had 58 members.

The diplomatic philosophy behind the League represented a fundamental shift from the preceding hundred years. The League lacked its own armed force and depended on the Great Powers to enforce its resolutions, keep to its economic sanctions, and provide an army when needed. However, the Great Powers were often reluctant to do so. Sanctions could hurt League members, so they were reluctant to comply. During the Second Italo-Abyssinian War,
when the League accused Italian soldiers of targeting Red Cross medical tents, Benito Mussolini responded that “the League is very well when sparrows shout, but no good at all when eagles fall out.”

After a number of notable successes and some early failures in the 1920s, the League ultimately proved incapable of preventing aggression by the Axis powers in the 1930s. Germany withdrew from the League, as did Japan, Italy, Spain, and others. The onset of the Second World War showed that the League had failed its primary purpose to prevent any future world war. The League lasted for 26 years; the United Nations (UN) replaced it after the end of the Second World War in April 1946 and inherited a number of agencies and organizations founded by the League.

Establishment of the League of Nations

American President Woodrow Wilson instructed Edward M. House to draft a U.S. plan that reflected Wilson’s own idealistic views (first articulated in the Fourteen Points of January 1918), as well as the work of the Phillimore Committee. The outcome of House’s work and Wilson’s own first draft, proposed the termination of “unethical” state behavior, including forms of espionage and dishonesty. Methods of compulsion against recalcitrant states would include severe measures, such as “blockading and closing the frontiers of that power to commerce or intercourse with any part of the world and to use any force that may be necessary...”

The two principal architects of the covenant of the League of Nations were Lord Robert Cecil (a lawyer and diplomat) and Jan Smuts (a Commonwealth statesman). Smuts’ proposals included the creation of a Council of the great powers as permanent members and a non-permanent selection of the minor states. He also proposed the creation of a mandate system for captured colonies of the Central Powers during the war. Cecil focused on the administrative side and proposed annual Council meetings and
quadrennial meetings for the Assembly of all members. He also argued for a large and permanent secretariat to carry out the League's administrative duties.

At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Wilson, Cecil, and Smuts put forward their draft proposals. After lengthy negotiations between the delegates, the Hurst-Miller draft was finally produced as a basis for the Covenant. After more negotiation and compromise, the delegates finally approved of the proposal to create the League of Nations on January 25, 1919. The final Covenant of the League of Nations was drafted by a special commission, and the League was established by Part I of the Treaty of Versailles. On June 28, 44 states signed the Covenant, including 31 states that took part in the war on the side of the Triple Entente or joined it during the conflict.

The League would consist of a General Assembly (representing all member states), an Executive Council (with membership limited to major powers), and a permanent secretariat. Member states were expected to “respect and preserve as against external aggression” the territorial integrity of other members and to disarm “to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.” All states were required to submit complaints for arbitration or judicial inquiry before going to war. The Executive Council would create a Permanent Court of International Justice to make judgments on the disputes.

Despite Wilson's efforts to establish and promote the League, for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 1919, the United States did not join. Opposition in the Senate, particularly from two Republican politicians, Henry Cabot Lodge and William Borah, and especially in regard to Article X of the Covenant, ensured that the United States would not ratify the agreement. Their objections were based on the fact that by ratifying such a document, the United States would be bound by international contract to defend a League of Nations member if it was attacked. They believed that it was best not to become involved in international conflicts.

The League held its first council meeting in Paris on January
16, 1920, six days after the Versailles Treaty and the Covenant of the League of Nations came into force. On November 1, the headquarters of the League was moved from London to Geneva, where the first General Assembly was held on November 15.

**Successes and Failures of the League**

The aftermath of the First World War left many issues to be settled, including the exact position of national boundaries and which country particular regions would join. Most of these questions were handled by the victorious Allied powers in bodies such as the Allied Supreme Council. The Allies tended to refer only particularly difficult matters to the League. This meant that during the early interwar period, the League played little part in resolving the turmoil resulting from the war. The questions the League considered in its early years included those designated by the Paris Peace treaties.

As the League developed, its role expanded, and by the middle of the 1920s it had become the center of international activity. This change can be seen in the relationship between the League and non-members. The United States and Russia, for example, increasingly worked with the League. During the second half of the 1920s, France, Britain, and Germany were all using the League of Nations as the focus of their diplomatic activity, and each of their foreign secretaries attended League meetings at Geneva during this period. They also used the League’s machinery to improve relations and settle their differences.

In addition to territorial disputes, the League also tried to intervene in other conflicts between and within nations. Among its successes were its fight against the international trade in opium and sexual slavery and its work to alleviate the plight of refugees, particularly in Turkey in the period up to 1926. One of its innovations in this latter area was the 1922 introduction of the
Nansen passport, the first internationally recognized identity card for stateless refugees.

The League failed to intervene in many conflicts leading up to World War II, including the Italian invasion of Abyssinia, the Spanish Civil War, and the Second Sino-Japanese War.

The onset of the Second World War demonstrated that the League had failed in its primary purpose, the prevention of another world war. There were a variety of reasons for this failure, many connected to general weaknesses within the organization, such as voting structure that made ratifying resolutions difficult and incomplete representation among world nations. Additionally, the power of the League was limited by the United States’ refusal to join.

The Gap in the Bridge: The sign reads “This League of Nations Bridge was designed by the President of the U.S.A.” Cartoon from Punch magazine, December 10, 1920, satirizing the gap left by the U.S. not joining the League. Attributions The League of Nations “League of Nations.”
“The_Gap_in_the_Bridge.png.”
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
League_of_Nations#/media/
29.6.1: New Technology in World War I

World War I began as a clash of 20th-century technology and 19th-century tactics, causing ineffective battles with huge numbers of casualties on both sides.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze the specific developments that made World War I different from previous wars

**Key Points**

- Technology during World War I reflected a trend toward industrialism and the application of mass-production methods to weapons and to warfare in general.
- One could characterize the early years of the First
World War as a clash of 20th-century technology with 19th-century warfare.

- On land, only in the final year of the war did the major armies make effective steps to revolutionize command and control, adapt to the modern battlefield, and harness the myriad new technologies to effective military purposes.

- Tactical reorganizations (such as shifting the focus of command from the 100+ man company to the 10+ man squad) went hand-in-hand with armored cars, the first submachine guns, and automatic rifles that a single individual soldier could carry and use.

- Although the use of poison gas was banned by the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, Germany turned to this industry for what it hoped would be a decisive weapon to break the deadlock of trench warfare. Chlorine gas was first used on the battlefield in April 1915 at the Second Battle of Ypres in Belgium.

- Although the concept of the tank had been suggested as early as the 1890s, few authorities showed interest until the trench stalemate of World War I caused serious contemplation of unending war and ever escalating casualties. By 1917, tanks were used by both the British and French armies to terrifying effect.
Key Terms

**Zeppelin**
A type of rigid airship named after the German Count Ferdinand von Zeppelin who pioneered rigid airship development at the beginning of the 20th century. Zeppelin's notions were first formulated in 1874 and developed in detail in 1893. During World War I, the German military made extensive use of these as bombers and scouts, killing over 500 people in bombing raids in Britain.

**mustard gas**
A cytotoxic and vesicant chemical warfare agent with the ability to form large blisters on exposed skin and in the lungs. Within 24 hours of exposure to this agent, victims experience intense itching and skin irritation, which gradually turns into large blisters filled with yellow fluid wherever the agent contacted the skin.

**U-boat**
Military submarines operated by Germany, particularly in the First and Second World Wars. Although at times they were efficient fleet weapons against enemy naval warships, they were most effectively used in an economic warfare role (commerce raiding), enforcing a naval blockade against enemy shipping.

World War I began as a clash of 20th-century technology and 19th-century tactics, with large ensuing casualties. By the end of 1917, however, the major armies, now numbering millions of men, had
modernized and used telephones, wireless communication, armoured cars, tanks, and aircraft.

Ground Warfare

Infantry formations were reorganized so that 100-man companies were no longer the main unit of maneuver; instead, squads of 10 or so men under the command of a junior NCO were favored.

In 1914, cannons were positioned in the front line and fired directly at their targets. By 1917, indirect fire with guns (as well as mortars and even machine guns) was commonplace, using new techniques for spotting and ranging, notably aircraft and the often-overlooked field telephone. Counter-battery missions became commonplace, and sound detection was used to locate enemy batteries.

Much of the combat involved trench warfare, in which hundreds often died for each meter gained. Many of the deadliest battles in history occurred during World War I, such as Ypres, the Marne, Cambrai, the Somme, Verdun, and Gallipoli. The Germans employed the Haber process of nitrogen fixation to provide forces with a constant supply of gunpowder despite the British naval blockade. Artillery was responsible for the largest number of casualties and consumed vast quantities of explosives. The large number of head wounds caused by exploding shells and fragmentation forced the combatant nations to develop the modern steel helmet, led by the French, who introduced the Adrian helmet in 1915. It was quickly followed by the Brodie helmet, worn by British Imperial and U.S. troops, and in 1916 by the distinctive German Stahlhelm, a design with improvements still in use today.

The widespread use of chemical warfare was a distinguishing feature of the conflict. Gases used included chlorine, mustard gas, and phosgene. Chlorine gas was first used on the battlefield in April 1915 at the Second Battle of Ypres in Belgium. The unknown
gas appeared to be a simple smoke screen, used to hide attacking soldiers, and Allied troops were ordered to the front trenches to repel the expected attack. The gas had a devastating effect, killing many defenders; however, because attackers were also killed when the wind changed. In the end, relatively few war casualties were caused by gas, as effective countermeasures like gas masks were quickly created. The use of chemical warfare and small-scale strategic bombing were both outlawed by the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, and both proved to be of limited effectiveness though they captured the public imagination.
The use of chemical warfare, such chlorine gas, mustard gas, and phosgene, had devastating effects until the development of effective countermeasures such as the gas mask. The most powerful land-based weapons were railway guns, weighing dozens of tons apiece. The German ones were nicknamed Big Berthas, even though
the namesake was not a railway gun. Germany developed the Paris Gun, able to bombard Paris from over 62 miles, though shells were relatively light at 210 pounds. Trenches, machine guns, air reconnaissance, barbed wire, and modern artillery with fragmentation shells helped bring the battle lines of World War I to a stalemate. The British and the French sought a solution with the creation of the tank and mechanized warfare. The first British tanks were used during the Battle of the Somme on September 15, 1916. Mechanical reliability was an issue, but the experiment proved its worth. Within a year, the British were fielding tanks by the hundreds, and they showed their potential during the Battle of Cambrai in November 1917 by breaking the Hindenburg Line while combined arms teams captured 8,000 enemy soldiers and 100 guns. Meanwhile, the French introduced the first tanks with a rotating turret, the Renault FT, which became a decisive tool of the victory. The conflict also saw the introduction of light automatic weapons and submachine guns, such as the Lewis Gun, the Browning automatic rifle, and the Bergmann MP18.
British Vickers machine gun crew on the Western Front: The machine gun emerged as one of the decisive technologies during World War I. Another new weapon, the flamethrower, was first used by the German army and later adopted by other forces. Although not of high tactical value, the flamethrower was a powerful, demoralising weapon that caused terror on the battlefield. Trench railways evolved to supply the enormous quantities of food, water, and ammunition required to support large numbers of soldiers in areas where conventional transportation systems had been destroyed. Internal combustion engines and improved traction systems for automobiles and trucks eventually rendered trench railways obsolete. Naval Developments Germany deployed U-boats (submarines) after the war began. Alternating between restricted and unrestricted
submarine warfare in the Atlantic, the Kaiserliche Marine employed them to deprive the British Isles of vital supplies. The deaths of British merchant sailors and the seeming invulnerability of U-boats led to the development of depth charges (1916), hydrophones (passive sonar, 1917), blimps, hunter-killer submarines (HMS R-1, 1917), forward-throwing anti-submarine weapons, and dipping hydrophones (the latter two abandoned in 1918). To extend their operations, the Germans proposed supply submarines (1916). Most of these would be forgotten in the interwar period until World War II revived the need. Aviation Advances Fixed-wing aircraft were first used militarily by the Italians in Libya in October 1911 during the Italo-Turkish War for reconnaissance, soon followed by the dropping of grenades and aerial photography the next year. By 1914, their military utility was obvious. They were initially used for reconnaissance and ground attack. To shoot down enemy planes, anti-aircraft guns and fighter aircraft were developed. Strategic bombers were created, principally by the Germans and British, though the former used Zeppelins as well. Towards the end of the conflict, aircraft carriers were used for the first time, with HMS Furious launching Sopwith
Camels in a raid to destroy the Zeppelin hangars at Tondern in 1918. Recognized for their value as observation platforms, balloons were important targets for enemy aircraft. To defend them against air attack, they were heavily protected by antiaircraft guns and patrolled by friendly aircraft; to attack them, unusual weapons such as air-to-air rockets were even tried. Thus, the reconnaissance value of blimps and balloons contributed to the development of air-to-air combat between all types of aircraft and to the trench stalemate, because it was impossible to move large numbers of troops undetected. The Germans conducted air raids on England during 1915 and 1916 with airships, hoping to damage British morale and cause aircraft to be diverted from the front lines. The resulting panic led to the diversion of several squadrons of fighters from France. Attributions New Technology in World War I “Technology during World War I.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Technology_during_World_War_I. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “World War I.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_I. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “Australian_infantry_small_box_respirators_Ypres_1917.jpg.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Technology_during_World_War_I#/media/
“Vickers_machine-gun_in_the_Battle_of_Passchendaele_-_September_1917.jpg.”
29.6.2: Total War

Almost the whole of Europe and its colonial empires mobilized to wage World War I, directing almost all aspects of life including industry, finance, labor, and food production toward military purposes.

Learning Objective

Discuss the costs of total war

Key Points

- Total war, such as World War I and World War II, mobilizes all of the resources of society (industry, finance, labor, etc.) to fight the war.
- It also expands the targets of war to include any and all civilian-associated resources and infrastructure.
- World War I mobilized almost all European nations and its colonies into total war with enormous costs, not only to military personnel lost in battle, but to
whole societies, dramatically affecting finance, culture, and industry.

- Civilians back home had to make major adjustments to their lifestyles: women took over for men in industry, food rationing came into effect, and business owners changed or adjusted their products to support the war.
- One estimate suggests that the Allies spent $147 billion on the war and the Central Powers only $61 billion.

**Key Terms**

**total war**

Warfare that includes any and all civilian-associated resources and infrastructure as legitimate military targets, mobilizes all of the resources of society to fight the war, and gives priority to warfare over non-combatant needs.

**conscription**

The compulsory enlistment of people in a national service, most often military service.

Total war includes all civilian-associated resources and infrastructure as legitimate military targets, mobilizes all societal resources to fight the war, and gives priority to warfare over non-combatant needs. The American-English Dictionary defines total war as “war that is unrestricted in terms of the weapons used,
the territory or combatants involved, or the objectives pursued, especially one in which the laws of war are disregarded.”

In the mid-19th century, scholars identified “total war” as a separate class of warfare. In a total war, to an extent inapplicable to other conflicts, the differentiation between combatants and non-combatants diminishes and even sometimes vanishes entirely as opposing sides consider nearly every human resource, even that of non-combatants, as part of the war effort.

Actions that characterize the post-19th century concept of total war include: blockade and sieging of population centers, as with the Allied blockade of Germany; commerce-raiding tonnage war, and unrestricted submarine warfare, as with privateering and the German U-Boat campaigns.

**World War I as Total War**

Almost the whole of Europe and its colonial empires mobilized to wage World War I. Young men were removed from production jobs to serve in military roles and were replaced by women. Rationing occurred on the home fronts. Conscription was common in most European countries but controversial in English-speaking countries. About 750,000 lost their lives. Though most deaths were young unmarried men, 160,000 wives lost husbands and 300,000 children lost fathers. In the United States, conscription began in 1917 and was generally well-received, with a few pockets of opposition in isolated rural areas. Bulgaria went so far as to mobilize a quarter of its population or 800,000 people, a greater share than any other country during the war.

In Britain, government propaganda posters were used to divert all attention to the war on the home front. They influenced public opinion about what to eat and what occupations to pursue, and changed the attitude toward the war effort to one of support. Even
the Music Hall was used as propaganda, with songs aimed at recruitment.

After the failure of the Battle of Neuve Chapelle, the large British offensive in March 1915, the British Commander-in-Chief Field Marshal John French blamed the lack of progress on insufficient and poor-quality artillery shells. This led to the Shell Crisis of 1915, which brought down both the Liberal government and Premiership of H. H. Asquith. He formed a new coalition government dominated by liberals and appointed David Lloyd George as Minister of Munitions. It was a recognition that the whole economy would have to be geared for war if the Allies were to prevail on the Western Front.

As young men left the farms for the front, domestic food production in Britain and Germany fell. In Britain the response was to import more food, despite the German introduction of unrestricted submarine warfare, and to introduce rationing. The Royal Navy’s blockade of German ports prevented Germany from importing food and hastened German capitulation by creating a food crisis in Germany.

Economics of World War I

All of the powers in 1914 expected a short war; none had made any economic preparations for a long war, such as stockpiling food or critical raw materials. The longer the war went on, the greater the advantages of the Allies, with their larger, deeper, more versatile economies and better access to global supplies. As historians Broadberry and Harrison conclude, once stalemate set in late in 1914:

The greater Allied capacity for taking risks, absorbing the cost of mistakes, replacing losses, and accumulating overwhelming quantitative superiority should eventually
have turned the balance against Germany.

The Allies had much more potential wealth they could spend on the war. One estimate (using 1913 U.S. dollars) is that the Allies spent $147 billion on the war and the Central Powers only $61 billion. Among the Allies, Britain and its Empire spent $47 billion and the U.S. $27 billion; among the Central Powers, Germany spent $45 billion.

Total war demanded total mobilization of all the nation's resources for a common goal. Manpower had to be channeled into the front lines (all the powers except the United States and Britain had large trained reserves designed just for that). Behind the lines labor power had to be redirected away from less necessary activities that were luxuries during a total war. In particular, vast munitions industries were created to provide shells, guns, warships, uniforms, airplanes, and a hundred other weapons both old and new. Agriculture had to be mobilized as well to provide food for both civilians and soldiers (many of whom had been farmers and needed to be replaced by old men, boys, and women), as well as horses to move supplies.

Transportation in general was a challenge, especially when Britain and Germany each tried to intercept merchant ships headed for the enemy. Finance was a special challenge. Germany financed the Central Powers. Britain financed the Allies until 1916, when it ran out of money and had to borrow from the United States. The U.S. took over the financing of the Allies in 1917 with loans that it insisted be repaid after the war. The victorious Allies looked to defeated Germany in 1919 to pay reparations that would cover some of their costs. Above all, it was essential to conduct the mobilization in such a way that the short-term confidence of the people was maintained, the long-term power of the political establishment was upheld, and the long-term economic health of the nation was preserved.
Total War: British poster encouraging investment in war bonds. Total war involved immense economic and labor costs through the restructuring of finance and industry toward military purposes.
Attributions

- Total War
30.1: Rebuilding Europe

30.1.1: Reparations

The victorious Allies of WWI imposed harsh reparations on Germany, which were both economically and psychologically damaging. Historians have long argued over the extent to which the reparations led to Germany's severe economic depression in the interwar period.

---

**Learning Objective**

Defend and critique the decision to demand high reparations from Germany after the war

---

**Key Points**

- One of the most contentious decisions at the Paris Peace Conference was the question of war reparations, payments intended to cover damage or
injury inflicted during a war.

- Most of the war's major battles occurred in France, and the French countryside was heavily damaged in the fighting, leading French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau to push for harsh reparations from Germany to rebuild France.
- Both the British and American representatives at the Conference (David Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson) opposed these harsh reparations, believing they would create economic instability in Europe overall, but in the end the Conference decided that Germany was to pay 132 billion gold marks (USD $33 billion) in reparations, a decision that angered the Germans and was a source of resentment for decades to come.
- Because of the lack of reparation payments by Germany, France occupied the Ruhr in 1923 to enforce payments, causing an international crisis that resulted in the implementation of the Dawes Plan in 1924. This raised money from other nations to help Germany pay and shifted the payment plan.
- Again, Germany was unable to pay and the plan was revised again with a reduced sum and more lenient plan.
- With the collapse of the German economy in 1931, reparations were suspended for a year and in 1932 during the Lausanne Conference they were cancelled altogether.
- Between 1919 and 1932, Germany paid fewer than 21 billion marks in reparations.
Key Terms

Young Plan
A program for settling German reparations debts after World War I, written in 1929 and formally adopted in 1930. After the Dawes Plan was put into operation in 1924, it became apparent that Germany would not willingly meet the annual payments over an indefinite period of time. This new plan reduced further payments by about 20 percent.

Indemnities
An obligation by a person to provide compensation for a particular loss suffered by another person.

Reparations
Payments intended to cover damage or injury inflicted during a war. Generally, the term refers to money or goods changing hands, but not to the annexation of land.

World War I reparations were imposed upon the Central Powers during the Paris Peace Conference following their defeat in the First World War by the Allied and Associate Powers. Each defeated power was required to make payments in either cash or kind. Because of the financial situation Austria, Hungary, and Turkey found themselves in after the war, few to no reparations were paid and the requirements were cancelled. Bulgaria paid only a fraction of what was required before its reparations were reduced and then cancelled. Historian Ruth Henig argues that the German requirement to pay reparations was the “chief battleground of the post-war era” and “the focus of the power struggle between France
and Germany over whether the Versailles Treaty was to be enforced or revised.”

The Treaty of Versailles and the 1921 London Schedule of Payments required Germany to pay 132 billion gold marks (USD $33 billion) in reparations to cover civilian damage caused during the war. This figure was divided into three categories of bonds: A, B, and C. Of these, Germany was only required to pay towards ‘A’ and ‘B’ bonds totaling 50 billion marks (USD $12.5 billion). The remaining ‘C’ bonds, which Germany did not have to pay, were designed to deceive the Anglo-French public into believing Germany was being heavily fined and punished for the war.

Because of the lack of reparation payments by Germany, France occupied the Ruhr in 1923 to enforce payments, causing an international crisis that resulted in the implementation of the Dawes Plan in 1924. This plan outlined a new payment method and raised international loans to help Germany to meet her reparation commitments. In the first year following the implementation of the plan, Germany would have to pay 1 billion marks. This would rise to 2.5 billion marks per year by the fifth year of the plan. A Reparations Agency was established with Allied representatives to organize the payment of reparations. Despite this, by 1928 Germany called for a new payment plan, resulting in the Young Plan that established the German reparation requirements at 112 billion marks (USD $26.3 billion) and created a schedule of payments that would see Germany complete payments by 1988. With the collapse of the German economy in 1931, reparations were suspended for a year and in 1932 during the Lausanne Conference they were cancelled altogether. Between 1919 and 1932, Germany paid fewer than 21 billion marks in reparations.

The German people saw reparations as a national humiliation; the German Government worked to undermine the validity of the Treaty of Versailles and the requirement to pay. British economist John Maynard Keynes called the treaty a Carthaginian peace that would economically destroy Germany. His arguments had a profound effect on historians, politicians, and the public. Despite
Keynes' arguments and those by later historians supporting or reinforcing Keynes' views, the consensus of contemporary historians is that reparations were not as intolerable as the Germans or Keynes had suggested and were within Germany's capacity to pay had there been the political will to do so.

Background

Most of the war's major battles occurred in France, substantially damaging the French countryside. Furthermore, in 1918 during the German retreat, German troops devastated France's most industrialized region in the north-east (Nord-Pas de Calais Mining Basin). Extensive looting took place as German forces removed whatever material they could use and destroyed the rest. Hundreds of mines were destroyed along with railways, bridges, and entire villages. Prime Minister of France Georges Clemenceau was determined, for these reasons, that any just peace required Germany to pay reparations for the damage it had caused. Clemenceau viewed reparations as a way of weakening Germany to ensure it could never threaten France again. Reparations would also go towards the reconstruction costs in other countries, including Belgium, which was also directly affected by the war.
British Prime Minister David Lloyd George opposed harsh reparations, arguing for a smaller sum that was less damaging to the German economy so that Germany could remain a viable economic power and trading partner. He also argued that reparations should include war pensions for disabled veterans and allowances for war widows, which would reserve a larger share of the reparations for the British Empire. Woodrow Wilson opposed these positions and was adamant that no indemnity should be imposed upon Germany.

The Paris Peace Conference opened on January 18, 1919, aiming to establish a lasting peace between the Allied and Central Powers. Demanding compensation from the defeated party was a common feature of peace treaties. However, the financial terms of treaties signed during the peace conference were labelled reparations to distinguish them from punitive settlements usually known as indemnities, intended for reconstruction and compensating families bereaved by the war. The opening article of the reparation section
of the Treaty of Versailles, Article 231, served as a legal basis for the following articles, which obliged Germany to pay compensation and limited German responsibility to civilian damages. The same article, with the signatory’s name changed, was also included in the treaties signed by Germany’s allies.

Did Reparations Ruin the German Economy?

Erik Goldstein wrote that in 1921, the payment of reparations caused a crisis and that the occupation of the Ruhr had a disastrous effect on the German economy, resulting in the German Government printing more money as the currency collapsed. Hyperinflation began and printing presses worked overtime to print Reichsbank notes; by November 1923 one U.S. dollar was worth 4.2 trillion marks. Geoff Harcourt writes that Keynes’ arguments that reparations would lead to German economic collapse have been adopted “by historians of almost all political persuasions” and have influenced the way historians and the public “see the unfolding events in Germany and the decades between Versailles and the outbreak of the Second World War.”

But not all historians agree. According to Detlev Peukert, the financial problems that arose in the early 1920s were a result of post-war loans and the way Germany funded its war effort, not reparations. During World War I, Germany did not raise taxes or create new ones to pay for wartime expenses. Rather, loans were taken out, placing Germany in an economically precarious position as more money entered circulation, destroying the link between paper money and the gold reserve maintained before the war. With its defeat, Germany could not impose reparations and pay off war debts, which were now colossal.

Niall Ferguson partially supports this analysis. He says that had
reparations not been imposed, Germany would still have had significant problems caused by the need to pay war debts and the demands of voters for more social services. Ferguson also says that these problems were aggravated by a trade deficit and a weak exchange rate for the mark during 1920. Afterwards, as the value of the mark rose, inflation became a problem. None of these effects, he says, were the result of reparations.

Several historians take the middle ground between condemning reparations and supporting the argument that they were not a complete burden upon Germany. Detlev Peukert states, “Reparations did not, in fact, bleed the German economy” as had been feared; however, the “psychological effects of reparations were extremely serious, as was the strain that the vicious circle of credits and reparations placed the international financial system.”

Attributions

- Reparations
30.1.2: The Weimar Republic

In its 14 years in existence, the Weimar Republic faced numerous problems, including hyperinflation, political extremism, and contentious relationships with the victors of the First World War, leading to its collapse during the rise of Adolf Hitler.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the Weimar Republic and the challenges it faced

**Key Points**

- The Weimar Republic came into existence during the final stages of World War I, during the German Revolution of 1918–19.
- From its beginnings and throughout its 14 years of existence, the Weimar Republic experienced numerous problems, most notably hyperinflation and unemployment.
- In 1919, one loaf of bread cost 1 mark; by 1923, the same loaf of bread cost 100 billion marks.
With its currency and economy in ruin, Germany failed to pay its heavy war reparations, which were resented by Germans to begin with.

Many people in Germany blamed the Weimar Republic rather than their wartime leaders for the country’s defeat and for the humiliating terms of the Treaty of Versailles, a belief that came to be known as the “stab-in-the-back myth,” which was heavily propagated during the rise of the Nazi party.

The passage of the Enabling Act of 1933 is widely considered to mark the end of the Weimar Republic and the beginning of the Nazi era.

**Key Terms**

**Stab-in-the-back myth**

The notion, widely believed in right-wing circles in Germany after 1918, that the German Army did not lose World War I on the battlefield but was instead betrayed by the civilians on the home front, especially the republicans who overthrew the monarchy in the German Revolution of 1918–19. Advocates denounced the German government leaders who signed the Armistice on November 11, 1918, as the “November Criminals.” When the Nazis came to power in 1933, they made the legend an integral part of their official history of the 1920s, portraying the Weimar Republic as the work of the “November Criminals” who seized power.
while betraying the nation.

**Enabling Act of 1933**

A 1933 Weimar Constitution amendment that gave the German Cabinet – in effect, Chancellor Adolf Hitler – the power to enact laws without the involvement of the Reichstag.

**hyperinflation**

This occurs when a country experiences very high and usually accelerating rates of inflation, rapidly eroding the real value of the local currency and causing the population to minimize their holdings of local money by switching to relatively stable foreign currencies. Under such conditions, the general price level within an economy increases rapidly as the official currency loses real value.

Weimar Republic is an unofficial historical designation for the German state between 1919 and 1933. The name derives from the city of Weimar, where its constitutional assembly first took place. The official name of the state was still *Deutsches Reich*; it had remained unchanged since 1871. In English the country was usually known simply as Germany. A national assembly was convened in Weimar, where a new constitution for the *Deutsches Reich* was written and adopted on August 11, 1919. In its 14 years, the Weimar Republic faced numerous problems, including hyperinflation, political extremism (with paramilitaries – both left- and right-wing); and contentious relationships with the victors of the First World War. The people of Germany blamed the Weimar Republic rather than their wartime leaders for the country’s defeat and for the humiliating terms of the Treaty of Versailles. However, the Weimar Republic government successfully reformed the currency, unified tax policies, and organized the railway system. Weimar Germany
eliminated most of the requirements of the Treaty of Versailles; it never completely met its disarmament requirements and eventually paid only a small portion of the war reparations (by twice restructuring its debt through the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan). Under the Locarno Treaties, Germany accepted the western borders of the republic, but continued to dispute the Eastern border.

From 1930 onward, President Hindenburg used emergency powers to back Chancellors Heinrich Brüning, Franz von Papen, and General Kurt von Schleicher. The Great Depression, exacerbated by Brüning's policy of deflation, led to a surge in unemployment. In 1933, Hindenburg appointed Adolf Hitler as Chancellor with the Nazi Party as part of a coalition government. The Nazis held two out of the remaining 10 cabinet seats. Von Papen as Vice Chancellor was intended to work behind the scenes to keep Hitler under control, using his close personal connection to Hindenburg. Within months the Reichstag Fire Decree and the Enabling Act of 1933 brought about a state of emergency: it wiped out constitutional governance and civil liberties. Hitler's seizure of power (Machtergreifung) brought the republic to an end. As democracy collapsed, a single-party state founded the Nazi era.

Challenges and Reasons for Failure

The reasons for the Weimar Republic's collapse are the subject of continuing debate. It may have been doomed from the beginning since even moderates disliked it and extremists on both the left and right loathed it, a situation referred to by some historians, such as Igor Primoratz, as a “democracy without democrats.” Germany had limited democratic traditions, and Weimar democracy was widely seen as chaotic. Weimar politicians had been blamed for Germany’s defeat in World War I through a widely believed theory called the “Stab-in-the-back myth,” which contended that Germany's
surrender in World War I had been the unnecessary act of traitors, and thus the popular legitimacy of the government was on shaky ground. As normal parliamentary lawmaking broke down and was replaced around 1930 by a series of emergency decrees, the decreasing popular legitimacy of the government further drove voters to extremist parties.

The Republic in its early years was already under attack from both left- and right-wing sources. The radical left accused the ruling Social Democrats of betraying the ideals of the workers' movement by preventing a communist revolution, and sought to overthrow the Republic and do so themselves. Various right-wing sources opposed any democratic system, preferring an authoritarian, autocratic state like the 1871 Empire. To further undermine the Republic's credibility, some right-wingers (especially certain members of the former officer corps) also blamed an alleged conspiracy of Socialists and Jews for Germany's defeat in World War I.

The Weimar Republic had some of the most serious economic problems ever experienced by any Western democracy in history. Rampant hyperinflation, massive unemployment, and a large drop in living standards were primary factors.

In the first half of 1922, the mark stabilized at about 320 marks per dollar. By fall 1922, Germany found itself unable to make reparations payments since the price of gold was now well beyond what it could afford. Also, the mark was by now practically worthless, making it impossible for Germany to buy foreign exchange or gold using paper marks. Instead, reparations were to be paid in goods such as coal. In January 1923, French and Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr, the industrial region of Germany in the Ruhr valley, to ensure reparations payments. Inflation was exacerbated when workers in the Ruhr went on a general strike and the German government printed more money to continue paying for their passive resistance. By November 1923, the US dollar was worth 4.2 trillion German marks. In 1919, one loaf of bread cost 1 mark; by 1923, the same loaf of bread cost 100 billion marks.
From 1923 to 1929, there was a short period of economic recovery, but the Great Depression of the 1930s led to a worldwide recession. Germany was particularly affected because it depended heavily on American loans. In 1926, about 2 million Germans were unemployed, which rose to around 6 million in 1932. Many blamed the Weimar Republic. That was made apparent when political parties on both right and left wanting to disband the Republic altogether made any democratic majority in Parliament impossible.

The reparations damaged Germany's economy by discouraging market loans, which forced the Weimar government to finance its deficit by printing more currency, causing rampant hyperinflation. In addition, the rapid disintegration of Germany in 1919 by the return of a disillusioned army, the rapid change from possible victory in 1918 to defeat in 1919, and the political chaos may have caused a psychological imprint on Germans that could lead to extreme nationalism, later epitomised and exploited by Hitler.

It is also widely believed that the 1919 constitution had several
weaknesses, making the eventual establishment of a dictatorship likely, but it is unknown whether a different constitution could have prevented the rise of the Nazi party.

Attributions

- The Weimar Republic
30.1.3: Self-Determination and New States

The dissolution of the German, Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires created a number of new countries in eastern Europe and the Middle East, often with large ethnic minorities. This caused numerous conflicts and hostilities.

Learning Objective

Give examples of self-determination in the interwar period

Key Points

- The self-determination of states, the principle that peoples, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and fair equality of opportunity, have the right to freely choose their sovereignty and international political status with no interference, developed throughout the modern period alongside nationalism.
During and especially after World War I, there was a renewed commitment to self-determination and a major influx of new states formed out of the collapsed empires of Europe: the German Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, Russian Empire, and the Ottoman Empire.

Many new states formed in Eastern Europe, some out of the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, where Russia renounced claims on Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, and Lithuania, and some from the various treaties that came out of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

These new countries tended to have substantial ethnic minorities who wished to unite with neighboring states where their ethnicity dominated (for example, example, Czechoslovakia had Germans, Poles, Ruthenians and Ukrainians, Slovaks, and Hungarians), which led to political instability and conflict.

The dissolution of the Ottoman Empire became a pivotal milestone in the creation of the modern Middle East, the result of which bore witness to the creation of new conflicts and hostilities in the region.

**Key Terms**

**Nansen passport**
Internationally recognized refugee travel documents,
first issued by the League of Nations to stateless refugees.

**self-determination**

A principle of international law that states that peoples, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and fair equality of opportunity, have the right to freely choose their sovereignty and international political status with no interference.

**Treaty of Brest-Litovsk**

A peace treaty signed on March 3, 1918, between the new Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire), that ended Russia’s participation in World War I. Part of its terms was the renouncement of Russia’s claims on Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, and Lithuania.

---

**Geopolitical Consequences of World War I**

The years 1919-24 were marked by turmoil as Europe struggled to recover from the devastation of the First World War and the destabilizing effects of the loss of four large historic empires: the German Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, Russian Empire, and the Ottoman Empire. There were numerous new nations in Eastern Europe, most of them small.

Internally these new countries tended to have substantial ethnic minorities who wished to unite with neighboring states where their ethnicity dominated. For example, Czechoslovakia had Germans, Poles, Ruthenians and Ukrainians, Slovaks, and Hungarians. Millions
of Germans found themselves in the newly created countries as minorities. More than two million ethnic Hungarians found themselves living outside of Hungary in Slovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia. Many of these national minorities found themselves in bad situations because the modern governments were intent on defining the national character of the countries, often at the expense of the minorities. The League of Nations sponsored various Minority Treaties in an attempt to deal with the problem, but with the decline of the League in the 1930s, these treaties became increasingly unenforceable. One consequence of the massive redrawing of borders and the political changes in the aftermath of World War I was the large number of European refugees. These and the refugees of the Russian Civil War led to the creation of the Nansen passport.

Ethnic minorities made the location of the frontiers generally unstable. Where the frontiers have remained unchanged since 1918, there has often been the expulsion of an ethnic group, such as the Sudeten Germans. Economic and military cooperation among these small states was minimal, ensuring that the defeated powers of Germany and the Soviet Union retained a latent capacity to dominate the region. In the immediate aftermath of the war, defeat drove cooperation between Germany and the Soviet Union but ultimately these two powers would compete to dominate eastern Europe.

At the end of the war, the Allies occupied Constantinople (Istanbul) and the Ottoman government collapsed. The Treaty of Sèvres, a plan designed by the Allies to dismember the remaining Ottoman territories, was signed on August 10, 1920, although it was never ratified by the Sultan.

The occupation of Smyrna by Greece on May 18, 1919, triggered a nationalist movement to rescind the terms of the treaty. Turkish revolutionaries led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, a successful Ottoman commander, rejected the terms enforced at Sèvres and under the guise of General Inspector of the Ottoman Army, left Istanbul for
Samsun to organize the remaining Ottoman forces to resist the terms of the treaty.

After Turkish resistance gained control over Anatolia and Istanbul, the Sèvres treaty was superseded by the Treaty of Lausanne, which formally ended all hostilities and led to the creation of the modern Turkish Republic. As a result, Turkey became the only power of World War I to overturn the terms of its defeat and negotiate with the Allies as an equal.

Europe in 1923: The dissolution of the German, Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires created a number of new countries in eastern Europe, such as Poland, Finland, Yugoslavia, and Turkey.

**Self-Determination**

The right of peoples to self-determination is a cardinal principle in modern international law. It states that peoples, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and fair equality of opportunity, have the right to freely choose their sovereignty and international
political status with no interference. The explicit terms of this principle can be traced to the Atlantic Charter, signed on August 14, 1941, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. It also is derived from principles espoused by United States President Woodrow Wilson following World War I, after which some new nation states were formed or previous states revived after the dissolution of empires. The principle does not state how the decision is to be made nor what the outcome should be, whether it be independence, federation, protection, some form of autonomy, or full assimilation. Neither does it state what the delimitation between peoples should be—nor what constitutes a people. There are conflicting definitions and legal criteria for determining which groups may legitimately claim the right to self-determination.

The employment of imperialism through the expansion of empires and the concept of political sovereignty, as developed after the Treaty of Westphalia, also explain the emergence of self-determination during the modern era. During and after the Industrial Revolution, many groups of people recognized their shared history, geography, language, and customs. Nationalism emerged as a uniting ideology not only between competing powers, but also for groups that felt subordinated or disenfranchised inside larger states; in this situation, self-determination can be seen as a reaction to imperialism. Such groups often pursued independence and sovereignty over territory, but sometimes a different sense of autonomy has been pursued or achieved.

The revolt of New World British colonists in North America during the mid-1770s has been seen as the first assertion of the right of national and democratic self-determination because of the explicit invocation of natural law, the natural rights of man, and the consent of and sovereignty by, the people governed; these ideas were inspired particularly by John Locke’s enlightened writings of the previous century. Thomas Jefferson further promoted the notion that the will of the people was supreme, especially through
authorship of the United States Declaration of Independence which inspired Europeans throughout the 19th century. Leading up to World War I, in Europe there was a rise of nationalism, with nations such as Greece, Hungary, Poland, and Bulgaria seeking or winning their independence.

Woodrow Wilson revived America's commitment to self-determination, at least for European states, during World War I. When the Bolsheviks came to power in Russia in November 1917, they called for Russia's immediate withdrawal as a member of the Allies of World War I. They also supported the right of all nations, including colonies, to self-determination. The 1918 Constitution of the Soviet Union acknowledged the right of secession for its constituent republics.

This presented a challenge to Wilson's more limited demands. In January 1918 Wilson issued his Fourteen Points that among other things, called for adjustment of colonial claims insofar as the interests of colonial powers had equal weight with the claims of subject peoples. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918 led to Russia's exit from the war and the independence of Armenia, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, and Poland.

The end of the war led to the dissolution of the defeated Austro-Hungarian Empire and the creation by the Allies of Czechoslovakia and the union of the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs and the Kingdom of Serbia as new states. However, this imposition of states where some nationalities (especially Poles, Czechs, and Serbs and Romanians) were given power over nationalities who disliked and distrusted them eventually helped lead to World War II. Also Germany lost land after WWI: Northern Slesvig voted to return to Denmark after a referendum. The defeated Ottoman empire was dissolved into the Republic of Turkey and several smaller nations, including Yemen, plus the new Middle East Allied “mandates” of Syria and Lebanon (future Syria, Lebanon and Hatay State), Palestine (future Transjordan and Israel), Mesopotamia (future Iraq). The League of Nations was proposed as much as a means of consolidating these new states, as a path to peace.
During the 1920s and 1930s there were some successful movements for self-determination in the beginnings of the process of decolonization. In the Statute of Westminster the United Kingdom granted independence to Canada, New Zealand, Newfoundland, the Irish Free State, the Commonwealth of Australia, and the Union of South Africa after the British parliament declared itself as incapable of passing laws over them without their consent. Egypt, Afghanistan, and Iraq also achieved independence from Britain and Lebanon from France. Other efforts were unsuccessful, like the Indian independence movement. Italy, Japan, and Germany all initiated new efforts to bring certain territories under their control, leading to World War II.

Attributions

• Self-Determination and New States
30.1.4: The Kellogg-Briand Pact

The Kellogg-Briand Pact intended to establish “the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy,” but was largely ineffective in preventing conflict or war.

**Learning Objective**

Identify why the Kellogg-Briand Pact was conceived and signed

**Key Points**

- After World War I, seeing the devastating consequences of total war, many politicians and diplomats strove to create measures that would prevent further armed conflict.
- This effort resulted in numerous international institutions and treaties, such as the creation of the League of Nations and in 1928, the Kellogg-Briand Pact.
- The Kellogg-Briand Pact was written by United
States Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg and French foreign minister Aristide Briand.

• It went into effect on July 24, 1929, and before long had a total of 62 signatories.
• Practically, the Kellogg-Briand Pact did not live up to its aim of ending war or stopping the rise of militarism, and in this sense it made no immediate contribution to international peace and proved to be ineffective in the years to come.
• Nevertheless, the pact has served as one of the legal bases establishing the international norms that the threat or use of military force in contravention of international law, as well as the territorial acquisitions resulting from it, are unlawful.
• It inspired and influenced future international agreements, including the United Nations Charter.

**Key Terms**

**annexation**

The political transition of land from the control of one entity to another. It is also the incorporation of unclaimed land into a state's sovereignty, which is in most cases legitimate. In international law it is the forcible transition of one state's territory by another state or the legal process by which a city acquires land. Usually, it is implied that the territory and population being annexed is the smaller, more peripheral, and
weaker of the two merging entities, barring physical size.

**multilateral treaty**
A treaty to which three or more sovereign states are parties. Each party owes the same obligations to all other parties, except to the extent that they have stated reservations.

**Kellogg–Briand Pact**
A 1928 international agreement in which signatory states promised not to use war to resolve “disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them.”

The Kellogg–Briand Pact (or Pact of Paris, officially General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy) is a 1928 international agreement in which signatory states promised not to use war to resolve “disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them.” Parties failing to abide by this promise “should be denied of the benefits furnished by this treaty.” It was signed by Germany, France, and the United States on August 27, 1928, and by most other nations soon after. Sponsored by France and the U.S., the Pact renounces the use of war and calls for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Similar provisions were incorporated into the Charter of the United Nations and other treaties and it became a stepping-stone to a more activist American policy. It is named after its authors, United States Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg and French foreign minister Aristide Briand.

The texts of the treaty reads:

```
Persuaded that the time has come when a frank
```
renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated; Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by pacific means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process, and that any signatory Power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by this Treaty; Hopeful that, encouraged by their example, all the other nations of the world will join in this humane endeavour and by adhering to the present Treaty as soon as it comes into force bring their peoples within the scope of its beneficent provisions, thus uniting the civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy; Have decided to conclude a Treaty...

After negotiations, the pact was signed in Paris at the French Foreign Ministry by the representatives from Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, British India, the Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Poland, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It was provided that it would come into effect on July 24, 1929. By that date, the following nations had deposited instruments of definitive adherence to the pact: Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Romania, the Soviet Union, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, Siam, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey. Eight further states joined after that date (Persia, Greece, Honduras, Chile, Luxembourg, Danzig, Costa Rica and Venezuela) for a total of 62 signatories.

In the United States, the Senate approved the treaty overwhelmingly, 85–1, with only Wisconsin Republican John J. Blaine...
voting against. While the U.S. Senate did not add any reservation to the treaty, it did pass a measure which interpreted the treaty as not infringing upon the United States’ right of self-defense and not obliging the nation to enforce it by taking action against those who violated it.


**Effect and Legacy**

As a practical matter, the Kellogg–Briand Pact did not live up to its aim of ending war or stopping the rise of militarism, and in this sense it made no immediate contribution to international peace and proved to be ineffective in the years to come. Moreover, the pact erased the legal distinction between war and peace because the signatories, having renounced the use of war, began to wage wars without declaring them as in the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, the Spanish Civil
War in 1936, the Soviet invasion of Finland in 1939, and the German and Soviet Union invasions of Poland. Nevertheless, the pact is an important multilateral treaty because, in addition to binding the particular nations that signed it, it has also served as one of the legal bases establishing the international norms that the threat or use of military force in contravention of international law, as well as the territorial acquisitions resulting from it, are unlawful.

Notably, the pact served as the legal basis for the creation of the notion of crime against peace. It was for committing this crime that the Nuremberg Tribunal and Tokyo Tribunal tried and sentenced a number of people responsible for starting World War II.

The interdiction of aggressive war was confirmed and broadened by the United Nations Charter, which provides in article 2, paragraph 4, that “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.” One legal consequence of this is that it is clearly unlawful to annex territory by force. However, neither this nor the original treaty has prevented the subsequent use of annexation. More broadly, there is a strong presumption against the legality of using or threatening military force against another country. Nations that have resorted to the use of force since the Charter came into effect have typically invoked self-defense or the right of collective defense.

Attributions

- The Kellogg-Briand Pact
The Kellogg-Briand Pact.
30.2: The Russian Revolution

30.2.1: The Russian Revolution of 1905

The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a wave of mass political and social unrest that spread through vast areas of the Russian Empire, which included worker strikes, peasant unrest, and military mutinies.

Learning Objective

Outline the events of the 1905 Revolution, along with its successes and failures

Key Points

• In January 1905, an incident known as “Bloody Sunday” occurred when Father Gapon led an enormous crowd to the Winter Palace in Saint Petersburg to present a petition to the tsar.
• When the procession reached the palace, Cossacks opened fire on the crowd, killing hundreds.
• The Russian masses were so aroused over the massacre that a general strike was declared demanding a democratic republic, which marked the beginning of the Russian Revolution of 1905.
• Soviets (councils of workers) appeared in most cities to direct revolutionary activity.
• In October 1905, Tsar Nicholas reluctantly issued the famous October Manifesto, which conceded the creation of a national Duma (legislature), as well as the right to vote, and affirmed that no law was to go into force without confirmation by the Duma.
• The moderate groups were satisfied, but the socialists rejected the concessions as insufficient and tried to organize new strikes.
• By the end of 1905, there was disunity among the reformers, and the tsar’s position was strengthened for the time being.

Key Terms

Russification

A form of cultural assimilation during which non-Russian communities, voluntarily or not, give up their culture and language in favor of the Russian one. In a historical sense, the term refers to both official and unofficial policies of Imperial Russia and the Soviet
Union with respect to their national constituents and to national minorities in Russia, aimed at Russian domination.

**State Duma**

The Lower House of the legislative assembly in the late Russian Empire, which held its meetings in the Taurida Palace in St. Petersburg. It convened four times between April 1906 and the collapse of the Empire in February 1917. It was founded during the Russian Revolution of 1905 as the Tsar’s response to rebellion.

**Russian Constitution of 1906**

A major revision of the 1832 Fundamental Laws of the Russian Empire, which transformed the formerly absolutist state into one in which the emperor agreed for the first time to share his autocratic power with a parliament. It was enacted on May 6, 1906, on the eve of the opening of the first State Duma.

The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a wave of mass political and social unrest that spread through vast areas of the Russian Empire, some of which was directed at the government. It included worker strikes, peasant unrest, and military mutinies and led to constitutional reform, including the establishment of the State Duma, the multi-party system, and the Russian Constitution of 1906.

**Causes of Unrest**

According to Sidney Harcave, author of *The Russian Revolution*
of 1905, four problems in Russian society contributed to the revolution. First, newly emancipated peasants earned too little and were not allowed to sell or mortgage their allotted land. Second, ethnic minorities resented the government because of its “Russification,” discrimination, and repression, both social and formal, such as banning them from voting and serving in the Guard or Navy and limiting attendance in schools. Third, a nascent industrial working class resented the government for doing too little to protect them, by banning strikes and labor unions. Finally, the educated class fomented and spread radical ideas after a relaxing of discipline in universities allowed a new consciousness to grow among students.

Taken individually, these issues might not have affected the course of Russian history, but together they created the conditions for a potential revolution. Historian James Defronzo writes, “At the turn of the century, discontent with the Tsar’s dictatorship was manifested not only through the growth of political parties dedicated to the overthrow of the monarchy but also through industrial strikes for better wages and working conditions, protests and riots among peasants, university demonstrations, and the assassination of government officials, often done by Socialist Revolutionaries.”

Start of the Revolution

In December 1904, a strike occurred at the Putilov plant (a railway and artillery supplier) in St. Petersburg. Sympathy strikes in other parts of the city raised the number of strikers to 150,000 workers in 382 factories. By January 21, 1905, the city had no electricity and newspaper distribution was halted. All public areas were declared closed.

Controversial Orthodox priest Georgy Gapon, who headed a police-sponsored workers’ association, led a huge workers’
procession to the Winter Palace to deliver a petition to the Tsar on Sunday, January 22, 1905. The troops guarding the palace were ordered to tell the demonstrators not to pass a certain point, according to Sergei Witte, and at some point, troops opened fire on the demonstrators, causing between 200 and 1,000 deaths. The event became known as Bloody Sunday and is considered by many scholars as the start of the active phase of the revolution.

The events in St. Petersburg provoked public indignation and a series of massive strikes that spread quickly throughout the industrial centers of the Russian Empire. Polish socialists called for a general strike. By the end of January 1905, over 400,000 workers in Russian Poland were on strike. Half of European Russia’s industrial workers went on strike in 1905, and 93.2% in Poland. There were also strikes in Finland and the Baltic coast.

Nationalist groups were angered by the Russification undertaken since Alexander II. The Poles, Finns, and Baltic provinces all sought autonomy and freedom to use their national languages and promote their own cultures. Muslim groups were also active — the First Congress of the Muslim Union took place in August 1905. Certain groups took the opportunity to settle differences with each other rather than the government. Some nationalists undertook anti-Jewish pogroms, possibly with government aid, and in total over 3,000 Jews were killed.

**Height of the Revolution**

Tsar Nicholas II agreed on February 18 to the creation of a State Duma of the Russian Empire with consultative powers only. When its slight powers and limits on the electorate were revealed, unrest redoubled. The Saint Petersburg Soviet was formed and called for a general strike in October, refusal to pay taxes, and the withdrawal of bank deposits.

In June and July 1905, there were many peasant uprisings in which
peasants seized land and tools. Disturbances in the Russian-controlled Congress Poland culminated in June 1905 in the Łódź insurrection. Surprisingly, only one landlord was recorded as killed. Far more violence was inflicted on peasants outside the commune with 50 deaths recorded.

The October Manifesto, written by Sergei Witte and Alexis Obolenskii, was presented to the Tsar on October 14. It closely followed the demands of the Zemstvo Congress in September, granting basic civil rights, allowing the formation of political parties, extending the franchise towards universal suffrage, and establishing the Duma as the central legislative body. The Tsar waited and argued for three days, but finally signed the manifesto on October 30, 1905, citing his desire to avoid a massacre and his realization that insufficient military force was available to pursue alternate options. He regretted signing the document, saying that he felt “sick with shame at this betrayal of the dynasty ... the betrayal was complete.”

When the manifesto was proclaimed, there were spontaneous demonstrations of support in all the major cities. The strikes in St. Petersburg and elsewhere officially ended or quickly collapsed. A political amnesty was also offered. The concessions came hand-in-hand with renewed, brutal action against the unrest. There was also a backlash from the conservative elements of society, with right-wing attacks on strikers, left-wingers, and Jews.

While the Russian liberals were satisfied by the October Manifesto and prepared for upcoming Duma elections, radical socialists and revolutionaries denounced the elections and called for an armed uprising to destroy the Empire.

Some of the November uprising of 1905 in Sevastopol, headed by retired naval Lieutenant Pyotr Schmidt, was directed against the government, while some was undirected. It included terrorism, worker strikes, peasant unrest, and military mutinies, and was only suppressed after a fierce battle. The Trans-Baikal railroad fell into the hands of striker committees and demobilized soldiers returning from Manchuria after the Russo-Japanese War. The Tsar had to
send a special detachment of loyal troops along the Trans-Siberian Railway to restore order.

Between December 5 and 7, there was another general strike by Russian workers. The government sent troops on December 7, and a bitter street-by-street fight began. A week later, the Semyonovsky Regiment was deployed and used artillery to break up demonstrations and shell workers’ districts. On December 18, with around a thousand people dead and parts of the city in ruins, the workers surrendered. After a final spasm in Moscow, the uprisings ended.

Russian Revolution of 1905: A locomotive overturned by striking workers at the main railway depot in Tiflis in 1905. Results According to figures presented in the Duma by Professor Maksim Kovalevsky, by April 1906, more than 14,000 people had been executed and 75,000 imprisoned. Following the Revolution of 1905, the Tsar made last attempts to save his regime
and offered reforms similar to those of most rulers pressured by a revolutionary movement. The military remained loyal throughout the Revolution of 1905, as shown by their shooting of revolutionaries when ordered by the Tsar, making overthrow difficult. These reforms were outlined in a precursor to the Constitution of 1906 known as the October Manifesto which created the Imperial Duma. The Russian Constitution of 1906, also known as the Fundamental Laws, set up a multiparty system and a limited constitutional monarchy. The revolutionaries were quelled and satisfied with the reforms, but it was not enough to prevent the 1917 revolution that would later topple the Tsar’s regime.

“Tiflis_railway_strike_1905.jpg.”
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/
File:Tiflis_railway_strike_1905.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
Under Tsar Nicholas II (reigned 1894–1917), the Russian Empire slowly industrialized amidst increased discontent and dissent among the lower classes. This only increased during World War I, leading to the utter collapse of the Tsarist régime in 1917 and an era of civil war.

Learning Objective

Name a few reasons the Russian populace was discontented with its leadership

Key Points

- During the 1890s, Russia’s industrial development led to a large increase in the size of the urban middle-class and working class, which gave rise to a more dynamic political atmosphere and the development of radical parties.
• During the 1890s and early 1900s, bad living and working conditions, high taxes, and land hunger gave rise to more frequent strikes and agrarian disorders.
• Russia’s backwards systems for agricultural production, the worst in Europe at the time, influenced the attitudes of peasants and other social groups to reform against the government and promote social changes.
• The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a major factor of the February Revolutions of 1917, unleashing a steady current of worker unrest and increased political agitation.
• The onset of World War I exposed the weakness of Nicholas II’s government.
• A show of national unity had accompanied Russia’s entrance into the war, with defense of the Slavic Serbs the main battle cry, but by 1915, the strain of the war began to cause popular unrest, with high food prices and fuel shortages causing strikes in some cities.

Key Terms

Tsar Nicholas II
The last Emperor of Russia, ruling from November 1894 until his forced abdication on March 15, 1917. His reign saw the fall of the Russian Empire from one of the foremost great powers of the world to economic and
military collapse. Due to the Khodynka Tragedy, anti-Semitic pogroms, Bloody Sunday, the violent suppression of the 1905 Revolution, the execution of political opponents, and his perceived responsibility for the Russo-Japanese War, he was given the nickname Nicholas the Bloody by his political adversaries.

**St. Petersburg Soviet**

A workers’ council or soviet circa 1905. The idea of a soviet as an organ to coordinate workers’ strike activities arose during the January–February 1905 meetings of workers at the apartment of Voline (later a famous anarchist) during the abortive revolution of 1905. However, its activities were quickly repressed by the government. The model would later become central to the communists during the Revolution of 1917.

**Bolshevik party**

Literally meaning “one of the majority,” this party was a faction of the Marxist Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) which split from the Menshevik faction at the Second Party Congress in 1903. They ultimately became the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Under Tsar Nicholas II (reigned 1894–1917), the Russian Empire slowly industrialized while repressing political opposition in the center and on the far left. It recklessly entered wars with Japan (1904) and with Germany and Austria (1914) for which it was very poorly prepared, leading to the utter collapse of the old régime in 1917 and an era of civil war.

During the 1890s, Russia’s industrial development led to a large increase in the size of the urban middle-class and orking class, which gave rise to a more dynamic political atmosphere and the
development of radical parties. Because the state and foreigners owned much of Russia's industry, the Russian working class was comparatively stronger and the Russian bourgeoisie comparatively weaker than in the West. The working class and peasants became the first to establish political parties in Russia because the nobility and the wealthy bourgeoisie were politically timid. During the 1890s and early 1900s, bad living and working conditions, high taxes, and land hunger gave rise to more frequent strikes and agrarian disorders. These activities prompted the bourgeoisie of various nationalities in the Russian Empire to develop a host of parties, both liberal and conservative.

The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a major factor in the February Revolutions of 1917. The events of Bloody Sunday triggered a line of protests. A council of workers called the St. Petersburg Soviet was created in all this chaos, beginning the era of communist political protest.

**Agrarian Backwardness**

Russia's systems for agricultural production influenced peasants and other social groups to reform against the government and promote social changes. Historians George Jackson and Robert Devlin write, “At the beginning of the twentieth century, agriculture constituted the single largest sector of the Russian economy, producing approximately one-half of the national income and employing two-thirds of Russia's population.” This illustrates the tremendous role peasants played economically, making them detrimental to the revolutionary ideology of the populist and social democrats. At the end of the 19th century, Russian agriculture as a whole was the worst in Europe. The Russian system of agriculture lacked capital investment and technological advancement. Livestock productivity was notoriously backwards and the lack of grazing land such as meadows forced livestock to graze in fallow
uncultivated land. Both the crop and livestock system failed to withstand the Russian winters. During the Tsarist rule, the agricultural economy diverged from subsistence production to production directly for the market. Along with the agricultural failures, Russia had rapid population growth, railroads expanded across farmland, and inflation attacked the price of commodities. Restrictions were placed on the distribution of food and ultimately led to famines. Agricultural difficulties in Russia limited the economy, influencing social reforms and assisting the rise of the Bolshevik party.

Worker Discontent

The social causes of the Russian Revolution mainly came from centuries of oppression of the lower classes by the Tsarist regime and Nicholas’s failures in World War I. While rural agrarian peasants had been emancipated from serfdom in 1861, they still resented paying redemption payments to the state, and demanded communal tender of the land they worked. The problem was further compounded by the failure of Sergei Witte’s land reforms of the early 20th century. Increasing peasant disturbances and sometimes actual revolts occurred, with the goal of securing ownership of the land they worked. Russia consisted mainly of poor farming peasants, with 1.5% of the population owning 25% of the land.

Workers had good reasons for discontent: overcrowded housing with often deplorable sanitary conditions; long hours at work (on the eve of the war, a 10-hour workday six days a week was the average and many were working 11–12 hours a day by 1916); constant risk of injury and death from poor safety and sanitary conditions; harsh discipline (not only rules and fines, but foremen’s fists); and inadequate wages (made worse after 1914 by steep wartime increases in the cost of living). At the same time, urban industrial life was full of benefits, though these could be just as dangerous, from
the point of view of social and political stability, as the hardships. There were many encouragements to expect more from life. Acquiring new skills gave many workers a sense of self-respect and confidence, heightening expectations and desires. Living in cities, workers encountered material goods they had never seen in villages. Most importantly, they were exposed to new ideas about the social and political order.

The rapid industrialization of Russia also resulted in urban overcrowding. Between 1890 and 1910, the population of the capital, Saint Petersburg, swelled from 1,033,600 to 1,905,600, with Moscow experiencing similar growth. This created a new proletariat that due to being crowded together in the cities was much more likely to protest and go on strike than the peasantry had been in previous eras. In one 1904 survey, it was found that an average of sixteen people shared each apartment in Saint Petersburg with six people per room. There was no running water, and piles of human waste were a threat to the health of the workers. The poor conditions only aggravated the situation, with the number of strikes and incidents of public disorder rapidly increasing in the years shortly before World War I. Because of late industrialization, Russia's workers were highly concentrated.

World War I

Tsar Nicholas II and his subjects entered World War I with enthusiasm and patriotism, with the defense of Russia's fellow Orthodox Slavs, the Serbs, as the main battle cry. In August 1914, the Russian army invaded Germany's province of East Prussia and occupied a significant portion of Austrian-controlled Galicia in support of the Serbs and their allies – the French and British. Military reversals and shortages among the civilian population, however, soon soured much of the population. German control of the Baltic Sea and German-Ottoman control of the Black Sea
severed Russia from most of its foreign supplies and potential markets.

By the middle of 1915, the impact of the war was demoralizing. Food and fuel were in short supply, casualties were increasing, and inflation was mounting. Strikes rose among low-paid factory workers, and there were reports that peasants, who wanted reforms of land ownership, were restless. The tsar eventually decided to take personal command of the army and moved to the front, leaving Alexandra in charge in the capital.

By its end, World War I prompted a Russian outcry directed at Tsar Nicholas II. It was another major factor contributing to the retaliation of the Russian Communists against their royal opponents. After the entry of the Ottoman Empire on the side of the Central Powers in October 1914, Russia was deprived of a major trade route through Ottoman Empire, which followed with a minor economic crisis in which Russia became incapable of providing munitions to its army in the years leading to 1917. However, the problems were merely administrative and not industrial, as Germany was producing great amounts of munitions whilst constantly fighting on two major battlefronts.

The war also developed a weariness in the city, owing to a lack of food in response to the disruption of agriculture. Food scarcity had become a considerable problem in Russia, but the cause did not lie in any failure of the harvests, which had not been significantly altered during wartime. The indirect reason was that the government, in order to finance the war, had been printing millions of ruble notes, and by 1917 inflation increased prices up to four times what they had been in 1914. The peasantry were consequently faced with the higher cost of purchases, but made no corresponding gain in the sale of their own produce, since this was largely taken by the middlemen on whom they depended. As a result, they tended to hoard their grain and to revert to subsistence farming, so the cities were constantly short of food. At the same time rising prices led to demands for higher wages in the factories, and in January and February 1916 revolutionary propaganda aided by German funds
led to widespread strikes. Heavy losses during the war also strengthened thoughts that Tsar Nicholas II was unfit to rule.

![Discontent Leading up the Russian Revolution: Russian soldiers marching in Petrograd in February 1917.](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Soldiers_demonstration.February_1917.jpg)

**Attributions**

- **Rising Discontent in Russia**
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File:Soldiers_demonstration.February_1917.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
157. The Provisional Government

30.2.3: The Provisional Government

The Russian Empire collapsed with the abdication of Emperor Nicholas II during the February Revolution. The old regime was replaced by a politically moderate provisional government that struggled for power with the socialist-led worker councils (soviets).

**Learning Objective**

Detail the workings of Russia’s provisional government

**Key Points**

- The February Revolution of 1917 was focused around Petrograd (now Saint Petersburg), then capital of Russia.
- The army leadership felt they did not have the means to suppress the revolution, resulting in Tsar Nicholas’s abdication and soon after, the end of the Tsarist regime altogether.
• To fill the vacuum of authority, the Duma (legislature) declared a provisional government headed by Prince Lvov, collectively known as the Russian Republic.

• Meanwhile, the socialists in Petrograd organized elections among workers and soldiers to form a soviet (council) of workers’ and soldiers’ deputies as an organ of popular power that could pressure the “bourgeois” provisional government.

• The Soviets initially permitted the provisional government to rule, but insisted on a prerogative to influence decisions and control various militias.

• A period of dual power ensued during which the provisional government held state power while the national network of soviets, led by socialists, had the allegiance of the lower classes and the political left.

• During this chaotic period there were frequent mutinies, protests, and strikes, such as the July Days.

• The period of competition for authority ended in late October 1917 when Bolsheviks routed the ministers of the Provisional Government in the events known as the October Revolution and placed power in the hands of the soviets, which had given their support to the Bolsheviks.
**Key Terms**

**July Days**
Events in 1917 that took place in Petrograd, Russia, between July 3 and 7 when soldiers and industrial workers engaged in spontaneous armed demonstrations against the Russian Provisional Government. The Bolsheviks initially attempted to prevent the demonstrations and then decided to support them.

**Soviet**
Political organizations and governmental bodies, essentially workers’ councils, primarily associated with the Russian Revolutions and the history of the Soviet Union, that gave the name to the latter state.

**February Revolution**
The first of two Russian revolutions in 1917. It involved mass demonstrations and armed clashes with police and gendarmes, the last loyal forces of the Russian monarchy. On March 12, mutinous Russian Army forces sided with the revolutionaries. Three days later, the result was the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II, the end of the Romanov dynasty, and the end of the Russian Empire.

**Russian Provisional Government**
A provisional government of the Russian Republic established immediately following the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II of the Russian Empire on 2 March.
Background: February Revolution

At the beginning of February 1917, Petrograd (Saint Petersburg) workers began several strikes and demonstrations. On March 7, workers at Putilov, Petrograd's largest industrial plant, announced a strike.

The next day, a series of meetings and rallies were held for International Women's Day, which gradually turned into economic and political gatherings. Demonstrations were organized to demand bread, supported by the industrial working force who considered them a reason to continue the strikes. The women workers marched to nearby factories, bringing out over 50,000 workers on strike. By March 10, virtually every industrial enterprise in Petrograd had been shut down along with many commercial and service enterprises. Students, white-collar workers, and teachers joined the workers in the streets and at public meetings.

To quell the riots, the Tsar looked to the army. At least 180,000 troops were available in the capital, but most were either untrained or injured. Historian Ian Beckett suggests around 12,000 could be regarded as reliable, but even these proved reluctant to move in on the crowd since it included so many women. For this reason, on March 11 when the Tsar ordered the army to suppress the rioting by force, troops began to mutiny. Although few actively joined the rioting, many officers were either shot or went into hiding; the ability of the garrison to hold back the protests was all but nullified, symbols of the Tsarist regime were rapidly torn down, and governmental authority in the capital collapsed – not helped by the fact that Nicholas had suspended the Duma (legislature) that morning, leaving it with no legal authority to act. The response of the Duma, urged on by the liberal bloc, was to establish a temporary committee to restore law and order; meanwhile, the socialist parties established the Petrograd Soviet to represent workers and soldiers. The remaining loyal units switched allegiance the next day.

The Tsar directed the royal train, stopped on March 14 by a group
of revolutionaries at Malaya Vishera, back to Petrograd. When the Tsar finally arrived at in Pskov, the Army Chief Ruzsky and the Duma deputees Guchkov and Shulgin suggested in unison that he abdicate the throne. He did so on March on behalf of both himself and his son, the Tsarevich. Nicholas nominated his brother, the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich, to succeed him, but the Grand Duke realized that he would have little support as ruler. He declined the crown on March 16, stating that he would take it only as the consensus of democratic action.

The immediate effect of the February Revolution was a widespread atmosphere of elation and excitement in Petrograd. On March 16, the provisional government was announced. The center-left was well represented, and the government was initially chaired by a liberal aristocrat, Prince Georgy Yevgenievich Lvov, a member of the Constitutional Democratic party (KD). The socialists had formed their rival body, the Petrograd Soviet (or workers’ council) four days earlier. The Petrograd Soviet and the provisional government competed for power over Russia.

Reign of the Provisional Government

The Russian Provisional Government was a provisional government of the Russian Republic established immediately following the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II of the Russian Empire on March 2, 1917. It was intended to organize elections to the Russian Constituent Assembly and its convention.

Despite its short reign of power and implementation shortcomings, the provisional government passed very progressive legislation. The policies enacted by this moderate government (by 1917 Russian standards) represented arguably the most liberal legislation in Europe at the time. It abolished capital punishment, declared the independence of Poland, redistributed wealth in the countryside, restored the constitution of Finland, established local
government on a universal suffrage basis, separated church and state, conceded language rights to all the nationalities, and confirmed liberty of speech, liberty of the Press, and liberty of assembly.

The provisional government lasted approximately eight months, ceasing when the Bolsheviks seized power after the October Revolution in October 1917. According to Harold Whitmore Williams, the eight months during which Russia was ruled by the provisional government was characterized by the steady and systematic disorganization of the army.

The provisional government was unable to make decisive policy decisions due to political factionalism and a breakdown of state structures. This weakness left the government open to strong challenges from both the right and the left. Its chief adversary on the left was the Petrograd Soviet, which tentatively cooperated with the government at first but then gradually gained control of the army, factories, and railways. While the Provisional Government retained the formal authority to rule over Russia, the Petrograd Soviet maintained actual power. With its control over the army and the railroads, the Petrograd Soviet had the means to enforce policies. The provisional government lacked the ability to administer its policies. In fact, local soviets, political organizations mostly of socialists, often maintained discretion when deciding whether or not to implement the provisional government’s laws.

A period of dual power ensued during which the provisional government held state power while the national network of soviets, led by socialists, had the allegiance of the lower classes and the political left. During this chaotic period there were frequent mutinies, protests, and strikes. When the provisional government chose to continue fighting the war with Germany, the Bolsheviks and other socialist factions campaigned for stopping the conflict. The Bolsheviks turned workers’ militias under their control into the Red Guards (later the Red Army), over which they exerted substantial control.

In July, following a series of crises known as the July Days (strikes
by soldiers and industrial workers) that undermined its authority with the public, the head of the provisional government resigned and was succeeded by Alexander Kerensky. Kerensky was more progressive than his predecessor but not radical enough for the Bolsheviks or many Russians discontented with the deepening economic crisis and the continuation of the war. While Kerensky’s government marked time, the socialist-led soviet in Petrograd joined with soviets (workers’ councils) that formed throughout the country to create a national movement.

The period of competition for authority ended in late October 1917 when Bolsheviks routed the ministers of the provisional government in the events known as the October Revolution and placed power in the hands of the soviets, which had given their support to the Bolsheviks.

July Days: Street demonstration on Nevsky Prospekt in Petrograd just after of the Provisional Government opened fire in the July Days.
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The October Revolution

30.2.4: The October Revolution

On October 25, 1917, Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin led his leftist revolutionaries in a successful revolt against the ineffective provisional government, an event known as the October Revolution.

Learning Objective

Explain the events of the October Revolution

Key Points

• In the October Revolution (November in the Gregorian calendar), the Bolsheviks, led by Vladimir Lenin, and the workers’ soviets overthrew the Russian Provisional Government in Petrograd.
• The Bolsheviks appointed themselves as leaders of various government ministries and seized control of the countryside, establishing the Cheka to quash dissent.
• The October Revolution ended the phase of the revolution instigated in February, replacing Russia’s
short-lived provisional parliamentary government with government by soviets, local councils elected by bodies of workers and peasants.

- To end Russia’s participation in the First World War, the Bolshevik leaders signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with Germany in March 1918.
- Soviet membership was initially freely elected, but many members of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, anarchists, and other leftists created opposition to the Bolsheviks through the soviets themselves.
- When it became clear that the Bolsheviks had little support outside of the industrialized areas of Saint Petersburg and Moscow, they simply barred non-Bolsheviks from membership in the soviets.
- The new government soon passed the Decree on Peace and the Decree on Land, the latter of which redistributed land and wealth to peasants throughout Russia.
- A coalition of anti-Bolshevik groups attempted to unseat the new government in the Russian Civil War from 1918 to 1922.

**Key Terms**

**Decree on Land**

Written by Vladimir Lenin, this law was passed by the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers’, Soldiers’, and Peasants’ Deputies on October 26, 1917, following the
The success of the October Revolution. It decreed an abolition of private property and the redistribution of the landed estates among the peasantry.

**Marxism–Leninism**

A political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of Classical Marxism and Leninism that seeks to establish socialist states and develop them further. They espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of Marxism and Leninism, but generally support the idea of a vanguard party, one-party state, proletarian state-dominance over the economy, internationalism, opposition to bourgeois democracy, and opposition to capitalism. It remains the official ideology of the ruling parties of China, Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, a number of Indian states, and certain governed Russian oblasts such as Irkutsk. It was the official ideology of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and the other ruling parties that made up the Eastern Bloc.

**Vladimir Lenin**

A Russian communist revolutionary, politician, and political theorist. He served as head of government of the Russian Republic from 1917 to 1918, of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic from 1918 to 1924, and of the Soviet Union from 1922 to 1924. Under his administration, Russia and then the wider Soviet Union became a one-party socialist state governed by the Russian Communist Party. Ideologically a Marxist, he developed political theories known as Leninism.

**October Revolution**

A seizure of state power by the Bolshevik Party
The October Revolution, commonly referred to as Red October, the October Uprising, or the Bolshevik Revolution, was a seizure of state power instrumental in the larger Russian Revolution of 1917. It took place with an armed insurrection in Petrograd on October 25, 1917. It followed and capitalized on the February Revolution of the same year.

It followed and capitalized on the February Revolution of the same year, which overthrew the Tsarist autocracy and resulted in a provisional government after a transfer of power proclaimed by Grand Duke Michael, brother of Tsar Nicolas II, who declined to take power after the Tsar stepped down. During this time, urban workers began to organize into councils (Russian: Soviet) wherein revolutionaries criticized the provisional government and its actions. The October Revolution in Petrograd overthrew the provisional government and gave the power to the local soviets. The Bolshevik party was heavily supported by the soviets. After the Congress of Soviets, now the governing body, had its second session, it elected members of the Bolsheviks and other leftist groups such as the Left Socialist Revolutionaries to key positions within the new state of affairs. This immediately initiated the establishment of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, the world's first self-proclaimed socialist state.

The revolution was led by the Bolsheviks, who used their influence in the Petrograd Soviet to organize the armed forces. Bolshevik Red Guards forces under the Military Revolutionary Committee began the takeover of government buildings on October 24, 1917. The following day, the Winter Palace (the seat of the Provisional government located in Petrograd, then capital of Russia), was captured.

The long-awaited Constituent Assembly elections were held on
November 12, 1917. The Bolsheviks only won 175 seats in the 715-seat legislative body, coming in second behind the Socialist Revolutionary party, which won 370 seats. The Constituent Assembly was to first meet on November 28, 1917, but its convocation was delayed until January 5, 1918, by the Bolsheviks. On its first and only day in session, the body rejected Soviet decrees on peace and land, and was dissolved the next day by order of the Congress of Soviets.

As the revolution was not universally recognized, there followed the struggles of the Russian Civil War (1917–22) and the creation of the Soviet Union in 1922.

Leadership and Ideology

The October Revolution was led by Vladimir Lenin and was based upon Lenin's writing on the ideas of Karl Marx, a political ideology often known as Marxism–Leninism. Marxist-Leninists espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of Marxism and Leninism, but generally support the idea of a vanguard party, one-party state, proletarian state–dominance over the economy, internationalism, opposition to bourgeois democracy, and opposition to capitalism. The October Revolution marked the beginning of the spread of communism in the 20th century. It was far less sporadic than the revolution of February and came about as the result of deliberate planning and coordinated activity to that end.

Though Lenin was the leader of the Bolshevik Party, it has been argued that since Lenin was not present during the actual takeover of the Winter Palace, it was really Trotsky's organization and direction that led the revolution, merely spurred by the motivation Lenin instigated within his party. Critics on the right have long argued that the financial and logistical assistance of German intelligence via agent Alexander Parvus was a key component as
well, though historians are divided since there is little evidence supporting that claim.

Results

The Second Congress of Soviets consisted of 670 elected delegates; 300 were Bolshevik and nearly a hundred were Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who also supported the overthrow of the Alexander Kerensky Government. When the fall of the Winter Palace was announced, the Congress adopted a decree transferring power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, thus ratifying the Revolution.

The transfer of power was not without disagreement. The center and right wings of the Socialist Revolutionaries as well as the Mensheviks believed that Lenin and the Bolsheviks had illegally seized power and walked out before the resolution was passed. As they exited, they were taunted by Leon Trotsky who told them “You are pitiful isolated individuals; you are bankrupts; your role is played out. Go where you belong from now on — into the dustbin of history!”

The following day, October 26, the Congress elected a Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) with Lenin as leader as the basis of a new Soviet Government, pending the convocation of a Constituent Assembly, and passed the Decree on Peace and the Decree on Land. This new government was also officially called “provisional” until the Assembly was dissolved. The Council of People's Commissars now began to arrest the leaders of opposition parties. Dozens of Constitutional Democratic Party (Kadet) leaders and members of the Constituent Assembly were imprisoned in The Peter and Paul Fortress. These would be followed by the arrests of Socialist Revolutionary Party and Menshevik leaders. Posters were pinned on walls and fences by the Socialist-Revolutionaries, describing the takeover as a “crime against the motherland and
revolution.” There was also strong anti-Bolshevik opposition within Petrograd. All in all, the transfer of power was complex and replete with conflict within the revolutionaries.

The Decree on Land ratified the actions of the peasants who throughout Russia seized private land and redistributed it among themselves. The Bolsheviks viewed themselves as representing an alliance of workers and peasants and memorialized that understanding with the hammer and sickle on the flag and coat of arms of the Soviet Union. Other decrees:

- All private property was seized by the state.
- All Russian banks were nationalized.
- Private bank accounts were confiscated.
- The Church’s properties (including bank accounts) were seized.
- All foreign debts were repudiated.
- Control of the factories was given to the soviets.
- Wages were fixed at higher rates than during the war, and a shorter, eight-hour working day was introduced.

The success of the October Revolution transformed the Russian state into a soviet republic. A coalition of anti-Bolshevik groups attempted to unseat the new government in the Russian Civil War from 1918 to 1922.
Lenin and Trotsky, Russian Revolutionaries: Vladimir Lenin, leader of the Bolsheviks, speaking at a meeting in Sverdlov Square in Moscow, with Leon Trotsky and Lev Kamenev adjacent to the right of the podium.
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The Russian Civil War, which broke out in 1918 shortly after the October Revolution, was fought mainly between the “Reds,” led by the Bolsheviks, and the “Whites,” a politically-diverse coalition of anti-Bolsheviks.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the various parties that participated in the Russian Civil War

**Key Points**

- The Russian Civil War, which broke out in 1918 shortly after the revolution, brought death and suffering to millions of people regardless of their political orientation.
- The war was fought mainly between the “Reds,” consisting of the uprising majority led by the Bolshevik minority, and the “Whites,” army officers and cossacks, the “bourgeoisie,” and political groups.
ranging from the far right to the Socialist revolutionaries who opposed the drastic restructuring championed by the Bolsheviks following the collapse of the Russian Provisional Government to the soviets (under clear Bolshevik dominance).

- The Whites had backing from Great Britain, France, the U.S., and Japan, while the Reds possessed internal support which proved to be much more effective.
- Though the Allied nations, using external interference, provided substantial military aid to the loosely knit anti-Bolshevik forces, they were ultimately defeated.
- By 1921, the Reds defeated their internal enemies and brought most of the newly independent states under their control, with the exception of Finland, the Baltic States, the Moldavian Democratic Republic (which joined Romania), and Poland (with whom they had fought the Polish–Soviet War).

Key Terms

**Cheka**

The first of a succession of Soviet state security organizations. It was created on December 20, 1917, after a decree issued by Vladimir Lenin, and was subsequently led by Felix Dzerzhinsky, a Polish aristocrat turned communist. These troops policed labor camps; ran the Gulag system; conducted
requisitions of food; subjected political opponents to secret arrest, detention, torture, and summary execution; and put down rebellions and riots by workers or peasants, and mutinies in the desertion-plagued Red Army.

**White Army**

A loose confederation of Anti-Communist forces that fought the Bolsheviks, also known as the Reds, in the Russian Civil War (1917–1923) and, to a lesser extent, continued operating as militarized associations both outside and within Russian borders until roughly World War II.

**Red Army**

The army and the air force of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, and after 1922 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The army was established immediately after the 1917 October Revolution.

The Russian Civil War (November 1917 – October 1922) was a multi-party war in the former Russian Empire immediately after the Russian Revolutions of 1917, as many factions vied to determine Russia’s political future. The two largest combatant groups were the Red Army, fighting for the Bolshevik form of socialism, and the loosely allied forces known as the White Army, which included diverse interests respectively favoring monarchism, capitalism, and alternative forms of socialism, each with democratic and antidemocratic variants. In addition, rival militant socialists and non-ideological Green armies fought against both the Bolsheviks and the Whites. The Whites had backing from Great Britain, France, the U.S., and Japan, while the Reds possessed internal support which proved much more effective.

The Red Army defeated the White Armed Forces of South Russia
in Ukraine and the army led by Admiral Aleksandr Kolchak in Siberia in 1919. The remains of the White forces commanded by Pyotr Nikolayevich Wrangel were beaten in Crimea and evacuated in late 1920. Lesser battles of the war continued on the periphery for two more years, and minor skirmishes with the remnants of the White forces in the Far East continued well into 1923. Armed national resistance in Central Asia was not completely crushed until 1934. There were an estimated 7-12 million casualties during the war, mostly civilians. The Russian Civil War has been described by some as the greatest national catastrophe that Europe had yet seen.

Many pro-independence movements emerged after the break-up of the Russian Empire and fought in the war. Several parts of the former Russian Empire—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland—were established as sovereign states, with their own civil wars and wars of independence. The rest of the former Russian Empire was consolidated into the Soviet Union shortly afterwards.

British historian Orlando Figes has contended that the root of the Whites’ defeat was their inability to dispel the popular image that they were associated with Tsarist Russia and supportive of a Tsarist restoration.
The Red Army

In the wake of the October Revolution, the old Russian Imperial Army had been demobilized; the volunteer-based Red Guard was the Bolsheviks’ main military force, augmented by an armed military
component of the Cheka, the Bolshevik state security apparatus. In January, after significant reverses in combat, War Commissar Leon Trotsky headed the reorganization of the Red Guard into a Workers’ and Peasants’ Red Army to create a more professional fighting force. Political commissars were appointed to each unit of the army to maintain morale and ensure loyalty.

In June 1918, when it became apparent that a revolutionary army composed solely of workers would be far too small, Trotsky instituted mandatory conscription of the rural peasantry into the Red Army. Opposition of rural Russians to Red Army conscription units was overcome by taking hostages and shooting them when necessary in order to force compliance, the same practices used by the White Army officers. Former Tsarist officers were utilized as “military specialists,” and sometimes their families were taken hostage in order to ensure their loyalty.

The White Army

While resistance to the Red Guard began on the day after the Bolshevik uprising, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the political ban became a catalyst for the formation of anti-Bolshevik groups both inside and outside Russia, pushing them into action against the new regime.

A loose confederation of anti-Bolshevik forces aligned against the Communist government, including landowners, republicans, conservatives, middle-class citizens, reactionaries, pro-monarchists, liberals, army generals, non-Bolshevik socialists who still had grievances, and democratic reformists voluntarily united only in their opposition to Bolshevik rule. Their military forces, bolstered by forced conscriptions and terror and by foreign influence and led by Gen. Yudenich, Adm. Kolchak, and Gen. Denikin, became known as the White movement (sometimes
referred to as the “White Army”) and controlled significant parts of
the former Russian Empire for most of the war.

The Western Allies armed and supported opponents of the
Bolsheviks. They were worried about (1) a possible Russo-German
alliance, (2) the prospect of the Bolsheviks making good on their
threats to default on Imperial Russia’s massive foreign loans and (3)
that the Communist revolutionary ideas would spread (a concern
shared by many Central Powers). Hence, many of these countries
expressed their support for the Whites, including the provision of
troops and supplies. Winston Churchill declared that Bolshevism
must be “strangled in its cradle.” The British and French had
supported Russia during World War I on a massive scale with war
materials. After the treaty, it looked like much of that material would
fall into the hands of the Germans. Under this pretext, the Allies
intervened in the Russian Civil War, with the United Kingdom and
France sending troops into Russian ports. There were violent
clashes with troops loyal to the Bolsheviks.

Aftermath

The results of the civil war were momentous. Soviet demographer
Boris Urlanis estimated the total number of men killed in action
in the Civil War and Polish-Soviet War at 300,000 (125,000 in the
Red Army, 175,500 White armies and Poles) and the total number
of military personnel dead from disease (on both sides) as 450,000.
During the Red Terror the Cheka carried out at least 250,000
summary executions of “enemies of the people” with estimates
reaching above a million.

At the end of the Civil War the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist
Republic was exhausted and near ruin. The droughts of 1920 and
1921, as well as the 1921 famine, worsened the disaster still further.
Disease had reached pandemic proportions, with 3 million dying
of typhus alone in 1920. Millions more also died of widespread
starvation, wholesale massacres by both sides, and pogroms against Jews in Ukraine and southern Russia. By 1922 there were at least 7 million street children in Russia as a result of nearly ten years of devastation from the Great War and the civil war.

Another one to two million people, known as the White émigrés, fled Russia, many with Gen. Wrangel—some through the Far East, others west into the newly independent Baltic countries. These émigrés included a large percentage of the educated and skilled population of Russia.

The Russian economy was devastated by the war, with factories and bridges destroyed, cattle and raw materials pillaged, mines flooded, and machines damaged. The industrial production value descended to one-seventh of the value of 1913 and agriculture to one-third.

War Communism saved the Soviet government during the Civil War, but much of the Russian economy had ground to a standstill. The peasants responded to requisitions by refusing to till the land. By 1921 cultivated land had shrunk to 62% of the pre-war area, and the harvest yield was only about 37% of normal.

Attributions

- The Russian Civil War
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30.2.6: Formation of the Soviet Union

The government of the Soviet Union, formed in 1922 with the unification of the Russian, Transcaucasian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian republics, was based on the one-party rule of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks), who increasingly developed a totalitarian regime, especially during the reign of Joseph Stalin.

Learning Objective

Assess the reasons for creating the Soviet Union

Key Points

- The Soviet Union had its roots in the October Revolution of 1917, when the Bolsheviks overthrew the Russian Provisional Government that had replaced Tsar Nicholas II. However, it only officially consolidated as the new government of Russia after the defeat of the White Army during the Russian Civil...
War in 1922.

- At that time, the new nation included four constituent republics: the Russian SFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Belarusian SSR, and the Transcaucasian SFSR.
- The period from the consolidation of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 until 1921 is known as the period of war communism, in which land, all industry, and small businesses were nationalized and the economy was restricted.
- The constitution, adopted in 1924, established a federal system of government based on a succession of soviets set up in villages, factories, and cities in larger regions, which culminated in the All-Union Congress of Soviets.
- However, while it appeared that the congress exercised sovereign power, this body was actually governed by the Communist Party, which in turn was controlled by the Politburo from Moscow, the capital of the Soviet Union.
- Following Lenin's death in 1924, a collective leadership (troika), and a brief power struggle, Joseph Stalin came to power in the mid-1920s and established a repressive totalitarian regime.
Key Terms

**Karl Marx**

A German-born scientist, philosopher, economist, sociologist, journalist, and revolutionary socialist. His theories about society, economics, and politics—collectively understood as Marxism—hold that human societies develop through class struggle; in capitalism, this manifests itself in the conflict between the ruling classes (known as the bourgeoisie) that control the means of production and working classes (known as the proletariat) that enable these means by selling their labor for wages. Through his theories of alienation, value, commodity fetishism, and surplus value, he argued that capitalism facilitated social relations and ideology through commodification, inequality, and the exploitation of labor.

**Great Purge**

A campaign of political repression in the Soviet Union from 1936 to 1938. It involved a large-scale purge of the Communist Party and government officials, repression of peasants and the Red Army leadership, and widespread police surveillance, suspicion of “saboteurs,” imprisonment, and arbitrary executions.

**First Five-Year Plan**

A list of economic goals created by General Secretary Joseph Stalin and based on his policy of Socialism in One Country, implemented between 1928 and 1932. In 1929, Stalin edited the plan to include the creation of collective farming systems that stretched over
The Soviet Union, officially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was a socialist state in Eurasia that existed from 1922 to 1991. It was nominally a supranational union of national republics, but its government and economy were highly centralized in a state that was unitary in most respects. The Union's capital was Moscow.

The Soviet Union had its roots in the October Revolution of 1917, when the Bolsheviks, led by Vladimir Lenin, overthrew the Russian Provisional Government that had replaced Tsar Nicholas II. This established the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic (Russian SFSR) and started the Russian Civil War between the revolutionary “Reds” and the counter-revolutionary “Whites.” The Red Army entered several territories of the former Russian Empire and helped local communists take power through workers’ councils called “soviets,” which nominally acted on behalf of workers and peasants.

In 1922, the communists (Reds) were victorious, forming the Soviet Union with the unification of the Russian, Transcaucasian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian republics. Under the control of the party, all politics and attitudes that were not strictly of the Russian Communist Party (RCP) were suppressed, under the premise that the RCP represented the proletariat and all activities contrary to the party’s beliefs were “counterrevolutionary” or “anti-socialist.” Eventually crushing all opponents, the RCP spread soviet-style rule quickly and established itself through all of Russia.
The original ideology of the state was primarily based on the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In its essence, Marx's theory stated that economic and political systems went through an inevitable evolution in form by which the current capitalist system would be replaced by a Socialist state before achieving international cooperation and peace in a “Workers’ Paradise,” creating a system directed by, what Marx called, “Pure Communism.”

Following Lenin’s death in 1924, a collective leadership (troika), and a brief power struggle, Joseph Stalin came to power in the mid-1920s. Stalin suppressed all political opposition to his rule, committed the state ideology to Marxism–Leninism (which he created), and initiated a centrally planned command economy. As a result, the country underwent a period of rapid industrialization and collectivization which laid the foundation for its victory in World War II and postwar dominance of Eastern Europe. Stalin also fomented political paranoia and conducted the Great Purge to remove opponents of his from the Communist Party through the mass arbitrary arrest of many people (military leaders, Communist Party members, and ordinary citizens alike) who were then sent to correctional labor camps (gulags) or sentenced to death.

Creation of the USSR and Early Years

On December 29, 1922, a conference of plenipotentiary delegations from the Russian SFSR, the Transcaucasian SFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, and the Byelorussian SSR approved the Treaty on the Creation of the USSR and the Declaration of the Creation of the USSR, forming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These documents were confirmed by the 1st Congress of Soviets of the USSR and signed by heads of delegations.

On February 1, 1924, the USSR was recognized by the British Empire. The same year, a Soviet Constitution was approved, legitimizing the December 1922 union.
An intensive restructuring of the economy, industry and politics of the country began in the early days of Soviet power in 1917. A large part of this was done according to the Bolshevik Initial Decrees, government documents signed by Vladimir Lenin. One of the most prominent breakthroughs was the GOELRO plan, which envisioned a major restructuring of the Soviet economy based on total electrification of the country. The plan was developed in 1920 and covered a 10- to 15-year period. It included construction of a network of 30 regional power stations, including ten large hydroelectric power plants and numerous electric-powered large industrial enterprises. The plan became the prototype for subsequent Five-Year Plans and was fulfilled by 1931.

During the Civil War (1917–21), the Bolsheviks adopted war communism, which entailed the breakup of the landed estates and the forcible seizure of agricultural surpluses. In the cities there were intense food shortages and a breakdown in the money system (at the time many Bolsheviks argued that ending money’s role as a transmitter of “value” was a sign of the rapidly approaching communist epoch). Many city dwellers fled to the countryside, often to tend the land that the Bolshevik breakup of the landed estates had transferred to the peasants. Even small-scale “capitalist” production was suppressed.

Strong opposition soon developed. The peasants wanted cash payments for their products and resented having to surrender their surplus grain to the government as a part of its civil war policies. Confronted with peasant opposition, Lenin began a strategic retreat from war communism known as the New Economic Policy (NEP). The peasants were freed from wholesale levies of grain and allowed to sell their surplus produce in the open market. Commerce was stimulated by permitting private retail trading. The state continued to be responsible for banking, transportation, heavy industry, and public utilities.

Although the left opposition among the Communists criticized the rich peasants, or kulaks, who benefited from the NEP, the program proved highly beneficial and the economy revived. The
NEP would later come under increasing opposition from within the party following Lenin's death in early 1924.

The Death of Lenin and the Rise of Stalin

Following Lenin's third stroke, a troika made up of Grigory Zinoviev of the Ukrainian SSR, Lev Kamenev of the Russian SFSR, and Joseph Stalin of the Transcaucasian SFSR emerged to take day-to-day leadership of the party and the country and block Trotsky from taking power. Lenin, however, became increasingly anxious about Stalin and following his December 1922 stroke, dictated a letter (known as Lenin's Testament) to the party criticizing him and urging his removal as general secretary, a position which was becoming the most powerful in the party. Stalin was aware of Lenin's Testament and acted to keep Lenin in isolation for health reasons and increase his control over the party apparatus.
Lenin and Stalin (1922): Toward the end of his life, Lenin became increasingly anxious about Stalin and began criticizing him and urging his removal as general secretary. Despite these misgivings, Stalin eventually replaced Lenin as the leader of the USSR.

Zinoviev and Bukharin became concerned about Stalin’s increasing power and proposed that the Orgburo which Stalin headed be abolished and Zinoviev and Trotsky be added to the party
secretariat, thus diminishing Stalin’s role as general secretary. Stalin reacted furiously and the Orgburo was retained, but Bukharin, Trotsky, and Zinoviev were added to the body.

On April 3, 1922, Stalin was named the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Lenin had appointed Stalin the head of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspectorate, which gave Stalin considerable power. By gradually consolidating his influence and isolating and outmaneuvering his rivals within the party, Stalin became the undisputed leader of the Soviet Union and, by the end of the 1920s, established totalitarian rule.

Lenin died in January 1924 and in May his Testament was read aloud at the Central Committee, but Zinoviev and Kamenev argued that Lenin’s objections had proven groundless and that Stalin should remain General Secretary. The Central Committee decided not to publish the testament.

In October 1927, Grigory Zinoviev and Leon Trotsky were expelled from the Central Committee and forced into exile.

In 1928, Stalin introduced the First Five-Year Plan for building a socialist economy. In place of the internationalism expressed by Lenin throughout the Revolution, it aimed to build Socialism in One Country. In industry, the state assumed control over all existing enterprises and undertook an intensive program of industrialization. In agriculture, rather than adhering to the “lead by example” policy advocated by Lenin, forced collectivization of farms was implemented all over the country.

Famines ensued, causing millions of deaths; surviving kulaks were persecuted and many sent to Gulags to do forced labor. Social upheaval continued in the mid-1930s. Stalin’s Great Purge resulted in the execution or detainment of many “Old Bolsheviks” who had participated in the October Revolution with Lenin. According to declassified Soviet archives, in 1937 and 1938 the NKVD arrested more than 1.5 million people, of whom 681,692 were shot. Over two years, that averages to over one thousand executions a day. According to historian Geoffrey Hosking, “…excess deaths during the 1930s as a whole were in the range of 10–11 million.” Yet despite
the turmoil of the mid-to-late 1930s, the Soviet Union developed a powerful industrial economy in the years before World War II.

Attributions

- Formation of the Soviet Union
30.3: The Great Depression

30.3.1: The Financial Crisis of the 1930s

The Great Depression was the longest, deepest, and most widespread depression of the 20th century, put into motion after the devastating stock market crash in 1929 in the United States known as Black Tuesday.

**Learning Objective**

Compose a list of factors that contributed to the global depression of the early 1930s

**Key Points**

- The Great Depression was a global economic depression, the worst by far in the 20th century.
- It began in October 1929 after a decade of massive spending and increased production throughout much
of the world after the end of World War I. The American stock market crashed on October 29, which became known as “Black Tuesday.”

- The market lost over $30 billion in two days.
- When stocks plummeted on Black Tuesday, the world noticed immediately, creating a ripple effect on the global economy.
- The gold standard was the primary transmission mechanism of the Great Depression, driving down the currency of even nations with no banking crisis.
- The sooner nations got off the gold standard, the sooner they recovered from the depression.
- In many countries, the negative effects of the Great Depression lasted until the beginning of World War II.

**Key Terms**

**speculation**

The purchase of an asset (a commodity, goods, or real estate) with the hope that it will become more valuable at a future date. In finance, it is the practice of engaging in risky financial transactions to profit from short-term fluctuations in the market value of a tradeable financial instrument rather than from its underlying financial attributes such as capital gains, dividends, or interest.
Black Tuesday
The most devastating stock market crash in the history of the United States, when taking into consideration the full extent and duration of its aftereffects. The crash, which followed the London Stock Exchange’s crash of September, signaled the beginning of the 10-year Great Depression that affected all Western industrialized countries.

gold standard
A monetary system in which the standard economic unit of account is based on a fixed quantity of gold.

The Great Depression

The Great Depression was a severe worldwide economic depression during the 1930s. The timing of the Great Depression varied across nations; in most countries it started in 1929 and lasted until the late 1930s. It was the longest, deepest, and most widespread depression of the 20th century. In the 21st century, the Great Depression is commonly used as an example of how far the world’s economy can decline.

The depression originated in the United States after a major fall in stock prices that began around September 4, 1929, and became worldwide news with the stock market crash of October 29, 1929 (known as Black Tuesday). Between 1929 and 1932, worldwide GDP fell by an estimated 15%. By comparison, worldwide GDP fell by less than 1% from 2008 to 2009 during the Great Recession. Some economies started to recover by the mid-1930s. However, in many
countries the negative effects of the Great Depression lasted until
the beginning of World War II.

The Great Depression had devastating effects in countries both
rich and poor. Personal income, tax revenue, profits, and prices
dropped, while international trade plunged by more than 50%.
Unemployment in the U.S. rose to 25% and in some countries as
high as 33%.

Cities all around the world were hit hard, especially those
dependent on heavy industry. Construction was virtually halted in
many countries. Farming communities and rural areas suffered as
crop prices fell by about 60%. Facing plummeting demand with
few alternative sources of jobs, areas dependent on primary sector
industries such as mining and logging suffered the most.

Black Tuesday

Economic historians usually attribute the start of the Great
Depression to the sudden devastating collapse of U.S. stock market
prices on October 29, 1929, known as Black Tuesday. However, some
dispute this conclusion and see the stock crash as a symptom rather
than a cause of the Great Depression.

The Roaring Twenties, the decade that followed World War I and
led to the crash, was a time of wealth and excess. Building on
post-war optimism, rural Americans migrated to the cities in vast
numbers throughout the decade with the hopes of finding a more
prosperous life in the ever-growing expansion of America's
industrial sector. While the American cities prospered, the
overproduction of agricultural produce created widespread
financial despair among American farmers throughout the decade.
This would later be blamed as one of the key factors that led to the
1929 stock market crash.

Despite the dangers of speculation, many believed that the stock
market would continue to rise forever. On March 25, 1929, after
the Federal Reserve warned of excessive speculation, a mini-crash occurred as investors started to sell stocks at a rapid pace, exposing the market’s shaky foundation.

Selling intensified in mid-October. On October 24 (“Black Thursday”), the market lost 11 percent of its value at the opening bell on very heavy trading. The huge volume meant that the report of prices on the ticker tape in brokerage offices around the nation was hours late, so investors had no idea what most stocks were actually trading for at that moment, increasing panic.

Over the weekend, these events were covered by the newspapers across the United States. On October 28, “Black Monday,” more investors facing margin calls decided to get out of the market, and the slide continued with a record loss in the Dow for the day of 38.33 points, or 13%.

The next day, “Black Tuesday,” October 29, 1929, about 16 million shares traded as the panic selling reached its peak. Some stocks actually had no buyers at any price that day (“air pockets”). The Dow lost an additional 30 points, or 12 percent. The volume of stocks traded on October 29, 1929, was a record that was not broken for nearly 40 years.

On October 29, William C. Durant joined with members of the Rockefeller family and other financial giants to buy large quantities of stocks to demonstrate to the public their confidence in the market, but their efforts failed to stop the large decline in prices. Due to the massive volume of stocks traded that day, the ticker did not stop running until about 7:45 p.m. that evening. The market had lost over $30 billion in the space of two days.
Great Depression: Crowd at New York’s American Union Bank during a bank run early in the Great Depression. The widespread panic after the Stock Market Crash of 1929 resulted in a bank crisis with massive bank runs, which occur when a large number of customers withdraw cash from deposit accounts with a financial institution at the same time because they believe that the institution is or might become insolvent.

Causes

The two classical competing theories of the Great Depression are the Keynesian (demand-driven) and the monetarist explanations. There are also various heterodox theories that downplay or reject these explanations. The consensus among demand-driven theorists is that a large-scale loss of confidence led to a sudden reduction in consumption and investment spending. Once panic and deflation set in, many people believed they could avoid further losses by keeping clear of the markets. Holding money became profitable as prices dropped lower and a given amount of money bought ever more goods, exacerbating the drop in demand. Monetarists believe
that the Great Depression started as an ordinary recession, but the shrinking of the money supply greatly exacerbated the economic situation, causing a recession to descend into the Great Depression.

Global Spread: Gold Standard

The stock market crash of October 1929 led directly to the Great Depression in Europe. When stocks plummeted on the New York Stock Exchange, the world noticed immediately. Although financial leaders in England, as in the United States, vastly underestimated the extent of the crisis that would ensue, it soon became clear that the world's economies were more interconnected than ever. The effects of the disruption to the global system of financing, trade, and production and the subsequent meltdown of the American economy were soon felt throughout Europe.

The gold standard was the primary transmission mechanism of the Great Depression. Even countries that did not face bank failures and a monetary contraction first-hand were forced to join the deflationary policy, since higher interest rates in countries that did so led to a gold outflow in countries with lower interest rates. Under the gold standard, countries that lost gold but nevertheless wanted to maintain the gold standard had to permit their money supply to decrease and the domestic price level to decline (deflation).

The Great Depression hit Germany hard. The impact of the Wall Street Crash forced American banks to end the new loans that had been funding the repayments under the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. The financial crisis escalated out of control and mid-1931, starting with the collapse of the Credit Anstalt in Vienna in May. This put heavy pressure on Germany, which was already in political turmoil.

Some economic studies have indicated that just as the downturn was spread worldwide by the rigidities of the Gold Standard, it was
suspending gold convertibility (or devaluing the currency in gold terms) that did the most to make recovery possible.

Every major currency left the gold standard during the Great Depression. Great Britain was the first to do so. Facing speculative attacks on the pound and depleting gold reserves, in September 1931 the Bank of England ceased exchanging pound notes for gold and the pound was floated on foreign exchange markets.

Great Britain, Japan, and the Scandinavian countries left the gold standard in 1931. Other countries, such as Italy and the U.S., remained on the gold standard into 1932 or 1933, while a few countries in the so-called “gold bloc,” led by France and including Poland, Belgium, and Switzerland, stayed on the standard until 1935–36.

According to later analysis, how soon a country left the gold standard reliably predicted its economic recovery. For example, Great Britain and Scandinavia, which left the gold standard in 1931, recovered much earlier than France and Belgium, which remained on gold much longer.

Attributions
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30.3.2: Decline in International Trade

Many economists have argued that the sharp decline in international trade after 1930 helped to worsen the Great Depression, and many historians partly blame this on the American Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act (enacted June 17, 1930) for reducing international trade and causing retaliatory tariffs in other countries.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the effect the Great Depression had on international trade

**Key Points**

- The Great Depression and international trade are deeply linked, with the decline in the stock markets affecting consumption and production in various countries. This slowed international trade, which in turn exacerbated the depression.
The situation was made worse by the rise of protectionism throughout the globe, which is the economic policy of restraining trade between countries through methods such as tariffs on imported goods, restrictive quotas, and other government regulations.

Protectionist policies protect the producers, businesses, and workers of the import-competing sector in a country from foreign competitors.

This attitude was put into effect most forcibly by the 1930 Smoot–Hawley Tariff Act, passed by the U.S. Congress.

The Smoot–Hawley Tariff Act aimed to protect American jobs and farmers from foreign competition by encouraging the purchase of American-made products by increasing the cost of imported goods.

Other nations increased tariffs on American-made goods in retaliation, reducing international trade and worsening the Depression.

**Key Terms**

**autarky**

The quality of being self-sufficient, usually applied to political states or their economic systems that can survive without external assistance or international trade. If a self-sufficient economy also refuses all trade with the outside world then it is called a closed
International Trade During the Great Depression

Many economists have argued that the sharp decline in international trade after 1930 worsen the depression, especially for countries significantly dependent on foreign trade. Most historians and economists partly blame the American Smoot–Hawley Tariff Act for worsening the depression by seriously reducing international trade and causing retaliatory tariffs in other countries.

While foreign trade was a small part of overall economic activity in the U.S. concentrated in a few businesses like farming, it was a much larger factor in many other countries. The average rate of duties on dutiable imports for 1921–25 was 25.9%, but under the new tariff it jumped to 50% during 1931–35.

In dollar terms, American exports declined over the next four years from about $5.2 billion in 1929 to $1.7 billion in 1933; not only did the physical volume of exports fall, but the prices fell by about 1/3 as written. Hardest hit were farm commodities such as wheat, cotton, tobacco, and lumber.

Economist Paul Krugman argues against the notion that
protectionism caused the Great Depression or made the decline in production worse. He cites a report by Barry Eichengreen and Douglas Irwin and argues that increased tariffs prevented trade from rebounding even after production recovered. Figure 1 in that report shows trade and production dropping together from 1929 to 1932, but production increasing faster than trade from 1932 to 1937. The authors argue that adherence to the gold standard forced many countries to resort to tariffs, when instead they should have devalued their currencies.

### Smoot–Hawley Tariff Act

The Tariff Act of 1930, otherwise known as the Smoot–Hawley Tariff Act, was an act sponsored by Senator Reed Smoot and Representative Willis C. Hawley and signed into law on June 17, 1930. The act raised U.S. tariffs on over 20,000 imported goods.

The intent of the Act was to encourage the purchase of American-made products by increasing the cost of imported goods while raising revenue for the federal government and protecting farmers. Other nations increased tariffs on American-made goods in retaliation, reducing international trade and worsening the Depression.

The tariffs under the act were the second-highest in the U.S. in 100 years, exceeded by a small margin by the Tariff of 1828. The Act and following retaliatory tariffs by America’s trading partners helped reduce American exports and imports by more than half during the Depression, but economists disagree on the exact amount.

As the global economy entered the first stages of the Great Depression in late 1929, the U.S.’s main goal was to protect American jobs and farmers from foreign competition. Reed Smoot championed another tariff increase within the U.S. in 1929, which
became the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Bill. In his memoirs, Smoot made it abundantly clear:

The world is paying for its ruthless destruction of life and property in the World War and for its failure to adjust purchasing power to productive capacity during the industrial revolution of the decade following the war.

Threats of retaliation by other countries began long before the bill was enacted into law in June 1930. As it passed the House of Representatives in May 1929, boycotts broke out and foreign governments moved to increase rates against American products, even though rates could be increased or decreased by the Senate or the conference committee. By September 1929, Hoover's administration had received protest notes from 23 trading partners, but threats of retaliatory actions were ignored.

In May 1930, Canada, the country's most loyal trading partner, retaliated by imposing new tariffs on 16 products that accounted altogether for around 30% of U.S. exports to Canada. Canada later also forged closer economic links with the British Empire via the British Empire Economic Conference of 1932. France and Britain protested and developed new trade partners. Germany developed a system of autarky, a self-sufficient, closed-economy with little or no international trade.

In 1932, with the depression having worsened for workers and farmers despite Smoot and Hawley's promises of prosperity from a high tariff, the two lost their seats in the elections that year.
Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act: Willis C. Hawley (left) and Reed Smoot in April 1929, shortly before the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act passed the House of Representatives. Many historians contend that the Act worsened the worldwide economic depression. Protectionism In economics, protectionism is the economic policy of restraining trade between states (countries) through methods such as tariffs on imported goods, restrictive quotas, and other government regulations. Protectionist policies protect the producers, businesses, and workers of the import-competing sector in a country from
foreign competitors. According to proponents, these policies can counteract unfair trade practices by allowing fair competition between imports and goods and services produced domestically. Protectionists may favor the policy to decrease the trade deficit, maintain employment in certain sectors, or promote the growth of certain industries. There is a broad consensus among economists that the impact of protectionism on economic growth (and on economic welfare in general) is largely negative, although the impact on specific industries and groups of people may be positive. The doctrine of protectionism contrasts with the doctrine of free trade, where governments reduce barriers to trade as much as possible. 
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30.4: The Rise of Fascism

30.4.1: Mussolini and Fascist Italy

After aligning itself with Italian conservatives, the fascist party rose to prominence using violence and intimidation, eventually seizing power in Rome in 1922 under the leadership of Benito Mussolini.

Learning Objective

Evaluate why Mussolini was able to seize power in Italy

Key Points

- The rise of fascism in Italy began during World War I, when Benito Mussolini and other radicals formed a political group (called a fasci) supporting the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary.
- The first meeting of Mussolini's Fasci of Revolutionary Action was held on January 24, 1915.
For the next several years, the small group of fascists took part in political actions, taking advantage of worker strikes to incite violence.

Around 1921, the fascists began to align themselves with mainstream conservatives, increasing membership exponentially.

Beginning in 1922, Fascist paramilitaries escalated their strategy from attacking socialist offices and homes of socialist leadership figures to violent occupation of cities, eventually setting their sites on Rome.

During the so-called “March on Rome,” Mussolini was appointed Prime Minister of Italy.

From 1925 to 1929, Fascism steadily became entrenched in power. Opposition deputies were denied access to parliament, censorship was introduced, and a December 1925 decree made Mussolini solely responsible to the King.

Italian Fascism, also known simply as Fascism, is the original fascist ideology as developed in Italy. The ideology is associated with the Fascist Revolutionary Party (PFR), founded in 1915; the succeeding National Fascist Party (PNF) in 1921, which under Benito Mussolini ruled the Kingdom of Italy from 1922 until 1943; the Republican Fascist Party that ruled the Italian Social Republic from 1943 to 1945; and the post-war Italian Social Movement and subsequent Italian neo-fascist movements.

Italian Fascism was rooted in Italian nationalism and the desire to restore and expand Italian territories, deemed necessary for a nation to assert its superiority and strength and avoid succumbing to decay. Italian Fascists claimed that modern Italy is the heir to ancient Rome and its legacy, and historically supported the creation
of an Italian Empire to provide spazio vitale ("living space") for colonization by Italian settlers and to establish control over the Mediterranean Sea.

Italian Fascism promoted a corporatist economic system whereby employer and employee syndicates were linked together in associations to collectively represent the nation's economic producers and work alongside the state to set national economic policy. This economic system intended to resolve class conflict through collaboration between the classes.

The Rise of Fascism in Italy

The first meeting of the Fasci of Revolutionary Action was held on January 24, 1915, led by Benito Mussolini. In the next few years, the relatively small group was various political actions. In 1920, militant strike activity by industrial workers reached its peak in Italy. Mussolini and the Fascists took advantage of the situation by allying with industrial businesses and attacking workers and peasants in the name of preserving order and internal peace in Italy.

Fascists identified their primary opponents as the majority of socialists on the left who had opposed intervention in World War I. The Fascists and the Italian political right held common ground: both held Marxism in contempt, discounted class consciousness, and believed in the rule of elites. Fascism began to accommodate Italian conservatives by making major alterations to its political agenda—abandoning its previous populism, republicanism, and anticlericalism, adopting policies in support of free enterprise, and accepting the Roman Catholic Church and the monarchy as institutions in Italy.

To appeal to Italian conservatives, Fascism adopted policies such as promoting family values, including policies designed to reduce the number of women in the workforce by limiting the woman's role to that of a mother. The fascists banned literature on birth
control and increased penalties for abortion in 1926, declaring both crimes against the state. Though Fascism adopted a number of positions designed to appeal to reactionaries, the Fascists sought to maintain Fascism’s revolutionary character, with Angelo Oliviero Olivetti saying “Fascism would like to be conservative, but it will [be] by being revolutionary.” The Fascists supported revolutionary action and committed to secure law and order to appeal to both conservatives and syndicalists.

Prior to Fascism’s accommodation of the political right, Fascism was a small, urban, northern Italian movement that had about a thousand members. After Fascism’s accommodation of the political right, the Fascist movement’s membership soared to approximately 250,000 by 1921.

Fascists Seize Power

Beginning in 1922, Fascist paramilitaries escalated their strategy from attacking socialist offices and homes of socialist leadership figures to violent occupation of cities. The Fascists met little serious resistance from authorities and proceeded to take over several northern Italian cities. The Fascists attacked the headquarters of socialist and Catholic labor unions in Cremona and imposed forced Italianization upon the German-speaking population of Trent and Bolzano. After seizing these cities, the Fascists made plans to take Rome.

On October 24, 1922, the Fascist party held its annual congress in Naples, where Mussolini ordered Blackshirts to take control of public buildings and trains and converge on three points around Rome. The Fascists managed to seize control of several post offices and trains in northern Italy while the Italian government, led by a left-wing coalition, was internally divided and unable to respond to the Fascist advances. King Victor Emmanuel III of Italy thought the risk of bloodshed in Rome to disperse the Fascists was too high.
Victor Emmanuel III decided to appoint Mussolini as Prime Minister of Italy, and Mussolini arrived in Rome on October 30 to accept the appointment. Fascist propaganda aggrandized this event, known as “March on Rome,” as a “seizure” of power because of Fascists’ heroic exploits.

March on Rome: Benito Mussolini with three of the four quadrumvirs during the March on Rome: from left to right: unknown, de Bono, Mussolini, Balbo and de Vecchi. Mussolini in Power Upon becoming Prime Minister of Italy, Mussolini had to form a coalition government, because the Fascists did not have control over the Italian parliament. Mussolini’s coalition government initially pursued economically liberal policies under the direction of liberal finance minister Alberto De Stefani, a member of the
Center Party, including balancing the budget through deep cuts to the civil service. Initially, little drastic change in government policy occurred and repressive police actions were limited. The Fascists began their attempt to entrench Fascism in Italy with the Acerbo Law, which guaranteed a plurality of the seats in parliament to any party or coalition list in an election that received 25% or more of the vote. Through considerable Fascist violence and intimidation, the list won a majority of the vote, allowing many seats to go to the Fascists. In the aftermath of the election, a crisis and political scandal erupted after Socialist Party deputy Giacomo Matteoti was kidnapped and murdered by a Fascist. The liberals and the leftist minority in parliament walked out in protest in what became known as the Aventine Secession. On January 3, 1925, Mussolini addressed the Fascist-dominated Italian parliament and declared that he was personally responsible for what happened, but insisted that he had done nothing wrong. He proclaimed himself dictator of Italy, assuming full responsibility over the government and announcing the dismissal of parliament. From 1925 to 1929, Fascism steadily became entrenched in power; opposition deputies were denied access to parliament, censorship was
introduced, and a December 1925 decree made Mussolini solely responsible to the King. In the 1920s, Fascist Italy pursued an aggressive foreign policy that included an attack on the Greek island of Corfu, aims to expand Italian territory in the Balkans, plans to wage war against Turkey and Yugoslavia, attempts to bring Yugoslavia into civil war by supporting Croat and Macedonian separatists to legitimize Italian intervention, and making Albania a de facto protectorate of Italy, achieved through diplomatic means by 1927. In response to revolt in the Italian colony of Libya, Fascist Italy abandoned previous liberal-era colonial policy of cooperation with local leaders. Instead, claiming that Italians were superior to African races and thereby had the right to colonize the “inferior” Africans, it sought to settle 10 to 15 million Italians in Libya. This resulted in an aggressive military campaign known as the Pacification of Libya against natives in Libya, including mass killings, the use of concentration camps, and the forced starvation of thousands of people. Italian authorities committed ethnic cleansing by forcibly expelling 100,000 Bedouin Cyrenaicans, half the population of Cyrenaica in Libya, from their settlements, slated to be given to Italian settlers. Attributions Mussolini and Fascist Italy “Italian Fascism.”
Fascism is a form of radical authoritarian nationalism that came to prominence in early 20th-century Europe, characterized by one-party totalitarian regimes run by charismatic dictators, glorification of violence, and racist ideology.

Learning Objective

Define fascism

Key Points

• Fascism is a far-right authoritarian political ideology that emerged in the early 20th century and rose to prominence after World War I in several nations, notably Italy, Germany, and Japan.

• Fascists believe that liberal democracy is obsolete and regard the complete mobilization of society under a totalitarian one-party state, led by a dictator, as necessary to prepare a nation for armed conflict and respond effectively to economic difficulties.
• Fascist regimes are often preoccupied “with community decline, humiliation, or victimhood and by compensatory cults of unity, energy, and purity,” culminating in nationalistic and racist ideologies and practices, such as the Holocaust in Nazi Germany.
• The term originated in Italy and is derived from *fascio*, meaning a bundle of rods, and is used to symbolize strength through unity: a single rod is easily broken, while the bundle is difficult to break.
• After the end of the World War I, fascism rose out of relative obscurity into international prominence, with fascist regimes forming most notably in Italy, Germany, and Japan, the three of which would be allied in World War II.
• Fascist Benito Mussolini seized power in Italy in 1922 and Adolf Hitler had successfully consolidated his power in Germany by 1933.

**Key Terms**

**Social Darwinism**

A name given to various ideologies emerging in the second half of the 19th century, trying to apply biological concepts of natural selection and survival of the fittest in human society. It was largely developed by Herbert Spencer, who compared society to a living organism and argued that just as biological organisms evolve through natural selection, society evolves and...
increases in complexity through analogous processes.

**fascism**

A form of radical authoritarian nationalism that came to prominence in early 20th-century Europe. It holds that liberal democracy is obsolete and that the complete mobilization of society under a totalitarian one-party state is necessary to prepare a nation for armed conflict and to respond effectively to economic difficulties.

**fin-de-siècle**

French for end of the century, a term which typically encompasses both the meaning of the similar English idiom turn of the century and also makes reference to the closing of one era and onset of another. The term is typically used to refer to the end of the 19th century. This was widely thought to be a period of degeneration, but at the same time one of hope for a new beginning. It often refers to the cultural hallmarks that were recognized as prominent in the 1880s and 1890s, including ennui, cynicism, pessimism, and “...a widespread belief that civilization leads to decadence.”

Fascism is a form of radical authoritarian nationalism that came to prominence in early 20th-century Europe. The first fascist movements emerged in Italy during World War I, then spread to other European countries. Opposed to liberalism, Marxism, and anarchism, fascism is usually placed on the far-right within the traditional left-right spectrum.
Fascist Ideologies

Fascists saw World War I as a revolution that brought massive changes to the nature of war, society, the state, and technology. The advent of total war and the total mass mobilization of society had broken down the distinction between civilians and combatants. A “military citizenship” arose in which all citizens were involved with the military in some manner during the war. The war resulted in the rise of a powerful state capable of mobilizing millions of people to serve on the front lines and providing economic production and logistics to support them, as well as having unprecedented authority to intervene in the lives of citizens.

Fascists believe that liberal democracy is obsolete, and they regard the complete mobilization of society under a totalitarian one-party state as necessary to prepare a nation for armed conflict and respond effectively to economic difficulties. Such a state is led by a strong leader—such as a dictator and a martial government composed of the members of the governing fascist party—to forge national unity and maintain a stable and orderly society. Fascism rejects assertions that violence is automatically negative in nature, and views political violence, war, and imperialism as means that can achieve national rejuvenation. Fascists advocate a mixed economy with the principal goal of achieving autarky (self-sufficiency) through protectionist and interventionist economic policies.

Historian Robert Paxton says that fascism is “a form of political behavior marked by obsessive preoccupation with community decline, humiliation, or victimhood and by compensatory cults of unity, energy, and purity, in which a mass–based party of committed nationalist militants, working in uneasy but effective collaboration with traditional elites, abandons democratic liberties and pursues with redemptive violence and without ethical or legal restraints goals of internal cleansing and external expansion.”

Since the end of World War II in 1945, few parties have openly described themselves as fascist, and the term is instead now usually
used pejoratively by political opponents. The terms neo-fascist or post-fascist are sometimes applied more formally to describe parties of the far right with ideologies similar to or rooted in 20th century fascist movements.

The term fascist comes from the Italian word *fascismo*, derived from *fascio* meaning a bundle of rods, ultimately from the Latin word *fasces*. This was the name given to political organizations in Italy known as fasci, groups similar to guilds or syndicates. At first, it was applied mainly to organizations on the political left. In 1919, Benito Mussolini founded the Fasci Italiani di Combattimento in Milan, which became the Partito Nazionale Fascista (National Fascist Party) two years later. The Fascists came to associate the term with the ancient Roman *fasces* or *fascio littorio*—a bundle of rods tied around an axe, an ancient Roman symbol of the authority of the civic magistrate carried by his lictors, which could be used for corporal and capital punishment at his command. The symbolism of the *fasces* suggested strength through unity: a single rod is easily broken, while the bundle is difficult to break.

**Early History of Fascism**

The historian Zeev Sternhell has traced the ideological roots of fascism back to the 1880s, and in particular to the fin-de-siècle (French for “end of the century”) theme of that time. This ideology was based on a revolt against materialism, rationalism, positivism, bourgeois society, and democracy. The *fin-de-siècle* generation supported emotionalism, irrationalism, subjectivism, and vitalism. The *fin-de-siècle* mindset saw civilization as being in a crisis that required a massive and total solution. Its intellectual school considered the individual only one part of the larger collectivity, which should not be viewed as an atomized numerical sum of individuals. They condemned the rationalistic individualism of
liberal society and the dissolution of social links in bourgeois society.

Social Darwinism, which gained widespread acceptance, made no distinction between physical and social life, and viewed the human condition as being an unceasing struggle to achieve the survival of the fittest. Social Darwinism challenged positivism’s claim of deliberate and rational choice as the determining behavior of humans, focusing on heredity, race, and environment. Its emphasis on biogroup identity and the role of organic relations within societies fostered legitimacy and appeal for nationalism. New theories of social and political psychology also rejected the notion of human behavior being governed by rational choice, and instead claimed that emotion was more influential in political issues than reason.

At the outbreak of World War I in August 1914, the Italian political left became severely split over its position on the war. The Italian Socialist Party (PSI) opposed the war but a number of Italian revolutionary syndicalists supported war against Germany and Austria-Hungary on the grounds that their reactionary regimes had to be defeated to ensure the success of socialism. Angelo Oliviero Olivetti formed a pro-interventionist fascio called the Fasci of International Action in October 1914. Benito Mussolini, upon expulsion from his position as chief editor of the PSI’s newspaper Avanti! for his anti-German stance, joined the interventionist cause in a separate fascio. The term “Fascism” was first used in 1915 by members of Mussolini’s movement, the Fasci of Revolutionary Action.

The first meeting of the Fasci of Revolutionary Action was held in January 1915 when Mussolini declared that it was necessary for Europe to resolve its national problems—including national borders—of Italy and elsewhere “for the ideals of justice and liberty for which oppressed peoples must acquire the right to belong to those national communities from which they descended.” Attempts to hold mass meetings were ineffective, and the organization was regularly harassed by government authorities and socialists.
Similar political ideas arose in Germany after the outbreak of the war. German sociologist Johann Plenge spoke of the rise of a “National Socialism” in Germany within what he termed the “ideas of 1914” that were a declaration of war against the “ideas of 1789” (the French Revolution). According to Plenge, the “ideas of 1789” that included rights of man, democracy, individualism and liberalism were being rejected in favor of “the ideas of 1914” that included “German values” of duty, discipline, law, and order. Plenge believed that racial solidarity (Volksgemeinschaft) would replace class division and that “racial comrades” would unite to create a socialist society in the struggle of “proletarian” Germany against “capitalist” Britain. He believed that the “Spirit of 1914” manifested itself in the concept of the “People’s League of National Socialism.”

After the end of the World War I, fascism rose out of relative obscurity into international prominence, with fascist regimes forming most notably in Italy, Germany, and Japan, the three of which would be allied in World War II. Fascist Benito Mussolini seized power in Italy in 1922 and Adolf Hitler had successfully consolidated his power in Germany by 1933.
Hitler and Mussolini: Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini were the two most prominent fascist dictators, rising to power in the decades after World War I.
Attributions

• Fascism
30.4.3: Fascism in Japan

During the 1930s, Japan moved into political totalitarianism, ultranationalism, and fascism, culminating in its invasion of China in 1937.

**Learning Objective**

Examine how fascism manifested itself in Japan

**Key Points**

- Similar to European nations like Italy and Germany, nationalism and aggressive expansionism began to rise to prominence in Japan after World War I.
- The 1919 Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I did not recognize the Empire of Japan's territorial claims, which angered the Japanese and led to a surge in nationalism.
- Throughout the 1920s, various nationalistic and xenophobic ideologies emerged among right-wing Japanese intellectuals, but it was not until the early
1930s that these ideas gained full traction in the ruling regime.

- During the Manchurian Incident of 1931, radical army officers bombed a small portion of the South Manchuria Railroad and, falsely attributing the attack to the Chinese, invaded Manchuria.
- International criticism of Japan following the invasion led to Japan withdrawing from the League of Nations, which led to political isolation and a redoubling of ultranationalist and expansionist tendencies.
- In 1932, a group of right-wing Army and Navy officers succeeded in assassinating the Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi.
- The plot fell short of staging a complete coup d'état, but it effectively ended rule by political parties in Japan and consolidated the power of the military elite under the dictatorship of Emperor Hirohito.

**Key Terms**

**Meiji Restoration**

An event that restored practical imperial rule to Japan in 1868 under Emperor Meiji, leading to enormous changes in Japan’s political and social structure and spanning both the late Edo period (often called the Late Tokugawa shogunate) and the beginning of the Meiji period. The period spanned from 1868 to
1912 and was responsible for the emergence of Japan as a modernized nation in the early 20th century, and its rapid rise to great power status in the international system.

**Shinto**

A Japanese ethnic religion that focuses on ritual practices carried out diligently to establish a connection between present-day Japan and its ancient past. Its practices were first recorded and codified in the written historical records of the Kojiki and Nihon Shoki in the 8th century. This term applies to the religion of public shrines devoted to the worship of a multitude of gods (kami), suited to various purposes such as war memorials and harvest festivals.

**Shōwa period**

The period of Japanese history corresponding to the reign of the Shōwa Emperor, Hirohito, from December 25, 1926, through January 7, 1989. This period was longer than the reign of any previous Japanese emperor. During the pre-1945 period, Japan moved into political totalitarianism, ultranationalism, and fascism culminating in Japan's invasion of China in 1937. This was part of an overall global period of social upheavals and conflicts, such as the Great Depression and World War II. Defeat in World War II brought radical change to Japan.

**statism**

The belief that the state should control either economic or social policy or both, sometimes taking the form of totalitarianism, but not necessarily. It is effectively the opposite of anarchism.
Statism in Japan

Statism in Shōwa Japan was a right-wing political ideology developed over a period of time from the Meiji Restoration of the 1860s. It is sometimes also referred to as Shōwa nationalism or Japanese fascism.

This statist movement dominated Japanese politics during the first part of the Shōwa period (reign of Hirohito). It was a mixture of ideas such as Japanese nationalism and militarism and “state capitalism” proposed by contemporary political philosophers and thinkers.

Development of Statist Ideology

The 1919 Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I did not recognize the Empire of Japan’s territorial claims, and international naval treaties between Western powers and the Empire of Japan (Washington Naval Treaty and London Naval Treaty) imposed limitations on naval shipbuilding that limited the size of the Imperial Japanese Navy. These measures were considered by many in Japan as refusal by the Occidental powers to consider Japan an equal partner.

On the basis of national security, these events released a surge of Japanese nationalism and resulted in the end of collaboration diplomacy that supported peaceful economic expansion. The implementation of a military dictatorship and territorial expansionism were considered the best ways to protect Japan.

In the early 1930s, the Ministry of Home Affairs began arresting left-wing political dissidents, generally to exact a confession and renouncement of anti-state leanings. Over 30,000 such arrests were made between 1930 and 1933. In response, a large group of writers founded a Japanese branch of the International Popular
Front Against Fascism and published articles in major literary journals warning of the dangers of statism.

Ikki Kita was an early 20th-century political theorist who advocated a hybrid of state socialism with “Asian nationalism,” which blended the early ultranationalist movement with Japanese militarism. Kita proposed a military coup d'état to replace the existing political structure of Japan with a military dictatorship. The new military leadership would rescind the Meiji Constitution, ban political parties, replace the Diet of Japan with an assembly free of corruption, and nationalize major industries. Kita also envisioned strict limits to private ownership of property and land reform to improve the lot of tenant farmers. Thus strengthened internally, Japan could then embark on a crusade to free all of Asia from Western imperialism.

Although his works were banned by the government almost immediately after publication, circulation was widespread, and his thesis proved popular not only with the younger officer class excited at the prospects of military rule and Japanese expansionism, but with the populist movement for its appeal to the agrarian classes and to the left wing of the socialist movement.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the supporters of Japanese statism used the slogan Showa Restoration, which implied that a new resolution was needed to replace the existing political order dominated by corrupt politicians and capitalists, with one which (in their eyes), would fulfill the original goals of the Meiji Restoration of direct Imperial rule via military proxies.

Early Shōwa statism is sometimes given the retrospective label “fascism,” but this was not a self-appellation and it is not entirely clear that the comparison is accurate. When authoritarian tools of the state such as the Kempeitai were put into use in the early Shōwa period, they were employed to protect the rule of law under the Meiji Constitution from perceived enemies on both the left and the right.
Nationalist Politics During the Shōwa Period

Emperor Hirohito's 63-year reign from 1926 to 1989 is the longest in recorded Japanese history. The first 20 years were characterized by the rise of extreme nationalism and a series of expansionist wars. After suffering defeat in World War II, Japan was occupied by foreign powers for the first time in its history, then re-emerged as a major world economic power.

Left-wing groups had been subject to violent suppression by the end of the Taishō period, and radical right-wing groups, inspired by fascism and Japanese nationalism, rapidly grew in popularity. The extreme right became influential throughout the Japanese government and society, notably within the Kwantung Army, a Japanese army stationed in China along the Japanese-owned South Manchuria Railroad. During the Manchurian Incident of 1931, radical army officers bombed a small portion of the South Manchuria Railroad and, falsely attributing the attack to the Chinese, invaded Manchuria. The Kwantung Army conquered Manchuria and set up the puppet government of Manchukuo there without permission from the Japanese government. International criticism of Japan following the invasion led to Japan withdrawing from the League of Nations.

The withdrawal from the League of Nations meant that Japan was politically isolated. Japan had no strong allies and its actions had been internationally condemned, while internally popular nationalism was booming. Local leaders such as mayors, teachers, and Shinto priests were recruited by the various movements to indoctrinate the populace with ultra-nationalist ideals. They had little time for the pragmatic ideas of the business elite and party politicians. Their loyalty lay to the Emperor and the military. In March 1932 the “League of Blood” assassination plot and the chaos surrounding the trial of its conspirators further eroded the rule of democratic law in Shōwa Japan. In May of the same year, a group
of right-wing Army and Navy officers succeeded in assassinating the Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi. The plot fell short of staging a complete coup d'état, but effectively ended rule by political parties in Japan.

Japan's expansionist vision grew increasingly bold. Many of Japan's political elite aspired to have Japan acquire new territory for resource extraction and settlement of surplus population. These ambitions led to the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937. After their victory in the Chinese capital, the Japanese military committed the infamous Nanking Massacre. The Japanese military failed to defeat the Chinese government led by Chiang Kai-shek and the war descended into a bloody stalemate that lasted until 1945. Japan's stated war aim was to establish the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, a vast pan-Asian union under Japanese domination. Hirohito's role in Japan's foreign wars remains a subject of controversy, with various historians portraying him as either a powerless figurehead or an enabler and supporter of Japanese militarism.

The United States opposed Japan's invasion of China and responded with increasingly stringent economic sanctions intended to deprive Japan of the resources to continue its war in China. Japan reacted by forging an alliance with Germany and Italy in 1940, known as the Tripartite Pact, which worsened its relations with the U.S. In July 1941, the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands froze all Japanese assets when Japan completed its invasion of French Indochina by occupying the southern half of the country, further increasing tension in the Pacific.
Statism in Japan: Emperor Shōwa riding his stallion Shirayuki during an Army inspection, August 1938. By the 1930’s, Japan had essentially become a military dictatorship with increasingly bold expansionist aims.

Attributions

• Fascism in Japan
Several historians believe that during the Spanish Civil War, General Francisco Franco’s goal was to turn Spain into a totalitarian state like Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, which he largely succeeded in doing.

### Learning Objective
Summarize the rise of the Franco regime in Spain

### Key Points

- As in Germany and Italy, fascism gained prominence in Spain during the interwar period, especially from the 1930s through World War II.
- Francisco Franco, a Spanish general, rose to prominence in the mid-1930s, but his right-wing party failed to gain power in the 1936 elections.
- Franco and other military leaders staged a failed coup that led to the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, which lasted from 1936-1939.
- Franco emerged victorious and established a one-

---

Franco's Spain | 1581
party military dictatorship, naming himself the leader under the name El Caudillo, a term similar to Il Duce (Italian) for Benito Mussolini and Der Führer (German) for Adolf Hitler.

- Franco's regime committed a series of violent human rights abuses against the Spanish people, causing an estimated 200,000 to 400,000 deaths.
- The consistent points in Franco's ideology (termed Francoism) included authoritarianism, nationalism, national Catholicism, militarism, conservatism, anti-communism, and anti-liberalism.

**Key Terms**

**Francisco Franco**
A Spanish general who ruled over Spain as a dictator for 36 years from 1939 until his death. He took control of Spain from the government of the Second Spanish Republic after winning the Civil War, and was in power 1978, when the Spanish Constitution of 1978 went into effect.

**personality cult**
When an individual uses mass media, propaganda, or other methods to create an idealized, heroic, and at times worshipful image, often through unquestioned flattery and praise.
Spanish Civil War
A war from 1936 to 1939 between the Republicans, who were loyal to the democratic, left-leaning and relatively urban Second Spanish Republic in an alliance of convenience with the Anarchists, and the Nationalists, a falangist, Carlist, and a largely aristocratic conservative group led by General Francisco Franco.

Falangism
A Fascist movement founded in Spain in 1933 and the one legal party in Spain under the regime of Franco.

Francisco Franco: El Caudillo

Francisco Franco (December 4, 1892 – November 20, 1975) was a Spanish general who ruled over Spain as a dictator for 36 years from 1939 until his death.

As a conservative and a monarchist, he opposed the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of a republic in 1931. With the 1936 elections, the conservative Spanish Confederation of Autonomous Right-wing Groups lost by a narrow margin and the leftist Popular Front came to power. Intending to overthrow the republic, Franco followed other generals in attempting a failed coup that precipitated the Spanish Civil War. With the death of the other generals, Franco quickly became his faction's only leader. In 1947, he declared Spain a monarchy with himself as regent.

Franco gained military support from various regimes and groups, especially Nazi Germany and the Kingdom of Italy, while the Republican side was supported by Spanish communists and
anarchists as well as the Soviet Union, Mexico, and the International Brigades. Leaving half a million dead, the war was eventually won by Franco in 1939. He established a military dictatorship, which he defined as a totalitarian state. Franco proclaimed himself Head of State and Government under the title El Caudillo, a term similar to Il Duce (Italian) for Benito Mussolini and Der Führer (German) for Adolf Hitler. Under Franco, Spain became a one-party state, as the various conservative and royalist factions were merged into the fascist party and other political parties were outlawed.

Franco’s regime committed a series of violent human rights abuses against the Spanish people, which included the establishment of concentration camps and the use of forced labor and executions, mostly against political and ideological enemies, causing an estimated 200,000 to 400,000 deaths in more than 190 concentration camps. Spain’s entry into the war on the Axis side was prevented largely by, as was much later revealed, British Secret Intelligence Service (MI-6) efforts that included up to $200 million in bribes for Spanish officials to keep the regime from getting involved. Franco was also able to take advantage of the resources of the Axis Powers and chose to avoid becoming heavily involved in the Second World War.
Francisco Franco: A photo of Francisco Franco in 1964. Franco strove to establish a fascist dictatorship similar to that of Germany and Italy, but in the end did not join the Axis in WWII.

Ideology of Francoist Spain

The consistent points in Francoism included authoritarianism,
nationalism, national Catholicism, militarism, conservatism, anticommunism, and anti-liberalism. The Spanish State was authoritarian: non-government trade unions and all political opponents across the political spectrum were either suppressed or controlled by all means, including police repression. Most country towns and rural areas were patrolled by pairs of Guardia Civil, a military police for civilians, which functioned as a chief means of social control. Larger cities and capitals were mostly under the heavily armed Policía Armada, commonly called grises due to their grey uniforms. Franco was also the focus of a personality cult which taught that he had been sent by Divine Providence to save the country from chaos and poverty.

Franco's Spanish nationalism promoted a unitary national identity by repressing Spain’s cultural diversity. Bullfighting and flamenco were promoted as national traditions, while those traditions not considered Spanish were suppressed. Franco's view of Spanish tradition was somewhat artificial and arbitrary: while some regional traditions were suppressed, Flamenco, an Andalusian tradition, was considered part of a larger, national identity. All cultural activities were subject to censorship, and many were forbidden entirely, often in an erratic manner.

Francoism professed a strong devotion to militarism, hypermasculinity, and the traditional role of women in society. A woman was to be loving to her parents and brothers and faithful to her husband, and reside with her family. Official propaganda confined women's roles to family care and motherhood. Most progressive laws passed by the Second Republic were declared void. Women could not become judges, testify in trial, or become university professors.

The Civil War had ravaged the Spanish economy. Infrastructure had been damaged, workers killed, and daily business severely hampered. For more than a decade after Franco’s victory, the economy improved little. Franco initially pursued a policy of autarky, cutting off almost all international trade. The policy had devastating effects, and the economy stagnated. Only black
marketeers could enjoy an evident affluence. Up to 200,000 people died of starvation during the early years of Francoism, a period known as Los Años de Hambre (the Years of Hunger).

Falangism: Spanish Fascism

Falangism was the political ideology of the Falange Española de las JONS and, afterwards, of the Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista (both known simply as the “Falange”), as well as derivatives of it in other countries. Falangism is widely considered a fascist ideology. Under the leadership of Francisco Franco, many of the radical elements of Falangism considered fascist were diluted, and it largely became an authoritarian, conservative ideology connected with Francoist Spain. Opponents of Franco’s changes to the party include former Falange leader Manuel Hedilla. Falangism places a strong emphasis on Catholic religious identity, though it held some secular views on the Church’s direct influence in society as it believed that the state should have the supreme authority over the nation. Falangism emphasized the need for authority, hierarchy, and order in society. Falangism is anti-communist, anti-capitalist, anti-democratic, and anti-liberal, although under Franco, the Falange abandoned its original anti-capitalist tendencies, declaring the ideology to be fully compatible with capitalism.

The Falange’s original manifesto, the “Twenty-Seven Points,” declared Falangism to support the unity of Spain and the elimination of regional separatism; established a dictatorship led by the Falange; used violence to regenerate Spain; promoted the revival and development of the Spanish Empire; and championed a social revolution to create a national syndicalist economy to mutually organize and control economic activity, agrarian reform, industrial expansion, and respect for private property with the exception of nationalizing credit facilities to prevent capitalist usury. It supports
criminalization of strikes by employees and lockouts by employers as illegal acts. Falangism supports the state to have jurisdiction of setting wages. The Franco-era Falange supported the development of cooperatives such as the Mondragon Corporation, because it bolstered the Francoist claim of the nonexistence of social classes in Spain during his rule.

Attributions
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The conditions of economic hardship caused by the Great Depression brought about significant social unrest around the world, leading to a major surge of fascism and in many cases, the collapse of democratic governments.

**Learning Objective**

Formulate an explanation for the decreasing number of democratic governments in Europe during this period

**Key Points**

- Mussolini’s seizure of power in Italy with the March on Rome brought fascism international attention.
- One early admirer of the Italian Fascists was Adolf Hitler. Less than a month after the March, he began to model himself and the Nazi Party upon Mussolini and the Fascists.
• The Nazis, led by Hitler and the German war hero Erich Ludendorff, attempted a “March on Berlin” modeled upon the March on Rome, which resulted in the failed Beer Hall Putsch in Munich in November 1923.

• Other early admirers of Italian Fascism were Gyula Gömbös, leader of the Hungarian National Defense Association, and Milan Pribićević of Yugoslavia, who led the Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists (ORJUNA).

• The Great Depression, which caused significant social unrest throughout the world, led to the major surge of fascism.

• Economic depression was one of the major causes of the rise of Nazism in Germany.

• Fascism was also popular during the Depression era outside of Europe, in Japan, Brazil, and Argentina among other nations.

• Historian and philosopher Ernst Nolte argues that fascism arose as a form of resistance to and a reaction against modernity.

Key Terms

modernity

A term used in the humanities and social sciences to designate both a historical period as well as the ensemble of particular socio-cultural norms, attitudes,
and practices that arose in post-medieval Europe and have developed since, in various ways and at various times, around the world. As a historical category, it refers to a period marked by a questioning or rejection of tradition; the prioritization of individualism, freedom, and formal equality; faith in inevitable social, scientific, and technological progress and human perfectibility; rationalization and professionalization; a movement from feudalism (or agrarianism) toward capitalism and the market economy; industrialization, urbanization, and secularization; and the development of the nation-state and its constituent institutions (e.g. representative democracy, public education, modern bureaucracy).

**Iron Guard**

The name most commonly given to a far-right movement and political party in Romania in the period from 1927 into the early part of World War II. It was ultra-nationalist, antisemitic, anti-communist, anti-capitalist, and promoted the Orthodox Christian faith. Its members were called “Greenshirts” because of the predominantly green uniforms they wore.

**Beer Hall Putsch**

A failed coup attempt by the Nazi Party leader Adolf Hitler to seize power in Munich, Bavaria, during November 8–9, 1923. About two thousand men marched to the center of Munich where they confronted the police, resulting in the death of 16 Nazis and four policemen.
Initial Surge of Fascism

The March on Rome, through which Mussolini became Prime Minister of Italy, brought Fascism international attention. One early admirer of the Italian Fascists was Adolf Hitler, who, less than a month after the March, had begun to model himself and the Nazi Party upon Mussolini and the Fascists. The Nazis, led by Hitler and the German war hero Erich Ludendorff, attempted a “March on Berlin” modeled upon the March on Rome, which resulted in the failed Beer Hall Putsch in Munich in November 1923. The Nazis briefly captured Bavarian Minister President Gustav Ritter von Kahr and announced the creation of a new German government to be led by a triumvirate of von Kahr, Hitler, and Ludendorff. The Beer Hall Putsch was crushed by Bavarian police, and Hitler and other leading Nazis were arrested and detained until 1925.

Another early admirer of Italian Fascism was Gyula Gömbös, leader of the Hungarian National Defence Association (known by its acronym MOVE) and a self-defined “national socialist” who in 1919 spoke of the need for major changes in property and in 1923 stated the need of a “march on Budapest.” Yugoslavia briefly had a significant fascist movement, the Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists (ORJUNA), that supported Yugoslavism, supported the creation of a corporatist economy, opposed democracy, and took part in violent attacks on communists, though it was opposed to the Italian government due to Yugoslav border disputes with Italy. ORJUNA was dissolved in 1929 when the King of Yugoslavia banned political parties and created a royal dictatorship, though ORJUNA supported the King's decision.

Amid a political crisis in Spain involving increased strike activity and rising support for anarchism, Spanish army commander Miguel Primo de Rivera engaged in a successful coup against the Spanish government in 1923 and installed himself as a dictator as head of a conservative military junta that dismantled the established party system of government. Upon achieving power, Primo de Rivera
sought to resolve the economic crisis by presenting himself as a compromise arbitrator figure between workers and bosses, and his regime created a corporatist economic system based on the Italian Fascist model. In Lithuania in 1926, Antanas Smetona rose to power and founded a fascist regime under his Lithuanian Nationalist Union.

Beer Hall Putsch: Nazis in Munich during the Beer Hall Putsch, a failed coup attempt by the Nazi Party leader Adolf Hitler to seize power in Munich, Bavaria, during November 8-9, 1923. About two thousand men marched to the center of Munich where they confronted the police, resulting in the death of 16 Nazis and four policemen. The Great Depression and the Spread of Fascism The events of the Great Depression resulted in an international surge of fascism and the creation of several fascist regimes and regimes that adopted fascist policies. According to
historian Philip Morgan, “the onset of the Great Depression...was the greatest stimulus yet to the diffusion and expansion of fascism outside Italy.” Fascist propaganda blamed the problems of the long depression of the 1930s on minorities and scapegoats: “Judeo-Masonic-bolshevik” conspiracies, left-wing internationalism, and the presence of immigrants. In Germany, it contributed to the rise of the National Socialist German Workers’ Party, which resulted in the demise of the Weimar Republic and the establishment of the fascist regime, Nazi Germany, under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. With the rise of Hitler and the Nazis to power in 1933, liberal democracy was dissolved in Germany, and the Nazis mobilized the country for war, with expansionist territorial aims against several countries. In the 1930s the Nazis implemented racial laws that deliberately discriminated against, disenfranchised, and persecuted Jews and other racial and minority groups. Fascist movements grew stronger elsewhere in Europe. Hungarian fascist Gyula Gömbös rose to power as Prime Minister of Hungary in 1932 and attempted to entrench his Party of National Unity throughout the country; he created an eight-hour work day and a 48-hour work week in industry, sought to entrench a
corporatist economy, and pursued irredentist claims on Hungary’s neighbors. The fascist Iron Guard movement in Romania soared in political support after 1933, gaining representation in the Romanian government, and an Iron Guard member assassinated Romanian prime minister Ion Duca. During the February 6, 1934 crisis, France faced the greatest domestic political turmoil since the Dreyfus Affair when the fascist Francist Movement and multiple far-right movements rioted en masse in Paris against the French government resulting in major political violence. A variety of para-fascist governments that borrowed elements from fascism were formed during the Great Depression, including those of Greece, Lithuania, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Fascism Beyond Europe Fascism also expanded its influence outside Europe, especially in East Asia, the Middle East, and South America. In China, Wang Jingwei’s Kai-tsu p’ai (Reorganization) faction of the Kuomintang (Nationalist Party of China) supported Nazism in the late 1930s. In Japan, a Nazi movement called the Tōhōkai was formed by Seigō Nakano. The Al-Muthanna Club of Iraq was a pan-Arab movement that supported Nazism and exercised its influence in the Iraqi government through cabinet minister Saib Shawkat, who formed a
paramilitary youth movement. Several, mostly short-lived fascist governments and prominent fascist movements were formed in South America during this period. Argentine President General José Félix Uriburu proposed that Argentina be reorganized along corporatist and fascist lines. Peruvian president Luis Miguel Sánchez Cerro founded the Revolutionary Union in 1931 as the state party for his dictatorship. It was later taken over by Raúl Ferrero Rebagliati who sought to mobilize mass support for the group’s nationalism in a manner akin to fascism. He even started a paramilitary Blackshirts arm as a copy of the Italian group, although the Union lost heavily in the 1936 elections and faded into obscurity. In Paraguay in 1940, Paraguayan President General Higinio Morínigo began his rule as a dictator with the support of pro-fascist military officers, appealed to the masses, exiled opposition leaders, and only abandoned his pro-fascist policies after the end of World War II. The Brazilian Integralists, led by Plínio Salgado, claimed as many as 200,000 members, although following coup attempts it faced a crackdown from the Estado Novo of Getúlio Vargas in 1937. In the 1930s, the National Socialist Movement of Chile gained seats in Chile’s parliament and attempted a coup d’état that resulted in the
Seguro Obrero massacre of 1938. *Fascism in its Epoch Fascism in its Epoch* is a 1963 book by historian and philosopher Ernst Nolte, widely regarded as his magnum opus and a seminal work on the history of fascism. The book, translated into English in 1965 as *The Three Faces of Fascism*, argues that fascism arose as a form of resistance to and a reaction against modernity. Nolte subjected German Nazism, Italian Fascism, and the French Action Française movements to a comparative analysis. Nolte's conclusion was that fascism was the great anti-movement: it was anti-liberal, anti-communist, anti-capitalist, and anti-bourgeois. In Nolte's view, fascism was the rejection of everything the modern world had to offer and was an essentially negative phenomenon. Nolte argued that fascism functioned at three levels: in the world of politics as a form of opposition to Marxism, at the sociological level in opposition to bourgeois values, and in the “metapolitical” world as “resistance to transcendence” (“transcendence” in German can be translated as the “spirit of modernity”). In regard to the Holocaust, Nolte contended that because Adolf Hitler identified Jews with modernity, the basic thrust of Nazi policies towards Jews had always aimed at genocide: “Auschwitz was contained in the
principles of Nazi racist theory like the seed in
the fruit.” Nolte believed that for Hitler, Jews
represented “the historical process itself.”
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168. Hitler and the Third Reich

30.5: Hitler and the Third Reich

30.5.1: Adolf Hitler

Adolf Hitler was born and raised in Austria-Hungary, was decorated during his service in the German Army in World War I, and began to rise to prominence in German politics with his vitriolic speeches promoting German nationalism, anti-semitism, and anti-communism.

Learning Objective

Discuss Adolf Hitler’s upbringing and character

Key Points

- Hitler was born in 1889 in Austria, then part of Austria-Hungary, and raised near Linz.
• He moved to Germany in 1913 and was decorated during his service in the German Army in World War I.
• He joined the German Workers' Party (DAP), the precursor of the Nazi Party, in 1919 and became leader of the Nazi Party in 1921.
• In 1923 he attempted a coup in Munich to seize power, called the Beer Hall Putsch.
• The failed coup resulted in Hitler's imprisonment, during which he dictated the first volume of his autobiography and political manifesto Mein Kampf ("My Struggle").
• After his release in 1924, Hitler gained popular support by attacking the Treaty of Versailles and promoting Pan-Germanism, anti-semitism, and anti-communism with charismatic oratory and Nazi propaganda.
• Hitler frequently denounced international capitalism and communism as part of a Jewish conspiracy.

**Key Terms**

**Mein Kampf**

A 1925 autobiographical book by Nazi Party leader Adolf Hitler. The work outlines Hitler's political ideology and future plans for Germany. In it, Hitler used the main thesis of “the Jewish peril,” which posits
a Jewish conspiracy to gain world leadership. The narrative describes the process by which he became increasingly antisemitic and militaristic, especially during his years in Vienna. He speaks of not having met a Jew until he arrived in Vienna, and that at first his attitude was liberal and tolerant. When he first encountered the anti-semitic press, he says, he dismissed it as unworthy of serious consideration. Later he accepted the same anti-semitic views, which became crucial in his program of national reconstruction of Germany.

**Beer Hall Putsch**

A failed coup attempt by the Nazi Party leader Adolf Hitler — along with Erich Ludendorff and others — to seize power in Munich, Bavaria, during November 8-9, 1923. About two thousand men marched to the center of Munich where they confronted the police, which resulted in the death of 16 Nazis and four policemen.

**National Socialist German Workers Party**

A political party in Germany that was active between 1920 and 1945 and practiced the ideology of Nazism. Its precursor, the German Workers' Party (Deutsche Arbeiterpartei; DAP), existed from 1919 to 1920. The party emerged from the German nationalist, racist, and populist Freikorps paramilitary culture, which fought against the communist uprisings in post-World War I Germany. The party was created to draw workers away from communism and into völkisch nationalism.

Adolf Hitler (April 20, 1889 – April 30, 1945) was a German politician who was the leader of the Nazi Party (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei; NSDAP), Chancellor of Germany from 1933
to 1945, and Führer (“Leader”) of Nazi Germany from 1934 to 1945. As dictator of the German Reich, he initiated World War II in Europe with the invasion of Poland in September 1939 and was central to the Holocaust.

By 1933, the Nazi Party was the largest elected party in the German Reichstag, which led to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on January 30, 1933. Following fresh elections won by his coalition, the Reichstag passed the Enabling Act, which began the process of transforming the Weimar Republic into Nazi Germany, a one-party dictatorship based on the totalitarian and autocratic ideology of National Socialism. Hitler aimed to eliminate Jews from Germany and establish a New Order to counter what he saw as the injustice of the post-World War I international order dominated by Britain and France. His first six years in power resulted in rapid economic recovery from the Great Depression, the effective abandonment of restrictions imposed on Germany after World War I, and the annexation of territories that were home to millions of ethnic Germans — actions that gave him significant popular support.

Hitler sought Lebensraum (“living space”) for the German people in Eastern Europe. His aggressive foreign policy is considered to be the primary cause of the outbreak of World War II in Europe. He directed large-scale rearmament and on September 1, 1939, invaded Poland, resulting in British and French declarations of war on Germany. In June 1941, Hitler ordered an invasion of the Soviet Union. By the end of 1941 German forces and the European Axis powers occupied most of Europe and North Africa. Failure to defeat the Soviets and the entry of the United States into the war forced Germany onto the defensive, and it suffered a series of escalating defeats. In the final days of the war, during the Battle of Berlin in 1945, Hitler married his long-time lover, Eva Braun. On April 30, 1945, less than two days later, the two killed themselves to avoid capture by the Red Army, and their corpses were burned.
Childhood and Education

Adolf Hitler was born on April 20, 1889 in Braunau am Inn, a town in Austria-Hungary (in present-day Austria), close to the border with the German Empire. He was one of six children born to Alois Hitler and Klara Pölzl. Three of Hitler's siblings—Gustav, Ida, and Otto—died in infancy. When Hitler was three, the family moved to Passau, Germany. There he acquired the distinctive lower Bavarian dialect rather than Austrian German, which marked his speech throughout his life. The family returned to Austria and settled in Leonding in 1894, and in June 1895 Alois retired to Hafeld, near Lambach, where he farmed and kept bees. Hitler attended Volksschule (a state-owned school) in nearby Fischlham.

The move to Hafeld coincided with the onset of intense father-son conflicts caused by Hitler's refusal to conform to the strict discipline of his school. Alois Hitler's farming efforts at Hafeld ended in failure, and in 1897 the family moved to Lambach. The eight-year-old Hitler took singing lessons, sang in the church choir, and even considered becoming a priest. In 1898 the family returned permanently to Leonding. Hitler was deeply affected by the death of his younger brother Edmund, who died in 1900 from measles. Hitler changed from a confident, outgoing, conscientious student to a morose, detached boy who constantly fought with his father and teachers.

After Alois's sudden death on January 3, 1903, Hitler's performance at school deteriorated and his mother allowed him to leave. He enrolled at the Realschule in Steyr in September 1904, where his behavior and performance improved. In 1905, after passing a repeat of the final exam, Hitler left the school without any ambitions for further education or clear plans for a career.
Early Adulthood

From 1905, Hitler lived a bohemian life in Vienna, financed by orphan’s benefits and support from his mother. He worked as a casual laborer and eventually as a painter, selling watercolors of Vienna’s sights. The Academy of Fine Arts Vienna rejected him in 1907 and again in 1908, citing “unfitness for painting.” The director recommended that Hitler study architecture, which was another of his interests, but he lacked academic credentials as he had not finished secondary school. On December 21, 1907, his mother died of breast cancer at the age of 47. Hitler ran out of money and was forced to live in homeless shelters and men’s hostels.

At the time Hitler lived there, Vienna was a hotbed of religious prejudice and racism. Fears of being overrun by immigrants from the East were widespread, and the populist mayor Karl Lueger exploited the rhetoric of virulent anti-Semitism for political effect. German nationalism had a widespread following in the Mariahilf district where Hitler lived. German nationalist Georg Ritter von Schönerer, who advocated Pan-Germanism, anti-Semitism, anti-Slavism, and anti-Catholicism, was one influence on Hitler. Hitler read local newspapers such as the Deutsches Volksblatt that fanned prejudice and played on Christian fears of being swamped by an influx of Eastern European Jews.

World War I

In 1914, at the outbreak of World War I, Hitler was living in Munich and voluntarily enlisted in the Bavarian Army. Posted to the Bavarian Reserve Infantry Regiment 16, he served as a dispatch runner on the Western Front in France and Belgium, spending nearly half his time at the regimental headquarters in Fournes-en-Weppes, well behind the front lines. He was present at the First Battle of Ypres, the Battle
of the Somme, the Battle of Arras, and the Battle of Passchendaele, and was wounded at the Somme. He was decorated for bravery, receiving the Iron Cross, Second Class, in 1914.

Entry into Politics

After World War I, Hitler returned to Munich. With no formal education or career prospects, he remained in the army. In July 1919 he was appointed an intelligence agent, assigned to influence other soldiers and infiltrate the German Workers’ Party (DAP).

At the DAP, Hitler met Dietrich Eckart, one of the party’s founders and a member of the occult Thule Society. Eckart became Hitler’s mentor, exchanging ideas with him and introducing him to a wide range of Munich society. To increase its appeal, the DAP changed its name to the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National
Socialist German Workers Party; NSDAP). Hitler designed the party’s banner of a swastika in a white circle on a red background.

Hitler was discharged from the army on March 31, 1920, and began working full-time for the NSDAP. The party headquarters was in Munich, a hotbed of anti-government German nationalists determined to crush Marxism and undermine the Weimar Republic. In February 1921 — already highly effective at speaking to large audiences — he addressed a crowd of over 6,000. To publicize the meeting, two truckloads of party supporters drove around Munich waving swastika flags and distributing leaflets. Hitler soon gained notoriety for his rowdy polemic speeches against the Treaty of Versailles, rival politicians, and especially Marxists and Jews.

Hitler’s vitriolic beer hall speeches began attracting regular audiences. He became adept at using populist themes, including the use of scapegoats, who were blamed for his listeners' economic hardships. Hitler used personal magnetism and an understanding of crowd psychology to his advantage while engaged in public speaking. Historians have noted the hypnotic effect of his rhetoric on large audiences, and of his eyes in small groups. Alfons Heck, a former member of the Hitler Youth, later recalled:

We erupted into a frenzy of nationalistic pride that bordered on hysteria. For minutes on end, we shouted at the top of our lungs, with tears streaming down our faces: Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil! From that moment on, I belonged to Adolf Hitler body and soul.

**Arrest, Imprisonment, and Mein Kampf**

In 1923 Hitler enlisted the help of World War I General Erich Ludendorff for an attempted coup known as the “Beer Hall Putsch.” The NSDAP used Italian Fascism as a model for their appearance and policies. Hitler wanted to emulate Benito Mussolini's “March on
Rome” of 1922 by staging his own coup in Bavaria, to be followed by a challenge to the government in Berlin.

On November 8, 1923, Hitler and the SA stormed a public meeting of 3,000 people organized by Gustav Ritter von Kahr (Bavaria's de facto ruler) in the Bürgerbräukeller, a beer hall in Munich. Interrupting Kahr's speech, he announced that the national revolution had begun and declared the formation of a new government with Ludendorff.

Hitler’s forces initially succeeded in occupying the local Reichswehr and police headquarters, but Kahr and his cohorts quickly withdrew their support. Neither the army nor the state police joined forces with Hitler. The next day, Hitler and his followers marched from the beer hall to the Bavarian War Ministry to overthrow the Bavarian government, but police dispersed them. Sixteen NSDAP members and four police officers were killed in the failed coup.

Hitler fled to the home of Ernst Hanfstaengl and by some accounts contemplated suicide. He was depressed but calm when arrested on November 11, 1923 for high treason. On April 1, Hitler was sentenced to five years' imprisonment at Landsberg Prison.

While at Landsberg, Hitler dictated most of the first volume of Mein Kampf (My Struggle; originally entitled Four and a Half Years of Struggle against Lies, Stupidity, and Cowardice) to his deputy, Rudolf Hess. The book, dedicated to Thule Society member Dietrich Eckart, was an autobiography and exposition of his ideology. The book laid out Hitler’s plans for transforming German society into one based on race. Some passages implied genocide. Published in two volumes in 1925 and 1926, it sold 228,000 copies between 1925 and 1932. One million copies were sold in 1933, Hitler's first year in office.
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The Nazi Party, which rose to prominence in Germany in the late 1920s and early 1930s, was a right-wing political party that sought to improve the stock of the Germanic people through racial purity and eugenics, broad social welfare programs, and a collective subordination of individual rights, sacrificed for the good of the state and the “Aryan master race.”

Learning Objective

Analyze the reasons for the success of the Nazi Party

Key Points

- The Nazi Party, officially the National Socialist German Workers’ Party, was founded in 1920 by Anton Drexler, an avid German nationalist.
- It evolved out of Drexler’s earlier party, the German Workers’ Party (Deutsche Arbeiterpartei; DAP), started in 1919.
- Drexler followed the typical views of militant
nationalists of the day, such as opposing the Treaty of Versailles, having antisemitic, anti-monarchist and anti-Marxist views, and believing in the superiority of Germans, whom nationalists claimed to be part of the Aryan “master race.”

- Adolf Hitler joined the DAP in 1919 and quickly became their main orator and spokesperson.
- Around that time, the party only had around 60 members.
- During 1921 and 1922, the Nazi Party grew significantly, partly through Hitler’s oratorical skills, partly through the SA’s (party militia) appeal to unemployed young men, and partly because there was a backlash against socialist and liberal politics in Bavaria as Germany’s economic problems deepened and the weakness of the Weimar regime became apparent.
- In 1923, Hitler and other Nazi Party members attempted a coup, which landed Hitler in prison for one year.
- Upon his release, Hitler continued to expand the Nazi base and by 1929, the party had 130,000 members.
- Despite its growth in popularity, the Nazi Party might never have come to power if not for the Great Depression and its effects on Germany.
Key Terms

Aryan
A racial grouping term used in the period of the late 19th century to the mid-20th century to describe multiple peoples. It has been variously used to describe all Indo-Europeans in general (spanning from India to Europe), the original Aryan people specifically in Persia, and most controversially through Nazi misinterpretation, the Nordic or Germanic peoples. The term derives from the Aryan people from Persia, who spoke a language similar to those found in Europe.

Hitler Youth
The youth organization of the Nazi Party in Germany, which originated in 1922. From 1933 until 1945, it was the sole official youth organization in Germany and was partially a paramilitary organization.

eugenics
A set of beliefs and practices that aims at improving the genetic quality of the human population.

Nuremberg Rally
The annual rally of the Nazi Party in Germany, held from 1923 to 1938. They were large Nazi propaganda events, especially after Hitler’s rise to power in 1933.

The National Socialist German Workers' Party (German: Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, abbreviated NSDAP), commonly referred to in English as the Nazi Party, was a political party in Germany that was active between 1920 and 1945 and practiced the ideology of Nazism. Its precursor, the German
Workers' Party (Deutsche Arbeiterpartei; DAP), existed from 1919 to 1920.

The party emerged from the German nationalist, racist, and populist paramilitary culture, which fought against the communist uprisings in post-World War I Germany. The party was created to draw workers away from communism and into populist (German: völkisch) nationalism. Initially, Nazi political strategy focused on anti-big business, anti-bourgeois, and anti-capitalist rhetoric, although such aspects were later downplayed to gain the support of industrial entities. In the 1930s the party's focus shifted to anti-Semitic and anti-Marxist themes.

Pseudo-scientific racism theories were central to Nazism. The Nazis propagated the idea of a “people’s community.” Their aim was to unite “racially desirable” Germans as national comrades, while excluding those deemed either to be political dissidents, physically or intellectually inferior, or of a foreign race. The Nazis sought to improve the stock of the Germanic people through racial purity and eugenics, broad social welfare programs, and a collective subordination of individual rights, sacrificed for the good of the state and the “Aryan master race.” To maintain the supposed purity and strength of the Aryan race, the Nazis sought to exterminate Jews, Romani, and the physically and mentally handicapped. They imposed exclusionary segregation on homosexuals, Africans, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and political opponents. The persecution reached its climax when the party-controlled German state organized the systematic murder of approximately six million Jews and five million people from the other targeted groups in what has become known as the Holocaust.

The party’s leader since 1921, Adolf Hitler, was appointed Chancellor of Germany by President Paul von Hindenburg on January 30, 1933. Hitler rapidly established a totalitarian regime known as the Third Reich. Following the defeat of the Third Reich at the conclusion of World War II in Europe, the party was “declared to be illegal” by the Allied powers, who carried out denazification in the years after the war.
Origins and Early History

The party grew out of smaller political groups with nationalist orientation that formed in the last years of World War I. In 1918, a league called the Freien Arbeiterausschuss für einen guten Frieden (Free Workers' Committee for a good Peace) was created in Bremen, Germany. On March 7, 1918, Anton Drexler, an avid German nationalist, formed a branch of this league in Munich. Drexler was a local locksmith who had been a member of the militarist Fatherland Party during World War I and was bitterly opposed to the armistice of November 1918 and the revolutionary upheavals that followed. Drexler followed the typical views of militant nationalists of the day, such as opposing the Treaty of Versailles, having antisemitic, anti-monarchist and anti-Marxist views, and believing in the superiority of Germans, whom nationalists claimed to be part of the Aryan “master race.” He also accused international capitalism of being a Jewish-dominated movement and denounced capitalists for war profiteering in World War I. Drexler saw the situation of political violence and instability in Germany as the result of the new Weimar Republic being out-of-touch with the masses, especially the lower classes.

Though very small, Drexler's movement did receive attention and support from some influential figures. Supporter Dietrich Eckhart brought military figure Count Felix Graf von Bothmer, a prominent supporter of the concept of “national socialism,” to address the movement. On January 5, 1919, Drexler created a new political party, the German Workers’ Party (Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, DAP). To ease concerns among potential middle-class supporters, Drexler made clear that unlike Marxists, the party supported the middle-class, and that the party's socialist policy was meant to give social welfare to German citizens deemed part of the Aryan race. The DAP was a comparatively small group with fewer than 60 members. Nevertheless, it attracted the attention of the German authorities,
who were suspicious of any organization that appeared to have subversive tendencies.

Adolf Hitler joined the DAP in 1919 and quickly became the party's most active orator, appearing in public as a speaker 31 times within the first year. Hitler's considerable oratory and propaganda skills were appreciated by the party leadership as crowds began to flock to hear his speeches.

To increase its appeal to larger segments of the population, on February 24, 1920, the same day as the biggest Hitler's speech to date, the DAP changed its name to the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National Socialist German Workers Party). That year, the Nazi Party officially announced that only persons of “pure Aryan descent” could become party members; if the person had a spouse, the spouse also had to be a “racially pure” Aryan. Party members could not be related either directly or indirectly to a so-called “non-Aryan.”

The SA (“storm troopers”, also known as “Brownshirts”) were founded as a party militia in 1921 and began violent attacks on other parties.

During 1921 and 1922, the Nazi Party grew significantly, partly through Hitler's oratorical skills, partly through the SA's appeal to unemployed young men, and partly because there was a backlash against socialist and liberal politics in Bavaria as Germany's economic problems deepened and the weakness of the Weimar regime became apparent. The party recruited former World War I soldiers, to whom Hitler as a decorated frontline veteran particularly appealed, as well as small businessmen and disaffected former members of rival parties. Nazi rallies were often held in beer halls, where downtrodden men could get free beer. The Hitler Youth was formed for the children of party members, although it remained small until the late 1920s.

After a failed coup (Beer Hall Putsch) in 1923, Hitler was arrested and the Nazi Party was largely disbanded.
Nazi Party Rises to Prominence

Adolf Hitler was released from prison on December 20, 1924. In the following year he re-founded and reorganized the Nazi Party with himself as its undisputed leader. The new Nazi Party was no longer a paramilitary organization and disavowed any intention of taking power by force. In any case, the economic and political situation had stabilized and the extremist upsurge of 1923 had faded, so there was no prospect of further revolutionary adventures.

In the 1920s the Nazi Party expanded beyond its Bavarian base. The areas of strongest Nazi support were in rural Protestant areas such as Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and East Prussia. Depressed working-class areas such as Thuringia also produced a strong Nazi vote, while the workers of the Ruhr and Hamburg largely remained loyal to the Social Democrats, the Communist Party of Germany, or the Catholic Centre Party. Nuremberg remained a Nazi Party stronghold, and the first Nuremberg Rally, a large annual propaganda rally, was held there in 1927. These rallies soon became massive displays of Nazi paramilitary power and attracted many recruits. The Nazis' strongest appeal was to the lower middle-classes – farmers, public servants, teachers, small businessmen – who had suffered most from the inflation of the 1920s and thus feared Bolshevism more than anything else. The small business class was receptive to Hitler's antisemitism, since it blamed Jewish big business for its economic problems. University students, disappointed at being too young to have served in the War of 1914–1918 and attracted by the Nazis' radical rhetoric, also became a strong Nazi constituency. By 1929, the party had 130,000 members.

Despite its growth in popularity, the Nazi Party might never have come to power if not for the Great Depression and its effects on Germany. By 1930 the German economy was beset with mass unemployment and widespread business failures. The Social Democrats and Communists were bitterly divided and unable to
formulate an effective solution. This gave the Nazis their opportunity; Hitler’s message, blaming the crisis on the Jewish financiers and the Bolsheviks, resonated with wide sections of the electorate. At the September 1930 Reichstag elections, the Nazis won 18.3% of the votes and became the second-largest party in the Reichstag after the SPD. Hitler proved a highly effective campaigner, pioneering the use of radio and aircraft for this purpose. His dismissal of Strasser and appointment of Goebbels as the party’s propaganda chief were major factors. While Strasser used his position to promote his own leftish version of national socialism, Goebbels was totally loyal to Hitler and worked only to improve Hitler’s image. Over the next several years, Hitler’s Nazi Party would continue to gain power and influence.

Nazi Party: Hitler with Nazi Party members in 1930. By 1929, the party had 130,000 members.

Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
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30.5.3: Hitler’s Rise to Power

In 1933, the Nazi Party became the largest elected party in the German Reichstag, Hitler was appointed Chancellor, and the Reichstag passed the Enabling Act. This began the transformation of the Weimar Republic into Nazi Germany, a one-party dictatorship based on the totalitarian and autocratic ideology of National Socialism.

Learning Objective

Describe the events that led to Hitler becoming chancellor

Key Points

- Hitler’s rise to power occurred throughout the 1920s and early 1930s. He first gained prominence in the right-wing German Workers’ Party, which in 1920 changed its name to the National Socialist German Workers’ Party, commonly known as the Nazi Party.
- In the early 1930s, the Nazi Party gained more seats
in the German Reichstag (parliament), and by 1933 it was the largest elected party, which led to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on January 30, 1933.

- Following fresh elections won by his coalition, the Reichstag passed the Reichstag Fire Decree, which suspended key civil liberties of German citizens, and Enabling Act, which gave the Hitler’s Cabinet the power to enact laws without the involvement of the Reichstag.

- With the passing of these two laws, Hitler’s power in government became nearly absolute and he soon used this power to eliminate all political opposition through both legal and violent means.

- On August 2, 1934, President Hindenburg died. Based on a law passed by the Reichstag the previous day, Hitler became head of state as well as head of government, and was formally named as *Führer und Reichskanzler* (leader and chancellor), thereby eliminating the last legal avenue by which he could be removed from office.

- Over the next few years, Hitler continued to consolidate his power, taking care to give his dictatorship the appearance of legality, by eliminating many military officials and taking personal command of the armed forces.
**Key Terms**

**Enabling Act**
A 1933 Weimar Constitution amendment that gave the German Cabinet – in effect, Chancellor Adolf Hitler – the power to enact laws without the involvement of the Reichstag. It passed in both the Reichstag and Reichsrat on March 24, 1933, and was signed by President Paul von Hindenburg later that day.

**Night of the Long Knives**
A purge that took place in Nazi Germany from June 30 to July 2, 1934, when the Nazi regime carried out a series of political extrajudicial executions intended to consolidate Hitler’s absolute hold on power in Germany. Many of those killed were leaders of the SA (Sturmabteilung), the Nazis’ own paramilitary Brownshirts organization; the best-known victim was Ernst Röhm, the SA’s leader and one of Hitler’s longtime supporters and allies.

**Reichstag Fire Decree**
This decree was issued by German President Paul von Hindenburg on the advice of Chancellor Adolf Hitler in direct response to the Reichstag fire of February 27, 1933. The decree nullified many of the key civil liberties of German citizens. With Nazis in powerful positions in the German government, the decree was used as the legal basis for the imprisonment of anyone considered an opponent of the Nazis and to suppress publications not considered “friendly” to the Nazi cause. The decree is considered
by historians to be one of the key steps in the establishment of a one-party Nazi state in Germany.

Hitler Runs for President

The Great Depression provided a political opportunity for Hitler. Germans were ambivalent about the parliamentary republic, which faced challenges from right- and left-wing extremists. The moderate political parties were increasingly unable to stem the tide of extremism, and the German referendum of 1929, which almost passed a law formally renouncing the Treaty of Versailles and making it a criminal offence for German officials to cooperate in the collecting of reparations, helped to elevate Nazi ideology. The elections of September 1930 resulted in the break-up of a grand coalition and its replacement with a minority cabinet. Its leader, chancellor Heinrich Brüning of the Centre Party, governed through emergency decrees from President Paul von Hindenburg. Governance by decree became the new norm and paved the way for authoritarian forms of government. The Nazi Party (NSDAP) rose from obscurity to win 18.3 percent of the vote and 107 parliamentary seats in the 1930 election, becoming the second-largest party in parliament.

Brüning’s austerity measures brought little economic improvement and were extremely unpopular. Hitler exploited this by targeting his political messages specifically at people who had been affected by the inflation of the 1920s and the Depression, such as farmers, war veterans, and the middle class.

Hitler ran against Hindenburg in the 1932 presidential elections. A January 1932 speech to the Industry Club in Düsseldorf won him support from many of Germany’s most powerful industrialists.
Hindenburg had support from various nationalist, monarchist, Catholic, and republican parties, as well as some social democrats. Hitler used the campaign slogan “Hitler über Deutschland” (“Hitler over Germany”), a reference to his political ambitions and campaigning by aircraft. He was one of the first politicians to use aircraft travel for political purposes and utilized it effectively. Hitler came in second in both rounds of the election, garnering more than 35 percent of the vote in the final election. Although he lost to Hindenburg, this election established Hitler as a strong force in German politics.

Appointment as Chancellor

The absence of an effective government prompted two influential politicians, Franz von Papen and Alfred Hugenberg, along with several industrialists and businessmen, to write a letter to Hindenburg. The signers urged Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as leader of a government “independent from parliamentary parties,” which could turn into a movement that would “enrapture millions of people.”

Hindenburg reluctantly agreed to appoint Hitler as chancellor after two further parliamentary elections—in July and November 1932—did not result in the formation of a majority government. Hitler headed a short-lived coalition government formed by the NSDAP and Hugenberg's party, the German National People's Party (DNVP). On January 30, 1933, the new cabinet was sworn in during a brief ceremony in Hindenburg's office. The NSDAP gained three posts: Hitler was named chancellor, Wilhelm Frick Minister of the Interior, and Hermann Göring Minister of the Interior for Prussia. Hitler had insisted on the ministerial positions to gain control over the police in much of Germany.
Hitler, Chancellor of Germany: Hitler, at the window of the Reich Chancellery, receives an ovation on the evening of his inauguration as chancellor, January 30, 1933.

Reichstag Fire and March Elections

As chancellor, Hitler worked against attempts by the NSDAP’s opponents to build a majority government. Because of the political stalemate, he asked Hindenburg to again dissolve the Reichstag, and elections were scheduled for early March. On February 27, 1933, the Reichstag building was set on fire. Göring blamed a communist plot, because Dutch communist Marinus van der Lubbe was found in incriminating circumstances inside the burning building. According to the British historian Sir Ian Kershaw, the consensus of nearly all historians is that van der Lubbe actually set the fire. Others, including William L. Shirer and Alan Bullock, are of the opinion that the NSDAP itself was responsible. At Hitler’s urging, Hindenburg responded with the Reichstag Fire Decree of 28 February, which suspended basic rights and allowed detention without trial. The decree was permitted under Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution,
which gave the president the power to take emergency measures to protect public safety and order. Activities of the German Communist Party (KPD) were suppressed, and some 4,000 KPD members were arrested.

In addition to political campaigning, the NSDAP engaged in paramilitary violence and the spread of anti-communist propaganda in the days preceding the election. On election day, March 6, 1933, the NSDAP’s share of the vote increased to 43.9 percent, and the party acquired the largest number of seats in parliament. Hitler's party failed to secure an absolute majority, necessitating another coalition with the DNVP.

The Enabling Act

To achieve full political control despite not having an absolute majority in parliament, Hitler’s government brought the Enabling Act to a vote in the newly elected Reichstag. The Act—officially titled the Gesetz zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich (“Law to Remedy the Distress of People and Reich”)—gave Hitler’s cabinet the power to enact laws without the consent of the Reichstag for four years. These laws could (with certain exceptions) deviate from the constitution. Since it would affect the constitution, the Enabling Act required a two-thirds majority to pass. Leaving nothing to chance, the Nazis used the provisions of the Reichstag Fire Decree to arrest all 81 Communist deputies (in spite of their virulent campaign against the party, the Nazis allowed the KPD to contest the election) and prevent several Social Democrats from attending.

On March 23, 1933, the Reichstag assembled at the Kroll Opera House under turbulent circumstances. Ranks of SA (Nazi paramilitary) men served as guards inside the building, while large groups outside opposing the proposed legislation shouted slogans and threats toward the arriving members of parliament. The position of the Centre Party, the third largest party in the Reichstag,
was decisive. After Hitler verbally promised party leader Ludwig Kaas that Hindenburg would retain his power of veto, Kaas announced the Centre Party would support the Enabling Act. The Act passed by a vote of 441–84, with all parties except the Social Democrats voting in favor. The Enabling Act, along with the Reichstag Fire Decree, transformed Hitler’s government into a de facto legal dictatorship.

**Dictatorship**

Having achieved full control over the legislative and executive branches of government, Hitler and his allies began to suppress the remaining opposition. The Social Democratic Party was banned and its assets seized. While many trade union delegates were in Berlin for May Day activities, SA stormtroopers demolished union offices around the country. On May 2, 1933, all trade unions were forced to dissolve and their leaders were arrested. Some were sent to concentration camps.

By the end of June, the other parties had been intimidated into disbanding. This included the Nazis’ nominal coalition partner, the DNVP; with the SA’s help, Hitler forced its leader, Hugenberg, to resign on June 29. On July 14, the NSDAP was declared the only legal political party in Germany. The demands of the SA for more political and military power caused anxiety among military, industrial, and political leaders. In response, Hitler purged the entire SA leadership in the Night of the Long Knives, which took place from June 30 to July 2, 1934. Hitler targeted Ernst Röhm and other SA leaders who, along with a number of Hitler’s political adversaries (such as Gregor Strasser and former chancellor Kurt von Schleicher), were rounded up, arrested, and shot. While the international community and some Germans were shocked by the murders, many in Germany believed Hitler was restoring order.

On August 2, 1934, Hindenburg died. The previous day, the cabinet
had enacted the “Law Concerning the Highest State Office of the Reich.” This law stated that upon Hindenburg's death, the office of president would be abolished and its powers merged with those of the chancellor. Hitler thus became head of state as well as head of government and was formally named as Führer und Reichskanzler (leader and chancellor). With this action, Hitler eliminated the last legal avenue by which he could be removed from office.

As head of state, Hitler became supreme commander of the armed forces. The traditional loyalty oath of servicemen was altered to affirm loyalty to Hitler personally, by name, rather than to the office of supreme commander or the state. On August 19, the merger of the presidency with the chancellorship was approved by 90 percent of the electorate voting in a plebiscite.

In early 1938, Hitler used blackmail to consolidate his hold over the military by instigating the Blomberg-Fritsch Affair. Hitler forced his War Minister, Field Marshal Werner von Blomberg, to resign by using a police dossier that showed that Blomberg's new wife had a record for prostitution. Army commander Colonel-General Werner von Fritsch was removed after the Schutzstaffel (SS paramilitary) produced allegations that he had engaged in a homosexual relationship. Both men fell into disfavor because they objected to Hitler's demand to make the Wehrmacht (German armed forces) ready for war as early as 1938. Hitler assumed Blomberg's title of Commander-in-Chief, thus taking personal command of the armed forces. On the same day, sixteen generals were stripped of their commands and 44 more were transferred; all were suspected of not being sufficiently pro-Nazi. By early February 1938, 12 more generals had been removed.

Hitler took care to give his dictatorship the appearance of legality. Many of his decrees were explicitly based on the Reichstag Fire Decree and hence on Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution. The Reichstag renewed the Enabling Act twice, each time for a four-year period. While elections to the Reichstag were still held (in 1933, 1936, and 1938), voters were presented with a single list of Nazis and pro-Nazi “guests” which carried with well over 90 percent of the...
vote. These elections were held in far-from-secret conditions; the Nazis threatened severe reprisals against anyone who didn't vote or dared to vote no.

Attributions

- Hitler's Rise to Power
Racism, especially antisemitism, was a central feature of the Nazi regime, based on a pseudo-scientific doctrine asserting the superiority of the Aryan “master race.”

**Learning Objective**

Give examples of antisemitism in Germany before the outbreak of World War II

**Key Points**

- One of the central tenets of the Nazi regime was a pseudo-scientific racial hierarchy placing the Nordic or Aryan races at the top and Slavs, Romani, and especially Jews at the bottom.
- Antisemitism in the Nazi regime was manifested in propaganda that scapegoated all of Germany’s problems on the Jews, various discriminating laws,
and finally mass-scale violence and murder culminating in the Holocaust, or in Nazi terms, the “Final Solution.”

• In April 1933, Hitler declared a national boycott of Jewish businesses and passed the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, which forced all non-Aryan civil servants to retire from the legal profession and civil service.

• On September 15, 1935, the Nuremberg Laws were passed, which included the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour. This forbade marriages and extramarital intercourse between Jews and Germans. The Reich Citizenship Law declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens.

• In November 1938, persecution of the Jews became violent when Nazi paramilitary damaged or destroyed synagogues and Jewish property throughout Germany during what became known as Kristallnacht, the “Night of Broken Glass.”

• Up until the outbreak of World War II, when the racist policies of the Nazis turned into outright genocide, the persecution of Jews and other “subhumans” continued under mostly legal means.
**Key Terms**

“**master race**”
A pseudo-scientific concept in Nazi ideology in which the Nordic or Aryan races, thought to predominate among Germans and other northern European peoples, were deemed the highest in an assumed racial hierarchy.

**stab-in-the-back legend**
The notion, widely believed in right-wing circles in Germany after 1918, that the German Army did not lose World War I on the battlefield but was instead betrayed by the civilians on the home front, especially the republicans who overthrew the monarchy in the German Revolution of 1918-19. Advocates denounced the German government leaders who signed the Armistice on November 11, 1918, as the “November Criminals.”

**Kristallnacht**
A pogrom against Jews throughout Nazi Germany on November 9-10, 1938, carried out by SA paramilitary forces and German civilians. German authorities looked on without intervening. The name comes from the shards of broken glass that littered the streets after the windows of Jewish-owned stores, buildings, and synagogues were smashed.

**Nuremberg Laws**
Antisemitic laws in Nazi Germany introduced on September 15, 1935, by the Reichstag at a special
meeting convened at the annual Nuremberg Rally of the Nazi Party (NSDAP). The two laws were the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, which forbade marriages and extramarital intercourse between Jews and Germans and the employment of German females under 45 in Jewish households, and the Reich Citizenship Law, which declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens; the remainder were classed as state subjects without citizenship rights.

Racism and antisemitism were basic tenets of the NSDAP and the Nazi regime. The Germanic peoples (the Nordic race) were considered by the Nazis to be the purest branch of the Aryan race and therefore viewed as the master race. The Nazis postulated the existence of a racial conflict between the Aryan master race and inferior races, particularly Jews, who were viewed as a mixed race that had infiltrated society and were responsible for the exploitation and repression of the Aryan race.

Nazi policies placed centuries-long residents in German territory who were not ethnic Germans such as Jews (a Semitic people of Levantine origins), Romanis (also known as Gypsies, an Indo-Aryan people of Indian Subcontinent origins), European non-Nordic peoples including Slavs (Poles, Serbs, Russians, etc.), and all other persons of color as inferior non-Aryan subhumans (i.e. non-Nordics, under the Nazi misinterpretation of the term “Aryan”) in a racial hierarchy with the Herrenvolk (“master race”) of the Volksgemeinschaft (“people’s community”) at the top. Jews were at the bottom, considered inhuman and thus unworthy of life.

Using the “stab-in-the-back legend,” the Nazis blamed poverty, hyperinflation in the Weimar Republic, unemployment, and the loss of World War I and surrender by the “November Criminals” all on the Jews and “cultural Bolsheviks,” the latter considered in
conspiracy with the Jews. German woes were attributed to the effects of the Treaty of Versailles, also considered a Jewish conspiracy. The Nazi Party used these populist antisemitic views to gain votes.

**Early Persecution of Jews**

Discrimination against Jews began immediately after the Nazi seizure of power. Following a month-long series of attacks by members of the SA (Nazi paramilitary) on Jewish businesses, synagogues, and members of the legal profession, on April 1, 1933, Hitler declared a national boycott of Jewish businesses. The Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, passed on April 7, forced all non-Aryan civil servants to retire from the legal profession and civil service. Similar legislation soon deprived Jewish members of other professions of their right to practice. On April 11, a decree was promulgated that stated anyone with even one Jewish parent or grandparent was considered non-Aryan. As part of the drive to remove Jewish influence from cultural life, members of the National Socialist Student League removed from libraries books considered un-German, and a nationwide book burning was held on May 10.

Violence and economic pressure were used by the regime to encourage Jews to voluntarily leave the country. Jewish businesses were denied access to markets, forbidden to advertise in newspapers, and deprived of access to government contracts. Citizens were harassed and subjected to violent attacks. Many towns posted signs forbidding entry to Jews.

In November 1938, a young Jewish man requested an interview with the German ambassador in Paris. He met with a legation secretary, whom he shot and killed to protest his family’s treatment in Germany. This incident provided the pretext for a pogrom the NSDAP incited against the Jews on November 9, 1938. Members
of the SA damaged or destroyed synagogues and Jewish property throughout Germany. At least 91 German Jews were killed during this pogrom, later called Kristallnacht, the “Night of Broken Glass.” Further restrictions were imposed on Jews in the coming months. They were forbidden to own businesses or work in retail shops, drive cars, go to the cinema, visit the library, or own weapons. Jewish pupils were removed from schools. The Jewish community was fined one billion marks to pay for the damage caused by Kristallnacht and told that any money received via insurance claims would be confiscated.

By 1939, around 250,000 of Germany’s 437,000 Jews emigrated to the United States, Argentina, Great Britain, Palestine, and other countries. Many chose to stay in continental Europe. Nonetheless, emigration was problematic, as Jews were required to remit up to 90 percent of their wealth as a tax upon leaving the country. By 1938 it was almost impossible for potential Jewish emigrants to find a country willing to take them. Mass deportation schemes such as the Madagascar Plan proved to be impossible for the Nazis to carry out, and starting in mid-1941, the German government started mass exterminations of the Jews of Europe.
Kristallnacht: Damage caused during Kristallnacht. On November 9-10, 1938, a pogrom against Jews was carried out by SA paramilitary forces and German civilians throughout Nazi Germany. Nuremberg Laws The Nuremberg Laws were introduced on September 15, 1935, by the Reichstag at a special meeting convened at the annual Nuremberg Rally of the Nazi Party. The two laws were the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, which forbade marriages and extramarital intercourse between Jews and Germans (seen as “race disgrace”) and the employment of German females under 45 in Jewish households, and the Reich Citizenship Law, which declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens; the remainder were classed as state subjects without citizenship rights. A supplementary decree outlining the definition of who was Jewish was passed on November 14, and the Reich Citizenship Law officially came into force on that date. The laws were expanded on November 26, 1935, to include Romani people and Afro-Germans. This supplementary decree defined Gypsies as “enemies of the race-based state,” the same category as Jews. The Nuremberg laws had a crippling economic and social impact on the Jewish community. Persons convicted of
violating the marriage laws were imprisoned, and (subsequent to March 8, 1938) upon completing their sentences were rearrested by the Gestapo and sent to Nazi concentration camps. Non-Jews gradually stopped socializing with Jews or shopping in Jewish-owned stores, many of which closed due to lack of customers. As Jews were no longer permitted to work in the civil service or government-regulated professions such as medicine and education, many middle-class business owners and professionals were forced to take menial employment. 

Attributions

Lebensraum and Anschluss

30.5.5: Lebensraum and Anschluss

The ideology of Nazism brought together elements of antisemitism, racial hygiene, and eugenics with pan-Germanism (“Heim ins Reich“) and territorial expansionism with the goal of obtaining more Lebensraum (“living space”) for the Germanic people.

Learning Objective

Define the terms Lebensraum and Anschluss

Key Points

- The foreign policy of the Nazi regime, outlined by Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf in 1925, expanded upon the German ideas of a “Greater Germany” that had been discussed and enacted in various ways since the 19th century.
- Similar to the Italian expansionist policy of Spazio vitale (“vital space”) under Mussolini, Hitler sought to
expand the territory of Germany to give room (Lebensraum: “living space”) for ethnic Germans to live and work.

• This territorial aim was combined with the racist ideologies of the Nazis to form the idea that people deemed to be part of inferior races (Slavs and Jews, for example), within the territory of Lebensraum expansion, were subjected to expulsion or destruction.

• Thus under the Nazi policies and military plans, the indigenous populations of Eastern Europe would have to be removed permanently, either through mass deportation to Siberia, death, or enslavement.

• The invasion of Poland, which started World War II, was motivated by this Lebensraum principle.

• Similar to the Lebensraum principle, the Nazis wanted to build a Great Germany by annexing ethnically-German territories, especially Austria.

• The annexation of Austria (termed Anschluss) occurred in 1938 when Hitler ordered troops into Austria to pressure its president to appoint a Nazi chancellor who would orchestrate the unification.

• Within two days of installation, Nazis transferred power to Germany, and Wehrmacht troops entered Austria to enforce the Anschluss, which was then ratified by a controlled popular vote.
settler colonialism
A form of colonial formation whereby foreign people move into a region. An imperial power oversees the immigration of these settlers who consent, often only temporarily, to government by that authority. This colonization sometimes leads, by a variety of means, to depopulation of the previous inhabitants, and the settlers take over the land left vacant by the previous residents.

“Heim ins Reich”
A foreign policy pursued by Adolf Hitler during World War II, beginning in 1938. The aim of Hitler’s initiative was to convince all Volksdeutsche (ethnic Germans) living outside of Nazi Germany (in Austria and the western districts of Poland) that they should strive to bring these regions “home” into Greater Germany and relocate from outside German-controlled territories following the conquest of Poland in accordance with the Nazi-Soviet pact.

Lebensraum
German for “living space,” this term refers to policies and practices of settler colonialism proliferated in Germany from the 1890s to the 1940s.

Anschluss
This is the term used to describe the annexation of Austria into Nazi Germany in March 1938, but the idea goes back to the 19th century.
Lebensraum

The German concept of Lebensraum (English: “living space”) refers to policies and practices of settler colonialism proliferated in Germany from the 1890s to the 1940s. The most extreme form of this ideology was supported by the Nazi Party (NSDAP) in the Third Reich until the end of World War II. First popularized around 1901, Lebensraum became a geopolitical goal of Imperial Germany in World War I (1914–1918).

In Mein Kampf (1925), Adolf Hitler dedicated a full chapter titled “Eastern Orientation or Eastern Policy,” outlining the need for the new living space for Germany. He claimed that achieving Lebensraum required political will, and that the National Socialist Movement should strive to expand the population area of the German people and acquire new sources of food. Hitler rejected the restoration of the pre-war borders of Germany as an inadequate half-measure toward reducing purported national overpopulation. From that perspective, he opined that the nature of national borders is always unfinished and momentary, and that their redrawing must continue as Germany’s political goal. Hence, Hitler identified the geopolitics of Lebensraum as the ultimate political will of his Party:

And so, we National Socialists consciously draw a line beneath the foreign policy tendency of our pre–War period. We take up where we broke off six hundred years ago. We stop the endless German movement to the south and west, and turn our gaze toward the land in the East. At long last, we break off the colonial and commercial policy of the pre–War period and shift to the soil policy of the future.

Following Hitler’s rise to power, Lebensraum became an ideological principle of Nazism and provided justification for the German territorial expansion into East–Central Europe. The Nazi Generalplan Ost policy (the Master Plan for the East) was based on its tenets. It stipulated that most of the indigenous populations
of Eastern Europe would have to be removed permanently (either through mass deportation to Siberia, death, or enslavement) including Polish, Ukrainian, Russian, and other Slavic nations considered racially inferior. The Third Reich aimed at repopulating these lands with Germanic colonists in the name of Lebensraum during World War II and thereafter. The entire populations were to be decimated by starvation, allowing for their own agricultural surplus to feed Germany. The invasion of Poland, which started WWII, was motivated by the Lebensraum principle and planned under Generalplan Ost.

Hitler's strategic program for world domination was based on the belief in the power of Lebensraum, pursued by a racially superior society. People deemed to be part of inferior races within the territory of Lebensraum expansion were subjected to expulsion or destruction. The eugenics of Lebensraum assumed the right of the German Aryan master race (Herrenvolk) to remove indigenous people they considered to be of inferior racial stock (Untermenschen) in the name of their own living space. Nazi Germany also supported other “Arian” nations pursuing their own Lebensraum, including Fascist Italy’s Spazio vitale.
Greater Germany and Lebensraum: The Greater Germanic Reich, to be realized with the policies of Lebensraum, had boundaries derived from the plans of the Generalplan Ost.

Anschluss

Anschluss (English: “connection” or “joining”) is the term used to describe the annexation of Austria into Nazi Germany in March 1938. The idea of an Anschluss (Austria and Germany uniting to form a “Greater Germany”) began after the Unification of Germany excluded Austria and the Austrian Germans from the Prussian-dominated German nation-state in 1871. The idea of grouping all Germans into a nation-state country had been the subject of debate in the 19th century from the end of the Holy Roman Empire until the end of the German Confederation.

Following the end of World War I in 1918, the Republic of German-Austria attempted union with Germany, but the Treaty of Saint Germain (September 10, 1919) and the Treaty of Versailles (June 28,
1919) forbade both the union and the continued use of the name “German-Austria.”

The constitutions of the Weimar Republic and the First Austrian Republic included the political goal of unification, which was widely supported by democratic parties. In the early 1930s, popular support in Austria for union with Germany remained overwhelming, and the Austrian government looked to a possible customs union with German Republic in 1931.

When the Nazis, led by Adolf Hitler, rose to power in the Weimar Republic, the Austrian government withdrew from economic ties. Austria shared the economic turbulence of the Great Depression, with a high unemployment rate and unstable commerce and industry. During the 1920s it was a target for German investment capital. By 1937 rapid German rearmament increased Berlin's interest in annexing Austria, rich in raw materials and labor. It supplied Germany with magnesium and the products of the iron, textile, and machine industries. It had gold and foreign currency reserves, many unemployed skilled workers, hundreds of idle factories, and large potential hydroelectric resources.

The Nazis aimed to re-unite all Germans either born or living outside of the Reich to create an “all-German Reich.” Hitler wrote in Mein Kampf that he would create a union between his birth country Austria and Germany by any means possible (“German-Austria must be restored to the great German Motherland.” “People of the same blood should be in the same Reich.”).

Austria was annexed by Nazi Germany on March 12, 1938. There had been several years of pressure from supporters in Austria and Germany (both Nazis and non-Nazis) for the “Heim ins Reich” (“back home to the Reich”) movement. Earlier, Nazi Germany provided support for the Austrian National Socialist Party (Austrian Nazi Party) in its bid to seize power from Austria's Fatherland Front government.

On March 9, 1938, in the face of rioting by the small but virulent Austrian Nazi Party and ever-expanding German demands on Austria, Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg called a plebiscite referendum
(popular vote) on the issue, to be held on March 13. Infuriated, on
March 11 Adolf Hitler threatened invasion of Austria and demanded
Chancellor von Schuschnigg’s resignation and the appointment of
the Nazi Arthur Seyss-Inquart as his replacement. Hitler’s plan was
for Seyss-Inquart to call immediately for German troops to rush
to Austria’s aid, restoring order and giving the invasion an air of
legitimacy. In the face of this threat, Schuschnigg informed Seyss-
Inquart that the plebiscite would be cancelled.

Nevertheless, the Hitler underestimated his opposition.
Schuschnigg did resign on the evening of March 11, but President
Wilhelm Miklas refused to appoint Seyss-Inquart as chancellor. At
8:45 p.m., Hitler, tired of waiting, ordered the invasion to commence
at dawn on March 12 regardless. Around 10 p.m., a forged telegram
was sent in Seyss-Inquart’s name asking for German troops, since
he was not yet chancellor and was unable to do so himself. Seyss-
Inquart was not installed as chancellor until after midnight, when
Miklas resigned himself to the inevitable.

As Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Edgar A Mowrer, reporting
from Paris for CBS, observed: “There is no one in all France who
does not believe that Hitler invaded Austria not to hold a genuine
plebiscite, but to prevent the plebiscite planned by Schusschnigg
from demonstrating to the entire world just how little hold National
Socialism really had on that tiny country.” Clearly it was Hitler and
not Schuschnigg who was terrified by the potential results of the
scheduled plebiscite, and that was the best indication of where
Austrians’ loyalty lay.

The newly installed Nazis within two days transferred power to
Germany, and Wehrmacht troops entered Austria to enforce the
Anschluss. The Nazis held a controlled plebiscite in the whole Reich
within the following month, asking the people to ratify the
annexation, and claimed that 99.7561% of the votes cast in Austria
were in favor. Austrian citizens of Jewish origin were not allowed to
vote.
“Greater_Germanic_Reich.png.”
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31.1: Axis Powers

31.1.1: Hitler’s Germany

Hitler and his Nazi Party ruled Germany from 1933–1945 as a fascist totalitarian state which controlled nearly all aspects of life.

Learning Objective

Characterize Germany under the Nazi regime

Key Points

- The German economy suffered severe setbacks after the end of World War I, partly because of reparations payments required under the 1919 Treaty of Versailles. These reparations created social unrest and provided an opportunity for the Nazi Party to attract popularity.
- Racism, especially antisemitism, was a central
feature of the Nazi Party.

- After the Nazi Party won a majority of seats in the German parliament, Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany by the President of the Weimar Republic Paul von Hindenburg on January 30, 1933, and soon eliminated all political opposition and consolidated his power.
- In March 1933, the Enabling Act, an amendment to the Weimar Constitution, passed in the Reichstag. This allowed Hitler and his cabinet to pass laws—even laws that violated the constitution—without the consent of the president or the Reichstag.
- President Hindenburg died on August 2, 1934, and Hitler became dictator of Germany by merging the powers and offices of the Chancellery and Presidency.
- Germany was now a totalitarian state with Hitler at its head.

**Key Terms**

**Adolf Hitler**

A German politician who was the leader of the Nazi Party, Chancellor of Germany from 1933 to 1945, and Führer of Nazi Germany from 1934 to 1945; he initiated World War II in Europe with the invasion of Poland in September 1939 and was a central figure of the Holocaust.
antisemitism

Hostility, prejudice, or discrimination against Jews.

Nazi Party

A political party in Germany active between 1920 and 1945 that practiced the ideology of Nazism, a form of fascism that incorporates scientific racism and antisemitism.

fascist

A form of radical authoritarian nationalism that came to prominence in early 20th-century Europe, whose proponents believe that liberal democracy is obsolete and regard the complete mobilization of society under a totalitarian one-party state as necessary to prepare a nation for armed conflict and respond effectively to economic difficulties.

Nazi Germany is the common English name for the period in German history from 1933 to 1945 when the country was governed by a dictatorship under the control of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party. Under Hitler’s rule, Germany was transformed into a fascist totalitarian state that controlled nearly all aspects of life. The official name of the state was Deutsches Reich from 1933 to 1943 and Großdeutsches Reich (“Greater German Reich”) from 1943 to 1945. The period is also known under the names the Third Reich and the National Socialist Period. The Nazi regime came to an end after the Allied Forces defeated Germany in May 1945, ending World War II in Europe.
Hitler’s Rise to Power

Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany by the President of the Weimar Republic Paul von Hindenburg on January 30, 1933. The Nazi Party then began to eliminate all political opposition and consolidate its power. Hindenburg died on August 2, 1934, and Hitler became dictator of Germany by merging the powers and offices of the Chancellery and Presidency. A national referendum held August 19, 1934 confirmed Hitler as sole Führer (leader) of Germany. All power was centralized in Hitler's person, and his word became above all laws. The government was not a coordinated, co-operating body, but a collection of factions struggling for power and Hitler's favor. In the midst of the Great Depression, the Nazis restored economic stability and ended mass unemployment using heavy military spending and a mixed economy. Extensive public works were undertaken, including the construction of Autobahnen (motorways). The return to economic stability boosted the regime's popularity.

Racism, especially antisemitism, was a central feature of the regime. The Germanic people (the Nordic race) were considered by the Nazis to be the purest branch of the Aryan race, and therefore were viewed as the master race. Millions of Jews and other peoples deemed undesirable by the state were murdered in the Holocaust. Opposition to Hitler's rule was ruthlessly suppressed. Members of the liberal, socialist, and communist opposition were killed, imprisoned, or exiled. The Christian churches were also oppressed, with many leaders imprisoned. Education focused on racial biology, population policy, and fitness for military service. Career and educational opportunities for women were curtailed. Recreation and tourism were organised via the Strength Through Joy program, and the 1936 Summer Olympics showcased the Third Reich on the international stage. Propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels made effective use of film, mass rallies, and Hitler's hypnotizing oratory to control public opinion. The government controlled artistic
expression, promoting specific art forms and banning or discouraging others.

Beginning in the late 1930s, Nazi Germany made increasingly aggressive territorial demands, threatening war if they were not met. It seized Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938 and 1939. Hitler made a pact with Joseph Stalin and invaded Poland in September 1939, launching World War II in Europe.

![Nazi Flag: National flag of Germany, 1935–45](image)

**The Rise of the Nazi Party**

The German economy suffered severe setbacks after the end of World War I, partly because of reparations payments required under the 1919 Treaty of Versailles. The government printed money to make the payments and repay the country’s war debt; the resulting hyperinflation led to higher prices for consumer goods, economic chaos, and food riots. When the government failed to make the reparations payments in January 1923, French troops occupied German industrial areas along the Ruhr. Widespread civil unrest followed.

The National Socialist German Workers’ Party (Nazi Party) was
the renamed successor of the German Workers’ Party founded in 1919, one of several far-right political parties active in Germany at the time. The party platform included removal of the Weimar Republic, rejection of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, radical antisemitism, and anti-Bolshevism. They promised a strong central government, increased Lebensraum (living space) for Germanic peoples, formation of a national community based on race, and racial cleansing via the active suppression of Jews, who would be stripped of their citizenship and civil rights. The Nazis proposed national and cultural renewal based upon the Völkisch (German populist) movement.

When the stock market in the United States crashed on October 24, 1929, the effect on Germany was dire. Millions were thrown out of work, and several major banks collapsed. Hitler and the Nazi Party prepared to take advantage of the emergency to gain support for their party. They promised to strengthen the economy and provide jobs. Many voters decided the Nazi Party was capable of restoring order, quelling civil unrest, and improving Germany’s international reputation. After the federal election of 1932, the Nazis were the largest party in the Reichstag (elected parliament), holding 230 seats with 37.4 percent of the popular vote.

**Hitler Seizes Power**

Although the Nazis won the greatest share of the popular vote in the two Reichstag general elections of 1932, they did not have a majority, so Hitler led a short-lived coalition government formed by the Nazi Party and the German National People’s Party. Under pressure from politicians, industrialists, and the business community, President Paul von Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor of Germany on January 30, 1933. This event is known as the Machtergreifung (seizure of power). In the following months, the Nazi Party used a process termed Gleichschaltung (co-ordination) to rapidly bring all
aspects of life under control of the party. All civilian organizations, including agricultural groups, volunteer organizations, and sports clubs, had their leadership replaced with Nazi sympathizers or party members. By June 1933, virtually the only organisations not under control of the Nazi Party were the army and the churches.

On the night of February 27, 1933, the Reichstag building was set afire; Marinus van der Lubbe, a Dutch communist, was found guilty of starting the blaze. Hitler proclaimed that the arson marked the start of a communist uprising. Violent suppression of communists by the Sturmabteilung (SA) was undertaken all over the country, and 4,000 members of the Communist Party of Germany were arrested. The Reichstag Fire Decree, imposed on February 28, 1933, rescinded most German civil liberties, including rights of assembly and freedom of the press. The decree also allowed the police to detain people indefinitely without charges or a court order. The legislation was accompanied by a propaganda blitz that led to public support for the measure.

In March 1933, the Enabling Act, an amendment to the Weimar Constitution, passed in the Reichstag by a vote of 444 to 94. This amendment allowed Hitler and his cabinet to pass laws—even laws that violated the constitution—without the consent of the president or the Reichstag. As the bill required a two-thirds majority to pass, the Nazis used the provisions of the Reichstag Fire Decree to keep several Social Democratic deputies from attending; the Communists had already been banned. On May 10 the government seized the assets of the Social Democrats; they were banned in June. The remaining political parties were dissolved, and on July 14, 1933, Germany became a de facto one-party state when the founding of new parties was made illegal. Further elections in November 1933, 1936, and 1938 were entirely Nazi-controlled and saw only the Nazis and a small number of independents elected. The regional state parliaments and the Reichsrat (federal upper house) were abolished in January 1934.

On 2 August 1934, President von Hindenburg died. The previous day, the cabinet had enacted the “Law Concerning the Highest State
Office of the Reich,” which stated that upon Hindenburg's death, the office of president would be abolished and its powers merged with those of the chancellor. Hitler thus became head of state as well as head of government. He was formally named as Führer und Reichskanzler (leader and chancellor). Germany was now a totalitarian state with Hitler at its head. As head of state, Hitler became Supreme Commander of the armed forces. The new law altered the traditional loyalty oath of servicemen so that they affirmed loyalty to Hitler personally rather than the office of supreme commander or the state. On August 19, the merger of the presidency with the chancellorship was approved by 90 percent of the electorate in a plebiscite.
Adolf Hitler

Hitler became Germany’s head of state, with the title of Führer und Reichskanzler, in 1934.

Attributions

- Hitler’s Germany
Nazi_Germany. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

Italian Fascism under Benito Mussolini was rooted in Italian nationalism and the desire to restore and expand Italian territories.

**Learning Objective**

Describe Mussolini’s Italy

**Key Points**

- Social unrest after World War I, led mainly by communists, led to counter-revolution and repression throughout Italy.
- The liberal establishment, fearing a Soviet-style revolution, started to endorse the small National Fascist Party led by Benito Mussolini.
- In the night between October 27-28, 1922, about 30,000 Fascist blackshirts (paramilitary of the Fascist party) gathered in Rome to demand the resignation of liberal Prime Minister Luigi Facta and the appointment of a new Fascist government. This event
is called the “March on Rome.”

- Between 1925 and 1927, Mussolini progressively dismantled virtually all constitutional and conventional restraints on his power, building a police state.
- A law passed on Christmas Eve 1925 changed Mussolini’s formal title from “president of the Council of Ministers” to “head of the government” and thereafter he began styling himself as Il Duce (the leader).
- On October 25, 1936, Mussolini agreed to form a Rome-Berlin Axis, sanctioned by a cooperation agreement with Nazi Germany and signed in Berlin, forming the so-called Axis Powers of World War II.

**Key Terms**

**March on Rome**  
A march by which Italian dictator Benito Mussolini’s National Fascist Party came to power in the Kingdom of Italy.

**Benito Mussolini**  
An Italian politician, journalist, and leader of the National Fascist Party, ruling the country as Prime Minister from 1922 to 1943; he ruled constitutionally until 1925, when he dropped all pretense of democracy and set up a legal dictatorship.
The socialist agitations that followed the devastation of World War I, inspired by the Russian Revolution, led to counter-revolution and repression throughout Italy. The liberal establishment, fearing a Soviet-style revolution, started to endorse the small National Fascist Party led by Benito Mussolini. In October 1922 the Blackshirts of the National Fascist Party attempted a coup (the “March on Rome”) which failed, but at the last minute, King Victor Emmanuel III refused to proclaim a state of siege and appointed Mussolini prime minister. Over the next few years, Mussolini banned all political parties and curtailed personal liberties, thus forming a dictatorship. These actions attracted international attention and eventually inspired similar dictatorships such as Nazi Germany and Francoist Spain.

In 1935, Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, resulting in international alienation and leading to Italy’s withdrawal from the League of Nations; Italy allied with Nazi Germany and the Empire of Japan and strongly supported Francisco Franco in the Spanish civil war. In 1939, Italy annexed Albania, a de facto protectorate for decades. Italy entered World War II on June 10, 1940. After initially advancing in British Somaliland and Egypt, the Italians were defeated in East Africa, Greece, Russia and North Africa.

**Mussolini’s Rise to Power**

The Fascisti, led by one of Mussolini’s close confidants, Dino Grandi,
formed armed squads of war veterans called Blackshirts (or squadristi) with the goal of restoring order to the streets of Italy with a strong hand. The blackshirts clashed with communists, socialists, and anarchists at parades and demonstrations; all of these factions were also involved in clashes against each other. The Italian government rarely interfered with the blackshirts' actions, owing in part to a looming threat and widespread fear of a communist revolution. The Fascisti grew rapidly, within two years transforming themselves into the National Fascist Party at a congress in Rome. In 1921 Mussolini won election to the Chamber of Deputies for the first time.

In the night between October 27-28, 1922, about 30,000 Fascist blackshirts gathered in Rome to demand the resignation of liberal Prime Minister Luigi Facta and the appointment of a new Fascist government. This event is known as the “March on Rome.” On the morning of October 28, King Victor Emmanuel III, who according to the Albertine Statute held the supreme military power, refused the government request to declare martial law, leading to Facta’s resignation. The King then handed over power to Mussolini (who stayed in his headquarters in Milan during the talks) by asking him to form a new government. The King’s controversial decision has been explained by historians as a combination of delusions and fears; Mussolini enjoyed a wide support in the military and among the industrial and agrarian elites, while the King and the conservative establishment were afraid of a possible civil war and ultimately thought they could use Mussolini to restore law and order in the country, but failed to foresee the danger of a totalitarian evolution.
As Prime Minister, the first years of Mussolini’s rule were characterized by a right-wing coalition government composed of Fascists, nationalists, liberals, and two Catholic clerics from the Popular Party. The Fascists made up a small minority in his original governments. Mussolini’s domestic goal was the eventual establishment of a totalitarian state with himself as supreme leader (*Il Duce*) a message that was articulated by the Fascist newspaper *Il Popolo*, now edited by Mussolini’s brother, Arnaldo. To that end, Mussolini obtained from the legislature dictatorial powers for one year (legal under the Italian constitution of the time). He favored the complete restoration of state authority with the integration of the *Fasci di Combattimento* into the armed forces (the foundation in January 1923 of
the *Milizia Volontaria per la Sicurezza Nazionale*) and the progressive identification of the party with the state. In political and social economy, he passed legislation that favored the wealthy industrial and agrarian classes (privatizations, liberalizations of rent laws, and dismantlement of the unions). Between 1925 and 1927, Mussolini progressively dismantled virtually all constitutional and conventional restraints on his power, thereby building a police state. A law passed on Christmas Eve 1925 changed Mussolini’s formal title from “president of the Council of Ministers” to “head of the government” (though he was still called “Prime Minister” by most non-Italian outlets). Thereafter he began styling himself as *Il Duce* (the leader). He was no longer responsible to Parliament and could be removed only by the king. While the Italian constitution stated that ministers were responsible only to the sovereign, in practice it had become all but impossible to govern against the express will of Parliament. The Christmas Eve law ended this practice, and also made Mussolini the only person competent to determine the body’s agenda. This law transformed Mussolini’s government into a de facto legal dictatorship. Local autonomy was abolished, and podestàs appointed by the Italian Senate replaced elected mayors and councils.
Fascist Italy Mussolini’s foremost priority was the subjugation of the minds of the Italian people and the use of propaganda to do so. A lavish cult of personality centered on the figure of Mussolini was promoted by the regime. Mussolini pretended to incarnate the new fascist Übermensch, promoting an aesthetics of exasperated Machism and a cult of personality that attributed to him quasi-divine capacities. At various times after 1922, Mussolini personally took over the ministries of the interior, foreign affairs, colonies, corporations, defense, and public works. Sometimes he held as many as seven departments simultaneously as well as the premiership. He was also head of the all-powerful Fascist Party and the armed local fascist militia, the MVSN or “Blackshirts,” who terrorized incipient resistances in the cities and provinces. He would later form the OVRA, an institutionalized secret police that carried official state support. He thus succeeded in keeping power in his own hands and preventing the emergence of any rival. All teachers in schools and universities had to swear an oath to defend the fascist regime. Newspaper editors were all personally chosen by Mussolini and no one without a certificate of approval from the fascist party could practice journalism. These
certificates were issued in secret; Mussolini thus skillfully created the illusion of a “free press.” The trade unions were also deprived of independence and integrated into what was called the “corporative” system. The aim (never completely achieved), inspired by medieval guilds, was to place all Italians in various professional organizations or corporations under clandestine governmental control. In his early years in power, Mussolini operated as a pragmatic statesman, trying to achieve advantages but never at the risk of war with Britain and France. An exception was the bombardment and occupation of Corfu in 1923, following an incident in which Italian military personnel charged by the League of Nations to settle a boundary dispute between Greece and Albania were assassinated by Greek bandits. At the time of the Corfu incident, Mussolini was prepared to go to war with Britain, and only desperate pleading by Italian Navy leadership, who argued that Italian Navy was no match for the British Royal Navy, persuaded him to accept a diplomatic solution. In a secret speech to the Italian military leadership in January 1925, Mussolini argued that Italy needed to win spazio vitale (vital space), and as such his ultimate goal was to join “the two shores of the Mediterranean and of the Indian Ocean into a single Italian
territory.” Path to War By the late 1930s, Mussolini’s obsession with demography led him to conclude that Britain and France were finished as powers, and that Germany and Italy were destined to rule Europe if for no other reason than their demographic strength. Mussolini stated his belief that declining birth rates in France were “absolutely horrifying” and that the British Empire was doomed because a quarter of the British population was older than 50. As such, Mussolini believed that an alliance with Germany was preferable to an alignment with Britain and France as it was better to be allied with the strong instead of the weak. Mussolini saw international relations as a Social Darwinian struggle between “virile” nations with high birth rates that were destined to destroy “effete” nations with low birth rates. Such was the extent of Mussolini’s belief that it was Italy’s destiny to rule the Mediterranean because of the country’s high birth rate that he neglected much of the serious planning and preparations necessary for a war with the Western powers. On October 25, 1936, Mussolini agreed to form a Rome-Berlin Axis, sanctioned by a cooperation agreement with Nazi Germany and signed in Berlin. At the Munich Conference in September 1938, Mussolini continued to pose as a moderate
working for European peace while helping Nazi Germany annex the Sudetenland. The 1936 Axis agreement with Germany was strengthened by the Pact of Steel signed on May 22, 1939, which bound Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany in a full military alliance.
Pre-WWII Japan was characterized by political totalitarianism, ultranationalism, expansionism, and fascism culminating in Japan's invasion of China in 1937.

**Learning Objective**

Identify Japanese actions taken in the interest of territorial expansion

**Key Points**

- During the early Shōwa period, Japan moved into political totalitarianism, ultranationalism, and fascism, as well as a series of expansionist wars culminating in Japan's invasion of China in 1937.
- The rise of Japanese nationalism paralleled the growth of nationalism within the West.
- During the Manchurian Incident of 1931, radical army officers bombed a small portion of the South Manchuria Railroad and, falsely attributing the attack...
to the Chinese, invaded Manchuria.

- Japan's expansionist ambitions led to the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937.
- After their victory in the Chinese capital, the Japanese military committed the infamous Nanking Massacre, also known as the Rape of Nanking, which involved a massive number of civilian deaths including infants and elderly and the large-scale rape of Chinese women.
- In response to American economic sanctions, Japan forged an alliance with Germany and Italy in 1940 known as the Tripartite Pact.

**Key Terms**

**Tripartite Pact**
An agreement between Germany, Japan, and Italy signed in Berlin on September 27, 1940 that created the alliance known as the Axis Powers of WWII.

**Manchurian Incident**
A staged event engineered by Japanese military personnel as a pretext for the Japanese invasion in 1931 of northeastern China, known as Manchuria.

**Nanking Massacre**
An episode of mass murder and rape committed by Japanese troops against the residents of Nanking.
The Shōwa period is the era of Japanese history corresponding to the reign of the Shōwa Emperor, Hirohito, from December 25, 1926, through January 7, 1989. The Shōwa period was longer than the reign of any previous Japanese emperor. During the pre-1945 period, Japan moved into political totalitarianism, ultranationalism, and fascism, as well as a series of expansionist wars culminating in Japan's invasion of China in 1937. This was part of an overall global period of social upheavals and conflicts such as the Great Depression and the Second World War.

**Rise of Nationalism**

Prior to 1868, most Japanese more readily identified with their feudal domain rather than the idea of “Japan” as a whole. But with the introduction of mass education, conscription, industrialization, centralization, and successful foreign wars, Japanese nationalism became a powerful force in society. Mass education and conscription served as a means to indoctrinate the coming generation with “the idea of Japan” as a nation instead of a series of Daimyo (domains), supplanting loyalty to feudal domains with loyalty to the state. Industrialization and centralization gave the Japanese a strong sense that their country could rival Western powers technologically and socially. Moreover, successful foreign wars gave the populace a sense of martial pride in their nation.

The rise of Japanese nationalism paralleled the growth of nationalism within the West. Certain conservatives such as Gondō Seikei and Asahi Heigo saw the rapid industrialization of Japan as something that had to be tempered. It seemed, for a time, that Japan was becoming too “Westernized” and that if left unimpeded, something intrinsically Japanese would be lost. During the Meiji period, such nationalists railed against the unequal treaties, but in the years following the First World War, Western criticism of Japanese imperial ambitions and restrictions on Japanese
immigration changed the focus of the nationalist movement in Japan. During the first part of the Shōwa era, racial discrimination against other Asians was habitual in Imperial Japan, starting with Japanese colonialism. The Shōwa regime preached racial superiority and racialist theories based on the sacred nature of the Yamato-damashii.

Invasion of China

Left-wing groups were subject to violent suppression by the end of the Taishō period, and radical right-wing groups, inspired by fascism and Japanese nationalism, rapidly grew in popularity. The extreme right became influential throughout the Japanese government and society, notably within the Kwantung Army, a Japanese army stationed in China along the Japanese-owned South Manchuria Railroad. During the Manchurian Incident of 1931, radical army officers bombed a small portion of the South Manchuria Railroad and, falsely attributing the attack to the Chinese, invaded Manchuria. The Kwantung Army conquered Manchuria and set up the puppet government of Manchukuo there without permission from the Japanese government. International criticism of Japan following the invasion led to Japan withdrawing from the League of Nations.

Prime Minister Tsuyoshi Inukai of the Seiyūkai Party attempted to restrain the Kwantung Army and was assassinated in 1932 by right-wing extremists. Because of growing opposition within the Japanese military and the extreme right to party politicians, who they saw as corrupt and self-serving, Inukai was the last party politician to govern Japan in the pre-World War II era. In February 1936 young radical officers of the Japanese Army attempted a coup d'état, assassinating many moderate politicians before the coup was suppressed. In its wake, the Japanese military consolidated its
control over the political system and most political parties were abolished when the Imperial Rule Assistance Association was founded in 1940.

Japan’s expansionist vision grew increasingly bold. Many of Japan’s political elite aspired to have the country acquire new territory for resource extraction and settlement of surplus population. These ambitions led to the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937. After their victory in the Chinese capital, the Japanese military committed the infamous Nanking Massacre, also known as the Rape of Nanking, which involved a massive number of civilian deaths including infants and elderly and the large-scale rape of Chinese women. The exact number of casualties is an issue of fierce debate between Chinese and Japanese historians; estimates range from 40,000 to 300,000 people.

Rape of Nanking: The corpses of massacred victims from the Nanking Massacre on the shore of the Qinhua River with a Japanese soldier standing nearby. The Japanese military failed to defeat the Chinese government led by Chiang
Kai-shek and the war descended into a bloody stalemate that lasted until 1945. Japan’s stated war aim was to establish the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, a vast pan-Asian union under Japanese domination. Hirohito’s role in Japan’s foreign wars remains a subject of controversy, with various historians portraying him as either a powerless figurehead or an enabler and supporter of Japanese militarism. The United States opposed Japan’s invasion of China and responded with increasingly stringent economic sanctions intended to deprive Japan of the resources to continue its war in China. Japan reacted by forging an alliance with Germany and Italy in 1940, known as the Tripartite Pact, which worsened its relations with the U.S. In July 1941, the U.S., Great Britain, and the Netherlands froze all Japanese assets when Japan completed its invasion of French Indochina by occupying the southern half of the country, further increasing tension in the Pacific. Attributions Japanese Expansion “Nanking Massacre.”
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31.2: The Allied Powers

31.2.1: The USSR

During Stalin’s totalitarian rule of the Soviet Union, he transformed the state through aggressive economic planning, the development of a cult of personality around himself, and the violent repression of so-called “enemies of the working class,” overseeing the murder of millions of Soviet citizens.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze the political atmosphere of the Soviet Union

**Key Points**

- After being appointed General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1922, Joseph Stalin sought to destroy his enemies while transforming Soviet society with aggressive economic
planning, in particular a sweeping collectivization of agriculture and rapid development of heavy industry.

• Stalin consolidated his power within the party and the state to degree of a cult of personality.
• Soviet secret-police and the mass-mobilization Communist party served as Stalin’s major tools in molding Soviet society.
• Stalin’s brutal methods to achieve his goals, which included party purges, political repression of the general population, and forced collectivization, led to millions of deaths in Gulag labor camps and during man-made famine.
• In August 1939, after failed attempts to conclude anti-Hitler pacts with other major European powers, Stalin entered into a non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. This agreement divided their influence and territory within Eastern Europe, resulting in their invasion of Poland in September of that year.

Key Terms

Bolsheviks
The founding and ruling political party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a communist party organized on the basis of democratic centralism.
Joseph Stalin
The leader and effective dictator of the Soviet Union from the mid-1920s until his death in 1953.

First Five-Year Plan
A list of economic goals created by General Secretary Joseph Stalin and based on his policy of Socialism in One Country, implemented between 1928 and 1932, that focused on the forced collectivization of agriculture.

The Rise of Stalin

From its creation, the government in the Soviet Union was based on the one-party rule of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks). The stated purpose of the one-party state was to ensure that capitalist exploitation would not return to the Soviet Union and that the principles of democratic centralism would be effective in representing the people's will in a practical manner. Debate over the future of the economy provided the background for a power struggle in the years after Lenin's death in 1924. Initially, Lenin was to be replaced by a “troika” ("collective leadership") consisting of Grigory Zinoviev of the Ukrainian SSR, Lev Kamenev of the Russian SFSR, and Joseph Stalin of the Transcaucasian SFSR.

On April 3, 1922, Stalin was named the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Lenin had appointed Stalin the head of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspectorate, which gave Stalin considerable power. By gradually consolidating his influence and isolating and outmaneuvering his rivals within the party, Stalin became the undisputed leader of the Soviet Union and by the end of
the 1920s had established totalitarian rule. In October 1927, Grigory Zinoviev and Leon Trotsky were expelled from the Central Committee and forced into exile.

In 1928, Stalin introduced the First Five-Year Plan for building a socialist economy. In place of the internationalism expressed by Lenin throughout the Revolution, it aimed to build Socialism in One Country. In industry, the state assumed control over all existing enterprises and undertook an intensive program of industrialization. In agriculture, rather than adhering to the “lead by example” policy advocated by Lenin, forced collectivization of farms was implemented all over the country. This was intended to increase agricultural output from large-scale mechanized farms, bring the peasantry under more direct political control, and make tax collection more efficient. Collectivization brought social change on a scale not seen since the abolition of serfdom in 1861 and alienation from control of the land and its produce. Collectivization also meant a drastic drop in living standards for many peasants, leading to violent reactions.

Purges and Executions

From collectivization, famines ensued, causing millions of deaths; surviving kulaks were persecuted and many sent to Gulags to do forced labour. Social upheaval continued in the mid-1930s. Stalin’s Great Purge resulted in the execution or detainment of many “Old Bolsheviks” who had participated in the October Revolution with Lenin. During the Great Purge, Lenin undertook a massive campaign of repression of the party, government, armed forces, and intelligentsia, in which millions of so-called “enemies of the working class” were imprisoned, exiled, or executed, often without due process. Major figures in the Communist Party and government, and many Red Army high commanders, were killed after being convicted of treason in show trials. According to declassified Soviet archives,
in 1937 and 1938, the NKVD arrested more than 1.5 million people, of whom 681,692 were shot. Over those two years, that averages to over 1,000 executions a day. According to historian Geoffrey Hosking, “...excess deaths during the 1930s as a whole were in the range of 10–11 million.”

Letter to Stalin: Lavrentiy Beria’s January 1940 letter to Stalin asking permission to execute 346 “enemies of the CPSU and of the Soviet authorities” who conducted “counter-revolutionary, right-Trotskyite plotting and spying activities.”
Cult of Personality

Cults of personality developed in the Soviet Union around both Stalin and Lenin. Numerous towns, villages and cities were renamed after the Soviet leader and the Stalin Prize and Stalin Peace Prize were named in his honor. He accepted grandiloquent titles (e.g., “Coryphaeus of Science,” “Father of Nations,” “Brilliant Genius of Humanity,” “Great Architect of Communism,” “Gardener of Human Happiness,” and others), and helped rewrite Soviet history to provide himself a more significant role in the revolution of 1917. At the same time, according to Nikita Khrushchev, he insisted that he be remembered for “the extraordinary modesty characteristic of truly great people.” Although statues of Stalin depict him at a height and build approximating the very tall Tsar Alexander III, sources suggest he was approximately 5 feet 4 inches.
International Relations Pre-WWII

The early 1930s saw closer cooperation between the West and the USSR. From 1932 to 1934, the Soviet Union participated in the World Disarmament Conference. In 1933, diplomatic relations between the United States and the USSR were established when in November, newly elected President of the United States Franklin D. Roosevelt...
chose to formally recognize Stalin’s Communist government and negotiated a new trade agreement between the two nations. In September 1934, the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations. After the Spanish Civil War broke out in 1936, the USSR actively supported the Republican forces against the Nationalists, who were supported by Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany.

In December 1936, Stalin unveiled a new Soviet Constitution. This document was seen as a personal triumph for Stalin, who on this occasion was described by Pravda as a “genius of the new world, the wisest man of the epoch, the great leader of communism.” By contrast, Western historians and historians from former Soviet occupied countries have viewed the constitution as a meaningless propaganda document.

The late 1930s saw a shift towards the Axis powers. In 1939, almost a year after the United Kingdom and France concluded the Munich Agreement with Germany, the USSR dealt with the Nazis both militarily and economically during extensive talks. The two countries concluded the German–Soviet Nonaggression Pact and the German–Soviet Commercial Agreement in August 1939. The nonaggression pact made possible Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bessarabia, northern Bukovina, and eastern Poland. In late November of the same year, unable to coerce the Republic of Finland by diplomatic means into moving its border 16 miles back from Leningrad, Joseph Stalin ordered the invasion of Finland.

In the east, the Soviet military won several decisive victories during border clashes with the Empire of Japan in 1938 and 1939. However, in April 1941 USSR signed the Soviet–Japanese Neutrality Pact with the Empire of Japan, recognizing the territorial integrity of Manchukuo, a Japanese puppet state.

Attributions

- The USSR


31.2.2: France at the End of the Interwar Period

During the interwar period, war-torn France collected reparations from Germany, in some cases through occupation, suffered social upheaval and the consequent rise of socialism, and promoted defensive foreign policies.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the state of France prior to 1939

**Key Points**

- Foreign policy was of central interest to France during the interwar period.
- Because of the horrible devastation of the war, including the death of 1.5 million French soldiers, the destruction of much of the steel and coal regions, and the long-term costs for veterans, France demanded that Germany assume many of the costs incurred.
from the war through annual reparation payments.

- As a response to the failure of the Weimar Republic to pay reparations in the aftermath of World War I, France occupied the industrial region of the Ruhr as a means of ensuring repayments from Germany.
- In the 1920s, France established an elaborate system of border defenses called the Maginot Line, designed to fight off any German attack.
- France experienced a mild financial depression during the time of the Great Depression, but saw a more potent social reaction to financial strain culminating in a riot in 1934.
- Socialist Leon Blum, leading the Popular Front, brought together Socialists and Radicals to become Prime Minister from 1936 to 1937.

Key Terms

**Maginot Line**
A line of concrete fortifications, obstacles, and weapon installations that France constructed on the French side of its borders with Switzerland, Germany, and Luxembourg during the 1930s.

**Treaty of Versailles**
One of the peace treaties at the end of World War I, which required “Germany [to] accept the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and
Losses from WWI, Gains from the Treaty of Versailles

The war brought great losses of manpower and resources. Fought in large part on French soil, it led to approximately 1.4 million French dead including civilians, and four times as many wounded. Peace terms were imposed by the Big Four, meeting in Paris in 1919: David Lloyd George of Britain, Vittorio Orlando of Italy, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Woodrow Wilson of the United States. Clemenceau demanded the harshest terms and won most of them in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. Germany was forced to admit its guilt for starting the war, and its military was permanently weakened. Germany also had to pay huge sums in war reparations to the Allies (who in turn had large loans from the U.S. to pay off).

France regained Alsace-Lorraine and occupied the German industrial Saar Basin, a coal and steel region. The German African colonies were put under League of Nations mandates to be administered by France and other victors. From the remains of the
Ottoman Empire, France acquired the Mandate of Syria and the Mandate of Lebanon.

**Interwar Period**

France was part of the Allied force that occupied the Rhineland following the Armistice. Foch supported Poland in the Greater Poland Uprising and in the Polish–Soviet War, and France also joined Spain during the Rif War. From 1925 until his death in 1932, Aristide Briand, as prime minister during five short intervals, directed French foreign policy, using his diplomatic skills and sense of timing to forge friendly relations with Weimar Germany as the basis of a genuine peace within the framework of the League of Nations. He realized France could neither contain the much larger Germany by itself nor secure effective support from Britain or the League.

As a response to the failure of the Weimar Republic to pay reparations in the aftermath of World War I, France occupied the industrial region of the Ruhr to ensure repayments from Germany. The intervention was a failure, and France accepted the American solution to the reparations issues expressed in the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan.
In the 1920s, France established an elaborate system of border defenses called the Maginot Line, designed to fight off any German attack. (Unfortunately, the Maginot Line did not extend into Belgium, where Germany attacked in 1940.) Military alliances were signed with weak powers in 1920–21, called the “Little Entente.”

**Great Depression and Social Upheaval**

The worldwide financial crisis affected France a bit later than other countries, hitting around 1931. While the GDP in the 1920s grew at the very strong rate of 4.43% per year, the 1930s rate fell to only 0.63%. The depression was relatively mild: unemployment peaked under 5% and the fall in production was at most 20% below the 1929 output; there was no banking crisis.

In contrast to the mild economic upheaval, though, the political upheaval was enormous. After 1931, rising unemployment and political unrest led to the February 6, 1934, riots. Socialist Leon Blum, leading the Popular Front, brought together Socialists and Radicals to become Prime Minister from 1936 to 1937; he was the first Jew and the first Socialist to lead France. The Communists in the Chamber of Deputies (parliament) voted to keep the government in power and generally supported its economic policies, but rejected its foreign policies. The Popular Front passed numerous labor reforms, which increased wages, cut working hours to 40 hours with overtime illegal, and provided many lesser benefits to the working class, such as mandatory two-week paid vacations. However, renewed inflation canceled the gains in wage rates, unemployment did not fall, and economic recovery was very slow. Historians agree that the Popular Front was a failure in terms of economics, foreign policy, and long-term stability. At first the Popular Front created enormous excitement and expectations on the left—including large-scale sitdown strikes—but in the end it failed to live up to its promise. In the long run, however, later
Socialists took inspiration from the attempts of the Popular Front to set up a welfare state.

Foreign Relations

The government joined Britain in establishing an arms embargo during the Spanish Civil War (1936–39). Blum rejected support for the Spanish Republicans because of his fear that civil war might spread to deeply divided France. Financial support in military cooperation with Poland was also a policy. The government nationalized arms suppliers and dramatically increased its program of rearming the French military in a last-minute catch up with the Germans.

Appeasement of Germany in cooperation with Britain was the policy after 1936, as France sought peace even in the face of Hitler's escalating demands. Édouard Daladier refused to go to war against Germany and Italy without British support as Neville Chamberlain wanted to save peace at Munich in 1938.

Attributions

- France at the End of the Interwar Period
178. The United Kingdom and Appeasement

31.2.3: The United Kingdom and Appeasement

Vivid memories of the horrors and deaths of the World War made Britain and its leaders strongly inclined to pacifism in the interwar era, exemplified by their policy of appeasement toward Nazi Germany, which led to the German annexation of Austria and parts of Czechoslovakia.

Learning Objective

Explain why Prime Minister Chamberlain followed the policy of appeasement

Key Points

- World War I was won by Britain and its allies at a terrible human and financial cost, creating a sentiment to avoid war at all costs.
- The theory that dictatorships arose where peoples had grievances and that by removing the source of
these grievances the dictatorship would become less aggressive led to Britain's policy of appeasement.

- One major example of appeasement was when Britain learned of Hitler's intention to annex Austria, which Chamberlain's government decided it was unable to stop and thus acquiesced to what later became known as the Anschluss of March 1938.
- When Germany intended to annex parts of Czechoslovakia, Britain and other European powers came together without consulting Czechoslovakia and created the Munich Agreement, allowing Hitler to take over portions of Czechoslovakia named the Sudetenland.

**Key Terms**

**Munich Agreement**

A settlement permitting Nazi Germany's annexation of portions of Czechoslovakia along the country's borders mainly inhabited by German speakers, for which a new territorial designation “Sudetenland” was coined.

**Appeasement**

A diplomatic policy of making political or material concessions to an enemy power in order to avoid conflict.
The Policy of Appeasement

World War I was won by Britain and its allies at a terrible human and financial cost, creating a sentiment that wars should be avoided at all costs. The League of Nations was founded with the idea that nations could resolve their differences peacefully. As with many in Europe who had witnessed the horrors of the First World War and its aftermath, United Kingdom Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain was committed to peace. The theory was that dictatorships arose where peoples had grievances, and that by removing the source of these grievances, the dictatorship would become less aggressive. His attempts to deal with Nazi Germany through diplomatic channels and quell any sign of dissent from within, particularly from Churchill, were called by Chamberlain “the general policy of appeasement.”

Chamberlain’s policy of appeasement emerged from the failures of the League of Nations and of collective security. The League of Nations was set up in the aftermath of World War I in the hope that international cooperation and collective resistance to aggression might prevent another war. Members of the League were entitled to assist other members if they came under attack. The policy of collective security ran in parallel with measures to achieve international disarmament and where possible was based on economic sanctions against an aggressor. It appeared ineffectual when confronted by the aggression of dictators, notably Germany’s...
Remilitarization of the Rhineland and Italian leader Benito Mussolini’s invasion of Abyssinia.

Anschluss

The first European crisis of Chamberlain’s premiership was over the German annexation of Austria. The Nazi regime was already behind the assassination of Austrian Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss in 1934 and was now pressuring Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg. Informed of Germany’s objectives, Chamberlain’s government decided it was unable to stop these events and acquiesced to what later became known as the Anschluss of March 1938. Although the victorious Allies of World War I had prohibited the union of Austria and Germany, their reaction to the Anschluss was mild. Even the strongest voices against annexation, those of Fascist Italy, France, and Britain, were not backed by force. In the House of Commons Chamberlain said that “The hard fact is that nothing could have arrested what has actually happened [in Austria] unless this country and other countries had been prepared to use force.” The American reaction was similar. The international reaction to the events of March 12, 1938 led Hitler to conclude that he could use even more aggressive tactics in his plan to expand the Third Reich. The Anschluss paved the way for Munich in September 1938 because it indicated the likely non-response of Britain and France to future German aggression.
Anschluss: Immediately after the Anschluss, Vienna’s Jews were forced to wash pro-independence slogans from the city’s pavements. The Sudetenland Crisis and the Munich Agreement The second crisis came over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia, home to a large ethnic German minority. Under the guise of seeking self-determination for the Sudeten Germans, Hitler planned to launch a war of aggression on October 1, 1938. In an effort to defuse the looming crisis, Chamberlain followed a strategy of pressuring Prague to make concessions to the ethnic Germans while warning Berlin about the dangers of war. The problems of the tight wire act were well-summarized by the Chancellor the Exchequer Sir John Simon in a diary entry during the May Crisis of 1938: We are endeavoring at one & the same time, to restrain
Germany by warning her that she must not assume we could remain neutral if she crossed the frontier; to stimulate Prague to make concessions; and to make sure that France will not take some rash action such as mobilization (when has mobilization been anything but a prelude to war?), under the delusion that we would join her in defense of Czechoslovakia. We won’t and can’t—but an open declaration to this effect would only give encouragement to Germany’s intransigence. In a letter to his sister, Chamberlain wrote that he would contact Hitler to tell him “The best thing you [Hitler] can do is tell us exactly what you want for your Sudeten Germans. If it is reasonable we will urge the Czechs to accept and if they do, you must give assurances that you will let them alone in the future.” Out of these attitudes grew what is known as the Munich Agreement, signed on September 30, 1938, a settlement permitting Nazi Germany’s annexation of portions of Czechoslovakia along the country’s borders mainly inhabited by German speakers. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the future of the Sudetenland in the face of ethnic demands made by Adolf Hitler. The agreement was signed by Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Italy. Sudetenland was of immense
strategic importance to Czechoslovakia, as most of its border defenses and banks were situated there along with heavy industrial districts. Because the state of Czechoslovakia was not invited to the conference, it considered itself betrayed and refers to this agreement as the “Munich Betrayal.” Czechoslovakia was informed by Britain and France that it could either resist Nazi Germany alone or submit to the prescribed annexations. The Czechoslovak government, realizing the hopelessness of fighting the Nazis alone, reluctantly capitulated and agreed to abide by the agreement. The settlement gave Germany the Sudetenland starting October 10 and de facto control over the rest of Czechoslovakia as long as Hitler promised to go no further. On September 30 after some rest, Chamberlain went to Hitler and asked him to sign a peace treaty between the United Kingdom and Germany. After Hitler’s interpreter translated it for him, he happily agreed.
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The United Kingdom and Appeasement
179. American Isolationism

31.2.4: American Isolationism

As Europe moved closer to war in the late 1930s, the United States Congress continued to demand American neutrality, but President Roosevelt and the American public began to support war with Nazi Germany by 1941.

**Learning Objective**

Describe why the United States initially stayed out of the war

**Key Points**

- In the wake of the First World War, non-interventionist tendencies of U.S. foreign policy and resistance to the League of Nations gained ascendancy, led by Republicans in the Senate such as William Borah and Henry Cabot Lodge.
- Although the U.S. was unwilling to commit to the League of Nations, they continued to engage in international negotiations and treaties that sought
international peace.

- The economic depression that ensued after the Crash of 1929 further committed the United States to doctrine of isolationism, the nation focusing instead on economic recovery.
- Between 1936 and 1937, much to the dismay of President Roosevelt, Congress passed the Neutrality Acts, which included an act forbidding Americans from sailing on ships flying the flag of a belligerent nation or trading arms with warring nations.
- When the war broke out in Europe after Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, the American people split into two camps: non-interventionists and interventionists.
- As 1940 became 1941, the actions of the Roosevelt administration made it more and more clear that the U.S. was on a course to war.
- By late 1941, 72% of Americans agreed that “the biggest job facing this country today is to help defeat the Nazi Government,” and 70% thought that defeating Germany was more important than staying out of the war.

**Key Terms**

**Lend-Lease Act**

A program under which the United States supplied Free France, the United Kingdom, the Republic of China, and later the USSR and other Allied nations with
food, oil, and materiel between 1941 and August 1945.

**Kellogg–Briand Pact**

A 1928 international agreement in which signatory states promised not to use war to resolve “disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them.”

## Interwar Period

In the wake of the First World War, non-interventionist tendencies of U.S. foreign policy gained ascendancy. The Treaty of Versailles and thus U.S. participation in the League of Nations, even with reservations, was rejected by the Republican-dominated Senate in the final months of Wilson’s presidency. A group of senators known as the Irreconcilables, identifying with both William Borah and Henry Cabot Lodge, had great objections regarding the clauses of the treaty which compelled America to come to the defense of other nations. Lodge, echoing Wilson, issued 14 Reservations regarding the treaty; among them, the second argued that America would sign only with the understanding that:

> Nothing compels the United States to ensure border contiguity or political independence of any nation, to interfere in foreign domestic disputes regardless of their status in the League, or to command troops or ships without Congressional declaration of war.

While some of the sentiment was grounded in adherence to Constitutional principles, some bore a reassertion of nativist and inward-looking policy.
Although the U.S. was unwilling to commit to the League of Nations, they continued to engage in international negotiations and treaties. In August 1928, 15 nations signed the Kellogg–Briand Pact, brainchild of American Secretary of State Frank Kellogg and French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand. This pact, said to outlaw war and show the U.S. commitment to international peace, had its semantic flaws. For example, it did not hold the U.S. to the conditions of any existing treaties, still allowed European nations the right to self-defense, and stated that if one nation broke the Pact, it would be up to the other signatories to enforce it. The Kellogg–Briand Pact was more of a sign of good intentions on the part of the U.S. than a legitimate step towards the sustenance of world peace.

The economic depression that ensued after the Crash of 1929 also encouraged non-intervention. The country focused mostly on addressing the problems of the national economy while the rise of aggressive expansionism policies by Fascist Italy and the Empire of Japan led to conflicts such as the Italian conquest of Ethiopia and the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. These events led to ineffectual condemnations by the League of Nations, while official American response was muted. America also did not take sides in the brutal Spanish Civil War.

**Non-Intervention Before Entering WWII**

As Europe moved closer to war in the late 1930s, the U.S. Congress continued to demand American neutrality. Between 1936 and 1937, much to the dismay of President Roosevelt, Congress passed the Neutrality Acts. For example, in the final Neutrality Act, Americans could not sail on ships flying the flag of a belligerent nation or trade arms with warring nations. Such activities played a role in American entrance into World War I.

On September 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland and Britain and France subsequently declared war on Germany, marking the start of
World War II. In an address to the American people two days later, President Roosevelt assured the nation that he would do all he could to keep them out of war. However, his words showed his true goals. “When peace has been broken anywhere, the peace of all countries everywhere is in danger,” Roosevelt said. Even though he was intent on neutrality as the official policy of the U.S., he still echoed the dangers of staying out of the war. He also cautioned the American people to not let their wish to avoid war at all costs supersede the security of the nation.

The war in Europe split the American people into two camps: non-interventionists and interventionists. The sides argued over America’s involvement in this Second World War. The basic principle of the interventionist argument was fear of German invasion. By the summer of 1940, France suffered a stunning defeat by Germans, and Britain was the only democratic enemy of Germany. In a 1940 speech, Roosevelt argued, “Some, indeed, still hold to the now somewhat obvious delusion that we ... can safely permit the United States to become a lone island ... in a world dominated by the philosophy of force.” A national survey found that in the summer of 1940, 67% of Americans believed that a German-Italian victory would endanger the United States, that if such an event occurred 88% supported “arm[ing] to the teeth at any expense to be prepared for any trouble”, and that 71% favored “the immediate adoption of compulsory military training for all young men.”

Ultimately, the ideological rift between the ideals of the U.S. and the goals of the fascist powers empowered the interventionist argument. Writer Archibald MacLeish asked, “How could we sit back as spectators of a war against ourselves?” In an address to the American people on December 29, 1940, President Roosevelt said, “the Axis not merely admits but proclaims that there can be no ultimate peace between their philosophy of government and our philosophy of government.”

However, there were many who held on to non-interventionism. Although a minority, they were well-organized and had a powerful presence in Congress. Non-interventionists rooted a significant
portion of their arguments in historical precedent, citing events such as Washington’s farewell address and the failure of World War I. “If we have strong defenses and understand and believe in what we are defending, we need fear nobody in this world,” Robert Maynard Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago, wrote in a 1940 essay. Isolationists believed that the safety of the nation was more important than any foreign war.

“As 1940 became 1941, the actions of the Roosevelt administration made it more and more clear that the U.S. was on a course to war. This policy shift, driven by the President, came in two phases. The first came in 1939 with the passage of the Fourth Neutrality Act, which permitted the U.S. to trade arms with belligerent nations as long as these nations came to America to retrieve the arms and paid for them in cash. This policy was quickly dubbed ‘Cash and Carry.’ The second phase was the Lend-Lease Act of early 1941, which allowed the President “to lend, lease, sell, or barter arms, ammunition, food, or any ‘defense article’ or any ‘defense information’ to ‘the government of any country whose defense the
President deems vital to the defense of the United States.” American public opinion supported Roosevelt’s actions. As U.S. involvement in the Battle of the Atlantic grew with incidents such as the sinking of the USS Reuben James (DD-245), by late 1941 72% of Americans agreed that “the biggest job facing this country today is to help defeat the Nazi Government,” and 70% thought that defeating Germany was more important than staying out of the war.

Attributions

- American Isolationism
31.3: Hostilities Commence

31.3.1: September 1, 1939

On September 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland under the false pretext that the Poles had carried out a series of sabotage operations against German targets near the border, an event that caused Britain and France to declare war on Germany.

Learning Objective

Summarize the events of September 1, 1939

Key Points

- Following several staged incidents that German propaganda used as a pretext to claim that German forces were acting in self-defense, the first regular act of war took place on September 1, 1939, when the Luftwaffe attacked the Polish town of Wieluń,
destroying 75% of the city and killing close to 1,200 people, most of them civilians.

- As the Wehrmacht advanced, Polish forces withdrew from their forward bases of operation close to the Polish-German border to more established lines of defense to the east. After the mid-September Polish defeat in the Battle of the Bzura, the Germans gained an undisputed advantage.

- On September 3 after a British ultimatum to Germany to cease military operations was ignored, Britain and France declared war on Germany.

- On October 8, after an initial period of military administration, Germany directly annexed western Poland and the former Free City of Danzig and placed the remaining block of territory under the administration of the newly established General Government.

**Key Terms**

**Gleiwitz incident**
A false flag operation by Nazi forces posing as Poles on August 31, 1939, against the German radio station Sender Gleiwitz in Gleiwitz, Upper Silesia, Germany on the eve of World War II in Europe. The goal was to use the staged attack as a pretext for invading Poland.
Battle of the Border

Refers to the battles that occurred in the first days of the German invasion of Poland in September, 1939; the series of battles ended in a German victory as Polish forces were either destroyed or forced to retreat.

The Invasion of Poland

The Invasion of Poland, also known as the September Campaign, was a joint invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany, the Free City of Danzig, the Soviet Union, and a small Slovak contingent that marked the beginning of World War II in Europe. The German invasion began on September 1, 1939, one week after the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, while the Soviet invasion commenced on September 17 following the Molotov-Tōgō agreement that terminated the Russian and Japanese hostilities in the east on September 16. The campaign ended on October 6 with Germany and the Soviet Union dividing and annexing the whole of Poland under the terms of the German-Soviet Frontier Treaty.

German forces invaded Poland from the north, south, and west the morning after the Gleiwitz incident. As the Wehrmacht advanced, Polish forces withdrew from their forward bases of operation close to the Polish-German border to more established lines of defense to the east. After the mid-September Polish defeat in the Battle of the Bzura, the Germans gained an undisputed advantage. Polish forces then withdrew to the southeast where they prepared for a long defense of the Romanian Bridgehead and awaited expected support and relief from France and the United Kingdom. While those two countries had pacts with Poland and
declared war on Germany on September 3, in the end their aid to
Poland was limited.

The Soviet Red Army's invasion of Eastern Poland on September
17, in accordance with a secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop
Pact, rendered the Polish plan of defense obsolete. Facing a second
front, the Polish government concluded that defense of the
Romanian Bridgehead was no longer feasible and ordered an
emergency evacuation of all troops to neutral Romania. On October
6, following the Polish defeat at the Battle of Kock, German and
Soviet forces gained full control over Poland. The success of the
invasion marked the end of the Second Polish Republic, though
Poland never formally surrendered.

On October 8, after an initial period of military administration,
Germany directly annexed western Poland and the former Free
City of Danzig and placed the remaining block of territory under
the administration of the newly established General Government.
The Soviet Union incorporated its newly acquired areas into its
constituent Belarusian and Ukrainian republics and immediately
started a campaign of sovietization. In the aftermath of the invasion,
a collective of underground resistance organizations formed the
Polish Underground State within the territory of the former Polish
state. Many military exiles who managed to escape Poland
subsequently joined the Polish Armed Forces in the West, an armed
force loyal to the Polish government in exile.
The Invasion of Poland: This map shows the beginning of World War II in September 1939 in a European context. The Second Polish Republic, one of the three original allies of World War II, was invaded and divided between the Third Reich and Soviet Union, acting together in line with the secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, dividing Central and Eastern Europe between the two countries. The Polish allies of that time were France and Great Britain.

Details of September 1 Invasion

Following several staged incidents (like the Gleiwitz incident, part of Operation Himmler), in which German propaganda was used as a pretext to claim that German forces were acting in self-defense, the first regular act of war took place on September 1, 1939, when the Luftwaffe attacked the Polish town of Wieluń, destroying 75% of the city and killing close to 1,200 people, mostly civilians. This
invasion subsequently began World War II. Five minutes later, the old German pre-dreadnought battleship Schleswig-Holstein opened fire on the Polish military transit depot at Westerplatte in the Free City of Danzig on the Baltic Sea. Four hours later, German troops—still without a formal declaration of war issued—attacked near the Polish town of Mokra. The Battle of the Border had begun. Later that day, Germans attacked on Poland’s western, southern and northern borders while German aircraft began raids on Polish cities. The main axis of attack led eastwards from Germany proper through the western Polish border. Supporting attacks came from East Prussia in the north and a co-operative German-Slovak tertiary attack by units from German-allied Slovakia in the south. All three assaults converged on the Polish capital of Warsaw.

Invasion of Poland: Soldiers of the German Wehrmacht tearing down the border crossing between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, September 1, 1939.
War Erupts

On September 3 after a British ultimatum to Germany to cease military operations was ignored, Britain and France, followed by the fully independent Dominions of the British Commonwealth—Australia (3 September), Canada (10 September), New Zealand (3 September), and South Africa (6 September)—declared war on Germany. However, initially the alliance provided limited direct military support to Poland, consisting of a cautious, half-hearted French probe into the Saarland.

The German-French border saw only a few minor skirmishes, although the majority of German forces, including 85% of their armored forces, were engaged in Poland. Despite some Polish successes in minor border battles, German technical, operational, and numerical superiority forced the Polish armies to retreat from the borders towards Warsaw and Lwów. The Luftwaffe gained air superiority early in the campaign. By destroying communications, the Luftwaffe increased the pace of the advance, overrunning Polish airstrips and early warning sites and causing logistical problems for the Poles. Many Polish Air Force units ran low on supplies, and 98 withdrew into then-neutral Romania. The Polish initial strength of 400 was reduced to just 54 by September 14, and air opposition virtually ceased.

The Western Allies also began a naval blockade of Germany, which aimed to damage the country’s economy and war effort. Germany responded by ordering U-boat warfare against Allied merchant and warships, which later escalated into the Battle of the Atlantic.

Attributions

- September 1, 1939
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31.3.2: German–Soviet Treaty of Friendship

The German–Soviet Treaty of Friendship was a secret supplementary protocol of the 1939 Hitler–Stalin Pact, signed on September 28, 1939, by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union after their joint invasion and occupation of sovereign Poland that delineated the spheres of interest between the two powers.

Learning Objective

Argue for and against the Soviet Union's decision to sign the Treaty of Friendship with the Third Reich

Key Points

- The German–Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Demarcation was a secret supplementary protocol of the 1939 Hitler–Stalin Pact, amended on September 28, 1939, by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union after their joint
invasion and occupation of sovereign Poland.

- These amendments allowed for the exchange of Soviet and German nationals between the two occupied zones of Poland, redrew parts of the central European spheres of interest dictated by the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, and stated that neither party to the treaty would allow on its territory any “Polish agitation” directed at the other party.

- The existence of this secret protocol was denied by the Soviet government until 1989, when it was finally acknowledged and denounced.

- The Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, also known as the Nazi-Soviet Pact, was a neutrality pact between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union signed in Moscow on August 23, 1939, that delineated the spheres of interest between the two powers.

**Key Terms**

**Wehrmacht**

The unified armed forces of Nazi Germany from 1935 to 1946, including army (Heer), navy (Kriegsmarine), and air force (Luftwaffe).

**German-Soviet Frontier Treaty**

Also known as the The German–Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Demarcation, this treaty was a secret clause amended on the
Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact on September 28, 1939, by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union after their joint invasion and occupation of sovereign Poland.

**Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact**
A neutrality pact between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union signed in Moscow on August 23, 1939.

The German–Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Demarcation (later known as the German–Soviet Frontier Treaty) was a second supplementary protocol of the 1939 Hitler–Stalin Pact. It was a secret clause as amended on September 28, 1939, by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union after their joint invasion and occupation of sovereign Poland and thus after the beginning of World War II. It was signed by Joachim von Ribbentrop and Vyacheslav Molotov, the foreign ministers of Germany and the Soviet Union respectively, in the presence of Joseph Stalin. The treaty was a follow-up to the first secret protocol of the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact signed on August 23, 1939, between the two countries prior to their invasion of Poland and the start of World War II in Europe. Only a small portion of the protocol which superseded the first treaty was publicly announced, while the spheres of influence of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union remained classified. The third secret protocol of the Pact was signed on January 10, 1941 by Friedrich Werner von Schulenberg and Molotov, in which Germany renounced its claims to portions of Lithuania only a few months before its anti-Soviet Operation Barbarossa.
Secret Articles

Several secret articles were attached to the treaty. These allowed for the exchange of Soviet and German nationals between the two occupied zones of Poland, redrew parts of the central European spheres of interest dictated by the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, and stated that neither party would allow on its territory any “Polish agitation” directed at the other party.

During the western invasion of Poland, the German Wehrmacht had taken control of the Lublin Voivodeship and eastern Warsaw Voivodeship, territories that according to the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact were in the Soviet sphere of influence. To compensate the Soviet Union for this “loss,” the treaty’s secret attachment transferred Lithuania to the Soviet sphere of influence, with the exception of a small territory in the Suwałki Region sometimes known as the Suwałki Triangle. After this transfer, the Soviet Union issued an ultimatum to Lithuania, occupied it on June 15, 1940, and established the Lithuanian SSR.

The existence of this secret protocol was denied by the Soviet government until 1989, when it was finally acknowledged and denounced. Some time later, the new Russian revisionists, including historians Alexander Dyukov and Nataliya Narotchnitskaya, described the pact as a necessary measure because of the British and French failure to enter into an anti-fascist pact. Vladimir Putin has also defended the pact.
Background: Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact

The Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, also known as the Nazi-Soviet Pact, was a neutrality pact between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union...
signed in Moscow on August 23, 1939 by foreign ministers Joachim von Ribbentrop and Vyacheslav Molotov, respectively.

The pact delineated the spheres of interest between the two powers, confirmed by the supplementary protocol of the German-Soviet Frontier Treaty amended after the joint invasion of Poland. The pact remained in force for nearly two years until the German government of Adolf Hitler launched an attack on the Soviet positions in Eastern Poland during Operation Barbarossa on June 22, 1941.

The clauses of the Nazi-Soviet Pact provided a written guarantee of non-belligerence by each party towards the other and a declared commitment that neither government would ally itself to or aid an enemy of the other party. In addition to stipulations of non-aggression, the treaty included a secret protocol that divided territories of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, and Romania into German and Soviet “spheres of influence,” anticipating “territorial and political rearrangements” of these countries. Thereafter, Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939. Soviet Union leader Joseph Stalin ordered the Soviet invasion of Poland on September 17, a day after the Soviet–Japanese ceasefire agreement came into effect. In November, parts of southeastern Finland were annexed by the Soviet Union after the Winter War. This was followed by Soviet annexations of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and parts of Romania. Advertised concern about ethnic Ukrainians and Belarusians had been proffered as justification for the Soviet invasion of Poland. Stalin’s invasion of Bukovina in 1940 violated the pact as it went beyond the Soviet sphere of influence agreed with the Axis.
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182. Dunkirk and Vichy France

31.3.3: Dunkirk and Vichy France

The Dunkirk evacuation was the removal of Allied soldiers from the beaches and harbor of Dunkirk by the attack of German soldiers, which started as a disaster but soon became a miraculous triumph.

Learning Objective

Evaluate the success or failure of the evacuation at Dunkirk

Key Points

- During the 1930s, the French constructed the Maginot Line, a series of fortifications along their border with Germany.
- The area immediately to the north of the Maginot Line was covered by the heavily wooded Ardennes region, which French General Philippe Pétain declared to be “impenetrable” as long as “special
provisions” were taken.

• The German army decided to attach through the Ardennes region, then establish bridgeheads on the Meuse River and rapidly drive to the English Channel. This would cut off the Allied armies in Belgium and Flanders.

• When this occurred and the French army was surrounded, the British decided on a plan of evacuation.

• On the first day of the evacuation, only 7,669 men were evacuated, but by the end of the eighth day, a total of 338,226 soldiers had been rescued by a hastily assembled fleet of over 800 boats.

• More than 100,000 evacuated French troops were quickly and efficiently shuttled to camps in various parts of southwest England, where they were temporarily lodged before being repatriated.

• In his speech to the House of Commons on June 4, Churchill reminded the country that “we must be very careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory. Wars are not won by evacuations.”

**Key Terms**

**Vichy France**

The common name of the French State during World War II, specifically the southern, unoccupied “Free
Dunkirk Evacuation

The Dunkirk evacuation, code-named Operation Dynamo and also known as the Miracle of Dunkirk, was the evacuation of Allied soldiers from the beaches and harbor of Dunkirk, France between May 26 and June 4, 1940, during World War II. The operation was decided upon when large numbers of Belgian, British, and French troops were cut off and surrounded by the German army during the Battle of France. In a speech to the House of Commons, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill called the events in France “a colossal military disaster,” saying “the whole root and core and brain of the British Army” had been stranded at Dunkirk and seemed about to perish or be captured. In his We shall fight on the beaches speech on June 4, he hailed their rescue as a “miracle of deliverance.”

On the first day of the evacuation, only 7,669 men were evacuated, but by the end of the eighth day, a total of 338,226 soldiers had been rescued by a hastily assembled fleet of over 800 boats. Many troops were able to embark from the harbor’s protective mole onto
39 British destroyers and other large ships, while others had to wade out from the beaches, waiting for hours in the shoulder-deep water. Some were ferried from the beaches to the larger ships by what came to be known as the little ships of Dunkirk, a flotilla of hundreds of merchant marine boats, fishing boats, pleasure craft, and lifeboats called into service for the emergency. The British Expeditionary Force (BEF) lost 68,000 soldiers during the French campaign and had to abandon nearly all of their tanks, vehicles, and other equipment.

In his speech to the House of Commons on June 4, Churchill reminded the country that “we must be very careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory. Wars are not won by evacuations.”

More than 100,000 evacuated French troops were quickly and efficiently shuttled to camps in various parts of southwest England, where they were temporarily lodged before being repatriated. British ships ferried French troops to Brest, Cherbourg, and other ports in Normandy and Brittany, although only about half of the repatriated troops were deployed against the Germans before the surrender of France. For many French soldiers, the Dunkirk evacuation represented only a few weeks’ delay before being killed or captured by the German army after their return to France. Of the French soldiers evacuated from France in June 1940, about 3,000 joined Charles de Gaulle’s Free French army in Britain.
Dunkirk Evacuation: British troops evacuating Dunkirk’s beaches. Background In 1939, after Nazi Germany invaded Poland marking the beginning of the Second World War, the United Kingdom sent the BEF to aid in the defense of France, landing troops at Cherbourg, Nantes, and Saint-Nazaire. By May 1940 the force consisted of ten divisions in three corps under the command
of General John Vereker, 6th Viscount Gort. Working with the BEF were the Belgian Army and the French First, Seventh, and Ninth Armies. During the 1930s, the French constructed the Maginot Line, a series of fortifications along their border with Germany. This line was designed to deter a German invasion across the Franco-German border and funnel an attack into Belgium, where it would be met by the best divisions of the French Army. Thus, any future war would take place outside of French territory, avoiding a repeat of the First World War. The area immediately to the north of the Maginot Line was covered by the heavily wooded Ardennes region, which French General Philippe Pétain declared to be “impenetrable” as long as “special provisions” were taken. He believed that any enemy force emerging from the forest would be vulnerable to a pincer attack and destroyed. The French commander-in-chief, Maurice Gamelin, also believed the area to be of limited threat, noting that it “never favoured large operations.” With this in mind, the area was left lightly defended. The initial plan for the German invasion of France called for an encirclement attack through the Netherlands and Belgium, avoiding the Maginot Line. Erich von Manstein, then Chief of Staff of the German Army Group
A, prepared the outline of a different plan and submitted it to the OKH (German High Command) via his superior, Generaloberst Gerd von Rundstedt. Manstein’s plan suggested that Panzer divisions should attack through the Ardennes, then establish bridgeheads on the Meuse River and rapidly drive to the English Channel. The Germans would thus cut off the Allied armies in Belgium and Flanders. This part of the plan later became known as the *Sichelschnitt* (“sickle cut”). Adolf Hitler approved a modified version of Manstein’s ideas, today known as the Manstein Plan, after meeting with him on February 17. On May 10, Germany attacked Belgium and the Netherlands. Army Group B, under Generaloberst Fedor von Bock, attacked into Belgium, while the three Panzer corps of Army Group A under Rundstedt swung around to the south and drove for the Channel. The BEF advanced from the Belgian border to positions along the River Dyle within Belgium, where they fought elements of Army Group B starting on May 10. They were ordered to begin a fighting withdrawal to the Escaut River on May 14 when the Belgian and French positions on their flanks failed to hold. During a visit to Paris on May 17, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill was astonished to learn from Gamelin
that the French had committed all their troops to the ongoing engagements and had no strategic reserves. On May 19, Gort met with French General Gaston Billotte, commander of the French First Army and overall coordinator of the Allied forces. Billotte revealed that the French had no troops between the Germans and the sea. Gort immediately saw that evacuation across the Channel was the best course of action and began planning a withdrawal to Dunkirk, the closest location with good port facilities. Surrounded by marshes, Dunkirk boasted old fortifications and the longest sand beach in Europe, where large groups could assemble. After continued engagements and a failed Allied attempt on May 21 at Arras to cut through the German spearhead, the BEF was trapped along with the remains of the Belgian forces and the three French armies in an area along the northern French coast. By May 24, the Germans had captured the port of Boulogne and surrounded Calais. Later that day, Hitler issued Directive 13, which called for the Luftwaffe to defeat the trapped Allied forces and stop their escape. On May 26, Hitler ordered the panzer groups to continue their advance, but most units took another 16 hours to attack. The delay gave the Allies time to prepare defenses vital for the evacuation and prevented the
Germans from stopping the Allied retreat from Lille. The Halt Order has been the subject of much discussion by historians. Guderian considered the failure to order a timely assault on Dunkirk to be one of the major German mistakes on the Western Front. Rundstedt called it “one of the great turning points of the war,” and Manstein described it as “one of Hitler’s most critical mistakes.” Vichy France is the common name of the French State headed by Marshal Philippe Pétain during World War II. In particular, it represents the unoccupied “Free Zone” (zone libre) that governed the southern part of the country. From 1940 to 1942, while the Vichy regime was the nominal government of France as a whole, Germany’s military occupied northern France. Thus, while Paris remained the de jure capital of France, the de facto capital of southern “unoccupied” France was the town of Vichy, 360 km to the south. Following the Allied landings in French North Africa in November 1942, southern France was also militarily occupied by Germany and Italy. The Vichy government remained in existence, but as a de facto client and puppet of Nazi Germany. It vanished in late 1944 when the Allies occupied all of France. The French State maintained nominal sovereignty over the whole of French territory, but had
31.4.1: The Battle of Britain

The Battle of Britain, when the British Royal Air Force defended the United Kingdom against the German Air Force attacks, was the first major Nazi defeat and a turning point of World War II.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the Battle of Britain

**Key Points**

- The Battle of Britain began in early July with Luftwaffe attacks on shipping and harbors.
- On July 19, Hitler publicly offered to end the war, saying he had no desire to destroy the British Empire. The United Kingdom rejected this ultimatum.
- The main German air superiority campaign started
in August but failed to defeat RAF Fighter Command, and a proposed invasion called Operation Sea Lion was postponed indefinitely on September 17.

- The German strategic bombing offensive intensified as night attacks on London and other cities in the Blitz, but largely failed to disrupt the British war effort.
- The Nazi failure in the Battle of Britain is seen as a turning point in the war toward German defeat.

Key Terms

The Blitz
The name borrowed by the British press and applied to the heavy and frequent bombing raids carried out over Britain in 1940 and 1941 during the Second World War.

Royal Air Force
The United Kingdom's aerial warfare force; formed towards the end of the First World War on 1 April 1918, it is the oldest independent air force in the world.

Operation Sea Lion
Nazi Germany's code name for a provisionally proposed invasion of the United Kingdom during the Battle of Britain in the Second World War.
Luftwaffe
The aerial warfare branch of the German Wehrmacht (armed forces) during World War II.

The Battle of Britain occurred during the Second World War when the Royal Air Force (RAF) defended the United Kingdom against the German Air Force (Luftwaffe) attacks from the end of June 1940. It is described as the first major campaign fought entirely by air forces.

The primary objective of the Nazi German forces was to compel Britain to agree to a negotiated peace settlement. In July 1940, the air and sea blockade began with the Luftwaffe mainly targeting coastal shipping convoys, ports, and shipping centers such as Portsmouth. On August 1, the Luftwaffe was directed to achieve air superiority over RAF with the aim of incapacitating RAF Fighter Command. Twelve days later, it shifted the attacks to RAF airfields and infrastructure. As the battle progressed, the Luftwaffe also targeted factories involved in aircraft production and strategic infrastructure and eventually employed terror bombing on areas of political significance and civilians.

By preventing the Luftwaffe's air superiority over the UK, the British forced Adolf Hitler to postpone and eventually cancel Operation Sea Lion, a proposed amphibious and airborne invasion of Britain. However, Nazi Germany continued bombing operations on Britain, known as the Blitz. The failure to destroy Britain's air defenses to force an armistice (or even outright surrender) is considered the Nazis' first major defeat in World War II and a crucial turning point in the conflict.

Several reasons have been suggested for the failure of the German air offensive. The Luftwaffe High Command did not develop a strategy for destroying British war industry; instead of maintaining pressure on any of them, it frequently switched from one type of industry to another. Neither was the Luftwaffe equipped to carry
out strategic bombing; the lack of a heavy bomber and poor intelligence on British industry denied it the ability to prevail.

Battle of Britain: Nazi Heinkel He 111 bombers during the Battle of Britain Background The early stages of World War II saw successful German invasions on the continent aided by the air power of the Luftwaffe, which was able to establish tactical air superiority with great efficiency. The speed with which German forces defeated most of the defending armies in Norway in early 1940 created a significant political crisis in Britain. In early May 1940, the Norway Debate questioned the fitness for office of British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. On May 10, the
same day Winston Churchill became British Prime Minister, the Germans initiated the Battle of France with an aggressive invasion of French territory. RAF Fighter Command was desperately short of trained pilots and aircraft, but despite the objections of its commander Hugh Dowding that the diversion of his forces would leave home defenses weak, Churchill sent fighter squadrons to support operations in France, where the RAF suffered heavy losses. After the evacuation of British and French soldiers from Dunkirk and the French surrender on June 22, 1940, Hitler mainly focused his energies on the possibility of invading the Soviet Union in the belief that the British, defeated on the continent and without European allies, would quickly come to terms. The Germans were so convinced of an imminent armistice that they began constructing street decorations for the homecoming parades of victorious troops. Although the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, and certain elements of the British public favored negotiated peace with an ascendant Germany, Churchill and a majority of his Cabinet refused to consider an armistice. Instead, Churchill used his skillful rhetoric to harden public opinion against capitulation and prepare the British for a long war. In his “This was their finest hour” speech of 18 June 1940,
Churchill declared: What General Weygand has called The Battle of France is over. The battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilisation. Upon it depends our own British life and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of a perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, “This was their finest hour.” From the outset of his rise to power, Hitler expressed admiration for Britain and throughout the Battle period he sought neutrality or a peace treaty. In secret conference on May 23, 1939 Hitler set out his rather contradictory strategy that an attack on Poland was essential and “will only be successful if the Western Powers keep out of it. If
this is impossible, then it will be better to attack in the West and to settle Poland at the same time [with a surprise attack]. If Holland and Belgium are successfully occupied and held, and if France is also defeated, the fundamental conditions for a successful war against England will have been secured. England can then be blockaded from Western France at close quarters by the Air Force, while the Navy with its submarines extend the range of the blockade.” The Blitz The Blitz, from the German word “Blitzkrieg” (lightning war) was the name borrowed by the British press and applied to the heavy and frequent bombing raids carried out over Britain in 1940 and 1941 during the Second World War. This concentrated, direct bombing of industrial targets and civilian centers began with heavy raids on London on September 7, 1940, during the Battle of Britain. Adolf Hitler’s and Hermann Goering’s plans to destroy the Royal Air Force to allow an invasion of Britain were failing. In response to an RAF raid on Berlin, itself prompted by an accidental German bombing of London, they changed their tactics to the sustained bombing of civilian targets. From September 7, 1940, one year into the war, London was systematically bombed by the Luftwaffe for 57 consecutive nights. More than one million London houses were destroyed
or damaged and more than 40,000 civilians were killed, almost half of them in London. Ports and industrial centers outside London were also attacked. The main Atlantic sea port of Liverpool was bombed, causing nearly 4,000 deaths within the Merseyside area during the war. The North Sea port of Hull, a convenient and easily found target or secondary target for bombers unable to locate their primary targets, was subjected to 86 raids in the Hull Blitz during the war, with a conservative estimate of 1,200 civilians killed and 95 percent of its housing stock destroyed or damaged. Other ports, including Bristol, Cardiff, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Southampton, and Swansea, were also bombed, as were the industrial cities of Birmingham, Belfast, Coventry, Glasgow, Manchester, and Sheffield. Birmingham and Coventry were chosen because of the Spitfire and tank factories in Birmingham and the many munitions factories in Coventry. The city center of Coventry was almost destroyed, as was Coventry Cathedral. The bombing failed to demoralize the British into surrender or significantly damage the war economy. The eight months of bombing never seriously hampered British production and the war industries continued to operate and expand. The Blitz was only authorized when the Luftwaffe
failed to meet preconditions for a 1940 launch of Operation Sea Lion, the provisionally planned German invasion of Britain. By May 1941, the threat of an invasion of Britain had ended, and Hitler’s attention turned to Operation Barbarossa, the invasion of the Soviet Union. In comparison to the later Allied bombing campaign against Germany, the Blitz resulted in relatively few casualties; the British bombing of Hamburg in July 1943 inflicted some 42,000 civilian deaths, about the same as the entire Blitz.
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184. Conflict in the Atlantic

31.4.2: Conflict in the Atlantic

The Battle of the Atlantic was the longest continuous military campaign in World War II, running from 1939 to the defeat of Germany in 1945. It focused on naval blockades and counter-blockades to prevent wartime supplies from reaching Britain or Germany.

Learning Objective

Explain the breadth of the conflict in the Atlantic

Key Points

- The Battle of the Atlantic pitted U-boats and other warships of the German navy against the Royal Canadian Navy, Royal Navy, United States Navy, and Allied merchant shipping.
- At its core was the Allied naval blockade of Germany, announced the day after the declaration of war, and Germany’s subsequent counter-blockade.
- In essence, the Battle of the Atlantic was a tonnage
war: the Allied struggle to supply Britain and the Axis attempt to stem the flow of merchant shipping that enabled Britain to keep fighting.

• The situation changed constantly, with one side or the other gaining advantage as participating countries surrendered, joined, and even changed sides, and as new weapons, tactics, counter-measures, and equipment were developed by both sides.

• The Germans failed to stop the flow of strategic supplies to Britain, which resulted in the build-up of troops and supplies needed for the D-Day landings.

Key Terms

U-boat
Military submarines, especially used by the German navy in WWI and WWII; the anglicised version of the German word U-Boot, a shortening of Unterseeboot, literally “undersea boat.”

Battle of the Atlantic
The longest continuous military campaign in World War II, running from 1939 to the defeat of Germany in 1945; at its core was the Allied naval blockade of Germany, announced the day after the declaration of war, and Germany’s subsequent counter-blockade.
campaign in World War II, running from 1939 to the defeat of Germany in 1945. At its core was the Allied naval blockade of Germany, announced the day after the declaration of war, and Germany’s subsequent counter-blockade. This battle peaked from mid-1940 through to the end of 1943. The Battle of the Atlantic pitted U-boats and other warships of the Kriegsmarine (German navy) and aircraft of the Luftwaffe (German Air Force) against the Royal Canadian Navy, Royal Navy, United States Navy, and Allied merchant shipping. The convoys, mainly from North America and going to the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, were primarily protected for the most part by the British and Canadian navies and air forces. These forces were aided by ships and aircraft of the United States from September 13, 1941. The Germans were joined by submarines of the Italian Royal Navy (Regia Marina) after their Axis ally Italy entered the war on June 10, 1940.

As an island nation, the United Kingdom was dependent on imported goods. Britain required more than a million tons of imported material per week in order to be able to survive and fight. In essence, the Battle of the Atlantic was a tonnage war: the Allied struggle to supply Britain and the Axis attempt to stem the flow of merchant shipping that enabled Britain to keep fighting. From 1942 on, the Germans sought to prevent the build-up of Allied supplies and equipment in the British Isles in preparation for the invasion of occupied Europe. The defeat of the U-boat threat was a prerequisite for pushing back the Germans. Winston Churchill later wrote,

*The Battle of the Atlantic was the dominating factor all through the war. Never for one moment could we forget that everything happening elsewhere, on land, at sea or in the air depended ultimately on its outcome.—* Winston Churchill

The outcome of the battle was a strategic victory for the Allies—the German blockade failed—but at great cost: 3,500 merchant ships and 175 warships were sunk for the loss of 783 U-boats.

The name “Battle of the Atlantic” was coined by Winston Churchill
in February 1941. It has been called the “longest, largest, and most complex” naval battle in history. It involved thousands of ships in more than 100 convoy battles and perhaps 1,000 single-ship encounters, in a theater covering thousands of square miles of ocean. The situation changed constantly, with one side or the other gaining advantage as participating countries surrendered, joined, and even changed sides, and as new weapons, tactics, countermeasures, and equipment were developed by both sides. The Allies gradually gained the upper hand, overcoming German surface raiders by the end of 1942 and defeating the U-boats by mid-1943, though losses due to U-boats continued until war’s end.

Early Skirmishes

In 1939, the Kriegsmarine lacked the strength to challenge the combined British Royal Navy and French Navy for command of the sea. Instead, German naval strategy relied on commerce raiding using capital ships, armed merchant cruisers, submarines, and aircraft. Many German warships were already at sea when war was
declared, including most of the available U-boats and the “pocket battleships” which sortied into the Atlantic in August. These ships immediately attacked British and French shipping. U-30 sank the ocean liner SS Athenia within hours of the declaration of war in breach of her orders not to sink passenger ships. The U-boat fleet which dominated so much of the Battle of the Atlantic was small at the beginning of the war; many of the 57 available U-boats were the small and short-range Type IIs, useful primarily for mine laying and operations in British coastal waters. Much of the early German anti-shipping activity involved mine laying by destroyers, aircraft, and U-boats off British ports.

With the outbreak of war, the British and French immediately began a blockade of Germany, although this had little immediate effect on German industry. The Royal Navy quickly introduced a convoy system for the protection of trade that gradually extended out from the British Isles, eventually reaching as far as Panama, Bombay, and Singapore. Convoys allowed the Royal Navy to concentrate its escorts near the one place the U-boats were guaranteed to be found, the convoys. Each convoy consisted of between 30 and 70 mostly unarmed merchant ships.

U-Boat Strategy

Early in the war, Dönitz submitted a memorandum to Grand Admiral Erich Raeder, the German navy’s Commander-in-Chief, in which he estimated effective submarine warfare could bring Britain to her knees because of her dependence on overseas commerce. He advocated a system known as the Rudeltaktik (the so-called “wolf pack”), in which U-boats would spread out in a long line across the projected course of a convoy. Upon sighting a target, they would come together to attack en masse and overwhelm any escorting warships. While escorts chased individual submarines, the rest of the “pack” would be able to attack the merchant ships with
impunity. Dönitz calculated that 300 of the latest Atlantic Boats (the Type VII) would create enough havoc among Allied shipping that Britain would be knocked out of the war.

Some historians maintain that the German U-boat strategy came close to winning the Battle of the Atlantic, that the Allies were almost defeated, and that Britain was brought to the brink of starvation. Others, including Blair and Alan Levin, disagree.

The focus on U-boat successes, the “aces” and their scores, the convoys attacked, and the ships sunk, serves to camouflage the Kriegsmarine’s manifold failures. In particular, this was because most of the ships sunk by U-boat were not in convoys, but sailing alone.

At no time during the campaign were supply lines to Britain interrupted; even during the Bismarck crisis, convoys sailed as usual (although with heavier escorts). In all, during the Atlantic Campaign only 10% of transatlantic convoys that sailed were attacked, and of those attacked only about 10% were lost. More than 99% of all ships sailing to and from the British Isles during World War II did so successfully.

**Outcomes**

The Germans failed to stop the flow of strategic supplies to Britain, resulting in the build-up of troops and supplies needed for the D-Day landings. The defeat of the U-boat was a necessary precursor for accumulation of Allied troops and supplies to ensure Germany’s defeat.

Victory was achieved at a huge cost: between 1939 and 1945, 3,500 Allied merchant ships (totaling 14.5 million gross tons) and 175 Allied warships were sunk and some 72,200 Allied naval and merchant seamen lost their lives. The Germans lost 783 U-boats and approximately 30,000 sailors killed, three-quarters of Germany’s 40,000-man U-boat fleet.
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In June 1941, the German army launched an invasion of the Soviet Union, opening the largest land theater of war in history and trapping most of the Axis' military forces in a war of attrition.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze the significance of Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union

**Key Points**

- Operation Barbarossa was the code name for Nazi Germany's World War II invasion of the Soviet Union, which began on June 22, 1941.
- The operation was driven by Adolf Hitler's ideological desire to destroy the Soviet Union as outlined in his 1925 manifesto Mein Kampf, which characterized Eastern Europeans as “sub-humans.”
- The Germans won resounding victories and occupied some of the most important economic areas.
of the Soviet Union, mainly in Ukraine, both inflicting and sustaining heavy casualties.

- Despite their successes, the German offensive stalled on the outskirts of Moscow and was subsequently pushed back by a Soviet counteroffensive, bolstered by the fact that the German army was unprepared for the harsh Soviet winter.

- The failure of Operation Barbarossa was a turning point in the fortunes of the Third Reich, including opening up the Eastern Front, to which more forces were committed than in any other theater of war in world history, and transforming the perception of the Soviet Union from aggressor to victim.

**Key Terms**

**Einsatzgruppen**
Paramilitary death squads of Nazi Germany that were responsible for mass killings, primarily by shooting, during World War II.

**Weltanschauungen**
A particular philosophy or view of life; the worldview of an individual or group.

**Mein Kampf**
An autobiography by the National Socialist leader Adolf Hitler, in which he outlines his political ideology.
Operation Barbarossa was the code name for Nazi Germany’s World War II invasion of the Soviet Union, which began on June 22, 1941. The operation was driven by Adolf Hitler’s ideological desire to destroy the Soviet Union as outlined in his 1925 manifesto Mein Kampf.

Setting the Stage for the Invasion

In the two years leading up to the invasion, the two countries signed political and economic pacts for strategic purposes. Nevertheless, on December 18, 1940, Hitler authorized an invasion of the Soviet Union with a planned start date of May 15, 1941. The actual invasion began on June 22, 1941. Over the course of the operation, about four million Axis soldiers invaded the Soviet Union along a 1,800-mile front, the largest invasion force in the history of warfare. In addition to troops, the Germans employed some 600,000 motor vehicles and between 600,000 and 700,000 horses. It transformed the perception of the Soviet Union from aggressor to victim and marked the beginning of the rapid escalation of the war, both geographically and in the formation of the Allied coalition.

The Germans won resounding victories and occupied some of the most important economic areas of the Soviet Union, mainly in Ukraine, both inflicting and sustaining heavy casualties. Despite their successes, the German offensive stalled on the outskirts of Moscow and was subsequently pushed back by a Soviet counteroffensive. The Red Army repelled the Wehrmacht’s strongest blows and forced the unprepared Germany into a war of
attrition. The Germans would never again mount a simultaneous offensive along the entire strategic Soviet-Axis front. The failure of the operation drove Hitler to demand further operations inside the USSR of increasingly limited scope that eventually failed, such as Case Blue and Operation Citadel.

The failure of Operation Barbarossa was a turning point in the fortunes of the Third Reich. Most importantly, the operation opened up the Eastern Front, to which more forces were committed than in any other theater of war in world history. The Eastern Front became the site of some of the largest battles, most horrific atrocities, and highest casualties for Soviets and Germans alike, all of which influenced the course of both World War II and the subsequent history of the 20th century. The German forces captured millions of Soviet prisoners of war who were not granted protections stipulated in the Geneva Conventions. A majority never returned alive; Germany deliberately starved the prisoners to death as part of a “Hunger Plan” that aimed to reduce the population of Eastern Europe and then re-populate it with ethnic Germans. Over a million Soviet Jews were murdered by Einsatzgruppen death squads and gassing as part of the Holocaust.

Motivations for Invading USSR

As early as 1925, Adolf Hitler vaguely declared in his political manifesto and autobiography Mein Kampf that he would invade the Soviet Union, asserting that the German people needed to secure Lebensraum (“living space”) to ensure the survival of Germany for generations to come. On February 10, 1939, Hitler told his army commanders that the next war would be “purely a war of Weltanschauungen...totally a people’s war, a racial war.” On November 23, once World War II already started, Hitler declared that “racial war has broken out and this war shall determine who shall govern Europe, and with it, the world.” The racial policy of Nazi
Germany viewed the Soviet Union (and all of Eastern Europe) as populated by non-Aryan Untermenschen (“sub-humans”), ruled by “Jewish Bolshevik conspirators.” Hitler claimed in Mein Kampf that Germany’s destiny was to “turn to the East” as it did “six hundred years ago.” Accordingly, it was stated Nazi policy to kill, deport, or enslave the majority of Russian and other Slavic populations and repopulate the land with Germanic peoples, under the Generalplan Ost (“General Plan for the East”). The Germans’ belief in their ethnic superiority is discernible in official German records and by pseudoscientific articles in German periodicals at the time, which covered topics such as “how to deal with alien populations.”

Overview of the Battles

The initial momentum of the German ground and air attack completely destroyed the Soviet organizational command and control within the first few hours, paralyzing every level of command from the infantry platoon to the Soviet High Command in Moscow. Therefore, Moscow failed to grasp the magnitude of the catastrophe that confronted the Soviet forces in the border area. Marshal Semyon Timoshenko called for a general counteroffensive on the entire front “without any regards for borders” that both men hoped would sweep the enemy from Soviet territory. Timoshenko’s order was not based on a realistic appraisal of the military situation at hand and resulted in devastating casualties.

Four weeks into the campaign, the Germans realized they had grossly underestimated Soviet strength. The German troops used their initial supplies without attaining the expected strategic freedom of movement. Operations were slowed to allow for resupply and adapt strategy to the new situation. Hitler had lost faith in battles of encirclement as large numbers of Soviet soldiers had escaped the pincers. He now believed he could defeat the Soviets by economic damage, depriving them of the industrial
capacity to continue the war. That meant seizing the industrial center of Kharkov, the Donbass, and the oil fields of the Caucasus in the south and the speedy capture of Leningrad, a major center of military production, in the north.

After a German victory in Kiev, the Red Army no longer outnumbered the Germans and no more trained reserves were available. To defend Moscow, Stalin could field 800,000 men in 83 divisions, but no more than 25 divisions were fully effective. Operation Typhoon, the drive to Moscow, began on October 2. The Germans initially won several important battles, and the German government now publicly predicted the imminent capture of Moscow and convinced foreign correspondents of a pending Soviet collapse. On December 2, the German army advanced to within 15 miles of Moscow and could see the spires of the Kremlin, but by then the first blizzards had already begun. A reconnaissance battalion also managed to reach the town of Khimki, about 5 miles away from the Soviet capital. It captured the bridge over the Moscow-Volga Canal as well as the railway station, which marked the farthest eastern advance of German forces. But in spite of the progress made, the Wehrmacht was not equipped for winter warfare, and the bitter cold caused severe problems for their guns and equipment. Further, weather conditions grounded the Luftwaffe from conducting large-scale operations. Newly created Soviet units near Moscow now numbered over 500,000 men, and on December 5, they launched a massive counterattack as part of the Battle of Moscow that pushed the Germans back over 200 miles. By late December 1941, the Germans had lost the Battle for Moscow, and the invasion had cost the German army over 830,000 casualties in killed, wounded, captured, or missing in action.

Significance

Operation Barbarossa was the largest military operation in human
history—more men, tanks, guns, and aircraft were committed than had ever been deployed before in a single offensive. Seventy-five percent of the entire German military participated. The invasion opened up the Eastern Front of World War II, the largest theater of war during that conflict, which witnessed titanic clashes of unprecedented violence and destruction for four years that resulted in the deaths of more than 26 million people. More people died fighting on the Eastern Front than in all other fighting across the globe during World War II. Damage to both the economy and landscape was enormous for the Soviets as approximately 1,710 towns and 70,000 villages were completely annihilated.

More than just ushering in untold death and devastation, Operation Barbarossa and the subsequent German failure to achieve their objectives changed the political landscape of Europe, dividing it into eastern and western blocs. The gaping political vacuum left in the eastern half of the continent was filled by the USSR when Stalin secured his territorial prizes of 1939–40 and firmly placed his Red Army in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the eastern half of Germany. As a consequence, eastern Europe became Communist in political disposition and western Europe fell under the democratic sway of the United States, a nation uncertain about its future policies in Europe. Instead of profiting the German people, Operation Barbarossa’s failure instigated untold suffering when an estimated 1.4 million ethnic Germans died as a result of their forced flight from the East to the West, whether during the German retreat or later following the surrender.
Operation Barbarossa: Clockwise from top left: German soldiers advance through Northern Russia, German flamethrower team in the Soviet Union, Soviet planes flying over German positions near Moscow, Soviet prisoners of war on the way to German prison camps, Soviet soldiers fire at German positions.

Attributions

• Operation Barbarossa

- “Operation_Barbarossa_Infobox.jpg.”
186. The Holocaust

31.4.4: The Holocaust

The German government led by Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party was responsible for the Holocaust: the deliberate and systematic extermination of approximately six million Jews, 2.7 million ethnic Poles, and four million others who were deemed “unworthy of life.”

Learning Objective

Connect the events of the Holocaust to previous Anti-Semitic actions taken under the Nazi Regime

Key Points

- The Holocaust, also known as the Shoah (Hebrew for “the catastrophe”), was a genocide in which Adolf Hitler’s Nazi Germany and its collaborators killed approximately six million Jews.
- Other victims of Nazi crimes included ethnic Poles, Soviet citizens and Soviet POWs, other Slavs, Romanis, communists, homosexuals, Freemasons, Jehovah’s Witnesses and the mentally and physically
disabled, bringing the total number of Holocaust victims to 11 million.

- The persecution and genocide were carried out in stages, culminating in what Nazis termed the “Final Solution to the Jewish Question,” an agenda to exterminate Jews in Europe. Initially, though, the Nazis used legal repression and forced deportation and relocation to eliminate Jews from German culture.
- In 1941, as Germany conquered new territory in eastern Europe, specialized paramilitary units called Einsatzgruppen (“death squads”) murdered around two million Jews, partisans, and others, often in mass shootings.
- By the end of 1942, victims were regularly transported by freight trains to extermination camps where most who survived the journey were systematically killed in gas chambers.

**Key Terms**

**Nuremberg Laws**
Antisemitic laws in Nazi Germany, which declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens; the remainder, mainly Jews, were classed as state subjects without citizenship rights.
Final Solution

The Nazi plan for the total extermination of the Jews during World War II, carried out in the period known as the Holocaust.

extermination camps

Camps designed and built by Nazi Germany during World War II to systematically kill millions of Jews, Slavs, and others considered “sub-human,” primarily by gassing but also in mass executions and through extreme work under starvation conditions.

genocide

The intentional action to destroy a people (usually defined as an ethnic, national, racial, or religious group) in whole or in part.

The Holocaust, also known as the Shoah (Hebrew for “the catastrophe”), was a genocide in which Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany and its collaborators killed approximately six million Jews. The victims included 1.5 million children and represented about two-thirds of the nine million Jews who resided in Europe. Some definitions of the Holocaust include the additional five million non-Jewish victims of Nazi mass murders, bringing the total to about 11 million. Killings took place throughout Nazi Germany, German-occupied territories, and territories held by allies of Nazi Germany.

The Plan for Genocide

From 1941 to 1945, Jews were systematically murdered in one of the deadliest genocides in history, part of a broader aggregate of
acts of oppression and killings of various ethnic and political groups in Europe by the Nazi regime. Under the coordination of the SS and direction from the highest leadership of the Nazi Party, every arm of Germany’s bureaucracy was involved in the logistics and administration of the genocide. Other victims of Nazi crimes included ethnic Poles, Soviet citizens and Soviet POWs, other Slavs, Romanis, communists, homosexuals, Freemasons, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and the mentally and physically disabled. A network of about 42,500 facilities in Germany and German-occupied territories was used to concentrate victims for slave labor, mass murder, and other human rights abuses. Over 200,000 people were Holocaust perpetrators.

The persecution and genocide were carried out in stages, culminating in what Nazis termed the “Final Solution to the Jewish Question,” an agenda to exterminate Jews in Europe. Initially, the German government passed laws to exclude Jews from civil society, most prominently the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Nazis established a network of concentration camps starting in 1933 and ghettos following the outbreak of World War II in 1939. In 1938, legal repression and resettlement turned to violence on Kristallnacht (“Night of Broken Glass”), when Jews were attacked and Jewish property was vandalized. Over 7,000 Jewish shops and more than 1,200 synagogues (roughly two-thirds of the synagogues in areas under German control) were damaged or destroyed. In 1941, as Germany conquered new territory in eastern Europe, specialized paramilitary units called Einsatzgruppen (“death squads”) murdered around two million Jews, partisans, and others, often in mass shootings. By the end of 1942, victims were regularly transported by freight trains to extermination camps where most who survived the journey were systematically killed in gas chambers. This continued until the end of World War II in Europe in April–May 1945.

Jewish armed resistance was limited. The most notable exception was the Warsaw Ghetto uprising of 1943, when thousands of poorly-armed Jewish fighters held the Waffen-SS at bay for four weeks. An estimated 20,000–30,000 Jewish partisans actively fought against
the Nazis and their collaborators in Eastern Europe. French Jews took part in the French Resistance, which conducted a guerrilla campaign against the Nazis and Vichy French authorities. More than 100 armed Jewish uprisings took place.

Nuremberg Laws: Racial classification chart based on the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Distinguishing Features All branches of Germany’s bureaucracy were engaged in the logistics that led to the genocides, turning the Third Reich into what one Holocaust scholar, Michael Berenbaum, has called “a genocidal state”: Every arm of the country’s sophisticated bureaucracy was involved in the killing process. Parish churches and the Interior Ministry supplied birth records showing who was Jewish; the Post Office delivered the deportation and denaturalization orders; the Finance Ministry
confiscated Jewish property; German firms fired Jewish workers and disenfranchised Jewish stockholders. Saul Friedländer writes that: “Not one social group, not one religious community, not one scholarly institution or professional association in Germany and throughout Europe declared its solidarity with the Jews.” He writes that some Christian churches declared that converted Jews should be regarded as part of the flock, but only up to a point. Friedländer argues that this makes the Holocaust distinctive because antisemitic policies were able to unfold without the interference of countervailing forces normally found in advanced societies, such as industry, small businesses, churches, trade unions, and other vested interests and lobby groups. In many other genocides, pragmatic considerations such as control of territory and resources were central to the genocide policy. The Holocaust, however, was driven almost entirely by ideology. Israeli historian and scholar Yehuda Bauer argues: The basic motivation [of the Holocaust] was purely ideological, rooted in an illusionary world of Nazi imagination, where an international Jewish conspiracy to control the world was opposed to a parallel Aryan quest. No genocide to date had been based so completely on myths, on hallucinations, on abstract, nonpragmatic
ideology—which was then executed by very rational, pragmatic means. The use of extermination camps (also called “death camps”) equipped with gas chambers for the systematic mass extermination of peoples was an unprecedented feature of the Holocaust. These were established at Auschwitz, Belzec, Chełmno, Jasenovac, Majdanek, Maly Trostenets, Sobibór, and Treblinka. They were built for the systematic killing of millions, primarily by gassing but also by execution and extreme work under starvation conditions. Stationary facilities built for the purpose of mass extermination resulted from earlier Nazi experimentation with poison gas during the secret Action T4 euthanasia program against mental patients. Rudolf Höss, the longest-serving commandant of Auschwitz concentration camp, said: Another improvement we made over Treblinka was that we built our gas chambers to accommodate 2,000 people at one time, whereas at Treblinka their 10 gas chambers only accommodated 200 people each. The way we selected our victims was as follows: we had two SS doctors on duty at Auschwitz to examine the incoming transports of prisoners. The prisoners would be marched by one of the doctors who would make spot decisions as they walked by. Those who were fit for work were sent into the
Camp. Others were sent immediately to the extermination plants. Children of tender years were invariably exterminated, since by reason of their youth they were unable to work. Still another improvement we made over Treblinka was that at Treblinka the victims almost always knew that they were to be exterminated and at Auschwitz we endeavored to fool the victims into thinking that they were to go through a delousing process. Of course, frequently they realized our true intentions and we sometimes had riots and difficulties due to that fact. Very frequently women would hide their children under the clothes but of course when we found them we would send the children in to be exterminated. We were required to carry out these exterminations in secrecy but of course the foul and nauseating stench from the continuous burning of bodies permeated the entire area and all of the people living in the surrounding communities knew that exterminations were going on at Auschwitz.
Auschwitz: Hungarian Jews being selected by Nazis to be sent to the gas chamber at Auschwitz concentration camp. 

31.5: The Pacific War

31.5.1: Pearl Harbor

The attack on Pearl Harbor was a surprise military strike by the Imperial Japanese Navy against the United States naval base on the morning of December 7, 1941, which led to the U.S. entry into World War II.

Learning Objective

Evaluate the effect the attack on Pearl Harbor had on the American nation

Key Points

- Japan intended the attack on Pearl Harbor as a preventive action to keep the U.S. Pacific Fleet from interfering with military actions the Empire of Japan planned in Southeast Asia against overseas territories.
of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States.

- During the attacks, 188 U.S. aircraft were destroyed, 2,403 Americans were killed, and 1,178 others were wounded.
- The attack came as a profound shock to the American people and led directly to the U.S. entry into World War II in both the Pacific and European theaters.
- Subsequent operations by the U.S. prompted Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy to declare war on the U.S. on December 11, reciprocated by the U.S. the same day.

**Key Terms**

**Tripartite Pact**
A defensive military alliance between Germany, Japan, and Italy signed in Berlin on September 27, 1940.

**Nanking Massacre**
An episode of mass murder and mass rape committed by Japanese troops against the residents of Nanking, then the capital of the Republic of China during the Second Sino-Japanese War.

The attack on Pearl Harbor was a surprise military strike by the Imperial Japanese Navy against the United States naval base at Pearl
Harbor, Hawaii Territory, on the morning of December 7, 1941. The attack led to the U.S. entry into World War II.

Japan intended the attack as a preventive action to keep the U.S. Pacific Fleet from interfering with military actions the Empire of Japan planned in Southeast Asia against overseas territories of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the U.S. Over the next seven hours there were coordinated Japanese attacks on the U.S.-held Philippines, Guam, and Wake Island and on the British Empire in Malaya, Singapore, and Hong Kong.

The Day of the Attack

At 7:48 a.m. Hawaiian Time, the base was attacked by 353 Imperial Japanese fighter planes, bombers, and torpedo planes in two waves, launched from six aircraft carriers. All eight U.S. Navy battleships were damaged and four sunk. All but the USS Arizona (BB-39) were later raised, and six were returned to service and went on to fight in the war. The Japanese also sank or damaged three cruisers, three destroyers, an anti-aircraft training ship, and one minelayer. 188 U.S. aircraft were destroyed, 2,403 Americans were killed, and 1,178 others were wounded. Important base installations such as the power station, shipyard, maintenance, and fuel and torpedo storage facilities, as well as the submarine piers and headquarters building (also home of the intelligence section) were not attacked. Japanese losses were light: 29 aircraft and five midget submarines lost and 64 servicemen killed. One Japanese sailor, Kazuo Sakamaki, was captured.

The attack came as a profound shock to the American people and led directly to the American entry into World War II in both the Pacific and European theaters. The following day, December 8, the United States declared war on Japan. Domestic support for non-interventionism, which had been fading since the Fall of France in 1940, disappeared entirely. Clandestine support of the United
Kingdom (e.g., the Neutrality Patrol) was replaced by active alliance. Subsequent operations by the U.S. prompted Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy to declare war on the U.S. on December 11, reciprocated by the U.S. the same day.

There were numerous historical precedents for unannounced military action by Japan. However, the lack of any formal warning, particularly while negotiations were still apparently ongoing, led President Franklin D. Roosevelt to proclaim December 7, 1941, “a date which will live in infamy.” Because the attack happened without a declaration of war and without explicit warning, the attack on Pearl Harbor was judged by the Tokyo Trials to be a war crime.

Background

War between Japan and the U.S. was a possibility each nation had
been planning for since the 1920s, and serious tensions began with Japan's 1931 invasion of Manchuria. Over the next decade, Japan continued to expand into China, leading to all-out war between those countries in 1937. Japan spent considerable effort trying to isolate China and achieve sufficient resource independence to attain victory on the mainland; the “Southern Operation” was designed to assist these efforts.

From December 1937, events such as the Japanese attack on USS Panay, the Allison incident, and the Nanking Massacre swung public opinion in the West sharply against Japan. Fearing Japanese expansion, the U.S., the United Kingdom, and France provided loan assistance for war supply contracts to the Republic of China.

The U.S. ceased oil exports to Japan in July 1941 following Japanese expansion into French Indochina after the fall of France, in part because of new American restrictions on domestic oil consumption. This caused the Japanese to proceed with plans to take the Dutch East Indies, an oil-rich territory. On August 17, Roosevelt warned Japan that the U.S. was prepared to take steps against Japan if it attacked “neighboring countries.” The Japanese were faced with the option of either withdrawing from China and losing face or seizing and securing new sources of raw materials in the resource-rich, European-controlled colonies of Southeast Asia.

The Japanese attack had several major aims. First, it intended to destroy important American fleet units, thereby preventing the Pacific Fleet from interfering with Japanese conquest of the Dutch East Indies and Malaya and enabling Japan to conquer Southeast Asia without interference. Second, it was hoped to buy time for Japan to consolidate its position and increase its naval strength before shipbuilding authorized by the 1940 Vinson–Walsh Act erased any chance of victory. Third, to deliver a blow to America's ability to mobilize its forces in the Pacific, battleships were chosen as the main targets since they were the prestige ships of any navy at the time. Finally, it was hoped that the attack would undermine American morale so the U.S. government would drop its demands contrary to Japanese interests and seek a compromise peace.
Aftermath of the Attack

The day after the attack, Roosevelt delivered his famous Infamy Speech to a Joint Session of Congress, calling for a formal declaration of war on the Empire of Japan. Congress obliged his request less than an hour later. On December 11, Germany and Italy, honoring their commitments under the Tripartite Pact, declared war on the United States. The pact was an earlier agreement between Germany, Italy, and Japan, which had the principal objective of limiting U.S. intervention in any conflicts involving the three nations. Congress issued a declaration of war against Germany and Italy later that same day. The UK actually declared war on Japan nine hours before the U.S. did, partially due to Japanese attacks on Malaya, Singapore, and Hong Kong and partially due to Winston Churchill’s promise to declare war “within the hour” of a Japanese attack on the United States.

The attack was an initial shock to all the Allies in the Pacific Theater. Further losses compounded the alarming setback. Japan attacked the Philippines hours later. Only three days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the battleships *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* were sunk off the coast of Malaya, causing British Prime Minister Winston Churchill later to recollect,

“In all the war I never received a more direct shock. As I turned and twisted in bed the full horror of the news sank in upon me. There were no British or American capital ships in the Indian Ocean or the Pacific except the American survivors of Pearl Harbor who were hastening back to California. Over this vast expanse of waters Japan was supreme and we everywhere were weak and naked.”
Attributions

• Pearl Harbor
The Battle of Midway was a decisive naval battle in the Pacific Theater of World War II, won by the American navy after code-breakers discovered the date and time of the Japanese attack.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the events of the Battle of Midway

**Key Points**

- This Japanese operation, like the earlier attack on Pearl Harbor, sought to eliminate the United States as a strategic power in the Pacific, giving Japan a free hand in establishing supremacy in East Asia.
- American cryptographers were able to determine the date and location of the planned attack, enabling the forewarned U.S. Navy to prepare its own ambush.
- All four of Japan's large aircraft carriers and a heavy cruiser were sunk, while the U.S. lost only the carrier *Yorktown* and a destroyer.
After Midway and the exhausting attrition of the Solomon Islands campaign, Japan’s capacity to replace its losses in material and men rapidly became insufficient to cope with mounting casualties, while the United States’ massive industrial and training capabilities made losses far easier to replace. Thus, the Midway battle was a turning point in the war.

**Key Terms**

**Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere**
An imperialist propaganda concept created and promulgated for occupied Asian populations during the first third of the Shōwa era by the government and military of the Empire of Japan. It extended further than East Asia and promoted the cultural and economic unity of Northeast Asians, Southeast Asians, and Oceanians. It also declared the intention to create a self-sufficient “bloc of Asian nations led by the Japanese and free of Western powers.”

**Pacific Theater**
A major theater of the war between the Allies and Japan. It was defined by the Allied powers’ Pacific Ocean Area command, which included most of the Pacific Ocean and its islands and excluded mainland Asia, the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies, Borneo, Australia, most of the Territory of New Guinea, and the
The Battle of Midway was a decisive naval battle in the Pacific Theater of World War II. Between June 4 and 7, 1942, only six months after Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor and one month after the Battle of the Coral Sea, the United States Navy under Admirals Chester Nimitz, Frank Jack Fletcher, and Raymond A. Spruance decisively defeated an attacking fleet of the Imperial Japanese Navy under Admirals Isoroku Yamamoto, Chuichi Nagumo, and Nobutake Kondo near Midway Atoll, inflicting devastating damage on the Japanese fleet that proved irreparable. Military historian John Keegan called it “the most stunning and decisive blow in the history of naval warfare.”

Reasons for the Attack

The Japanese operation, like the earlier attack on Pearl Harbor, sought to eliminate the United States as a strategic power in the Pacific, giving Japan a free hand in establishing its Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. The Japanese hoped another demoralizing defeat would force the U.S. to capitulate in the Pacific War and thus ensure Japanese dominance in the Pacific. Luring the American aircraft carriers into a trap and occupying Midway was part of an overall “barrier” strategy to extend Japan’s defensive perimeter in response to the Doolittle air raid on Tokyo. This operation was also preparatory for further attacks against Fiji, Samoa, and Hawaii itself.

The plan was handicapped by faulty Japanese assumptions of the American reaction and poor initial dispositions. Most significantly, American cryptographers were able to determine the date and location of the planned attack, enabling the forewarned U.S. Navy
to prepare its own ambush. All four of Japan’s large aircraft carriers—*Akagi*, *Kaga*, *Soryu* and *Hiryu*, part of the six-carrier force that attacked Pearl Harbor six months earlier—and a heavy cruiser were sunk, while the U.S. lost only the carrier *Yorktown* and a destroyer. After Midway and the exhausting attrition of the Solomon Islands campaign, Japan’s capacity to replace its losses in material (particularly aircraft carriers) and men (especially well-trained pilots and maintenance crewmen) rapidly became insufficient to cope with mounting casualties, while the United States’ massive industrial and training capabilities made losses far easier to replace. The Battle of Midway, along with the Guadalcanal Campaign, is considered a turning point in the Pacific War.

![USS Yorktown: Yorktown at the moment of impact of a torpedo from a Nakajima B5N of Lieutenant Hashimoto’s 2nd fleet.](image)

**The Role of Code-Breaking**

American Admiral Chester Nimitz had one priceless advantage
going into battle: US cryptanalysts had partially broken the Japanese Navy's JN-25b code. Since early 1942, the US had been decoding messages stating that there would soon be an operation at objective “AF”. It was initially not known where “AF” was, but Commander Joseph Rochefort and his team at Station HYPO were able to confirm that it was Midway; Captain Wilfred Holmes devised a ruse of telling the base at Midway (by secure undersea cable) to broadcast an uncoded radio message stating that Midway’s water purification system had broken down. Within 24 hours, the code breakers picked up a Japanese message that “AF was short on water.” No Japanese radio operators who intercepted the message seemed concerned that the Americans were broadcasting uncoded that a major naval installation close to the Japanese threat ring was having a water shortage, which could have tipped off Japanese intelligence officers that it was a deliberate attempt at deception. HYPO was also able to determine the date of the attack as either June 4 or 5 and provide Nimitz with a complete IJN order of battle. Japan had a new codebook, but its introduction was delayed, enabling HYPO to read messages for several crucial days. The new code came into use on May 24 and took several days to crack, but the important breaks had already been made.

As a result, the Americans entered the battle with a very good picture of where, when, and in what strength the Japanese would appear. Nimitz knew that the Japanese had negated their numerical advantage by dividing their ships into four separate task groups, all too widely separated to support each other. This dispersal resulted in few fast ships being available to escort the Carrier Striking Force, reducing the number of anti-aircraft guns protecting the carriers. Nimitz calculated that the aircraft on his three carriers plus those on Midway Island gave the U.S. rough parity with Yamamoto’s four carriers, mainly because American carrier air groups were larger than Japanese ones. The Japanese, by contrast, remained mainly unaware of their opponent’s true strength and dispositions even after the battle began.
The Battle

As anticipated by Nimitz, the Japanese fleet arrived off Midway on June 4 and was spotted by PBY patrol aircraft. Nagumo executed a first strike against Midway, while Fletcher launched his aircraft for Nagumo's carriers. At 09:20 the first U.S. carrier aircraft arrived, TBD Devastator torpedo bombers from *Hornet*, but their attacks were poorly coordinated and ineffectual; thanks in part to faulty aerial torpedoes, they failed to score a single hit and all 15 were wiped out by defending Zero fighters. At 09:35, 15 additional TBDs from *Enterprise* attacked and 14 were lost, again with no hits. Thus far, Fletcher's attacks were disorganized and seemingly ineffectual, but succeeded in drawing Nagumo's defensive fighters down to sea level where they expended much of their fuel and ammunition repulsing the two waves of torpedo bombers. As a result, when U.S. dive bombers arrived at high altitude, the Zeros were poorly positioned to defend. To make matters worse, Nagumo's four carriers drifted out of formation in their efforts to avoid torpedoes, reducing the concentration of their anti-aircraft fire. Nagumo's indecision had also created confusion aboard his carriers. Alerted to the need of a second strike on Midway but wary of the need to deal with the American carriers that he now knew were in the vicinity, Nagumo twice changed the arming orders for his aircraft. As a result, the American dive bombers found the Japanese carriers with their decks cluttered with munitions as the crews worked hastily to properly re-arm their air groups.

With the Japanese CAP out of position and the carriers at their most vulnerable, SBD Dauntlesses from *Enterprise* and *Yorktown* appeared at an altitude of 10,000 feet (3,000 m) and commenced their attack, quickly dealing fatal blows to three fleet carriers: *Sōryū*, *Kaga*, and *Akagi*. Within minutes, all three were ablaze and had to be abandoned with great loss of life. *Hiryū* managed to survive the wave of dive bombers and launched a counter-attack against the American carriers, which caused severe damage to *Yorktown* (later
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finished off by a Japanese submarine). A second attack from the U.S. carriers a few hours later found and destroyed Hiryū, the last remaining fleet carrier available to Nagumo.

With his carriers lost and the Americans withdrawn out of range of his powerful battleships, Yamamoto was forced to call off the operation, leaving Midway in American hands. The battle proved to be a decisive victory for the Allies. For the second time, Japanese expansion had been checked and its formidable Combined Fleet was significantly weakened by the loss of four fleet carriers and many highly trained, virtually irreplaceable personnel. Japan would be largely on the defensive for the rest of the war.

Attributions

- The Battle of Midway
The Guadalcanal Campaign

31.5.3: The Guadalcanal Campaign

Guadalcanal marked the decisive Allied transition from defensive operations to the strategic initiative in the Pacific theater, leading to offensive operations such as the Solomon Islands, New Guinea, and Central Pacific campaigns that eventually resulted in Japan’s surrender and the end of World War II.

Learning Objective

Understand the strategic significance of the Guadalcanal Campaign

Key Points

- Up to this point, the Allies were on the defensive in the Pacific, but the strategic victories at Midway and other battles provided an opportunity to seize the initiative from Japan.
- On August 7, 1942, Allied forces, predominantly
United States Marines, landed on the islands of Guadalcanal, Tulagi, and Florida in the southern Solomon Islands with the objective of denying their use by the Japanese to threaten Allied supply and communication routes between the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand.

- The Allies overwhelmed the outnumbered Japanese defenders who had occupied the islands since May 1942 and captured Tulagi and Florida as well as an airfield (later named Henderson Field) that was under construction on Guadalcanal.
- Surprised by the Allied offensive, the Japanese made several attempts between August and November to retake Henderson Field.
- Three major land battles, seven large naval battles (five nighttime surface actions and two carrier battles), and continual, almost daily aerial battles culminated in the decisive Naval Battle of Guadalcanal in early November, in which the last Japanese attempt to bombard Henderson Field from the sea and land with enough troops to retake it was defeated.

**Key Terms**

**Europe first**

Also known as Germany first, the key element of the grand strategy agreed upon by the United States and
the United Kingdom during World War II. According to this policy, the United States and the United Kingdom would use the preponderance of their resources to subdue Nazi Germany in Europe first. Simultaneously, they would fight a holding action against Japan in the Pacific, using fewer resources. After the defeat of Germany—considered the greatest threat to Great Britain—all Allied forces could be concentrated against Japan.

**parity**

Functional equivalence, as in the weaponry or military strength of adversaries.

The Guadalcanal Campaign, also known as the Battle of Guadalcanal and code-named Operation Watchtower, originally referred to an operation to take the island of Tulagi by Allied forces. This military campaign was fought between August 7, 1942, and February 9, 1943, on and around the island of Guadalcanal in the Pacific theater of World War II. It was the first major offensive by Allied forces against the Empire of Japan.

**Overview**

On August 7, 1942, Allied forces, predominantly United States Marines, landed on the islands of Guadalcanal, Tulagi, and Florida in the southern Solomon Islands with the objective of denying their use by the Japanese to threaten Allied supply and communication routes between the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand. The Allies also intended to use Guadalcanal and Tulagi as bases to support a campaign to capture or neutralize the major Japanese base at
Rabaul on New Britain. The Allies overwhelmed the outnumbered Japanese defenders, who had occupied the islands since May 1942, and captured Tulagi and Florida, as well as an airfield (later named Henderson Field) that was under construction on Guadalcanal. Powerful American and Australian naval forces supported the landings.

Surprised by the Allied offensive, the Japanese made several attempts between August and November to retake Henderson Field. Three major land battles, seven large naval battles (five nighttime surface actions and two carrier battles), and continual, almost daily aerial battles culminated in the decisive Naval Battle of Guadalcanal in early November, in which the last Japanese attempt to bombard Henderson Field from the sea and land with enough troops to retake it was defeated. In December, the Japanese abandoned their efforts to retake Guadalcanal and evacuated their remaining forces by February 7, 1943, in the face of an offensive by the U.S. Army’s XIV Corps.

The Guadalcanal campaign was a significant strategic combined arms Allied victory in the Pacific theater. Along with the Battle of Midway, it has been called a turning-point in the war against Japan. The Japanese reached the peak of their conquests in the Pacific. The victories at Milne Bay, Buna-Gona, and Guadalcanal marked the Allied transition from defensive operations to strategic initiative, leading to offensive operations such as the Solomon Islands, New Guinea, and Central Pacific campaigns that eventually resulted in Japan’s surrender and the end of World War II.

Background

On December 7, 1941, Japanese forces attacked the United States Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. The attack crippled much of the U.S. battleship fleet and precipitated an open and formal war between the two nations. The initial goals of Japanese leaders
were to neutralize the U.S. Navy, seize possessions rich in natural resources, and establish strategic military bases to defend Japan's empire in the Pacific Ocean and Asia. To further those goals, Japanese forces captured the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya, Singapore, Burma, the Dutch East Indies, Wake Island, Gilbert Islands, New Britain, and Guam. Joining the U.S. in the war against Japan were the rest of the Allied powers, several of whom, including the United Kingdom, Australia and the Netherlands, had also been attacked by Japan.

Two attempts by the Japanese to continue their strategic initiative and offensively extend their outer defensive perimeter in the south and central Pacific to where they could threaten Australia and Hawaii or the U.S. West Coast were thwarted at the naval battles of Coral Sea and Midway respectively. Coral Sea was a tactical stalemate, but a strategic Allied victory which became clear only much later. Midway was not only the Allies' first major victory against the Japanese, it significantly reduced the offensive capability of Japan's carrier forces but did not change their offensive mindset for several crucial months in which they compounded mistakes by moving ahead with brash decisions such as the attempt to assault Port Moresby over the Kokoda trail. Up to this point, the Allies were on the defensive in the Pacific, but these strategic victories provided them an opportunity to seize the initiative from Japan.

**Significance**

The Battle of Guadalcanal was one of the first prolonged campaigns in the Pacific, alongside the related and concurrent Solomon Islands campaign. Both were battles that strained the logistical capabilities of the combatant nations. For the United States, this need prompted the development of effective combat air transport for the first time. A failure to achieve air superiority forced Japan to rely on reinforcement by barges, destroyers, and submarines, with very
uneven results. Early in the campaign, the Americans were hindered by a lack of resources as they suffered heavy losses in cruisers and carriers, with replacements from ramped-up shipbuilding programs still months away.

The U.S. Navy suffered such high personnel losses during the campaign that it refused to publicly release total casualty figures for years. However, as the campaign continued and the American public became more and more aware of the plight and perceived heroism of the American forces on Guadalcanal, more forces were dispatched to the area. This spelled trouble for Japan as its military-industrial complex was unable to match the output of American industry and manpower. As the campaign wore on, the Japanese were losing irreplaceable units while the Americans were rapidly replacing and even augmenting their forces.

The Guadalcanal campaign was costly to Japan both strategically and in material losses and manpower. Roughly 30,000 personnel, including 25,000 experienced ground troops, died during the campaign. As many as three-quarters of the deaths were from non-combat causes such as starvation and tropical diseases. The drain on resources directly contributed to Japan’s failure to achieve its objectives in the New Guinea campaign.

After the victory at the Battle of Midway, America was able to establish naval parity in the Pacific. However, this alone did not change the direction of the war. It was only after the Allied victories in Guadalcanal and New Guinea that the Japanese offensive thrust was ended and the strategic initiative passed to the Allies permanently. The Guadalcanal Campaign ended all Japanese expansion attempts and placed the Allies in a position of clear supremacy. It can be argued that this Allied victory was the first step in a long string of successes that eventually led to the surrender of Japan and the occupation of the Japanese home islands.

The “Europe first” policy of the United States initially only allowed for defensive actions against Japanese expansion to focus resources on defeating Germany. However, Admiral King’s argument for the Guadalcanal invasion and its successful implementation convinced
President Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Pacific Theater could be pursued offensively as well. By the end of 1942, it was clear that Japan had lost the Guadalcanal campaign, a serious blow to Japan’s strategic plans for defense of its empire and an unanticipated defeat at the hands of the Americans.

Perhaps as important as the military victory for the Allies was the psychological victory. On a level playing field, the Allies had beaten Japan’s best land, air, and naval forces. After Guadalcanal, Allied personnel regarded the Japanese military with much less fear and awe than they had previously. In addition, the Allies viewed the eventual outcome of the Pacific War with increased optimism.

**Guadalcanal Campaign: A U.S. Marine patrol crosses the Matanikau River in September 1942.**

**Attributions**

- The Guadalcanal Campaign
The Guadalcanal Campaign

Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

31.6: The Allies Gain Ground

31.6.1: The Battle of Stalingrad

The Battle of Stalingrad has been described as the biggest defeat in the history of the German Army and a decisive turning point in the downfall of Hitler in World War II.

Learning Objective

Argue for or against the categorization of the Battle of Stalingrad as a turning point in the war

Key Points

- The Battle of Stalingrad was marked by constant close quarters combat and direct assaults on civilians by air raids, and it is often regarded as one of the single largest and bloodiest battles in the history of warfare.
• By mid-November, the Germans had nearly taken Stalingrad in bitter street fighting when the Soviets began their second winter counter-offensive, starting with an encirclement of German forces at Stalingrad and an assault on the Rzhev salient near Moscow.

• By early February 1943, the German Army had taken tremendous losses; German troops at Stalingrad were forced to surrender, and the front line had been pushed back beyond its position before the summer offensive.

• It was a turning point in the European theater of World War II; German forces never regained the initiative in the East and withdrew a vast military force from the West to replace their losses.

**Key Terms**

**Battle of Moscow**

The name given by Soviet historians to two periods of strategically significant fighting on a 600 km (370 mi) sector of the Eastern Front during World War II. It took place between October 1941 and January 1942 and was part of the German Operation Barbarossa.

**Operation Barbarossa**

The code name for Nazi Germany’s World War II invasion of the Soviet Union, which began on June 22, 1941.
Overview

The Battle of Stalingrad (August 23, 1942 – February 2, 1943) was a major battle on the Eastern Front of World War II in which Nazi Germany and its allies fought the Soviet Union for control of the city of Stalingrad (now Volgograd) in Southern Russia, on the eastern boundary of Europe.

Marked by constant close-quarters combat and direct assaults on civilians by air raids, it is often regarded as one of the single largest (nearly 2.2 million personnel) and bloodiest (1.7–2 million wounded, killed, or captured) battles in the history of warfare. The heavy losses inflicted on the German Wehrmacht make it arguably the most strategically decisive battle of the whole war and a turning point in the European theater of World War II. German forces never regained the initiative in the East and withdrew a vast military force from the West to replace their losses.

The German offensive to capture Stalingrad began in late summer 1942, using the German 6th Army and elements of the 4th Panzer Army. The attack was supported by intensive Luftwaffe bombing that reduced much of the city to rubble. The fighting degenerated into house-to-house fighting, and both sides poured reinforcements into the city. By mid-November 1942, the Germans pushed the Soviet defenders back at great cost into narrow zones along the west bank of the Volga River.

On November 19, 1942, the Red Army launched Operation Uranus, a two-pronged attack targeting the weaker Romanian and Hungarian forces protecting the German 6th Army's flanks. The Axis forces on the flanks were overrun and the 6th Army was cut off and surrounded in the Stalingrad area. Adolf Hitler ordered that the army stay in Stalingrad and make no attempt to break out; instead, attempts were made to supply the army by air and to break the encirclement from the outside. Heavy fighting continued for another two months. By the beginning of February 1943, the Axis forces in Stalingrad had exhausted their ammunition and food. The
remaining elements of the 6th Army surrendered. The battle lasted five months, one week, and three days.

Battle of Stalingrad: Soviet soldiers attack a house, February 1943

Background

By the spring of 1942, despite the failure of Operation Barbarossa to decisively defeat the Soviet Union in a single campaign, the Germans had captured vast expanses of territory, including Ukraine, Belarus, and the Baltic republics. Elsewhere, the war had been progressing well: the U-boat offensive in the Atlantic had been very successful and Rommel had just captured Tobruk. In the east, they stabilized their front in a line running from Leningrad in the north to Rostov in the south. There were a number of salients, but these were not particularly threatening. Hitler was confident that he could master the Red Army after the winter of 1942, because even though Army Group Centre had suffered heavy losses west of Moscow the previous winter, 65% of its infantry had not been engaged and was rested and re-equipped. Neither Army Group North nor Army Group South had been particularly hard pressed over the winter. Stalin was expecting the main thrust of the German summer attacks to be directed against Moscow again.

Since the initial operations were so successful, the Germans
decided that their summer campaign in 1942 would be directed at the southern parts of the Soviet Union. The initial objectives in the region around Stalingrad were the destruction of the industrial capacity of the city and the deployment of forces to block the Volga River. The river was a key route from the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea to central Russia. Its capture would disrupt commercial river traffic. The Germans cut the pipeline from the oilfields when they captured Rostov on July 23. The capture of Stalingrad would make the delivery of Lend Lease supplies from America via the Persian Corridor much more difficult.

Aftermath

The German public was not officially told of the impending disaster until the end of January 1943, though positive media reports ended in the weeks before the announcement. Stalingrad marked the first time that the Nazi government publicly acknowledged a failure in its war effort; it was not only the first major setback for the German military, but a crushing, unprecedented defeat where German losses were almost equal to those of the Soviets. Prior losses of the Soviet Union were generally three times as high as the German ones. On January 31, regular programming on German state radio was replaced by a broadcast of the somber Adagio movement from Anton Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony, followed by the announcement of the defeat at Stalingrad.

On 18 February, Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels gave the famous Sportpalast speech in Berlin, encouraging the Germans to accept a total war that would claim all resources and efforts from the entire population.

Based on Soviet records, more than 10,000 soldiers continued to resist in isolated groups within the city for the next month. Some have presumed that they were motivated by a belief that fighting on was better than a slow death in Soviet captivity. The Israeli historian
Omer Bartov claims they were motivated by National Socialism. He studied 11,237 letters sent by soldiers inside of Stalingrad between December 20, 1942 and January 16, 1943 to their families in Germany. Almost every letter expressed belief in Germany's ultimate victory and their willingness to fight and die at Stalingrad to achieve that victory. Bartov reported that many of the soldiers were aware that they would not be able to escape from Stalingrad, but in their letters to their families boasted that they were proud to “sacrifice themselves for the Führer.”

Significance

Stalingrad has been described as the biggest defeat in the history of the German Army. It is often identified as the turning point on the Eastern Front, in the war against Germany overall, and the entire Second World War. Before Stalingrad, the German forces went from victory to victory on the Eastern Front, with only a limited setback in the winter of 1941–42. After Stalingrad, they won no decisive battles, even in summer. The Red Army had the initiative and the Wehrmacht was in retreat. A year of German gains during Case Blue had been wiped out. Germany's Sixth Army had ceased to exist, and the forces of Germany's European allies, except Finland, had been shattered. In a speech on November 9, 1944, Hitler himself blamed Stalingrad for Germany's impending doom.

Stalingrad’s significance has been downplayed by some historians, who point either to the Battle of Moscow or the Battle of Kursk as more strategically decisive. Others maintain that the destruction of an entire army (the largest killed, captured, wounded figures for Axis soldiers, nearly 1 million, during the war) and the frustration of Germany's grand strategy made the battle a watershed moment. At the time, however, the global significance of the battle was not in doubt.

Regardless of the strategic implications, there is little doubt that
Stalingrad was a morale watershed. Germany’s defeat shattered its reputation for invincibility and dealt a devastating blow to morale. On January 30, 1943, his 10th anniversary of coming to power, Hitler chose not to speak. Joseph Goebbels read the text of his speech for him on the radio. The speech contained an oblique reference to the battle which suggested that Germany was now in a defensive war. The public mood was sullen, depressed, fearful, and war-weary. Germany was looking in the face of defeat.

The reverse was the case on the Soviet side. There was an overwhelming surge in confidence and belief in victory. A common saying was: “You cannot stop an army which has done Stalingrad.” Stalin was feted as the hero of the hour and made a Marshal of the Soviet Union.

The news of the battle echoed round the world, with many people now believing that Hitler’s defeat was inevitable.

Attributions

- **The Battle of Stalingrad**
The North African Campaign was fought between the Allies and Axis powers, many of whom had colonial interests in Africa dating from the late 19th century. It took place from June 10, 1940, to May 13, 1943, and included campaigns fought in the Libyan and Egyptian deserts in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia.

**Learning Objective**

Examine the significance of the North African Campaign

**Key Points**

- The North African Campaign of WWII included campaigns fought in the Libyan and Egyptian deserts (Western Desert Campaign, also known as the Desert War) and in Morocco and Algeria (Operation Torch) and Tunisia (Tunisia Campaign).
- Fighting in North Africa started with the Italian declaration of war on June 10, 1940, when British troops crossed the border from Egypt into Libya and
captured the Italian Fort Capuzzo.

- A see-saw series of battles for control of Libya and parts of Egypt followed, reaching a climax in the Second Battle of El Alamein in 1942 when British Commonwealth forces under the command of Lieutenant-General Bernard Montgomery delivered a decisive defeat to the Axis forces and pushed them back to Tunisia.
- Operation Torch in November 1942 was a compromise operation that met the British objective of securing victory in North Africa while allowing American armed forces the opportunity to engage in the fight against Nazi Germany on a limited scale.
- After fighting in Tunisia, the Axis forces surrendered on May 13, 1943 yielding over 275,000 prisoners of war.

**Key Terms**

**Tunisia Campaign**
A series of battles that took place in Tunisia during the North African Campaign of the Second World War, between Axis and Allied forces.

**Ultra**
The designation adopted by British military intelligence in June 1941 for wartime signals intelligence obtained by breaking high-level encrypted
enemy radio and teleprinter communications at the Government Code and Cypher School at Bletchley Park.

**pincer**

A military maneuver in which forces simultaneously attack both flanks (sides) of an enemy formation.

---

**Overview**

The North African Campaign of the Second World War took place in North Africa from June 10, 1940, to May 13, 1943. It included campaigns fought in the Libyan and Egyptian deserts (Western Desert Campaign, also known as the Desert War) and in Morocco and Algeria (Operation Torch) and Tunisia (Tunisia Campaign).

The campaign was fought between the Allies and Axis powers, many of whom had colonial interests in Africa dating from the late 19th century. The Allied war effort was dominated by the British Commonwealth and exiles from German-occupied Europe. The United States entered the war in December 1941 and began direct military assistance in North Africa on May 11, 1942.

Fighting in North Africa started with the Italian declaration of war on June 10, 1940. On June 14, the British Army's 11th Hussars (assisted by elements of the 1st Royal Tank Regiment, 1st RTR) crossed the border from Egypt into Libya and captured the Italian Fort Capuzzo. This was followed by an Italian counter-offensive into Egypt and the capture of Sidi Barrani in September 1940 and then in December 1940 by a Commonwealth counteroffensive, Operation Compass. During Operation Compass, the Italian 10th Army was destroyed and the German *Afrika Korps*—commanded by Erwin Rommel, who later became known as “The Desert Fox”—was dispatched to North
Africa during Operation Sonnenblume to reinforce Italian forces and prevent a complete Axis defeat.

A see-saw series of battles for control of Libya and parts of Egypt followed, reaching a climax in the Second Battle of El Alamein in 1942 when British Commonwealth forces under the command of Lieutenant-General Bernard Montgomery delivered a decisive defeat to the Axis forces and pushed them back to Tunisia. After the Allied Operation Torch landings in Northwest Africa in late 1942 and subsequent battles against Vichy France forces (who then changed sides), the Allies finally encircled Axis forces in northern Tunisia and forced their surrender.

Operation Torch in November 1942 was a compromise operation that met the British objective of securing victory in North Africa while allowing American armed forces the opportunity to engage in the fight against Nazi Germany on a limited scale. In addition, as Joseph Stalin, the leader of the Soviet Union, had long been demanding a second front be opened to engage the Wehrmacht and relieve pressure on the Red Army, it provided some degree of relief for the Red Army on the Eastern Front by diverting Axis forces to the African theater, tying them up and destroying them there.

Information gleaned via British Ultra code-breaking intelligence proved critical to Allied success in North Africa. Victory for the Allies in this campaign immediately led to the Italian Campaign, which culminated in the downfall of the fascist government in Italy and the elimination of a German ally.

**Western Desert Campaign**

The Western Desert Campaign, or the Desert War, took place in the Western Desert of Egypt and Libya and was a theater in the North African Campaign during the Second World War. The campaign began in September 1940 with the Italian invasion of Egypt. The Italians halted to bring up supplies and Operation Compass, a
British five-day raid in December 1940, led to the destruction of the Italian 10th Army. Benito Mussolini sought help from Adolf Hitler and a small German blocking detachment was sent to Tripoli under Directive 22 (January 11). These were the first units of the Afrika Korps under nominal Italian command but Italian dependency on Nazi Germany made it the dominant partner.

In the spring of 1941, Axis forces under Rommel pushed the British back and reached Tobruk, which was subjected to the Siege of Tobruk until it was relieved during Operation Crusader. The Axis forces were forced to retire to their starting point by the end of the year. In 1942 Axis forces drove the British back and captured Tobruk at the end of the Battle of Gazala, but failed to gain a decisive victory. On the final Axis push to Egypt, the British retreated to El Alamein. At the Second Battle of El Alamein the Eighth Army defeated the Axis forces, which never recovered and were driven out of Libya to Tunisia, where they were defeated in the Tunisia Campaign. After the British defeats in the Balkan Campaign, the Western Desert Campaign became more important to British strategy. For Hitler, the Eastern Front against the Soviet Union dwarfed the desert war, which was a holding action of secondary importance. The Axis never had sufficient resources or the means to deliver them to defeat the British, who missed several opportunities to finish the campaign by diverting resources to Greece and the Levant in 1941 and the Far East in 1942.
Operation Torch

Operation Torch was the British-American invasion of French North Africa during the North African Campaign of the Second World War. The Soviet Union pressed the United States and United Kingdom to start operations in Europe and open a second front to reduce the pressure of German forces on the Soviet troops. While the American commanders favored Operation Sledgehammer and landed in Occupied Europe as soon as possible, the British commanders believed that such a course would end in disaster.

An attack on French North Africa was proposed instead, which
would clear the Axis powers from North Africa, improve naval control of the Mediterranean Sea, and prepare for an invasion of Southern Europe in 1943. U.S. President, Franklin D. Roosevelt suspected the African operation would rule out an invasion of Europe in 1943, but agreed to support British Prime Minister Winston Churchill.

Operation Torch started on November 8, 1942, and finished on November 11. In an attempt to pincer German and Italian forces, Allied forces (American and British Commonwealth), landed in Vichy-held French North Africa under the assumption that there would be little to no resistance. In fact, Vichy French forces put up a strong and bloody resistance to the Allies in Oran and Morocco, but not in Algiers, where a coup d'état by the French resistance on November 8 neutralized the French XIX Corps before the landing and arrested the Vichy commanders. Consequently, the landings met no practical opposition in Algiers, and the city was captured on the first day along with the entire Vichy African command. After three days of talks and threats, Generals Mark Clark and Dwight Eisenhower compelled the Vichy Admiral François Darlan (and General Alphonse Juin) to order the cessation of armed resistance in Oran and Morocco by French forces on November 10-11 with the provision that Darlan would be head of a Free French administration. During Operation Torch, American, Vichy French, and German navy vessels fought the Naval Battle of Casablanca, ending in an American victory.

The Allied landings prompted the Axis occupation of Vichy France. In addition, the French fleet was captured at Toulon by the Italians, which did them little good as the main portion of the fleet had been scuttled to prevent its use by the Axis. The Vichy army in North Africa joined the Allies.
Tunisian Campaign

Following the Operation Torch landings, the Germans and Italians initiated a buildup of troops in Tunisia to fill the vacuum left by Vichy troops who had withdrawn. During this period of weakness, the Allies decided against a rapid advance into Tunisia while they wrestled with the Vichy authorities. Many of the Allied soldiers were tied up in garrison duties because of the uncertain status and intentions of the Vichy forces.

By the beginning of March, the British Eighth Army—advancing westward along the North African coast—reached the Tunisian border. Rommel and von Arnim found themselves in an Allied “two army” pincer. They were outflanked, outmanned, and outgunned. The British Eighth Army bypassed the Axis defence on the Mareth Line in late March and First Army in central Tunisia launched their main offensive in mid-April to squeeze the Axis forces until their resistance in Africa collapsed. The Axis forces surrendered on May 13, 1943, yielding over 275,000 prisoners of war. The last Axis force to surrender in North Africa was the 1st Italian Army. This huge loss of experienced troops greatly reduced the military capacity of the Axis powers, although the largest percentage of Axis troops escaped.
Tunisia. This defeat in Africa led to all Italian colonies in Africa being captured.

Attributions

- The North African Front
The Allied invasion of Sicily, code named *Operation Husky*, was a major campaign of World War II in which the Allies took the island of Sicily from the Axis powers.

**Learning Objective**

Discuss the events of the Sicilian Campaign

**Key Points**

- Following the defeat of the Axis Powers in North Africa in May 1943, there was disagreement between the Allies as to what the next step should be. Churchill wanted to invade Italy, which he called “the soft underbelly of the axis.”
- Joseph Stalin, the Soviet leader, was pressing Churchill and Roosevelt to open a “second front” in Europe to lessen the German Army’s focus on the Eastern Front, where the bulk of its forces were fighting in the largest armed conflict in history.
To distract and confuse the Axis, the Allies engaged in several deception operations, most famously Operation Mincemeat, where the British allowed a corpse disguised as a British Royal Marines officer to drift ashore in Spain carrying a briefcase containing fake secret documents.

Joint Allied forces planned and commanded the invasion of Sicily in July 1943, followed in September by the invasion of the Italian mainland and the campaign on Italian soil until the surrender of the German Armed Forces in Italy in May 1945.

**Key Terms**

**Operation Mincemeat**

A successful British disinformation plan during the Second World War, which convinced the German high command that the Allies planned to invade Greece and Sardinia in 1943 instead of Sicily, the actual objective.

**Operation Husky**

Codename for the allied invasion of Sicily in which the Allies took the island of Sicily from the Axis powers.
Overview

The Allied invasion of Sicily, code named Operation Husky, was a major campaign of World War II in which the Allies took the island of Sicily from the Axis powers (Italy and Nazi Germany). It was a large amphibious and airborne operation followed by a six-week land campaign and began the Italian Campaign.

Husky began on the night of July 9-10, 1943, and ended on August 17. Strategically, Husky achieved the goals set out for it by Allied planners; the Allies drove Axis air, land, and naval forces from the island and the Mediterranean sea lanes were opened for Allied merchant ships for the first time since 1941. Italian fascist leader, Benito Mussolini, was toppled from power, opening the way for the invasion of Italy. Hitler “canceled a major offensive at Kursk after only a week, in part to divert forces to Italy,” resulting in a reduction of German strength on the Eastern Front.

Background

Following the defeat of the Axis Powers in North Africa in May 1943, there was disagreement between the Allies as to what the next step should be. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill wanted to invade Italy, which in November 1942 he called “the soft underbelly of the axis” (and General Mark Clark, in contrast, later called “one tough gut”). Popular support in Italy for the war was declining, and he believed an invasion would remove Italy and thus the influence of Axis forces in the Mediterranean Sea, opening it to Allied traffic. This would reduce the shipping capacity needed to supply Allied forces in the Middle East and Far East at a time when the disposal of Allied shipping capacity was in crisis, and increase British and American supplies to the Soviet Union. In addition, it would tie down German forces. Joseph Stalin, the Soviet leader, had been
pressing Churchill and Roosevelt to open a “second front” in Europe, which would lessen the German Army's focus on the Eastern Front where the bulk of its forces were fighting in the largest armed conflict in history.

**Deception**

To distract the Axis and possibly divert some of their forces to other areas, the Allies engaged in several deception operations. The most famous and successful of these was *Operation Mincemeat*. The British allowed a corpse disguised as a British Royal Marines officer to drift ashore in Spain carrying a briefcase containing fake secret documents that purported to reveal that the Allies were planning “Operation Brimstone” and that an “Operation Husky” was an invasion of Greece. German intelligence accepted the authenticity of the documents and the Germans diverted much of their defensive effort from Sicily to Greece until the occupation of Pantellaria on June 11, which concentrated German and Italian attention on the western Mediterranean. *Generalfeldmarschall* Erwin Rommel was sent to Greece to assume command. The Germans transferred a group of “R boats” (German minesweepers and minelayers) from Sicily and laid three additional minefields off the Greek coast. They also moved three panzer divisions to Greece, one from France and two from the Eastern Front, which reduced German combat strength in the Kursk salient.

**The Invasion of Sicily**

A combined British-Canadian-Indian-American invasion of Sicily began on July 10, 1943 with both amphibious and airborne landings
at the Gulf of Gela (U.S. Seventh Army, Patton) and north of Syracuse (British Eighth Army, Montgomery). The original plan contemplated a strong advance by the British northwards along the east coast to Messina, with the Americans in a supporting role along their left flank. When the Eighth Army were held up by stubborn defenses in the rugged hills south of Mount Etna, Patton amplified the American role by a wide advance northwest toward Palermo and then directly north to cut the northern coastal road. This was followed by an eastward advance north of Etna towards Messina, supported by a series of amphibious landings on the north coast, that propelled Patton’s troops into Messina shortly before the first elements of Eighth Army. The defending German and Italian forces were unable to prevent the Allied capture of the island, but succeeded in evacuating most of their troops to the mainland, the last leaving on August 17, 1943. Allied forces gained experience in opposed amphibious operations, coalition warfare, and mass airborne drops.
The Italian Campaign

After the successful invasion of Sicily, forces of the British Eighth Army, still under Montgomery, landed in the “toe” of Italy on September 3, 1943 in Operation Baytown, the day the Italian government agreed to an armistice with the Allies. The armistice was publicly announced on September 8 by two broadcasts, first by Eisenhower and then a proclamation by Marshal Badoglio. Although the German forces prepared to defend without Italian assistance, only two of their divisions opposite the Eighth Army and one at Salerno were not tied up disarming the Italian Army.

On September 9, forces of the U.S. Fifth Army, expecting little resistance, landed against heavy German resistance at Salerno in Operation Avalanche; in addition, British forces landed at Taranto in Operation Slapstick, which was almost unopposed. There had been a hope that with the surrender of the Italian government, the Germans would withdraw to the north, since at the time Adolf Hitler had been persuaded that Southern Italy was strategically unimportant. However, this was not to be, though the Eighth Army was able to make relatively easy progress up the eastern coast, capturing the port of Bari and the important airfields around Foggia.

The American forces took possession of Rome on June 4, 1944. The German Tenth Army were allowed to get away and in the next few weeks were responsible for doubling the Allied casualties in the previous few months.

The Allies’ final offensive commenced with massive aerial and artillery bombardments on April 9, 1945. By April 18, Eighth Army forces in the east had broken through the Argenta Gap and sent armor racing forward in an encircling move to meet the US IV Corps advancing from the Apennines in Central Italy and trap the remaining defenders of Bologna.

As April came to an end, Army Group C, the Axis forces in Italy, was retreating on all fronts and had lost most of its fighting strength, left with little option but surrender. General Heinrich von
Vietinghoff, who had taken command of Army Group C after Kesselring was transferred to become Commander-in-Chief of the Western Front (OB West) in March 1945, signed the instrument of surrender on behalf of the German armies in Italy on April 29, formally bringing hostilities to an end on May 2, 1945.

Attributions

- The Sicilian Campaign
  - “Troops_from_51st_Highland_Division_unloading_store
to_from_tank_landing_craft_on_the_opening_day_of_the_Ali
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The Tehran Conference was a strategy meeting of Joseph Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill from November 28 to December 1, 1943, resulting in the Western Allies’ commitment to open a second front against Nazi Germany.

**Learning Objective**

List the agreements reached by the parties participating in the Tehran Conference

**Key Points**

- The Tehran Conference was the first World War II conference of the “Big Three” Allied leaders.
- Although the leaders arrived with differing objectives, the main outcome of the Tehran Conference was the Western Allies’ commitment to open a second front against Nazi Germany, including an invasion on France.
- Iran and Turkey were discussed in detail, with
Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin all agreeing to support Iran's government and the Soviet Union pledging support to Turkey if they entered the war.

- After the conference, the Yugoslav Partisans were given full Allied support and Allied support to the Yugoslav Chetniks was halted as they were believed to be cooperating with the occupying Germans rather than fighting them.
- The invasion of France on June 6, 1944 took place about as planned.

**Key Term**

**Big Three**

The leaders of the main three countries that together opposed the Axis powers during the Second World War: the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union, namely Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin.

**Overview**

The Tehran Conference (code named Eureka) was a strategy meeting of Joseph Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston
Churchill from November 28 to December 1, 1943. It was held in the
Soviet Union’s embassy in Tehran, Iran and was the first World War
II conference of the “Big Three” Allied leaders (the Soviet Union,
the United States, and the United Kingdom). It closely followed the
Cairo Conference which took place on November 22-26 1943, and
preceded the 1945 Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Although the
three leaders arrived with differing objectives, the main outcome
of the Tehran Conference was the Western Allies’ commitment to
open a second front against Nazi Germany. The conference also
addressed the Allies’ relations with Turkey and Iran, operations in
Yugoslavia and against Japan, and the envisaged post-war
settlement. A separate protocol signed at the conference pledged
the Big Three to recognize Iran’s independence.

Proceedings

The conference was to convene at 4 p.m. on November 28, 1943.
Stalin arrived early, followed by Roosevelt, who brought in his
wheelchair from his accommodation adjacent to the venue.
Roosevelt, who had traveled 7,000 miles (11,000 km) to attend and
whose health was already deteriorating, met Stalin for the first
time. Churchill, walking with his General Staff from their
accommodations nearby, arrived half an hour later.

The U.S. and Great Britain wanted to secure the cooperation of
the Soviet Union in defeating Germany. Stalin agreed, but at a price:
the U.S. and Britain would accept Soviet domination of eastern
Europe, support the Yugoslav Partisans, and agree to a westward
shift of the border between Poland and the Soviet Union.

The leaders then turned to the conditions under which the
Western Allies would open a new front by invading northern France
(Operation Overlord), as Stalin had pressed them to do since 1941.
Up to this point Churchill had advocated the expansion of joint
operations of British, American, and Commonwealth forces in the
Mediterranean, as Overlord in 1943 was physically impossible due to a lack of shipping, which left the Mediterranean and Italy as viable goals for 1943. It was agreed Overlord would occur by May 1944; Stalin agreed to support it by launching a concurrent major offensive on Germany’s eastern front to divert German forces from northern France.

Iran and Turkey were discussed in detail. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin all agreed to support Iran’s government. In addition, the Soviet Union was required to pledge support to Turkey if that country entered the war. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin agreed that it would also be most desirable if Turkey entered on the Allies’ side before the year was out.

Despite accepting the above arrangements, Stalin dominated the conference, using the prestige of the Soviet victory at the Battle of Kursk to get his way. Roosevelt attempted to cope with Stalin’s onslaught of demands, but was able to do little except appease him. Churchill argued for the invasion of Italy in 1943, then Overlord in 1944, on the basis that Overlord was physically impossible in 1943 and it would be unthinkable to do anything major until it could be launched.

Churchill proposed to Stalin a moving westwards of Poland, which Stalin accepted, giving the Poles industrialized German land to the west and gave up marshlands to the east while providing a territorial buffer to the Soviet Union against invasion.

**Decisions**

The declaration issued by the three leaders on conclusion of the conference on December 1, 1943, recorded the following military conclusions:

1. The Yugoslav Partisans should be supported by supplies and equipment and also by commando operations.
2. It would be desirable for Turkey to enter war on the side of the Allies before the end of the year.

3. The leaders took note of Stalin’s statement that if Turkey found herself at war with Germany and as a result Bulgaria declared war on Turkey or attacked her, the Soviet Union would immediately be at war with Bulgaria. The Conference further noted that this could be mentioned in the forthcoming negotiations to bring Turkey into the war.

4. The cross-channel invasion of France (Operation Overlord) would be launched during May 1944 in conjunction with an operation against southern France. The latter operation would be as strong as availability of landing-craft permitted. The Conference further noted Joseph Stalin’s statement that the Soviet forces would launch an offensive at about the same time with the object of preventing the German forces from transferring from the Eastern to the Western Front.

5. The leaders agreed that the military staffs of the Three Powers should keep in close touch with each other in regard to the impending operations in Europe. In particular, it was agreed that a cover plan to mislead the enemy about these operations should be concerted between the staffs concerned.

Results

The Yugoslav Partisans were given full Allied support, and Allied support to the Yugoslav Chetniks was halted as they were believed to be cooperating with the occupying Germans rather than fighting them. The Communist Partisans under Tito took power in Yugoslavia as the Germans retreated from the Balkans.

Turkey’s president conferred with Roosevelt and Churchill at the Cairo Conference in November 1943 and promised to enter the war when it was fully armed. By August 1944 Turkey broke off relations with Germany. In February 1945, Turkey declared war on Germany.
and Japan, which may have been a symbolic move that allowed Turkey to join the future United Nations.

The invasion of France on June 6, 1944 took place about as planned, and the supporting invasion of southern France also occurred (Operation Dragoon). The Soviets launched a major offensive against the Germans on June 22, 1944 (Operation Bagration).

![Tehran Conference 1943: The “Big Three.” From left to right: Joseph Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill on the portico of the Russian Embassy during the Tehran Conference to discuss the European Theatre in 1943. Churchill is shown in the uniform of a Royal Air Force air commodore.](image)

Attributions

- The Tehran Conference
The End of the War

31.7: The End of the War

31.7.1: The Invasion of Normandy

The Western Allies of World War II launched the largest amphibious invasion in history when they assaulted Normandy, located on the northern coast of France, on June 6, 1944. They were able to establish a beachhead after a successful “D-Day,” the first day of the invasion.

Learning Objective

Outline the events of the Invasion of Normandy

Key Points

- The Normandy invasion began with overnight parachute and glider landings, massive air attacks, and naval bombardments.
- In the early morning, amphibious landings on five
beaches code named Sword, Juno, Gold, Omaha, and Utah began. During the evening, the remaining elements of the airborne divisions landed.

- In the months leading up to the invasion, the Allies conducted a substantial military deception, code named Operation Bodyguard, that successfully misled the Germans as to the date and location of the main Allied landings.
- The invasion was costly in terms of men for the Allies, but the defeat inflicted on the Germans was one of the largest of the war and led to the loss of the German position in most of France.

**Key Terms**

**Operation Overlord**

The code name for the Invasion of Normandy, the Allied operation that launched the successful invasion of German-occupied Western Europe during World War II.

**D-Day**

The landing operations on Tuesday, June 6, 1944, the first day of the Allied invasion of Normandy in Operation Overlord during World War II.
Overview

The Western Allies of World War II launched the largest amphibious invasion in history when they assaulted Normandy, located on the northern coast of France, on June 6, 1944. The invaders were able to establish a beachhead as part of Operation Overlord after a successful “D-Day,” the first day of the invasion.

Allied land forces came from the United States, Britain, Canada, and Free France. In the weeks following the invasion, Polish forces and contingents from Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, and the Netherlands participated in the ground campaign; most also provided air and naval support alongside elements of the Royal Australian Air Force, the Royal New Zealand Air Force, and the Royal Norwegian Navy.

The Normandy invasion began with overnight parachute and glider landings, massive air attacks, and naval bombardments. In the early morning, amphibious landings on five beaches code named Sword, Juno, Gold, Omaha, and Utah began. During the evening the remaining elements of the airborne divisions landed. Land forces used on D-Day sailed from bases along the south coast of England, most importantly Portsmouth.

The Allies failed to reach their goals for the first day, but gained a tenuous foothold that they gradually expanded when they captured the port at Cherbourg on June 26 and the city of Caen on July 21. A failed counterattack by German forces on August 8 led to 50,000 soldiers of the 7th Army being trapped in the Falaise pocket. The Allies launched an invasion of southern France (code-named Operation Dragoon) on August 15, and the Liberation of Paris followed on August 25. German forces retreated across the Seine on August 30, 1944, marking the close of Operation Overlord.
D-Day: The Normandy Landings

The Normandy landings (code named Operation Neptune) on Tuesday, June 6, 1944, (termed D-Day) were the Allied invasion of Normandy in Operation Overlord during World War II. The largest seaborne invasion in history, the operation began the liberation of German-occupied northwestern Europe from Nazi control and contributed to the Allied victory on the Western Front.

Planning for the operation began in 1943. In the months leading up to the invasion, the Allies conducted a substantial military deception, code named Operation Bodyguard, to mislead the Germans as to the date and location of the main Allied landings. The weather on D-Day was far from ideal, but postponing would have meant a delay of at least two weeks as the invasion planners had requirements for the phase of the moon, the tides, and the time of day that meant only a few days in each month were suitable. Adolf
Hitler placed German Field Marshal Erwin Rommel in command of German forces and of developing fortifications along the Atlantic Wall in anticipation of an Allied invasion.

The amphibious landings were preceded by extensive aerial and naval bombardment and an airborne assault—the landing of 24,000 American, British, and Canadian airborne troops shortly after midnight. Allied infantry and armored divisions began landing on the coast of France at 06:30. The target 50-mile stretch of the Normandy coast was divided into five sectors: Utah, Omaha, Gold, Juno, and Sword. Strong winds blew the landing craft east of their intended positions, particularly at Utah and Omaha. The men landed under heavy fire from gun emplacements overlooking the beaches, and the shore was mined and covered with obstacles such as wooden stakes, metal tripods, and barbed wire, making the work of the beach-clearing teams difficult and dangerous. Casualties were heaviest at Omaha, with its high cliffs. At Gold, Juno, and Sword, several fortified towns were cleared in house-to-house fighting, and two major gun emplacements at Gold were disabled using specialized tanks.

The Allies failed to achieve any of their goals on the first day. Carentan, St. Lô, and Bayeux remained in German hands, and Caen, a major objective, was not captured until July 21. Only two of the beaches (Juno and Gold) were linked on the first day, and all five beachheads were not connected until June 12; however, the operation gained a foothold which the Allies gradually expanded over the coming months. German casualties on D-Day have been estimated at 4,000 to 9,000 men. Allied casualties were at least 10,000, with 4,414 confirmed dead. Museums, memorials, and war cemeteries in the area now host many visitors each year.
Assessment and Significance

The Normandy landings were the first successful opposed landings across the English Channel in over eight centuries. They were costly in terms of men, but the defeat inflicted on the Germans was one of the largest of the war. Strategically, the campaign led to the loss of the German position in most of France and the secure establishment of a new major front. In larger context, the Normandy landings helped the Soviets on the Eastern Front, who were facing the bulk of the German forces and to a certain extent contributed to the shortening of the conflict there.

Although there was a shortage of artillery ammunition, at no time were the Allies critically short of any necessity. This was a
remarkable achievement considering they did not hold a port until Cherbourg fell. By the time of the breakout the Allies also enjoyed considerable superiority in numbers of troops (approximately 7:2) and armored vehicles (approximately 4:1), which helped overcome the natural advantages the terrain gave to the German defenders.

Allied intelligence and counterintelligence efforts were successful beyond expectations. The Operation Fortitude deception before the invasion kept German attention focused on the Pas de Calais, and high-quality German forces were kept in this area, away from Normandy, until July. Prior to the invasion, few German reconnaissance flights took place over Britain, and those that did saw only the dummy staging areas. Ultra decrypts of German communications were helpful as well, exposing German dispositions and revealing their plans such as the Mortain counterattack.

Allied air operations also contributed significantly to the invasion via close tactical support, interdiction of German lines of communication (preventing timely movement of supplies and reinforcements—particularly the critical Panzer units), and rendering the Luftwaffe ineffective in Normandy. Although the impact upon armored vehicles was less than expected, air activity intimidated these units and cut their supplies.

Despite initial heavy losses in the assault phase, Allied morale remained high. Casualty rates among all the armies were tremendous, and the Commonwealth forces had to use a recently created category—Double Intense—to describe them.

Attributions

- The Invasion of Normandy

The Yalta Conference, held from February 4 to 11, 1945, was the World War II meeting of the heads of government of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union to discuss Europe's post-war reorganization.

Learning Objective

Compare the Yalta Conference to the Tehran Conference

Key Points

- The meeting was intended mainly to discuss the re-establishment of the nations of war-torn Europe, especially focusing on German reparations and post-war occupation as well as Poland.
- Yalta was the second of three wartime conferences among the Big Three, preceded by the Tehran Conference in 1943 and followed by the Potsdam Conference in July 1945.
- Each leader had an agenda for the Yalta
Conference: Roosevelt wanted Soviet support in the U.S. Pacific War against Japan and Soviet participation in the UN; Churchill pressed for free elections and democratic governments in Eastern and Central Europe (specifically Poland); and Stalin demanded a Soviet sphere of political influence in Eastern and Central Europe.

- Stalin pledged to permit free elections in Poland, “because the Russians had greatly sinned against Poland.”
- It was decided that Germany would undergo demilitarization and denazification and be split into four occupied zones: Soviet, British, French, and American zones.

**Key Terms**

**reparations**

Payments intended to cover damage or injury inflicted during a war.

**denazification**

An Allied initiative to rid German and Austrian society, culture, press, economy, judiciary, and politics of any remnants of the National Socialist ideology (Nazism). It was carried out by removing from positions of power and influence those who had been Nazi Party members and disbanding or rendering impotent the
organizations associated with Nazism.

**Declaration of Liberated Europe**
A declaration as created by Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Joseph Stalin during the Yalta Conference. It was a promise that allowed the people of Europe “to create democratic institutions of their own choice.”

**Overview**

The Yalta Conference, sometimes called the Crimea Conference and code named the Argonaut Conference, was held from February 4 to 11, 1945. This World War II meeting comprised the heads of government of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, represented by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Premier Joseph Stalin, respectively, to discuss Europe’s post-war reorganization. The conference convened in the Livadia Palace near Yalta in Crimea.

The meeting was intended mainly to discuss the re-establishment of the nations of war-torn Europe. Within a few years, with the Cold War dividing the continent, Yalta had become a subject of intense controversy. To a degree, it has remained controversial.

Yalta was the second of three wartime conferences among the Big Three, preceded by the Tehran Conference in 1943 and followed by the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, attended by Stalin, Churchill (who was replaced halfway through by the newly elected British Prime Minister Clement Attlee), and Harry S. Truman, Roosevelt’s successor. The Yalta conference was a crucial turning point in the Cold War.
The Conference

All three leaders attempted to establish an agenda for governing post-war Europe and keep peace between post-war countries. On the Eastern Front, the front line at the end of December 1943 remained in the Soviet Union but by August 1944, Soviet forces were inside Poland and Romania as part of their drive west. By the time of the Conference, Red Army Marshal Georgy Zhukov’s forces were 40 miles from Berlin. Stalin's felt his position at the conference was so strong that he could dictate terms. According to U.S. delegation member and future Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, “[i]t was not a question of what we would let the Russians do, but what we could get the Russians to do.” Moreover, Roosevelt hoped for a commitment from Stalin to participate in the United Nations.

Each leader had an agenda for the Yalta Conference: Roosevelt wanted Soviet support in the U.S. Pacific War against Japan, specifically for the planned invasion of Japan (Operation August Storm), as well as Soviet participation in the UN; Churchill pressed for free elections and democratic governments in Eastern and Central Europe (specifically Poland); and Stalin demanded a Soviet sphere of political influence in Eastern and Central Europe, an essential aspect of the USSR's national security strategy.

Poland was the first item on the Soviet agenda. Stalin stated that “For the Soviet government, the question of Poland was one of honor” and security because Poland had served as a historical corridor for forces attempting to invade Russia. In addition, Stalin stated that “because the Russians had greatly sinned against Poland,” “the Soviet government was trying to atone for those sins.” Stalin concluded that “Poland must be strong” and that “the Soviet Union is interested in the creation of a mighty, free and independent Poland.” Accordingly, Stalin stipulated that Polish government-in-exile demands were not negotiable: the Soviet Union would keep the territory of eastern Poland they had already annexed in 1939, and Poland was to be compensated by extending its western borders.
at the expense of Germany. Comporting with his prior statement, Stalin promised free elections in Poland despite the Soviet-sponsored provisional government recently installed in Polish territories occupied by the Red Army.

The Declaration of Liberated Europe was created by Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Joseph Stalin during the Yalta Conference. It was a promise that allowed the people of Europe “to create democratic institutions of their own choice.” The declaration pledged, “the earliest possible establishment through free elections governments responsive to the will of the people.” This is similar to the statements of the Atlantic Charter, which says, “the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live.” Stalin broke the pledge by encouraging Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and many more countries to construct a Communist government instead of letting the people construct their own. These countries later became known as Stalin’s Satellite Nations.

Key Points

The key points from the meeting are as follows:

- Agreement to the priority of the unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany. After the war, Germany and Berlin would be split into four occupied zones.
- Stalin agreed that France would have a fourth occupation zone in Germany that would be formed out of the American and British zones.
- Germany would undergo demilitarization and denazification.
- German reparations were partly to be in the form of forced labor to repair damage that Germany had inflicted on its victims.
- Creation of a reparation council located in the Soviet Union.
• The Polish eastern border would follow the Curzon Line, and Poland would receive territorial compensation in the west from Germany.
• Stalin pledged to permit free elections in Poland.
• Citizens of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia were to be handed over to their respective countries, regardless of their consent.
• Roosevelt obtained a commitment by Stalin to participate in the UN.
• Stalin requested that all of the 16 Soviet Socialist Republics would be granted UN membership. This was taken into consideration, but 14 republics were denied.
• Stalin agreed to enter the fight against the Empire of Japan.
• Nazi war criminals were to be found and put on trial.
• A “Committee on Dismemberment of Germany” was to be set up to decide whether Germany would be divided into six nations.

Yalta Conference: Yalta Conference in February 1945 with (from left to right) Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin.
Attributions

• The Yalta Conference

The war in Europe concluded with an invasion of Germany by the Western Allies and the Soviet Union, culminating in the capture of Berlin by Soviet and Polish troops and the subsequent German unconditional surrender on May 8, 1945.

**Learning Objective**

Summarize the last weeks of the war and the final days of the Nazi Regime

**Key Points**

- By the time the Allied forces launched an invasion of Germany from the Western and Eastern front, Allied victory in Europe was inevitable.
- Having gambled his future ability to defend Germany on the Ardennes offensive and lost, Hitler had no strength left to stop the powerful Allied armies.
- In early April, the Western Allies finally pushed
forward in Italy and swept across western Germany, while Soviet and Polish forces stormed Berlin in late April.

- On April 30, 1945, the Reichstag was captured, signalling the military defeat of Nazi Germany.
- On that same day, Hitler committed suicide and was succeeded by Grand Admiral Karl Dönitz.
- As the Allies advanced on Germany, they began to discover the extent of the Holocaust and liberated many concentration camps along their route.

**Key Terms**

**Joseph Goebbels**

A German politician and Reich Minister of Propaganda in Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1945; one of Adolf Hitler's close associates and most devoted followers, he was known for his skills in public speaking and his deep and virulent antisemitism, which led to his support of the extermination of the Jews in the Holocaust.

**Eva Braun**

The longtime companion of Adolf Hitler and for less than 40 hours, his wife.

**Battle of Berlin**

The final major offensive of the European theatre of World War II when the Soviet Red Army invaded Berlin,
Overview

On December 16, 1944, Germany made a last attempt on the Western Front by using most of its remaining reserves to launch a massive counter-offensive in the Ardennes to split the Western Allies, encircle large portions of Western Allied troops, and capture their primary supply port at Antwerp to prompt a political settlement. By January, the offensive was repulsed with no strategic objectives fulfilled. In Italy, the Western Allies remained stalemated at the German defensive line. In mid-January 1945, the Soviets and Poles attacked in Poland, pushing from the Vistula to the Oder river in Germany, and overran East Prussia. On February 4, U.S., British, and Soviet leaders met for the Yalta Conference. They agreed on the occupation of post-war Germany and when the Soviet Union would join the war against Japan.

In February, the Soviets entered Silesia and Pomerania, while Western Allies entered western Germany and closed to the Rhine river. By March, the Western Allies crossed the Rhine north and south of the Ruhr, encircling the German Army Group B, while the Soviets advanced to Vienna. In early April, the Western Allies finally pushed forward in Italy and swept across western Germany, while Soviet and Polish forces stormed Berlin in late April. American and Soviet forces joined on Elbe river on April 25. On April 30, 1945, the Reichstag was captured, signalling the military defeat of Nazi Germany.

Several changes in leadership occurred during this period. On April 12, President Roosevelt died and was succeeded by Harry Truman. Benito Mussolini was killed by Italian partisans on April 28.
Two days later, as the Battle of Berlin raged above him, realizing that all was lost and not wishing to suffer Mussolini’s fate, German dictator Adolf Hitler committed suicide in his Führerbunker along with Eva Braun, his long-term partner whom he married less than 40 hours before their joint suicide. In his will, Hitler dismissed Reichsmarschall Hermann Göring, his second-in-command, and Interior minister Heinrich Himmler after each of them separately tried to seize control of the crumbling Third Reich. Hitler appointed his successors as follows; Großadmiral Karl Dönitz as the new Reichspräsident (“President of Germany”) and Joseph Goebbels as the new Reichskanzler (Chancellor of Germany). However, Goebbels committed suicide the following day, leaving Dönitz as the sole leader of Germany.

German forces surrendered in Italy on April 29. Total and unconditional surrender was signed on May 7 to be effective by the end of May 8. German Army Group Centre resisted in Prague until May 11.

At the end of the war, millions of people were homeless, the European economy had collapsed, and much of the European industrial infrastructure had been destroyed.

The Western Allied Invasion of Germany

The Western Allied invasion of Germany was coordinated by the Western Allies during the final months of hostilities in the European theater of World War II. The Allied invasion of Germany started with the Western Allies crossing the River Rhine in March 1945 before overrunning all of western Germany from the Baltic in the north to Austria in the south before the Germans surrendered on May 8, 1945. This is known as the “Central Europe Campaign” in United States military histories and is often considered the end of the second World War in Europe.

By the beginning of the Central Europe Campaign, Allied victory in
Europe was inevitable. Having gambled his future ability to defend Germany on the Ardennes offensive and lost, Hitler had no strength left to stop the powerful Allied armies. The Western Allies still had to fight, often bitterly, for victory. Even when the hopelessness of the German situation became obvious to his most loyal subordinates, Hitler refused to admit defeat. Only when Soviet artillery was falling around his Berlin headquarters bunker did he begin to perceive the final outcome.

The crossing of the Rhine, the encirclement and reduction of the Ruhr, and the sweep to the Elbe-Mulde line and the Alps all established the final campaign on the Western Front as a showcase for Allied superiority in maneuver warfare. Drawing on the experience gained during the campaign in Normandy and the Allied advance from Paris to the Rhine, the Western Allies demonstrated in Central Europe their capability to absorb the lessons of the past. By attaching mechanized infantry units to armored divisions, they created a hybrid of strength and mobility that served them well in the pursuit warfare through Germany. Key to the effort was the logistical support that kept these forces fueled and the determination to maintain the forward momentum at all costs. These mobile forces made great thrusts to isolate pockets of German troops, which were mopped up by additional infantry following close behind. The Allies rapidly eroded any remaining ability to resist.

The Battle of Berlin

The Battle of Berlin, designated the Berlin Strategic Offensive Operation by the Soviet Union, was the final major offensive of the European theater of World War II. Following the Vistula–Oder Offensive of January–February 1945, the Red Army temporarily halted on a line 37 miles east of Berlin. When the offensive resumed on April 16, two Soviet army groups
attacked Berlin from the east and south, while a third overran German forces positioned north of Berlin.

The first defensive preparations at the outskirts of Berlin were made on March 20 under the newly appointed commander of Army Group Vistula, General Gotthard Heinrici. Before the main battle in Berlin commenced, the Red Army encircled the city after successful battles of the Seelow Heights and Halbe. On April 20, 1945, the 1st Belorussian Front led by Marshal Georgy Zhukov started shelling Berlin’s city center, while Marshal Ivan Konev’s 1st Ukrainian Front pushed from the south through the last formations of Army Group Centre. Defenses in Berlin’s city center were mainly led by General Helmuth Weidling. These units consisted of several depleted and disorganized Wehrmacht and Waffen-SS divisions, along with poorly trained Volkssturm and Hitler Youth members. Within the next few days, the Red Army reached the city center, where close-quarters combat raged.

The city’s garrison surrendered to Soviet forces on May 2, but fighting continued to the northwest, west, and southwest of the city until the end of the war in Europe on May 8 as German units fought westward so that they could surrender to the Western Allies rather than to the Soviets.

Battle of Berlin: After the battle, Soviet soldiers hoist the Soviet flag on the balcony of the Hotel Adlon in Berlin
Liberation of Concentration Camps

As the Allies advanced on Germany, they began to discover the extent of the Holocaust. The first major camp to be encountered by Allied troops, Majdanek, was discovered by the advancing Soviets on July 23, 1944. Chełmno was liberated by the Soviets on January 20, 1945. Auschwitz was liberated, also by the Soviets, on January 27, 1945; Buchenwald by the Americans on April 11; Bergen-Belsen by the British on April 15; Dachau by the Americans on April 29; Ravensbrück by the Soviets on the same day; Mauthausen by the Americans on May 5; and Theresienstadt by the Soviets on May 8. Treblinka, Sobibór, and Bełżec were never liberated, but were destroyed by the Nazis in 1943. Colonel William W. Quinn of the US Seventh Army said of Dachau: “There our troops found sights, sounds, and stenches horrible beyond belief, cruelties so enormous as to be incomprehensible to the normal mind.”

In most of the camps discovered by the Soviets, almost all the prisoners had already been removed, leaving only a few thousand alive—7,600 inmates were found in Auschwitz, including 180 children who had been experimented on by doctors. Some 60,000 prisoners were discovered at Bergen-Belsen by the British 11th Armoured Division, 13,000 corpses lay unburied, and another 10,000 died from typhus or malnutrition over the following weeks. The British forced the remaining SS guards to gather up the corpses and place them in mass graves.

The BBC’s Richard Dimbleby described the scenes that greeted him and the British Army at Belsen:

Here over an acre of ground lay dead and dying people. You could not see which was which... The living lay with their heads against the corpses and around them moved the awful, ghostly procession of emaciated, aimless people, with nothing to do and with no hope of life, unable to move out of your way, unable to look at the terrible sights around them...
Babies had been born here, tiny wizened things that could not live... A mother, driven mad, screamed at a British sentry to give her milk for her child, and thrust the tiny mite into his arms... He opened the bundle and found the baby had been dead for days. This day at Belsen was the most horrible of my life.

*Attributions*

- The Allied Push to Berlin

Liberation: Starving prisoners in Mauthausen camp liberated on May 5, 1945.
The Allied Push to Berlin

- “Western Allied invasion of Germany.”
- “Ebensee_concentration_camp_prisoners_1945.jpg.”
- “Bundesarchiv_Bild_183-R77767,_Berlin,_Rotarmisten_Unter_den_Linden.jpg.”
31.7.4: Okinawa and Iwo Jima

Hard-fought battles on the Japanese home islands of Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and others resulted in horrific casualties on both sides but finally produced a Japanese defeat.

Learning Objective

Connect the battles for Okinawa and Iwo Jima with the greater American “island hopping” strategy

Key Points

- The Battle of Iwo Jima (February 19 – March 26, 1945) was a major battle in which the U.S. Marines landed on and eventually captured the island of Iwo Jima from the Japanese Imperial Army during World War II.
- After the heavy losses incurred in the battle, the strategic value of the island became controversial; it was useless to the U.S. Army as a staging base and useless to the U.S. Navy as a fleet base.
• The largest and bloodiest American battle of the Pacific theater came at Okinawa, as the U.S. sought airbases for 3,000 B-29 bombers and 240 squadrons of B-17 bombers for the intense bombardment of Japan's home islands in preparation for a full-scale invasion in late 1945.

• At Okinawa, the Americans suffered 75,000 casualties on the ground; 94% of the Japanese soldiers died along with many civilians.

• Many military historians believe that the Okinawa campaign led directly to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as a means of avoiding the planned ground invasion of the Japanese mainland.

---

Key Terms

**island hopping**

A military strategy employed by the Allies in the Pacific War against Japan to bypass heavily fortified Japanese positions and instead concentrate the limited Allied resources on strategically important islands that were not well-defended but were capable of supporting the drive to the main islands of Japan.

**“typhoon of steel”**

American nickname for the battle of Okinawa, named for the ferocity of the fighting, the intensity of Japanese kamikaze attacks, and the sheer numbers of
Allied ships and armored vehicles that assaulted the island.

**Iwo Jima**

The battle of Iwo Jima (“Operation Detachment”) in February 1945 was one of the bloodiest battles fought by the Americans in the Pacific War. Iwo Jima was an eight-square-mile island situated halfway between Tokyo and the Mariana Islands. Holland Smith, the commander of the invasion force, aimed to capture the island and use its three airfields as bases to carry out air attacks against the Home Islands. Lt. General Tadamichi Kuribayashi, the commander of the island’s defense, knew that he could not win the battle but hoped to make the Americans suffer far more than they could endure.

From early 1944 until the days leading up to the invasion, Kuribayashi transformed the island into a massive network of bunkers, hidden guns, and 11 miles of underground tunnels. The heavy American naval and air bombardment did little but drive the Japanese further underground, making their positions impervious to enemy fire. Their pillboxes and bunkers were all connected so that if one was knocked out it could be reoccupied again. The network of bunkers and pillboxes greatly favored the defender.

Starting in mid-June 1944, Iwo Jima came under sustained aerial bombardment and naval artillery fire. However, Kuribayashi’s hidden guns and defenses survived the constant bombardment virtually unscathed. On February 19, 1945, some 30,000 men of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Marine Divisions landed on the southeast coast of Iwo, just under Mount Suribachi, where most of the island’s defenses were concentrated. For some time, they did not come
under fire. This was part of Kuribayashi’s plan to hold fire until the landing beaches were full. As soon as the Marines pushed inland to a line of enemy bunkers, they came under devastating machine gun and artillery fire which cut down many of the men. By the end of the day, the Marines reached the west coast of the island, but their losses were appalling: almost 2,000 men killed or wounded.

On February 23, the 28th Marine Regiment reached the summit of Suribachi, prompting the now famous Raising the Flag on Iwo Jima picture. Navy Secretary James Forrestal, upon seeing the flag, remarked “there will be a Marine Corps for the next 500 years.” The flag raising is often cited as the most reproduced photograph of all time and became the archetypal representation not only of that battle, but of the entire Pacific War. For the rest of February, the Americans pushed north, and by March 1 had taken two-thirds of the island, but it was not until March 26 that the island was finally secured. The Japanese fought to the last man, killing 6,800 Marines and wounding nearly 20,000 more. The Japanese losses totaled well over 20,000 men killed, and only 1,083 prisoners were taken. Historians debate whether it was strategically worth the casualties sustained.
Iwo Jima: Raising the Flag on Iwo Jima, by Joe Rosenthal, became the only photograph to win the Pulitzer Prize for Photography in the same year as its publication, and came to be regarded in the United States as one of the most significant and recognizable images of the war.

Okinawa

The Battle of Okinawa, code named Operation Iceberg, was a series of battles fought in the Japanese Ryukyu Islands, centered on the island of Okinawa. It included the largest amphibious assault in the Pacific War during World War II, the April 1, 1945 invasion of Okinawa itself. The 82-day-long battle lasted from April 1 until June 22, 1945. After a long campaign of island hopping, the Allies were approaching Japan and planned to use Okinawa, a large island only 340 miles away from mainland Japan, as a base for air operations for the planned invasion of Honshu, the Japanese mainland. Four divisions of the U.S. 10th Army (the 7th, 27th, 77th, and 96th) and two
Marine Divisions (the 1st and 6th) fought on the island, supported by naval, amphibious, and tactical air forces.

The battle has been referred to as the “typhoon of steel” in English, and tetsu no ame (“rain of steel”) in Japanese. The nicknames refer to the ferocity of the fighting, the intensity of Japanese kamikaze attacks, and the sheer numbers of Allied ships and armored vehicles that assaulted the island. The battle was one of the bloodiest in the Pacific, with more than 82,000 direct casualties on both sides: 14,009 Allied deaths (over 12,500 Americans killed or missing) and 77,166 Japanese soldiers, excluding those who died from their injuries later. Some islands that saw major battles, such as Iwo Jima, were uninhabited or previously evacuated. Okinawa, by contrast, had a large indigenous civilian population. 42,000 to 150,000 local civilians were killed, committed suicide, or went missing, a significant proportion of the estimated prewar local population of 300,000.

As part of the naval operations surrounding the battle, the Japanese super-battleship Yamato was sunk and both sides lost considerable numbers of ships and aircraft. The military value of Okinawa “exceeded all hope.” After the battle, Okinawa provided a fleet anchorage, troop staging areas, and airfields in proximity to Japan in preparation for the planned invasion of Japan.

Many military historians believe that the Okinawa campaign led directly to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as a means of avoiding the planned ground invasion of the Japanese mainland. This view is explained by Victor Davis Hanson in his book *Ripples of Battle*:

...because the Japanese on Okinawa... were so fierce in their defense (even when cut off, and without supplies), and because casualties were so appalling, many American strategists looked for an alternative means to subdue mainland Japan, other than a direct invasion. This means presented itself, with the advent of atomic bombs, which worked admirably in convincing the Japanese to sue for
peace [unconditionally], without American casualties.

Island Hopping

Leapfrogging, also known as island hopping, was a military strategy employed by the Allies in the Pacific War against Japan and the Axis powers during World War II. The idea was to bypass heavily fortified Japanese positions and instead concentrate the limited Allied resources on strategically important islands that were not well-defended but were capable of supporting the drive to the main islands of Japan.

This strategy was possible in part because the Allies used submarine and air attacks to blockade and isolate Japanese bases, weakening their garrisons and reducing the Japanese ability to resupply and reinforce them. Thus troops on islands which had been bypassed, such as the major base at Rabaul, were useless to the Japanese war effort and left to “wither on the vine.” General Douglas MacArthur supported this strategy in his effort to regain the Philippines and it was implemented in late 1943 in Operation Cartwheel. While MacArthur claimed to have invented the strategy, it initially came out of the Navy.

Leapfrogging had a number of advantages. It would allow the United States forces to reach Japan quickly and not expend the time, manpower, and supplies to capture every Japanese-held island on the way. It would give the Allies the advantage of surprise and keep the Japanese off balance. The overall leapfrogging strategy would involve two prongs. A force led by Admiral Chester Nimitz, with a smaller land force and larger fleet, would advance north towards the island and capture the Gilbert and Marshall Islands and the Marianas, going in the direction of the Bonin Islands. The southern prong, led by General MacArthur and with larger land forces, would take the Solomons, New Guinea, and the Bismarck Archipelago, advancing toward the Philippines.
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31.7.5: The Potsdam Conference

In July 1945, Allied leaders met in Potsdam, Germany, confirmed earlier agreements about post-war Germany, and reiterated the demand for unconditional surrender of all Japanese forces, specifically stating that “the alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction.”

**Learning Objective**

Analyze the relations between the Allied nations at the Potsdam Conference

**Key Points**

- A few months after the surrender of Germany and the end of the war in Europe, the Allied leaders from the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom met in Potsdam, Germany to confirm the agreements decided at the Yalta Conference and discuss other post-war issues.
- America had won decisive battles against Japan, but
the Pacific war still continued.

- Since the Yalta Conference, Harry S. Truman succeeded Roosevelt after his death and Clement Attlee succeeded Churchill after the 1945 general election in the UK, shifting some of the existing dynamics among the nations.
- The Potsdam Agreements resulted in the military occupation and reconstruction of Germany and the entire European theater of War territory. It also included Germany’s demilitarization, reparations, and prosecution of war criminals.
- Truman mentioned an unspecified “powerful new weapon” to Stalin during the conference, a reference to the nuclear bombs just developed by the U.S.
- Towards the end of the conference, Japan was given an ultimatum to surrender or meet “prompt and utter destruction,” but Prime Minister Kantarō Suzuki did not respond.

Key Terms

**Clement Attlee**
A British politician who was the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1945 to 1951, taking over from Winston Churchill at the end of World War II.

**Yalta Conference**
A meeting in February 1945 between the three heads
of the main Allied forces in WWII, intended mainly to discuss the re-establishment of the nations of war-torn Europe.

**Manhattan Project**

A research and development project that produced the first nuclear weapons during World War II.

---

**Overview**

The Potsdam Conference was held at Cecilienhof, the home of Crown Prince Wilhelm in Potsdam, occupied Germany, from July 17 to August 2, 1945. Participants were the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The powers were represented by Communist Party General Secretary Joseph Stalin, Prime Ministers Winston Churchill and, later, Clement Attlee, and President Harry S. Truman.

Stalin, Churchill, and Truman—as well as Attlee, who participated alongside Churchill while awaiting the outcome of the 1945 general election and then became prime minister after the Labour Party's defeat of the Conservatives—gathered to decide how to administer defeated Nazi Germany, which had agreed to unconditional surrender nine weeks earlier on May 8 (V-E Day). The goals of the conference included the establishment of post-war order, peace treaty issues, and countering the effects of the war.

After the war, the Soviet Union converted the other countries of eastern Europe into Soviet Satellite states within the Eastern Bloc, such as the People's Republic of Poland, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the People’s Republic of Hungary, the Czechoslovak Republic, the People’s Republic of Romania, and the People’s
Republic of Albania. The Soviets later formed the puppet state of East Germany from the Soviet zone of German occupation.

**Relationships Among the Leaders**

In the five months since the Yalta Conference, a number of changes had taken place that greatly affected the relationships between the leaders. By July, the Red Army effectively controlled the Baltic states, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania, and fearing a Stalinist take-over, refugees were fleeing from these countries. Stalin had set up a communist government in Poland. He insisted that his control of Eastern Europe was a defensive measure against possible future attacks and claimed that it was a legitimate sphere of Soviet influence.

President Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, and Vice President Harry Truman assumed the presidency; his succession saw VE Day (Victory in Europe) within a month and VJ Day (Victory in Japan) on the horizon. During the war and in the name of Allied unity, Roosevelt had brushed off warnings of a potential domination by a Stalin dictatorship in part of Europe. While inexperienced in foreign affairs, Truman had closely followed the Allied progress during the war. George Lenczowski notes “despite the contrast between his relatively modest background and the international glamour of his aristocratic predecessor, [Truman] had the courage and resolution to reverse the policy that appeared to him naive and dangerous,” which was “in contrast to the immediate, often ad hoc moves and solutions dictated by the demands of the war.” With the end of the war, the priority of Allied unity was replaced with a new challenge, the nature of the relationship between the two emerging superpowers.

Truman was much more suspicious of communist moves than Roosevelt had been, and became increasingly suspicious of Soviet intentions under Stalin. Truman and his advisers saw Soviet actions
in Eastern Europe as aggressive expansionism, which was incompatible with the agreements Stalin committed to at Yalta the previous February. In addition, at the Potsdam Conference Truman became aware of possible complications elsewhere when Stalin objected to Churchill's proposal for an early Allied withdrawal from Iran ahead of the schedule agreed at the Tehran Conference. The Potsdam Conference marks the first and only time Truman would ever meet Stalin in person.

Potsdam Conference: The “Big Three”: Clement Attlee, Harry S. Truman and Joseph Stalin at the Potsdam Conference, circa 28 July – 1 August 1945

**Potsdam Agreements**

At the end of the conference, the three heads of government agreed on the following actions. All other issues would to be answered by the final peace conference to be called as soon as possible.
• Allied Chiefs of Staff at the Potsdam Conference would temporarily partition Vietnam at the 16th parallel (just North of Da Nang) for operational convenience.
• It was agreed that British forces would take the surrender of Japanese forces in Saigon for the southern half of Indochina, whilst Japanese troops in the northern half would surrender to the Chinese.
• Issuance of a statement of aims of the occupation of Germany by the Allies: demilitarization, denazification, democratization, decentralization, and decartelization.
• Division of Germany and Austria respectively into four occupation zones (earlier agreed in principle at Yalta), and the similar division of each capital, Berlin and Vienna, into four zones.
• Agreement on the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.
• Reversion of all German annexations in Europe, including Sudetenland, Alsace-Lorraine, Austria, and the westernmost parts of Poland.
• Germany's eastern border was to be shifted westwards to the Oder–Neisse line, effectively reducing Germany in size by approximately 25% compared to its 1937 borders. The territories east of the new border comprised East Prussia, Silesia, West Prussia, and two thirds of Pomerania. These areas were mainly agricultural, with the exception of Upper Silesia which was the second largest centre of German heavy industry.
• “Orderly and humane” expulsions of the German populations remaining beyond the new eastern borders of Germany from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, but not Yugoslavia.
• Agreement on war reparations to the Soviet Union from their zone of occupation in Germany.
• Ensuring that German standards of living did not exceed the European average.
• Destruction of German industrial war-potential through the destruction or control of all industry with military potential.
• A Provisional Government of National Unity recognized by all three powers should be created in Poland.
• Poles who were serving in the British Army should be free to return to Poland, with no security upon their return to the communist country guaranteed.
• The provisional western border of Poland should be the Oder–Neisse line, defined by the Oder and Neisse rivers.
• The Soviet Union declared it would settle the reparation claims of Poland from its own share of the overall reparation payments.

**Truman’s Secret Weapon**

Truman mentioned an unspecified “powerful new weapon” to Stalin during the conference. Towards the end of the meeting, Japan was given an ultimatum to surrender or meet “prompt and utter destruction,” which did not mention the new bomb. Prime minister Kantarō Suzuki did not respond. Therefore, the United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima on August 6 and Nagasaki on August 9, 1945. The justification was that both cities were legitimate military targets to end the war swiftly and preserve American lives. However, to some the timing has suggested that Truman did not want Stalin involved in the terms of Japan’s surrender. It is important to note that Truman delayed the Potsdam Conference in order to be sure of the functionality of this “powerful new weapon.” Notably, when Truman informed Stalin of the atomic bomb, he did not explicitly mention its atomic nature. Stalin, though, had full knowledge of the atomic bomb’s development due to Soviet spy networks inside the Manhattan Project, and told Truman at the conference to “make good use of this new addition to the Allied arsenal.”
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The Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki

On August 6, 1945, the United States dropped an atomic bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima in the first nuclear attack in history. Three days later, on August 9, the U.S. dropped another atomic bomb on Nagasaki, the last nuclear attack in history.

Learning Objective

Analyze the decision to drop the atomic bombs

Key Points

• In the final year of the war, the Allies prepared for what was anticipated to be a very costly invasion of the Japanese mainland, with estimates of half a million casualties on both sides.
• At the Potsdam Conference, the Allies called for the unconditional surrender of the Japanese armed forces, with the alternative being “prompt and utter
destruction.” The Japanese ignored this ultimatum, prompting the American government to plan a nuclear attack.

- On August 6, the U.S. dropped a uranium gun-type atomic bomb (Little Boy) on Hiroshima.
- American President Harry S. Truman called for Japan's surrender 16 hours later, warning them to “expect a rain of ruin from the air, the like of which has never been seen on this earth,” an ultimatum that was again ignored by the Japanese, who planned to continue fighting.
- Three days later, on August 9, the U.S. dropped a plutonium implosion-type bomb (Fat Man) on Nagasaki.
- Within the first two to four months of the bombings, the acute effects of the atomic bombings killed 90,000-146,000 people in Hiroshima and 39,000-80,000 in Nagasaki; roughly half of the deaths in each city occurred on the first day.
- On August 15, six days after the bombing of Nagasaki and the Soviet Union's declaration of war, Japan announced its surrender to the Allies.
- The bombings’ role in Japan's surrender and their ethical justification are still debated by historians and other scholars.
Overview

The United States, with the consent of the United Kingdom as laid down in the Quebec Agreement, dropped nuclear weapons on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6 and 9, 1945, during the final stage of World War II. The two bombings, which killed at least 129,000 people, remain the only use of nuclear weapons for warfare in history.

In the final year of the war, the Allies prepared for what was anticipated to be a very costly invasion of the Japanese mainland. This was preceded by a U.S. firebombing campaign that destroyed 67 Japanese cities. The war in Europe concluded when Nazi Germany signed its instrument of surrender on May 8, 1945. The Japanese, facing the same fate, refused to accept the Allies’ demands for unconditional surrender and the Pacific War continued. Together with the United Kingdom and China, the United States
called for the unconditional surrender of the Japanese armed forces in the Potsdam Declaration on July 26, 1945—the alternative being “prompt and utter destruction.” The Japanese responded to this ultimatum by ignoring it.

On July 16, 1945, the Allied Manhattan Project successfully detonated an atomic bomb in the New Mexico desert and by August had produced atomic weapons based on two alternate designs. The 509th Composite Group of the United States Army Air Forces (USAAF) was equipped with the specialized Silverplate version of the Boeing B-29 Superfortress, that could deliver them from Tinian in the Mariana Islands.

On August 6, the U.S. dropped a uranium gun-type atomic bomb (Little Boy) on Hiroshima. Six planes of the 509th Composite Group participated in this mission: one to carry the bomb (Enola Gay), one to take scientific measurements of the blast (The Great Artiste), the third to take photographs (Necessary Evil), while the others flew approximately an hour ahead to act as weather scouts. Bad weather would disqualify a target as the scientists insisted on visual delivery. American President Harry S. Truman called for Japan’s surrender 16 hours later, warning them to “expect a rain of ruin from the air, the like of which has never been seen on this earth.” Three days later, on August 9, the U.S. dropped a plutonium implosion-type bomb (Fat Man) on Nagasaki. Within the first two to four months of the bombings, the acute effects of the atomic bombings killed 90,000–146,000 people in Hiroshima and 39,000–80,000 in Nagasaki; roughly half of the deaths in each city occurred on the first day. During the following months, large numbers died from the effect of burns, radiation sickness, and other injuries, compounded by illness and malnutrition. In both cities, most of the dead were civilians, although Hiroshima had a sizable military garrison.

On August 15, six days after the bombing of Nagasaki and the Soviet Union’s declaration of war, Japan announced its surrender to the Allies. On September 2, it signed the instrument of surrender, effectively ending World War II. The bombings’ role in Japan’s surrender and their ethical justification are still debated.
Background

In 1945, the Pacific War between the Empire of Japan and the Allies entered its fourth year. The Japanese fought fiercely, ensuring that U.S. victory would come at an enormous cost. Of the 1.25 million battle casualties incurred by the United States in World War II, including both military personnel killed in action and wounded in action, nearly one million occurred from June 1944 to June 1945.

Even before the surrender of Nazi Germany on May 8, 1945, plans were underway for the largest operation of the Pacific War, Operation Downfall, the invasion of Japan. The operation had two parts: Operation Olympic and Operation Coronet. Set to begin in October 1945, Olympic involved a series of landings by the U.S. Sixth Army intended to capture the southern third of the southernmost main Japanese island, Kyūshū. Operation Olympic was to be followed in March 1946 by Operation Coronet, the capture of the Kantō Plain near Tokyo on the main Japanese island of Honshū by the U.S. First, Eighth, and Tenth Armies, as well as a Commonwealth Corps made up of Australian, British, and Canadian divisions.

Japan's geography made this invasion plan obvious to the Japanese; they were able to predict the Allied invasion plans.
accurately and adjust their defensive plan, Operation Ketsugō, accordingly. The Japanese planned an all-out defense of Kyūshū, with little left in reserve for any subsequent defense operations. Four veteran divisions were withdrawn from the Kwantung Army in Manchuria in March 1945 to strengthen the forces in Japan, and 45 new divisions were activated between February and May 1945.

The Americans were alarmed by the Japanese buildup, which was accurately tracked through Ultra intelligence. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson was sufficiently concerned about high American estimates of probable casualties to commission his own study by Quincy Wright and William Shockley. Wright and Shockley spoke with Colonels James McCormack and Dean Rusk and examined casualty forecasts by Michael E. DeBakey and Gilbert Beebe. Wright and Shockley estimated the invading Allies would suffer between 1.7 and 4 million casualties in such a scenario, of whom between 400,000 and 800,000 would be dead, while Japanese fatalities would have been around 5 to 10 million.

**Manhattan Project**

The discovery of nuclear fission by German chemists Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann in 1938, and its theoretical explanation by Lise Meitner and Otto Frisch, made the development of an atomic bomb a theoretical possibility. Fears that a German atomic bomb project would develop atomic weapons first, especially among scientists who were refugees from Nazi Germany and other fascist countries, were expressed in the Einstein-Szilard letter. This prompted preliminary research in the United States in late 1939, supported by President Roosevelt. Progress was slow until the arrival of the British MAUD Committee report in late 1941, which indicated that only 5–10 kilograms of isotopically enriched uranium-235 was needed for a bomb instead of tons of unenriched uranium and a neutron moderator (e.g. heavy water).
Working in collaboration with the United Kingdom and Canada, with their respective projects Tube Alloys and Chalk River Laboratories, the Manhattan Project, under the direction of Major General Leslie R. Groves, Jr., of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, designed and built the first atomic bombs. Groves appointed J. Robert Oppenheimer to organize and head the project’s Los Alamos Laboratory in New Mexico, where bomb design work was carried out. Two types of bombs were eventually developed. Little Boy was a gun-type fission weapon that used uranium-235, a rare isotope of uranium separated at the Clinton Engineer Works at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The other, known as a Fat Man, was a more powerful and efficient, but more complicated, implosion-type nuclear weapon that used plutonium created in nuclear reactors at Hanford, Washington. A test implosion weapon, the gadget, was detonated at Trinity Site, on July 16, 1945, near Alamogordo, New Mexico.

Decision to Drop the Second Bomb

After the Hiroshima bombing, Truman issued a statement announcing the use of the new weapon. He stated, “We may be grateful to Providence” that the German atomic bomb project had failed, and that the United States and its allies had “spent two billion dollars on the greatest scientific gamble in history—and won.” Truman then warned Japan: “If they do not now accept our terms, they may expect a rain of ruin from the air, the like of which has never been seen on this earth. Behind this air attack will follow sea and land forces in such numbers and power as they have not yet seen and with the fighting skill of which they are already well aware.”

The Japanese government did not react. On August 7, a day after Hiroshima was destroyed, Dr. Yoshio Nishina and other atomic physicists arrived at the city and carefully examined the damage. They returned to Tokyo and told the cabinet that Hiroshima was indeed destroyed by an atomic bomb. Admiral Soemu Toyoda, the
Chief of the Naval General Staff, estimated that no more than one or two additional bombs could be readied, so they decided to endure the remaining attacks, acknowledging “there would be more destruction but the war would go on.” American Magic codebreakers intercepted the cabinet’s messages.

Purnell, Parsons, Tibbets, Spaatz, and LeMay met on Guam that same day to discuss what should be done next. Since there was no indication of Japan surrendering, they decided to proceed with dropping another bomb. Parsons said that Project Alberta would have it ready by August 11, but Tibbets pointed to weather reports indicating poor flying conditions on that day due to a storm, and asked if the bomb could be readied by August 9. Parsons agreed to try to do so.

Debate Over Bombings

The role of the bombings in Japan’s surrender and the U.S.’s ethical justification for them has been the subject of scholarly and popular debate for decades. J. Samuel Walker wrote in an April 2005 overview of recent historiography on the issue, “the controversy over the use of the bomb seems certain to continue.” He wrote that “the fundamental issue that has divided scholars over a period of nearly four decades is whether the use of the bomb was necessary to achieve victory in the war in the Pacific on terms satisfactory to the United States.”

Supporters of the bombings generally assert that they caused the Japanese surrender, preventing casualties on both sides during Operation Downfall. One figure of speech, “One hundred million [subjects of the Japanese Empire] will die for the Emperor and Nation,” served as a unifying slogan. In Truman’s 1955 Memoirs, “he states that the atomic bomb probably saved half a million U.S. lives—anticipated casualties in an Allied invasion of Japan planned for November. Stimson subsequently talked of saving one million
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U.S. casualties, and Churchill of saving one million American and half that number of British lives.” Scholars have pointed out various alternatives that could have ended the war without an invasion, but these could have resulted in the deaths of many more Japanese. Supporters also point to an order given by the Japanese War Ministry on August 1, 1944, ordering the execution of Allied prisoners of war when the POW camp was in the combat zone.

Those who oppose the bombings cite a number of reasons, including the belief that atomic bombing is fundamentally immoral, that the bombings counted as war crimes, that they were militarily unnecessary, that they constituted state terrorism, and that they involved racism against and the dehumanization of the Japanese people. Another popular view among critics of the bombings, originating with Gar Alperovitz in 1965 and becoming the default position in Japanese school history textbooks, is the idea of atomic diplomacy: that the United States used nuclear weapons to intimidate the Soviet Union in the early stages of the Cold War. The bombings were part of an already fierce conventional bombing campaign. This, together with the sea blockade and the collapse of Germany (with its implications regarding redeployment), could also have led to a Japanese surrender. At the time the United States dropped its atomic bomb on Nagasaki on August 9, 1945, the Soviet Union launched a surprise attack with 1.6 million troops against the Kwantung Army in Manchuria. “The Soviet entry into the war,” argued Japanese historian Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, “played a much greater role than the atomic bombs in inducing Japan to surrender because it dashed any hope that Japan could terminate the war through Moscow’s mediation.”
Atomic Bombing of Nagasaki: Nagasaki, before and after the atomic bomb detonation
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31.8: Impact of War World II

31.8.1: Terms of Surrender

The unconditional surrender of Germany on May 8, 1945, and Japan on September 2, 1945, brought World War II to an end. Various documents and treaties placed stringent terms on Axis powers to prevent future hostilities.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the terms under which Germany, Japan, and Italy surrendered

**Key Points**

- The German Instrument of Surrender ended World War II in Europe on the night of May 8, 1945.
- The terms of Germany’s unconditional surrender had been discussed since January 1944 and further
clarified at the Yalta conference. They established, among other things, that the Allied Representatives “will take such steps, including the complete disarmament, demilitarisation and dismemberment of Germany as they deem requisite for future peace and security.”

- The surrender of Japan was announced by Imperial Japan on August 15 and formally signed on September 2, 1945, bringing the hostilities of World War II to a close.
- Their terms of surrender included disarmament and occupation by Allied forces.
- The terms of Italy's defeat were determined during the Paris Peace Conference in 1947, and included limits on their military and a ban on all fascist organizations.

**Key Terms**

**Paris Peace Treaties**

A series of document wherein victorious wartime Allied powers negotiated the details of peace treaties with minor Axis powers, namely Italy (though it was considered a major Axis Power), Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland, following the end of World War II in 1945.
German Instrument of Surrender

The legal document that established the unconditional surrender of Germany in World War II.

unconditional surrender

A surrender in which no guarantees are given to the surrendering party.

Potsdam Declaration

A statement that called for the surrender of all Japanese armed forces during World War II.

Surrender of Germany

The German Instrument of Surrender ended World War II in Europe. The definitive text was signed in Karlshorst, Berlin on the night of May 8, 1945 by representatives of the three armed services of the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht (OKW) and the Allied Expeditionary Force together with the Supreme High Command of the Red Army, with further French and U.S. representatives signing as witnesses. An earlier version of the text was signed in a ceremony in Reims in the early hours of May 7, 1945, but the Soviets rejected that version as it underplayed their role in the defeat of Germany in Berlin. In the West, May 8 is known as Victory in Europe Day, whereas in post-Soviet states the Victory Day is celebrated on May 9 since the definitive signing occurred after midnight Moscow time.

Preparations of the text of the instrument of surrender began by representatives of the then three Allied Powers, the U.S., the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom, at the European Advisory Commission (EAC) throughout 1944. By January 3, 1944, the Working
Security Committee in the EAC proposed, “that the capitulation of Germany should be recorded in a single document of unconditional surrender.”

The agreed text was in three parts. The first consisted of a brief preamble “The German Government and German High Command, recognizing and acknowledging the complete defeat of the German armed forces on land, at sea and in the air, hereby announce Germany's unconditional surrender.”

The instrument of surrender itself followed in fourteen articles. The second part, articles 1-5, related to the military surrender by the German High Command of all forces on land, at sea, and in the air, to the surrender of their weapons, to their evacuation from any territory outside German boundaries by December 31, 1937, and to their liability to captivity as prisoners of war. The third part, articles 6 to 12, related to the surrender by the German Government to Allied Representatives of almost all its powers and authority, the release and repatriation of prisoners and forced laborers, the cessation of radio broadcasts, the provision of intelligence and information, the non-destruction of weapons and infrastructure, the yielding of Nazi leaders for war-crime trials, and the power of Allied Representatives to issue proclamations, orders, ordinances, and instructions covering “additional political, administrative, economic, financial, military and other requirements arising from the complete defeat of Germany.” The key article in the third part was article 12, providing that the German Government and German High command would comply fully with any proclamations, orders, ordinances, and instructions of the accredited Allied Representatives; this was understood by the Allies as allowing unlimited scope to impose arrangements for the restitution and reparation of war damages. Articles 13 and 14 specified the date of surrender and the languages of the definitive texts.

The Yalta Conference in February 1945 led to a further development of the terms of surrender, as it was agreed that administration of post-war Germany would be split into four occupation zones for Britain, France, the United States, and the
Soviet Union respectively. In addition, but separately, it was agreed at Yalta that an additional clause 12a would be added to the July 1944 surrender text: that the Allied Representatives “will take such steps, including the complete disarmament, demilitarisation and dismemberment of Germany as they deem requisite for future peace and security.”

In the event of the German signings of Instruments of Surrender at Reims and Berlin, the EAC text was not used; a simplified, military-only version, based largely on the wording of the partial surrender instrument of German forces in Italy signed at Caserta, was applied instead. The reasons for the change are disputed, but it may reflect awareness of reservations as to the capability of the German signatories to agree the provisions of the full text.

With the Potsdam Agreement, signed on August 12, 1945, the Allied leaders planned the new post-war German government, resettled war territory boundaries, de facto annexed a quarter of prewar Germany situated east of the Oder-Neisse line, and mandated and organized the expulsion of the millions of Germans who remained in the annexed territories and elsewhere in the east. They also ordered German demilitarization, denazification, industrial disarmament, and settlements of war reparations.
German Instrument of Surrender: The first instrument of surrender signed at Reims on May 7, 1945.

Surrender of Japan

The surrender of Japan was announced by Imperial Japan on August 15 and formally signed on September 2, 1945, bringing the hostilities of World War II to a close. By the end of July 1945, the Imperial Japanese Navy was incapable of conducting major operations, and an Allied invasion of Japan was imminent. Together with the United Kingdom and China, the United States called for the unconditional surrender of the Japanese armed forces in the Potsdam Declaration on July 26, 1945—the alternative being “prompt and utter destruction.”

On August 6, 1945, at 8:15 a.m. local time, the U.S. detonated an atomic bomb over the Japanese city of Hiroshima. Sixteen hours later, American President Harry S. Truman called again for Japan’s surrender, warning them to “expect a rain of ruin from the air, the
like of which has never been seen on this earth.” Late in the evening of August 8, 1945, in accordance with the Yalta agreements but in violation of the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact, the Soviet Union declared war on Japan, and soon after midnight on August 9, 1945, invaded the Imperial Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo. Later in the day, the U.S. dropped a second atomic bomb, this time on the Japanese city of Nagasaki. Following these events, Emperor Hirohito intervened and ordered the Supreme Council for the Direction of the War to accept the terms the Allies had set down in the Potsdam Declaration for ending the war. After several more days of behind-the-scenes negotiations and a failed coup d’état, Emperor Hirohito gave a recorded radio address across the Empire on August 15. In the radio address, called the Jewel Voice Broadcast, he announced the surrender of Japan to the Allies.

The term for Japan’s surrender were decided at the Potsdam Conference. On July 26 1945, the United States, Britain, and China released the Potsdam Declaration announcing the terms for Japan’s surrender, with the warning, “We will not deviate from them. There are no alternatives. We shall brook no delay.” For Japan, the terms of the declaration specified:

- the elimination “for all time [of] the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest”
- the occupation of “points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies”
- that the “Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshū, Hokkaidō, Kyūshū, Shikoku and such minor islands as we determine.” As had been announced in the Cairo Declaration in 1943, Japan was to be reduced to her pre-1894 territory and stripped of her prewar empire including Korea and Taiwan, as well as all her recent conquests.
- that “[t]he Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with the opportunity to lead peaceful and productive lives.”
that “[w]e do not intend that the Japanese shall be enslaved as a race or destroyed as a nation, but stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners.”
• “The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.”
• “We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction.”

On August 28, the occupation of Japan by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers began. The surrender ceremony was held on September 2 aboard the United States Navy battleship USS Missouri, at which officials from the Japanese government signed the Japanese Instrument of Surrender, thereby ending the hostilities.

Terms of Peace with Italy

The Treaty of Peace with Italy (one of the Paris Peace Treaties) was signed on February 10, 1947 between Italy and the victorious powers of World War II, formally ending hostilities. It came into general effect on September 15, 1947.

Articles 47 and 48 called for the demolition of all permanent fortifications along the Franco-Italian and Yugoslav-Italian frontier. Italy was banned from possessing, building, or experimenting with atomic weapons, guided missiles, guns with a range of over 30
km, non-contact naval mines and torpedoes as well as manned torpedoes (article 51).

The military of Italy was limited in size. Italy was allowed a maximum of 200 heavy and medium tanks (article 54). Former officers and non-commissioned officers of the Blackshirts and the National Republican Army were barred from becoming officers or non-commissioned officers in the Italian military (except those exonerated by the Italian courts, article 55).

The Italian navy was reduced. Some warships were awarded to the governments of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France (articles 56 and 57). Italy was ordered to scuttle all its submarines (article 58) and banned from acquiring new battleships, submarines, and aircraft carriers (article 59). The navy was limited to a maximum force of 25,000 personnel (article 60). The Italian army was limited to a size of 185,000 personnel plus 65,000 Carabinieri for a maximum total of 250,000 personnel (article 61). The Italian air force was limited to 200 fighters and reconnaissance aircraft plus 150 transport, air-rescue, training, and liaison aircraft, and was banned from owning and operating bomber aircraft (article 64). The number of air force personnel was limited to 25,000 (article 65).

Article 17 of the treaty banned Fascist organizations (“whether political, military, or semi-military”) in Italy.
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201. Casualties of World War II

31.8.2: Casualties of World War II

Some 75 million people died in World War II, including about 20 million military personnel and 40 million civilians, many of whom died because of deliberate genocide, massacres, mass-bombings, disease, and starvation.

Learning Objective

Assess the losses and damages of World War II

Key Points

• World War II was the deadliest military conflict in history in terms of total dead, with some 75 million people casualties including military and civilians, or around 3% of the world’s population at the time.
• Many civilians died because of deliberate genocide, massacres, mass-bombings, disease, and starvation.
• The Soviet Union lost around 27 million people
during the war, including 8.7 million military and 19 million civilians. This represents the most military deaths of any nation by a large margin.

- Germany sustained 5.3 million military losses, mostly on the Eastern Front and during the final battles in Germany.
- Of the total number of deaths in World War II, approximately 85 percent were on the Allied side and 15 percent were on the Axis side, with many of these deaths caused by war crimes committed by German and Japanese forces in occupied territories.
- Nazi Germany, as part of a deliberate program of extermination, systematically killed over 11 million people including 6 million Jews.
- In addition to Nazi concentration camps, the Soviet gulags (labor camps) led to the deaths of 3.6 million civilians.

**Key Terms**

**“unworthy of life”**

In German, “Lebensunwertes Leben,” this term was a Nazi designation for the segments of the populace which, according to the Nazi regime of the time, had no right to live.

**Executive Order 9066**

A United States presidential executive order signed
and issued during World War II by the United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt on February 19, 1942, authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe certain areas as military zones, clearing the way for the deportation of Japanese Americans and Italian-Americans to internment camps.

**gulag**
The government agency that administered the main Soviet forced labour camp systems during the Stalin era, from the 1930s until the 1950s.

### Casualties and War Crimes

Estimates for the total number of casualties in the war vary because many deaths went unrecorded. Most suggest that some 75 million people died in the war, including about 20 million military personnel and 40 million civilians. Many civilians died because of deliberate genocide, massacres, mass-bombings, disease, and starvation.

The Soviet Union lost around 27 million people during the war, including 8.7 million military and 19 million civilian deaths. The largest portion of military dead were 5.7 million ethnic Russians, followed by 1.3 million ethnic Ukrainians. A quarter of the people in the Soviet Union were wounded or killed. Germany sustained 5.3 million military losses, mostly on the Eastern Front and during the final battles in Germany.

Of the total number of deaths in World War II, approximately 85 percent—mostly Soviet and Chinese—were on the Allied side and 15 percent on the Axis side. Many deaths were caused by war crimes committed by German and Japanese forces in occupied territories. An estimated 11 to 17 million civilians died either as a direct or as an
indirect result of Nazi ideological policies, including the systematic genocide of around 6 million Jews during the Holocaust and an additional 5 to 6 million ethnic Poles and other Slavs (including Ukrainians and Belarusians), Roma, homosexuals, and other ethnic and minority groups. Hundreds of thousands of ethnic Serbs, along with gypsies and Jews, were murdered by the Axis-aligned Croatian Ustaše in Yugoslavia, and retribution-related killings were committed just after the war ended.

In Asia and the Pacific, between 3 million and more than 10 million civilians, mostly Chinese (estimated at 7.5 million), were killed by the Japanese occupation forces. The best-known Japanese atrocity was the Nanking Massacre, in which 50 to 300 thousand Chinese civilians were raped and murdered. Mitsuyoshi Himeta reported that 2.7 million casualties occurred during the Sankō Sakusen. General Yasuji Okamura implemented the policy in Heipei and Shantung.

Axis forces employed biological and chemical weapons. The Imperial Japanese Army used a variety of such weapons during its invasion and occupation of China and in early conflicts against the Soviets. Both the Germans and Japanese tested such weapons against civilians and sometimes on prisoners of war.

The Soviet Union was responsible for the Katyn massacre of 22,000 Polish officers and the imprisonment or execution of thousands of political prisoners by the NKVD in the Baltic states and eastern Poland annexed by the Red Army.

The mass-bombing of civilian areas, notably the cities of Warsaw, Rotterdam and London, included the aerial targeting of hospitals and fleeing refugees by the German Luftwaffe, along with the bombings of Tokyo and the German cities of Dresden, Hamburg, and Cologne by the Western Allies. These bombings may be considered war crimes. The latter resulted in the destruction of more than 160 cities and the death of more than 600,000 German civilians. However, no positive or specific customary international humanitarian law with respect to aerial warfare existed before or during World War II.
### World War II Casualties

Estimates suggest that some 75 million people died in World War II, including about 20 million military personnel and 40 million civilians.

#### Concentration Camps, Slave Labor, and Genocide

The German government led by Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party was responsible for the Holocaust, the killing of approximately 6 million Jews, 2.7 million ethnic Poles, and 4 million others who were deemed “unworthy of life” (including the disabled and mentally ill, Soviet prisoners of war, homosexuals, Freemasons, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Romani) as part of a program of deliberate extermination. About 12 million, mostly Eastern Europeans, were employed in the German war economy as forced laborers.

In addition to Nazi concentration camps, the Soviet gulags (labor camps) led to the death of citizens of occupied countries such as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as well as German prisoners of war (POWs) and Soviet citizens who were thought to be Nazi supporters. Of the 5.7 million Soviet POWs of the Germans, 57
percent died or were killed during the war, a total of 3.6 million. Soviet ex-POWs and repatriated civilians were treated with great suspicion as potential Nazi collaborators, and some were sent to the Gulag upon being checked by the NKVD.

Japanese POW camps, many of which were used as labor camps, also had high death rates. The International Military Tribunal for the Far East found the death rate of Western prisoners was 27.1 percent (for American POWs, 37 percent), seven times that of POWs under the Germans and Italians. While 37,583 prisoners from the UK, 28,500 from the Netherlands, and 14,473 from the United States were released after the surrender of Japan, the number of Chinese released was only 56.

According to historian Zhifen Ju, at least five million Chinese civilians from northern China and Manchukuo were enslaved between 1935 and 1941 by the East Asia Development Board, or Kōain, for work in mines and war industries. After 1942, the number reached 10 million. The US Library of Congress estimates that in Java, between 4 and 10 million rōmusha (Japanese: “manual laborers”), were forced to work by the Japanese military. About 270,000 of these Javanese laborers were sent to other Japanese-held areas in South East Asia, and only 52,000 were repatriated to Java.

On February 19, 1942, Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, interning about 100,000 Japanese living on the West Coast. Canada had a similar program. In addition, 14,000 German and Italian citizens who had been assessed as being security risks were also interned.

In accordance with the Allied agreement made at the Yalta Conference, millions of POWs and civilians were used as forced labor by the Soviet Union. Hungarians were forced to work for the Soviet Union until 1955.
The Liberation of Bergen-Belsen Concentration: SS female camp guards remove prisoners' bodies from lorries and carry them to a mass grave, inside the German Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, 1945
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202. The Atlantic Charter

31.8.3: The Atlantic Charter

The Atlantic Charter set goals for the post-war world and inspired many of the international agreements that shaped the world thereafter, most notably the United Nations.

Learning Objective

Explain what the Atlantic Charter promised and who committed to it

Key Points

- The Atlantic Charter was a pivotal policy statement issued on August 14, 1941, that defined the Allied goals for the post-war world, including self-determination for nations and economic and social cooperation among nations.
- British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt drafted the Atlantic Charter at the Atlantic Conference in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland in 1941.
Adherents of the Atlantic Charter signed the 
*Declaration by United Nations* on January 1, 1942; it 
became the basis for the modern United Nations.

In a September 1941 speech, Churchill stated that 
the Charter was only meant to apply to states under 
German occupation and not to people who formed 
part of the British Empire, a statement which became 
controversial and resulted in strong pushback from 
figures such as Gandhi.

---

**Key Terms**

**self-determination**

A cardinal principle in modern international law that 
states that nations, based on respect for the principle 
of equal rights and fair equality of opportunity, have 
the right to freely choose their sovereignty and 
international political status with no interference.

**United Nations**

An intergovernmental organization to promote 
international cooperation. A replacement for the 
ineffective League of Nations, the organization was 
established on October 24, 1945 after World War II to 
prevent another such conflict.
Overview

The Atlantic Charter was a pivotal policy statement issued on August 14, 1941, that defined the Allied goals for the post-war world. The leaders of the United Kingdom and the United States drafted the work and all the Allies of World War II later confirmed it. The Charter stated the ideal goals of the war with eight principal points:

1. No territorial gains were to be sought by the United States or the United Kingdom;
2. Territorial adjustments must be in accord with the wishes of the peoples concerned;
3. All people had a right to self-determination;
4. Trade barriers were to be lowered;
5. There was to be global economic cooperation and advancement of social welfare;
6. The participants would work for a world free of want and fear;
7. The participants would work for freedom of the seas;
8. There was to be disarmament of aggressor nations, and a post-war common disarmament.

Adherents of the Atlantic Charter signed the Declaration by United Nations on January 1, 1942; it became the basis for the modern United Nations.

The Atlantic Charter made it clear that America was supporting Britain in the war. Both America and Britain wanted to present their unity, mutual principles, and hopes for the post-war world and the policies they agreed to follow once the Nazis had been defeated. A fundamental aim was to focus on the peace that would follow and not specific American involvement and war strategy, although U.S. involvement appeared increasingly likely.

The Atlantic Charter set goals for the post-war world and inspired many of the international agreements that shaped the world.
thereafter. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the post-war independence of European colonies, and many other key policies are derived from the Atlantic Charter.

Impact and Response

The public of Britain and the Commonwealth was delighted with the principles of the meetings but disappointed that the U.S. was not entering the war. Churchill admitted that he had hoped the U.S. would finally decide to commit itself. Regardless, the acknowledgement that all people had a right to self-determination gave hope to independence leaders in British colonies.

The Americans were insistent that the charter was to acknowledge that the war was being fought to ensure self-determination. The British were forced to agree to these aims, but in a September 1941 speech, Churchill stated that the Charter was only meant to apply to states under German occupation, and certainly not to the peoples who formed part of the British Empire.

Churchill rejected its universal applicability when it came to the self-determination of subject nations such as British India. Mohandas Gandhi in 1942 wrote to President Roosevelt: “I venture to think that the Allied declaration that the Allies are fighting to make the world safe for the freedom of the individual and for democracy sounds hollow so long as India and for that matter Africa are exploited by Great Britain...” Roosevelt repeatedly brought the need for Indian independence to Churchill’s attention, but was rebuffed. However Gandhi refused to help either the British or the American war effort against Germany and Japan in any way, and Roosevelt chose to back Churchill. India was already contributing significantly to the war effort, sending over 2.5 million men (the largest volunteer force in the world at the time) to fight for the Allies, mostly in West Asia and North Africa.

The Axis powers interpreted these diplomatic agreements as a
potential alliance against them. In Tokyo, the Atlantic Charter rallied support for the militarists in the Japanese government, who pushed for a more aggressive approach against the U.S. and Britain.

The British dropped millions of flysheets over Germany to allay fears of a punitive peace that would destroy the German state. The text cited the Charter as the authoritative statement of the joint commitment of Great Britain and the U.S. “not to admit any economical discrimination of those defeated” and promised that “Germany and the other states can again achieve enduring peace and prosperity.”

The most striking feature of the discussion was that an agreement had been made between a range of countries that held diverse opinions, who were accepting that internal policies were relevant to the international problem. The agreement proved to be one of the first steps towards the formation of the United Nations.
Atlantic Charter: Winston Churchill’s edited copy of the final draft of the Atlantic Charter.
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31.8.4: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a non-binding declaration adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, partly in response to the barbarism of World War II.

Learning Objective

Understand the purpose and legal effect of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Key Points

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) arose directly from the experience of the Second World War and represents the first global expression of what many believe are the rights to which all human beings are inherently entitled.
- The UDHR was framed by members of the Human
Rights Commission, with Eleanor Roosevelt as Chair, who began to discuss an International Bill of Rights in 1947.

- The Declaration consists of thirty articles which, although not legally binding, have been elaborated in subsequent international treaties, economic transfers, regional human rights instruments, national constitutions, and other laws, thereby making many of their principles legally binding in various nations.
- The United Nations (UN) is an intergovernmental organization to promote international cooperation established in 1945 after the end of WWII to replace the ineffectual League of Nations.

**Key Terms**

**United Nations Charter**

The foundational treaty of the United Nations, signed October 24, 1945.

**International Bill of Human Rights**

The name given to UN General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) and two international treaties established by the United Nations. It consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted in 1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) with its two Optional Protocols, and the

**Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

A declaration adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, the first global expression of what many believe are the rights to which all human beings are inherently entitled.

## Overview

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is a declaration adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948 at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris. The Declaration arose directly from the experience of the Second World War and represents the first global expression of what many believe are the rights to which all human beings are inherently entitled. The UDHR urges member nations to promote a number of human, civil, economic, and social rights, asserting these rights are part of the “foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.” It aims to recognize, “the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.” The full text is published by the United Nations on its website.

The UDHR was framed by members of the Human Rights Commission, with Eleanor Roosevelt as Chair, who began to discuss an International Bill of Rights in 1947. The members of the Commission did not immediately agree on the form of such a bill of rights and whether or how it should be enforced.

The Declaration consists of 30 articles which, although not legally binding, have been elaborated in subsequent international treaties,
economic transfers, regional human rights instruments, national constitutions, and other laws. The International Bill of Human Rights consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols. In 1966, the General Assembly adopted the two detailed Covenants, which complete the International Bill of Human Rights. In 1976, after the Covenants had been ratified by a sufficient number of individual nations, the Bill became an international law.

![Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Eleanor Roosevelt with the Spanish language version of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.](image)

**Precursors to the Declaration**

The United Nations (UN) is an intergovernmental organization to promote international cooperation. A replacement for the
ineffective League of Nations, the organization was established after World War II to prevent another such conflict. The United Nations Charter was drafted at a conference in April–June 1945; this charter took effect October 24, 1945, and the UN began operation.

During World War II, the Allies adopted the Four Freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want—as their basic war aims. The United Nations Charter “reaffirmed faith in fundamental human rights, and dignity and worth of the human person” and committed all member states to promote “universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.”

When the atrocities committed by Nazi Germany became apparent after the war, the consensus within the world community was that the United Nations Charter did not sufficiently define the rights to which it referred. A universal declaration that specified the rights of individuals was necessary to give effect to the Charter’s provisions on human rights.

**Legal Effect**

While not a treaty itself, the Declaration was explicitly adopted for the purpose of defining the meaning of the words “fundamental freedoms” and “human rights” appearing in the United Nations Charter, which is binding on all member states. For this reason, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a fundamental constitutive document of the United Nations. In addition, many international lawyers believe that the Declaration forms part of customary international law and is a powerful tool in applying diplomatic and moral pressure to governments that violate any of its articles.

The 1968 United Nations International Conference on Human Rights advised that the Declaration “constitutes an obligation for
the members of the international community” to all persons. The
Declaration has served as the foundation for two binding UN human
rights covenants: the International Covenant on Civil and Political
Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and
Cultural Rights. The principles of the Declaration are elaborated in
international treaties such as the International Convention on the
Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International
Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women,
the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the
United Nations Convention Against Torture, and many more. The
Declaration continues to be widely cited by governments,
academics, advocates, and constitutional courts, as well as by
individuals who appeal to its principles for the protection of their
recognized human rights.

Even though it is not legally binding, the Declaration has been
adopted in or has influenced most national constitutions since 1948.
It has also served as the foundation for a growing number of
national laws, international laws, and treaties, as well as regional,
subnational, and national institutions protecting and promoting
human rights.
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32.1: The Beginning of the Cold War

32.1.1: Europe After World War II

At the end of the war, millions of people were homeless, the European economy had collapsed, and much of the continent’s industrial infrastructure had been destroyed.

Learning Objective

Describe the condition of the European continent after World War II

Key Points

- The aftermath of World War II was the beginning of an era defined by the decline of the old great powers and the rise of two superpowers: the Soviet Union
(USSR) and the United States of America (U.S.), who soon entered the Cold War.

- The Allies established occupation administrations in Germany, divided into western and eastern occupation zones controlled by the Western Allies and the USSR accordingly.
- A denazification program in Germany led to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals and the removal of ex-Nazis from power, along with a “industrial disarmament” of the German economy, initially leading to economic stagnation.
- After a few years, the U.S. and the other Allied power rescinded on this attitude toward Germany and instead focused on economic support.
- Recovery began with the mid-1948 currency reform in Western Germany, and was sped up by the liberalization of European economic policy both directly and indirectly caused by the Marshall Plan (1948–1951).

**Key Terms**

**Marshall Plan**

An American initiative to aid Western Europe in which the United States gave more than $12 billion in economic support to help rebuild Western European economies after the end of World War II.
German economic miracle

Also known as The Miracle on the Rhine, the rapid reconstruction and development of the economies of West Germany and Austria after World War II.

Overview

The aftermath of World War II was the beginning of an era defined by the decline of the old great powers and the rise of two superpowers: the Soviet Union (USSR) and the United States of America (U.S.), creating a bipolar world. Allied during World War II, the U.S. and USSR became competitors on the world stage and engaged in the Cold War, so-called because it never boiled over into open war between the two powers but was focused on espionage, political subversion, and proxy wars. Western Europe and Japan were rebuilt through the American Marshall Plan whereas Eastern Europe fell in the Soviet sphere of influence and rejected the plan. Europe was divided into a U.S.-led Western Bloc and a Soviet-led Eastern Bloc.

As a consequence of the war, the Allies created the United Nations, a new global organization for international cooperation and diplomacy. Members of the United Nations agreed to outlaw wars of aggression to avoid a third world war. The devastated great powers of Western Europe formed the European Coal and Steel Community, which later evolved into the European Common Market and ultimately into the current European Union. This effort primarily began as an attempt to avoid another war between Germany and France by economic cooperation and integration and as a common market for important natural resources.
Occupation and Territory Reallocation

The Allies established occupation administrations in Austria and Germany. The former became a neutral state, non-aligned with any political bloc. The latter was divided into western and eastern occupation zones controlled by the Western Allies and the USSR accordingly. A denazification program in Germany led to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals and the removal of ex-Nazis from power, although this policy moved towards amnesty and reintegration of ex-Nazis into West German society.

Germany lost a quarter of its prewar (1937) territory. Among the eastern territories, Silesia, Neumark, and most of Pomerania were taken over by Poland; East Prussia was divided between Poland and the USSR and 9 million Germans expelled from these provinces; and 3 million Germans from the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia to Germany. By the 1950s, every fifth West German was a refugee from the east. The Soviet Union also took over the Polish provinces east of the Curzon line, from which 2 million Poles were expelled; northeast Romania, parts of eastern Finland, and the three Baltic states were also incorporated into the USSR.

Economic Aftermath

By the end of the war, the European economy had collapsed and 70% of the industrial infrastructure was destroyed. The property damage in the Soviet Union consisted of complete or partial destruction of 1,710 cities and towns, 70,000 villages, and 31,850 industrial establishments. The strength of the economic recovery following the war varied throughout the world, though in general it was quite robust. In Europe, West Germany declined economically during the first years of the Allied occupation but later experienced a remarkable recovery, and had by the end of the 1950s doubled
production from its prewar levels. Italy came out of the war in poor economic condition, but by the 1950s, the Italian economy was marked by stability and high growth. France rebounded quickly and enjoyed rapid economic growth and modernization under the Monnet Plan. The UK, by contrast, was in a state of economic ruin after the war and continued to experience relative economic decline for decades to follow.

The U.S. emerged much richer than any other nation and dominated the world economy; it had a baby boom and by 1950 its gross domestic product per person was much higher than that of any of the other powers. The UK and US pursued a policy of industrial disarmament in Western Germany in the years 1945–1948. International trade interdependencies thus led to European economic stagnation and delayed the continent’s recovery for several years.

U.S. policy in post-war Germany from April 1945 until July 1947 was to give the Germans no help in rebuilding their nation, save for the minimum required to mitigate starvation. The Allies’ immediate
post-war “industrial disarmament” plan for Germany was to destroy Germany's capability to wage war by complete or partial deindustrialization. The first industrial plan for Germany, signed in 1946, required the destruction of 1,500 manufacturing plants to lower heavy industry output to roughly 50% of its 1938 level. Dismantling of West German industry ended in 1951. By 1950, equipment had been removed from 706 manufacturing plants and steel production capacity had been reduced by 6.7 million tons.

After lobbying by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Generals Lucius D. Clay and George Marshall, the Truman administration accepted that economic recovery in Europe could not go forward without the reconstruction of the German industrial base on which it had previously been dependent. In July 1947, President Truman rescinded on “national security grounds” the directive that ordered the U.S. occupation forces to “take no steps looking toward the economic rehabilitation of Germany.” A new directive recognized that “[a]n orderly, prosperous Europe requires the economic contributions of a stable and productive Germany.”

Recovery began with the mid-1948 currency reform in Western Germany and was sped up by the liberalization of European economic policy that the Marshall Plan (1948–1951) both directly and indirectly caused. The post-1948 West German recovery has been called the German economic miracle.
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In February 1946, George F. Kennan’s “Long Telegram” from Moscow helped articulate the U.S. government’s increasingly hard line against the Soviets and became the basis for the U.S. “containment” strategy toward the Soviet Union for the duration of the Cold War.

Learning Objective

Recall the significance of the Long Telegram

Key Points

- In February 1946, the U.S. State Department asked George F. Kennan, then at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, why the Russians opposed the creation of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.
- Kennan responded with a wide-ranging analysis of Russian policy now called the “Long Telegram.”
- In the “Long Telegram,” Kennan emphasized that the Soviet Union did not see the possibility for long-term peaceful coexistence with the capitalist
world and that the best strategy was to “contain” communist expansion around the globe.

- A year later, Kennan published an article under the anonymous pseudonym “X” summarizing and clarifying his analysis in the “Long Telegram.”
- The attitudes and strategies promoted in these two documents, namely the strategy of “containment,” formed the basis of America’s approach to the USSR for the most of the Cold War.

Key Terms

“Long Telegram”
A 1946 cable telegram by U.S. diplomat George F. Kennan during the post-WWII administration of U.S. President Harry Truman that articulated the policy of containment toward the USSR.

Containment
A military strategy to stop the expansion of an enemy. It is best known as the Cold War policy of the United States and its allies to prevent the spread of communism.
Overview

The first phase of the Cold War began in the first two years after the end of the Second World War in 1945. The USSR consolidated its control over the states of the Eastern Bloc, while the United States began a strategy of global containment to challenge Soviet power, extending military and financial aid to the countries of Western Europe. An important moment in the development of America's initial Cold War strategy was the delivery of the “Long Telegram” sent from Moscow by American diplomat George Kennan in 1946.

Kennan's “Long Telegram” and the subsequent 1947 article “The Sources of Soviet Conduct” argued that the Soviet regime was inherently expansionist and that its influence had to be “contained” in areas of vital strategic importance to the United States. These texts provided justification for the Truman administration's new anti-Soviet policy. Kennan played a major role in the development of definitive Cold War programs and institutions, notably the Marshall Plan.

The “Long Telegram”

In Moscow, Kennan felt his opinions were being ignored by Harry S. Truman and policymakers in Washington. Kennan tried repeatedly to persuade policymakers to abandon plans for cooperation with the Soviet government in favor of a sphere of influence policy in Europe to reduce the Soviets' power there. Kennan believed that a federation needed to be established in western Europe to counter Soviet influence in the region and compete against the Soviet stronghold in eastern Europe.

Kennan served as deputy head of the mission in Moscow until April 1946. Near the end of that term, the Treasury Department requested that the State Department explain recent Soviet behavior,
such as its disinclination to endorse the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Kennan responded on February 22, 1946, by sending a 5,500-word telegram (sometimes cited as more than 8,000 words) from Moscow to Secretary of State James Byrnes outlining a new strategy for diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

Kennan described dealing with Soviet Communism as “undoubtedly the greatest task our diplomacy has ever faced and probably the greatest it will ever have to face.” In the first two sections, he posited concepts that became the foundation of American Cold War policy:

- The USSR perceived itself at perpetual war with capitalism.
- The USSR viewed left-wing, but non-communist, groups in other countries as an even worse enemy than the capitalist ones.
- The USSR would use controllable Marxists in the capitalist world as allies.
- Soviet aggression was fundamentally not aligned with the views of the Russian people or with economic reality, but rooted in historic Russian nationalism and neurosis.
- The Soviet government’s structure inhibited objective or accurate pictures of internal and external reality.

According to Kennan, the Soviet Union did not see the possibility for long-term peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world; its ever-present aim was to advance the socialist cause. Capitalism was a menace to the ideals of socialism, and capitalists could not be trusted or allowed to influence the Soviet people. Outright conflict was never a desirable avenue for the propagation of the Soviet cause, but their eyes and ears were always open for the opportunity to take advantage of “diseased tissue” anywhere in the world.

In Section Five, Kennan explicated Soviet weaknesses and proposed U.S. strategy, stating that despite the great challenge, “my conviction that problem is within our power to solve—and that
without recourse to any general military conflict.” He argued that the Soviet Union would be sensitive to force, that the Soviets were weak compared to the united Western world, that the Soviets were vulnerable to internal instability, and that Soviet propaganda was primarily negative and destructive.

The solution was to strengthen Western institutions in order to render them invulnerable to the Soviet challenge while awaiting the mellowing of the Soviet regime.

The X Article

Unlike the “Long Telegram,” Kennan’s well-timed article in the July 1947 issue of Foreign Affairs attributed the pseudonym “X,” entitled “The Sources of Soviet Conduct,” did not begin by emphasizing “traditional and instinctive Russian sense of insecurity”; instead, it asserted that Stalin’s policy was shaped by a combination of Marxist and Leninist ideology, which advocated revolution to defeat the capitalist forces in the outside world and Stalin’s determination to use the notion of “capitalist encirclement” to legitimize his regimentation of Soviet society so that he could consolidate his political power. Kennan argued that Stalin would not (and moreover could not) moderate the supposed Soviet determination to overthrow Western governments. Thus,

the main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies ... Soviet pressure against the free institutions of the Western world is something that can be contained by the adroit and vigilant application of counterforce at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points, corresponding to the shifts and manoeuvres of Soviet policy, but which cannot be charmed or talked out of existence.
The publication of the “X Article” soon began one of the more intense debates of the Cold War. Walter Lippmann, a leading American commentator on international affairs, strongly criticized the “X Article.” He argued that Kennan’s strategy of containment was “a strategic monstrosity” that could “be implemented only by recruiting, subsidizing and supporting a heterogeneous array of satellites, clients, dependents, and puppets.” Lippmann argued that diplomacy should be the basis of relations with the Soviets; he suggested that the U.S. withdraw its forces from Europe and reunify and demilitarize Germany. Meanwhile, it was revealed informally that “X” was indeed Kennan. This information seemed to give the “X Article” the status of an official document expressing the Truman administration’s new policy toward the USSR. In the years that followed, this implication was proved correct by the actions taken by the U.S. government toward foreign affairs, including entering the Korean War and the Vietnam War.
George F. Kennan: George F. Kennan in 1947, the year the “X Article” was published.
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On March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill gave a speech declaring that an “iron curtain” had descended across Europe, pointing to efforts by the Soviet Union to block itself and its satellite states from open contact with the West.

**Learning Objective**

Explain the term Iron Curtain

**Key Points**

- The antagonism between the Soviet Union and the West that came to be described as the “iron curtain” had various origins, including events going back to the Russian Revolution of 1917, disagreements during and immediately after WWII, and various annexations of Eastern European nations by the Soviet Union.
- The Iron Curtain specifically refers to the imaginary line dividing Europe between Soviet influence and Western influence, and
symbolizes efforts by the Soviet Union to block itself and its satellite states from open contact with the West and non-Soviet-controlled areas.

- On either side of the Iron Curtain, states developed their own international military alliances, namely the Warsaw Pact and NATO.
- Physically, the Iron Curtain took the form of border defenses between the countries of Europe in the middle of the continent, most notably the Berlin Wall.

---

**Key Terms**

**Warsaw Pact**

A collective defense treaty among the Soviet Union and seven other Soviet satellite states in Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War.

**NATO**

An intergovernmental military alliance signed on April 4, 1949 and including the five Treaty of Brussels states (Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, and the United Kingdom) plus the United States, Canada, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland.

**“iron curtain”**

A term indicating the imaginary boundary dividing Europe into two separate areas from the end of World War II in 1945 until the end of the Cold War in 1991.
Overview

The Iron Curtain formed the imaginary boundary dividing Europe into two separate areas from the end of World War II in 1945 until the end of the Cold War in 1991. The term symbolized efforts by the Soviet Union to block itself and its satellite states from open contact with the West and non-Soviet-controlled areas. On the east side of the Iron Curtain were the countries connected to or influenced by the Soviet Union. On either side of the Iron Curtain, states developed their own international economic and military alliances:

• Member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the Warsaw Pact, with the Soviet Union as the leading state
• Member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) with the United States as the preeminent power

Physically, the Iron Curtain took the form of border defenses between the countries of Europe in the middle of the continent. The most notable border was marked by the Berlin Wall and its “Checkpoint Charlie,” which served as a symbol of the Curtain as a whole.

Background

The antagonism between the Soviet Union and the West that came to be described as the “iron curtain” had various origins. The Allied Powers and the Central Powers backed the White movement against the Bolsheviks during the 1918–1920 Russian Civil War, a fact not forgotten by the Soviets.

A series of events during and after World War II exacerbated
tensions, including the Soviet-German pact during the first two years of the war leading to subsequent invasions, the perceived delay of an amphibious invasion of German-occupied Europe, the western Allies’ support of the Atlantic Charter, disagreement in wartime conferences over the fate of Eastern Europe, the Soviets' creation of an Eastern Bloc of Soviet satellite states, western Allies scrapping the Morgenthau Plan to support the rebuilding of German industry, and the Marshall Plan.

In the course of World War II, Stalin determined to acquire a buffer area against Germany, with pro-Soviet states on its border in an Eastern bloc. Stalin’s aims led to strained relations at the Yalta Conference (February 1945) and the subsequent Potsdam Conference (August 1945). People in the West expressed opposition to Soviet domination over the buffer states, leading to growing fear that the Soviets were building an empire that might threaten them and their interests.

Nonetheless, at the Potsdam Conference, the Allies assigned parts of Poland, Finland, Romania, Germany, and the Balkans to Soviet control or influence. In return, Stalin promised the Western Allies he would allow those territories the right to national self-determination. Despite Soviet cooperation during the war, these concessions left many in the West uneasy. In particular, Churchill feared that the United States might return to its prewar isolationism, leaving the exhausted European states unable to resist Soviet demands.

Iron Curtain Speech

Winston Churchill’s “Sinews of Peace” address of March 5, 1946, at Westminster College, used the term “iron curtain” in the context of Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe:

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an “Iron
“Curtain” has descended across the continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia; all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject, in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and in some cases increasing measure of control from Moscow.

Churchill mentioned in his speech that regions under the Soviet Union's control were expanding their leverage and power without any restriction. He asserted that to put a brake on this phenomenon, the commanding force of and strong unity between the UK and the U.S. was necessary.

Much of the Western public still regarded the Soviet Union as a close ally in the context of the recent defeat of Nazi Germany and of Japan. Although not well received at the time, the phrase iron curtain gained popularity as a shorthand reference to the division of Europe as the Cold War strengthened. The Iron Curtain served to keep people in and information out, and people throughout the West eventually came to accept the metaphor.

Stalin took note of Churchill's speech and responded in Pravda (the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union) soon afterward. He accused Churchill of warmongering, and defended Soviet “friendship” with eastern European states as a necessary safeguard against another invasion. He further accused Churchill of hoping to install right-wing governments in eastern Europe to agitate those states against the Soviet Union. Andrei Zhdanov, Stalin's chief propagandist, used the term against the West in an August 1946 speech:

Hard as bourgeois politicians and writers may strive to conceal the truth of the achievements of the Soviet order and Soviet culture, hard as they may strive to erect an iron curtain to keep the truth about the Soviet Union from penetrating abroad, hard as they may strive to belittle the
genuine growth and scope of Soviet culture, all their efforts are foredoomed to failure.

Iron Curtain: The Iron Curtain depicted as a black line. Warsaw Pact countries on one side of the Iron Curtain appear shaded red; NATO members on the other shaded blue; militarily neutral countries shaded gray. The black dot represents Berlin. Yugoslavia, although communist-ruled, remained largely independent of the two major blocs and is shaded green. Communist Albania broke off contacts with the Soviet Union in the early 1960s, aligning itself with the People’s Republic of China after the Sino-Soviet split; it appears stripe-hatched with grey.
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32.2: Life in the USSR

32.2.1: Marxism-Leninism

Marxism-Leninism, proclaimed the official ideology of the Soviet Union by Joseph Stalin, was based on Karl Marx’s economic theory but included important differences specific to Stalin’s totalitarian government.

Learning Objective

Contrast Marxism-Leninism with pure Marxism

Key Points

- Marxism-Leninism is a political philosophy founded on ideas of Marxism and Leninism, often used specifically to refer to the state ideologies of communist nations such as the USSR. In contrast, classical Marxism did not specify how the socialist
mode of production would function in government.

- Generally Marxist-Leninists support the ideas of a vanguard party, one-party state, state-dominance over the economy, internationalism, opposition to bourgeois democracy, and opposition to capitalism.
- Marxism-Leninism first became a distinct philosophical movement in the Soviet Union during the 1920s, when Joseph Stalin and his supporters gained control of the Russian Communist Party.
- His version of Marxism-Leninism, sometimes called Stalinism (not an explicit ideology at the time but rather a historically descriptive term), rejected the notions, common among Marxists at the time, of world revolution as a prerequisite for building socialism in Russia in favor of the concept of Socialism in One Country.
- Stalin's regime was a totalitarian state under his dictatorship, in which Stalin exercised extensive personal control over the Communist Party and unleashed an unprecedented level of violence to eliminate any potential threat to his regime.

Key Terms

class consciousness
A term used in political theory, especially Marxism, to refer to the belief a person holds regarding their social class or economic rank in society, the structure
of their class, and their class interests; used to point toward a distinctions between a “class in itself,” defined as a category of people with a common relation to the means of production, and a “class for itself,” defined as a stratum organized in active pursuit of its own interests.

**Socialism in One Country**

A theory put forth by Joseph Stalin in 1924 which held that given the defeat of all the communist revolutions in Europe in 1917–1921 except Russia’s, the Soviet Union should begin to strengthen itself internally. This turn toward national communism was a shift from the previously held Marxist position that socialism must be established globally (world communism).

**bourgeoisie**

In Marxist philosophy, the social class that came to own the means of production during modern industrialization and whose societal concerns are the value of property and the preservation of capital, to ensure the perpetuation of their economic supremacy in society.

---

**Overview**

Marxism–Leninism is a political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of Marxism and Leninism that seeks to establish socialist states and develop them further. Marxist–Leninists espouse an array of views depending on their understanding of Marxism and
Leninism, but generally support the idea of a vanguard party, one-party state, state-dominance over the economy, internationalism, opposition to bourgeois democracy, and opposition to capitalism. It remains the official ideology of the ruling parties of China, Cuba, Laos, and Vietnam, and was the official ideology of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and the other ruling parties making up the Eastern Bloc.

Marxism–Leninism first became a distinct philosophical movement in the Soviet Union during the 1920s, when Joseph Stalin and his supporters gained control of the Russian Communist Party (bolsheviks). It rejected the notions, common among Marxists at the time, of world revolution as a prerequisite for building socialism in Russia (in favor of the concept of Socialism in One Country), and of a gradual transition from capitalism to socialism (signified by the introduction of the First Five-Year Plan). The internationalism of Marxism–Leninism was expressed in supporting revolutions in foreign countries.

The goal of Marxism–Leninism is the development of a state into a socialist republic through the leadership of a revolutionary vanguard, the part of the working class who come to class consciousness as a result of the dialectic of class struggle. The socialist state, representing a “dictatorship of the proletariat” (as opposed to that of the bourgeoisie) is governed by the party of the revolutionary vanguard through the process of democratic centralism, which Vladimir Lenin described as “diversity in discussion, unity in action.” It seeks the development of socialism into the full realization of communism, a classless social system with common ownership of the means of production and full equality of all members of society.

**Leninism**

In Marxist philosophy, Leninism is the body of political theory
developed by Lenin for the democratic organization of a revolutionary vanguard party and the achievement of a dictatorship of the proletariat as political prelude to the establishment of the socialist mode of production. Since Karl Marx barely, if ever, wrote about how the socialist mode of production would function, these tasks were left for Lenin to solve. His main contribution to Marxist thought is the concept of the vanguard party of the working class, conceived as a close-knit central organization led by intellectuals rather than by the working class itself. The party was open only to a few of the workers since the workers in Russia still had not developed class consciousness and needed to be educated to reach such a state. Lenin believed that the vanguard party could initiate policies in the name of the working class even if the working class did not support them, since the party would know what was best for the workers since its functionaries had attained consciousness.

Leninism was by definition authoritarianism. Lenin, through his interpretation of Marx's theory of the state (which views the state as an oppressive organ of the ruling class), had no qualms of forcing change upon the country. The repressive powers of the state were to be used to transform the country and strip of the former ruling class of their wealth. In contrast to Karl Marx, who believed that the socialist revolution would be composed of and led by the working class alone, Lenin argued that a socialist revolution did not necessarily need to be led by or composed of the working class alone, instead contending that a revolution needed to be led by the oppressed classes of society, which in Russia was the peasant class.
Stalinism

Within five years of Vladimir Lenin’s death in 1924, Stalin completed his rise to power in the Soviet Union. According to G. Lisichkin (1989), Stalin compiled Marxism–Leninism as a separate ideology in his book Concerning Questions of Leninism. During the period of Stalin’s rule in the Soviet Union, Marxism–Leninism was proclaimed the official ideology of the state. There is no definite agreement...
among historians about whether or Stalin actually followed the principles established by Marx and Lenin.

A key point of conflict between Marxism-Leninism and other tendencies is that whereas Marxism-Leninism defines Stalin's USSR as a workers' state, other types of communists and Marxists deny this, and Trotskyists specifically consider it a deformed or degenerated workers' state. Trotskyists in particular believe that Stalinism contradicted authentic Marxism and Leninism, and they initially used the term “Bolshevik-Leninism” to describe their own ideology of anti-Stalinist communism.

Stalinism, while not an ideology per se, refers to Stalin's thoughts and policies. Stalin's introduction of the concept “Socialism in One Country” in 1924 was a major turning point in Soviet ideological discourse, which claimed that the Soviet Union did not need a socialist world revolution to construct a socialist society. The theory held that given the defeat of all the communist revolutions in Europe in 1917–1921 except Russia's, the Soviet Union should begin to strengthen itself internally. That turn toward national communism was a shift from the previously held Marxist position that socialism must be established globally (world communism), and it was in opposition to Leon Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution. Four years later, Stalin initiated his “Second Revolution” with the introduction of state socialism and central planning. In the early-1930s, he initiated collectivization of Soviet agriculture, by deprivatizing agriculture, not putting it under the responsibility of the state but instead creating peasant cooperatives. With the initiation of his “Second Revolution”, Stalin launched the “Cult of Lenin” and a cult of personality centered upon himself.

Stalin's regime was a totalitarian state under his dictatorship. He exercised extensive personal control over the Communist Party and unleashed an unprecedented level of violence to eliminate any potential threat to his regime. While Stalin exercised major control over political initiatives, their implementation was in the control of localities, often with local leaders interpreting the policies in a way that served themselves best. This abuse of power by local leaders
exacerbated the violent purges and terror campaigns carried out by Stalin against members of the Party deemed to be traitors. Stalin unleashed the Great Terror campaign against alleged “socially dangerous” and “counterrevolutionary” persons that resulted in the Great Purge of 1936–38, during which 1.5 million people were arrested from 1937–38 and 681,692 of those executed. The Stalinist era saw the introduction of a system of forced labor for convicts and political dissidents, the Gulag system created in the early 1930s.

Joseph Stalin and Nikolai Bukharin: With the help of Nikolai Bukharin, Stalin developed the concept of “Socialism in One Country,” which contrasted with Marx’s concept of “world communism.”
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The satellites states that arose in the Eastern Bloc not only reproduced the command economies of the Soviet Union, but also adopted the brutal methods employed by Joseph Stalin and Soviet secret police to suppress real and potential opposition.

Learning Objective

Define a Soviet Socialist Republic

Key Points

- The Soviet Union, officially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), was a federation of Soviet Republics that were outwardly independent nations, but existed essentially as satellite states under the control of Russian power.
- During the opening stages of World War II, the Soviet Union laid the foundation for the Eastern Bloc.
by invading and then annexing several countries as Soviet Socialist Republics, adding to the existing Soviet Union of Russia, Transcaucasia, Ukraine, and Byelorussia.

- The defining characteristic of communism implemented in the Eastern Bloc was the unique symbiosis of the state with society and the economy, resulting in politics and economics losing their distinctive features as autonomous and distinguishable spheres.
- The Soviet-style “replica regimes” that arose in the Bloc not only reproduced Soviet command economies, but also adopted the brutal methods employed by Joseph Stalin and Soviet secret police to suppress real and potential opposition.
- The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 or the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 was a nationwide revolt against the government of the Hungarian People’s Republic and its Soviet-imposed policies, lasting from October 23 until November 10, 1956.

**Key Terms**

**satellite state**

A country that is formally independent in the world, but under heavy political, economic, and military influence or control from another country.
Soviet Socialist Republic

Ethnically based administrative units in communist states of Eastern Europe that were subordinated directly to the Government of the Soviet Union.

Eastern Bloc

The group of communist states of Central and Eastern Europe, generally the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Pact.

Soviet

Derived from a Russian word signifying council, assembly, advice, harmony, concord, political organizations and governmental bodies associated with the Russian Revolutions and the history of the Soviet Union.

Formation of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc

The Soviet Union, officially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), was a union of multiple subnational Soviet republics; its government and economy were highly centralized.

The Soviet Union had its roots in the October Revolution of 1917, when the Bolsheviks, headed by Vladimir Lenin, overthrew the provisional government that replaced the Tsar. They established the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic (renamed Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic in 1936), beginning a civil war between the revolutionary “Reds” and the counter-revolutionary “Whites.” The Red Army entered several territories of the former
Russian Empire and helped local Communists take power through soviets, which nominally acted on behalf of workers and peasants. In 1922, the Communists were victorious, forming the Soviet Union with the unification of the Russian, Transcaucasian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian republics. Following Lenin’s death in 1924, Joseph Stalin came to power in the mid-1920s. Stalin suppressed all political opposition to his rule, committed the state ideology to Marxism–Leninism (which he created), and initiated a centrally planned command economy. As a result, the country underwent a period of rapid industrialization and collectivization which laid the foundation for its victory in World War II and post-war dominance of Eastern Europe.

During the opening stages of World War II, the Soviet Union created the Eastern Bloc (the group of communist states of Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War) by invading and then annexing several countries as Soviet Socialist Republics by agreement with Nazi Germany in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. These included eastern Poland (incorporated into two different SSRs), Latvia (which became the Latvian SSR), Estonia (which became the Estonian SSR), Lithuania (which became the Lithuanian SSR), part of eastern Finland (which became the Karelo-Finnish SSR) and eastern Romania (which became the Moldavian SSR).
Soviet Republics: Eastern Bloc area border changes between 1938 and 1948
Satellite States

According to Article 76 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, a Union Republic was a sovereign Soviet socialist state that had united with other Soviet Republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Article 81 of the Constitution stated that “the sovereign rights of Union Republics shall be safeguarded by the USSR.” In 1944, amendments to the All-Union Constitution allowed for separate branches of the Red Army for each Soviet Republic. They also allowed for Republic-level commissariats for foreign affairs and defense, allowing them to be recognized as de jure independent states in international law. This allowed for two Soviet Republics, Ukraine, and Byelorussia, as well as the USSR as a whole to join the United Nations General Assembly as founding members in 1945.

Therefore, constitutionally the Soviet Union was a federation. In accordance with provisions present in the Constitution (versions adopted in 1924, 1936, and 1977), each republic retained the right to secede from the USSR. Throughout the Cold War, this right was widely considered meaningless, and the Soviet Republics were often referred to as “satellite states.” The term satellite state designates a country that is formally independent in the world, but under heavy political, economic, and military influence or control from another country. The term is used mainly to refer to Central and Eastern European countries of the Warsaw Pact during the Cold War.

For the duration of the Cold War, the countries of Eastern Europe became Soviet satellite states — they were “independent” nations, one-party Communist States whose General Secretary had to be approved by the Kremlin, and so their governments usually kept their policy in line with the wishes of the Soviet Union. However, nationalistic forces and pressures within the satellite states played a part in causing deviation from strict Soviet rule.
Conditions in the Eastern Bloc

Throughout the Eastern Bloc, both in the Soviet Socialist Republic and the rest of the Bloc, Russia was given prominence and referred to as the *naibolee vydajuščaja nacija* (the most prominent nation) and the *rukovodjaščij narod* (the leading people). The Soviets encouraged the worship of everything Russian and the reproduction of their own Communist structural hierarchies in each of the Bloc states.

The defining characteristic of communism in the Eastern Bloc was the unique symbiosis of the state with society and the economy, resulting in politics and economics losing their distinctions and autonomy. While more than 15 million Eastern Bloc residents migrated westward from 1945 to 1949, emigration was effectively halted in the early 1950s, with the Soviet approach to controlling national movement emulated by most of the Eastern Bloc. The Soviets mandated expropriation of private property.

The Soviet-style “replica regimes” that arose in the Bloc not only reproduced Soviet command economies, but also adopted the brutal methods employed by Joseph Stalin and Soviet secret police to suppress real and potential opposition. Stalinist regimes in the Eastern Bloc saw even marginal groups of opposition intellectuals as a potential threat because of the bases underlying Stalinist power therein. The suppression of dissent and opposition was a central prerequisite for the security of Stalinist power within the Eastern Bloc, though the degree of opposition and dissident suppression varied by country and time throughout the Eastern Bloc. Furthermore, the Eastern Bloc experienced economic mismanagement by central planners resulting in extensive rather than intensive development, and lagged far behind their western European counterparts in per capita gross domestic product. In addition, media in the Eastern Bloc served as an organ of the state, completely reliant on and subservient to the communist party. The state owned radio and television organizations while print media
was usually owned by political organizations, mostly the ruling communist party.

**Hungarian Uprising of 1956**

The Hungarian Revolution or Uprising of 1956 was a nationwide revolt against the government of the Hungarian People's Republic and its Soviet-imposed policies, lasting from October 23 until November 10, 1956. Though leaderless when it first began, it was the first major threat to Soviet control since the USSR's forces drove Nazi Germany from its territory at the end of World War II and broke into Central and Eastern Europe.

The revolt began as a student demonstration, which attracted thousands who marched through central Budapest to the Parliament building, calling out on the streets using a van with loudspeakers via Radio Free Europe. A student delegation, entering the radio building to try to broadcast the students’ demands, was detained. When the delegation's release was demanded by the demonstrators outside, they were fired upon by the State Security Police (ÁVH) from within the building. One student died and was wrapped in a flag and held above the crowd. This was the start of the revolution. As the news spread, disorder and violence erupted throughout the capital.

The revolt spread quickly across Hungary and the government collapsed. Thousands organised into militias, battling the ÁVH and Soviet troops. Pro-Soviet communists and ÁVH members were often executed or imprisoned and former political prisoners were released and armed. Radical impromptu workers' councils wrested municipal control from the ruling Hungarian Working People's Party and demanded political changes. A new government formally disbanded the ÁVH, declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, and pledged to re-establish free elections. By the end
of October, fighting had almost ceased and a sense of normality began to return.

After announcing willingness to negotiate a withdrawal of Soviet forces, the Politburo changed its mind and moved to crush the revolution. On November 4, a large Soviet force invaded Budapest and other regions of the country. The Hungarian resistance continued until November 10. Over 2,500 Hungarians and 700 Soviet troops were killed in the conflict, and 200,000 Hungarians fled as refugees. Mass arrests and denunciations continued for months thereafter. By January 1957, the new Soviet-installed government had suppressed all public opposition. These Soviet actions, while strengthening control over the Eastern Bloc, alienated many Western Marxists, leading to splits and/or considerable losses of membership for Communist Parties in the West.

Public discussion about this revolution was suppressed in Hungary for more than 30 years.
Hungarian Revolution: Flag of Hungary, with the communist coat of arms cut out. The flag with a hole became the symbol of the revolution.
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209. Culture of the Soviet Union

32.2.3: Culture of the Soviet Union

During Stalin’s rule, Soviet culture was characterized by the rise and domination of the government-imposed style of socialist realism, with all other trends severely repressed. At the same time, a degree of social liberalization included more equality for women.

Learning Objective

Give examples of culture in the Soviet Union

Key Points

- The culture of the Soviet Union passed through several stages during the USSR’s 69-year existence, from relative freedom to repressive control and censorship.
- During the Stalin era, art and culture was put under strict control and public displays of Soviet life were limited to optimistic, positive, and realistic depictions.
of the Soviet man and woman, a style called socialist realism.

- Despite the strict censorship of the arts and the repression of political dissidence during this period, the Soviet people benefited from some social liberalization, including more equal education and social roles for women, free and improved health care, and other social benefits.

- Starting in the early 1930s, the Soviet government began an all-out war on organized religion in the country, and atheism was vigorously promoted by the government.

**Key Terms**

**Socialist realism**

A style of realistic art that was developed in the Soviet Union and became a dominant style in other socialist countries.

**Great Purge**

A campaign of political repression in the Soviet Union from 1936 to 1938 that involved a large-scale purge of the Communist Party and government officials, repression of peasants and the Red Army leadership, widespread police surveillance, suspicion of “saboteurs”, imprisonment, and arbitrary executions.
**Overview**

The culture of the Soviet Union passed through several stages during the USSR's 69-year existence. People of various nationalities from all 15 union republics contributed, with a narrow majority of Russians. The Soviet state supported cultural institutions but also carried out strict censorship.

During the first 11 years following the Russian Revolution (1918–1929), there was relative freedom for artists, as Lenin wanted art to be accessible to the Russian people. On the other hand, hundreds of intellectuals, writers, and artists were exiled or executed and their work banned.

The government encouraged a variety of trends. In art and literature, numerous schools, some traditional and others radically experimental, proliferated.

Later, during Stalin's rule, Soviet culture was characterized by the rise and domination of the government-imposed style of socialist realism, with all other trends severely repressed with rare exceptions like Mikhail Bulgakov's works. Many writers were imprisoned and killed.
Lenin Years

The main feature of communist attitudes towards the arts and artists from 1918-1929 was relative freedom and significant experimentation with several different methods to find a distinctive Soviet style of art.

This was a time of relative freedom and experimentation for the social and cultural life of the Soviet Union. The government tolerated a variety of trends in these areas, provided they were not overtly hostile to the regime. In art and literature, numerous schools, some traditional and others radically experimental, proliferated. Communist writers Maxim Gorky and Vladimir Mayakovsky were active during this time, but other authors, many of whose works were later repressed, published work without socialist political content. Film, as a means of influencing a largely illiterate society, received encouragement from the state; much of cinematographer Sergei Eisenstein's best work dates from this period.

Under Commissar Anatoliy Lunacharskiy, education entered a phase of experimentation based on progressive theories of learning. At the same time, the state expanded the primary and secondary school system and introduced night schools for working adults. The quality of higher education was affected by admissions policies that preferred entrants from the proletarian class over those of bourgeois backgrounds, regardless of the applicants' qualifications.

The state eased the active persecution of religion dating to war communism but continued to agitate on behalf of atheism. The party supported the Living Church reform movement within the Russian Orthodox Church in hopes that it would undermine faith in the church, but the movement died out in the late 1920s.

In family life, attitudes generally became more permissive. The state legalized abortion and made divorce progressively easier to obtain, while public cafeterias proliferated at the expense of private family kitchens.
Culture During the Stalin Era

Socialist realism is characterized by the glorified depiction of communist values, such as the emancipation of the proletariat, with realistic imagery. The purpose of socialist realism was to limit popular culture to a specific, highly regulated faction of creative expression that promoted Soviet ideals. The party was of the utmost importance and was always to be favorably featured. Revolutionary romanticism elevated the common worker, whether factory or agricultural, by presenting his life, work, and recreation as admirable to show how much the standard of living had improved thanks to the revolution. Art was used as educational information.

Many writers were imprisoned and killed or died of starvation, including Daniil Kharms, Osip Mandelstam, Isaac Babel, and Boris Pilnyak. Andrei Platonov worked as a caretaker and wasn’t allowed to publish. The work of Anna Akhmatova was also condemned by the regime, although she notably refused the opportunity to escape to the West. After a short Ukrainian literature renaissance, more than 250 Soviet Ukrainian writers died during the Great Purge. Texts of imprisoned authors were confiscated, though some were published later. Books were removed from libraries and destroyed.

Musical expression was also repressed during the Stalin era, and at times the music of many Soviet composers was banned. Dmitri Shostakovich experienced a long and complex relationship with Stalin during which his music was denounced and prohibited twice, in 1936 and 1948 (see Zhdanov decree). Sergei Prokofiev and Aram Khachaturian had similar cases. Although Igor Stravinsky did not live in the Union, his music was officially considered formalist and anti-Soviet.
The Worker and Kolkhoz Woman: The Worker and Kolkhoz Woman by Vera Mukhina (1937), an example of socialist realism during the Stalin Era.

Society During the Stalin Era

During this period (1927-1953), the Soviet people benefited from social liberalization. Women were eligible for the same education as
men and at least legally speaking, obtained the same rights as men in the workplace. Although in practice these goals were not reached, the efforts to achieve them and the statement of theoretical equality led to a general improvement in the socioeconomic status of women. Stalinist development also contributed to advances in health care, which marked a massive improvement over the Imperial era. Stalin’s policies granted the Soviet people access to free health care and education. Widespread immunization programs created the first generation free from fear of typhus and cholera. The occurrences of these diseases dropped to record-low numbers and infant mortality rates were substantially reduced, increasing the life expectancy for both men and women by more than 20 years by the mid-to-late 1950s. Many of the more extreme social and political ideas that were fashionable in the 1920s, such as anarchism, internationalism, and the belief that the nuclear family was a bourgeois concept, were abandoned. Schools began to teach a more nationalistic course with emphasis on Russian history and leaders, though Marxist underpinnings remained. Stalin also began to create a Lenin cult. During the 1930s, Soviet society assumed the basic form it would maintain until its collapse in 1991.

Urban women under Stalin were the first generation able to give birth in a hospital with access to prenatal care. Education also improved with economic development. The generation born during Stalin’s rule was the first in which most members were literate. Some engineers were sent abroad to learn industrial technology, and hundreds of foreign engineers were brought to Russia on contract. Transport links were also improved as many new railways were built—with forced labor, costing thousands of lives. Workers who exceeded their quotas, Stakhanovites, received many incentives, although many were in fact “arranged” to succeed by receiving extreme help, and their achievements then used for propaganda.

Starting in the early 1930s, the Soviet government began an all-out war on organized religion. Many churches and monasteries were closed and scores of clergymen were imprisoned or executed.
The state propaganda machine vigorously promoted atheism and denounced religion as an artifact of capitalist society. In 1937, Pope Pius XI decried the attacks on religion in the Soviet Union. By 1940, only a small number of churches remained. The early anti-religious campaigns under Lenin were mostly directed at the Russian Orthodox Church, as it was a symbol of the czarist government. In the 1930s, however, all faiths were targeted: minority Christian denominations, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism.

Attributions

- Culture of the Soviet Union
210. Famine and Oppression

32.2.4: Famine and Oppression

Under Stalin, forced collectivization of farms was implemented all over the country, causing widespread famine and millions of deaths, primarily of Ukrainian peasants.

Learning Objective

Explain the reasons for the recurring food shortages of the Soviet Union and how the government used hunger as a tool.

Key Points

- With Stalin’s first Five-Year Plan, the state sought increased political control of agriculture to feed the rapidly growing urban population and obtain a source of foreign currency through increased cereal exports.
- This brought about widespread collectivization of agriculture in the Soviet Union, and by 1936, about 90% of Soviet agriculture had been collectivized.
- Kulaks, a term referring to prosperous peasants
and anyone who opposed collectivizations, were forcibly resettled to Kazakhstan, Siberia, and the Russian Far North, as well as sent to Gulags. In 1930 around 20,000 “kulaks” were killed by the Soviet government.

- Widespread famine ensued from collectivization and affected Ukraine, southern Russia, and other parts of the USSR, with the death toll estimated at between 5 and 10 million.
- The Holodomor, considered a genocide by many historians, was a man-made famine in Ukraine in 1932 and 1933 that killed an estimated 2.5–7.5 million Ukrainians.

**Key Terms**

**first Five-Year Plan**

A list of economic goal, created by General Secretary Joseph Stalin and based on his policy of Socialism in One Country, including the creation of collective farming systems that stretched over thousands of acres of land and had hundreds of peasants working on them.

**kulaks**

A category of affluent landlords in the later Russian Empire, Soviet Russia, and the early Soviet Union, especially any peasant who resisted collectivization. According to the political theory of Marxism-Leninism
of the early 20th century, these peasants were class enemies of the poorer peasants.

**Holodomor**

A man-made famine in Ukraine in 1932 and 1933 that killed an estimated 2.5–7.5 million Ukrainians.

---

**Collectivization**

The Soviet Union enforced the collectivization of its agricultural sector between 1928 and 1940 during the ascendancy of Joseph Stalin. It began during and was part of the first Five-Year Plan. The policy aimed to consolidate individual landholdings and labor into collective farms. The Soviet leadership expected that the replacement of individual peasant farms by collectives would immediately increase the food supply for the urban population, the supply of raw materials for processing industry, and agricultural exports. Planners regarded collectivization as the solution to the crisis of agricultural distribution (mainly in grain deliveries) that began in 1927. This problem became more acute as the Soviet Union pressed ahead with its ambitious industrialization program.

In the early 1930s, more than 91% of agricultural land became “collectivized” as rural households entered collective farms with their land, livestock, and other assets. The sweeping policy came at tremendous human and social costs.

Despite the expectations, collectivization led to a catastrophic drop in farm productivity, which did not return to the levels achieved under the NEP until 1940. In the first years of collectivization, it was estimated that industrial production would rise by 200% and agricultural production by 50%, but these expectations were not realized. Stalin blamed this unanticipated
failure on kulaks who resisted collectivization. However, so-called kulaks made up only 4% of the peasant population; Stalin targeted the slightly better-off peasants who took the brunt of violence from the OGPU and the Komsomol, who comprised about 60% of the population. Those officially defined as “kulaks,” “kulak helpers,” and, later, “ex-kulaks” were shot, placed in Gulag labor camps, or deported to remote areas of the country, depending on the charge. Archival data indicates that 20,201 people were executed during 1930, the year of Dekulakization.

The upheaval associated with collectivization was particularly severe in Ukraine and the heavily Ukrainian Volga region. Peasants slaughtered their livestock en masse rather than give them up. In 1930 alone, 25% of the nation’s cattle, sheep, and goats and one-third of all pigs were killed. It was not until the 1980s that the Soviet livestock numbers returned to their 1928 level. Government bureaucrats who had been given a rudimentary education on farming techniques were dispatched to the countryside to “teach” peasants the new ways of socialist agriculture, relying largely on Marxist theoretical ideas that had little basis in reality. The farmers who knew agriculture well and were familiar with the local climates, soil types, and other factors had been sent to the gulags or shot as enemies of the state. Even after the state inevitably succeeded in imposing collectivization, the peasants sabotaged as much as possible by cultivating far smaller portions of their land and working much less. The scale of the Ukrainian famine has led many Ukrainian scholars to argue that there was a deliberate policy of genocide against the Ukrainian people. Other scholars argue that the massive death totals were an inevitable result of a very poorly planned operation against all peasants, who gave little support to Lenin or Stalin.
Widespread famine ensued from collectivization and affected Ukraine, southern Russia, and other parts of the USSR. The death toll from famine in the Soviet Union is estimated between 5 and 10 million people. Most modern scholars agree that the famine was caused by the policies of the government of the Soviet Union under Stalin, rather than by natural causes. According to Alan Bullock, “the total Soviet grain crop was no worse than that of 1931 ... it was not a crop failure but the excessive demands of the state, ruthlessly enforced, that cost the lives of as many as five million Ukrainian peasants.” Stalin refused to release large grain reserves that could have alleviated the famine, while continuing to export grain; he was convinced that the Ukrainian peasants had hidden grain away and strictly enforced draconian new collective-farm theft laws in response. Other historians hold it was largely the insufficient harvests of 1931 and 1932 caused by a variety of natural disasters that resulted in famine, ended with the successful harvest of 1933. Soviet and other historians have argued that the rapid collectivization of agriculture was necessary to achieve an equally rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union and ultimately win World War II. Alec Nove claims that the Soviet Union industrialized in spite of rather than because of its collectivized agriculture.
The Soviet famine of 1932–33 affected the major grain-producing areas of the Soviet Union, leading to millions of deaths in those areas and severe food shortage throughout the USSR. These areas included Ukraine, Northern Caucasus, Volga Region and Kazakhstan, the South Urals, and West Siberia. Gareth Jones was the first western journalist to report the inhumane devastation. The subset of the famine within the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Kuban, is called Holodomor. All affected areas were heavily populated by Ukrainians.

**Holodomor**

The Holodomor (Ukrainian for “extermination by hunger”), also known as the Terror-Famine and Famine-Genocide in Ukraine, was a man-made famine in Ukraine in 1932 and 1933 that killed an estimated 2.5–7.5 million Ukrainians, with millions more in demographic estimates. It was part of the wider disaster, the Soviet famine of 1932–33, which affected the major grain-producing areas of the country.

During the Holodomor millions of inhabitants of Ukraine, primarily ethnic Ukrainians, died of starvation in a peacetime catastrophe unprecedented in the history of the country. Since 2006, the Holodomor has been recognized by the independent Ukraine and 24 other countries as a genocide of the Ukrainian people carried out by the Soviet Union.

Some scholars believe that the famine was planned by Joseph Stalin to eliminate the Ukrainian independence movement. Using Holodomor in reference to the famine emphasizes its man-made aspects, arguing that actions such as rejection of outside aid, confiscation of all household foodstuffs, and restriction of population movement confer intent, defining the famine as genocide; the loss of life has been compared to the Holocaust. If Soviet policies and actions were conclusively documented as
intending to eradicate the rise of Ukrainian nationalism, they would fall under the legal definition of genocide.

Golodomor: Starved peasants on a street in Kharkiv, Ukraine, 1933

Attributions

- Famine and Oppression
  - “History of the Soviet Union (1927–1953).”
  - “Droughts and famines in Russia and the Soviet Union.”
  - “Collectivization in the Soviet Union.”
  - ““Strengthen_working_discipline_in_collective_farms”_
- “_Uzbek,_Tashkent,_1933_(Mardjani).jpg.”
2II. Containment

32.3: Containment

32.3.1: The Truman Doctrine

The Truman Doctrine was an American foreign policy created to contain Soviet geopolitical spread during the Cold War, first announced to Congress by President Harry S. Truman on March 12, 1947.

Learning Objective

Paraphrase the Truman Doctrine

Key Points

• In February 1947, the British government announced that it could no longer afford to finance the Greek monarchical military regime in its civil war against communist-led insurgents.
• The American government’s response to this
announcement was the adoption of containment, a policy designed to stop the spread of communism from the Soviet Union, in this case to Greece.

- In March 1947, Truman delivered a speech to Congress that called for the allocation of $400 million to intervene in the war and unveiled the Truman Doctrine, which framed the conflict as a contest between free peoples and totalitarian regimes.
- Historians often use Truman's speech to date the start of the Cold War.
- The Truman Doctrine underpinned American Cold War policy in Europe and internationally and influenced many foreign policy decisions in the decades to come.

Key Terms

Greek Civil War
A war fought in Greece from 1946 to 1949 between the Greek government army (backed by the United Kingdom and the United States), and the Democratic Army of Greece (DSE, the military branch of the Greek Communist Party (KKE), backed by Yugoslavia and Albania as well as by Bulgaria.

Truman Doctrine
An American foreign policy created to counter Soviet geopolitical spread during the Cold War, announced by
Overview

The Truman Doctrine was an American foreign policy created to counter Soviet geopolitical spread during the Cold War. It was first announced to Congress by President Harry S. Truman on March 12, 1947, and further developed on July 12, 1948, when he pledged to contain Soviet threats to Greece and Turkey. American military force was usually not involved, but Congress appropriated free gifts of financial aid to support the economies and the military of Greece and Turkey. More generally, the Truman Doctrine implied American support for other nations threatened by Soviet communism. The Truman Doctrine became the foundation of American foreign policy, and led in 1949 to the formation of NATO, a military alliance that is still in effect. Historians often use Truman’s speech to date the start of the Cold War.

Truman told Congress that “it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.” Truman reasoned that because the totalitarian regimes coerced free peoples, they represented a threat to international peace and the national security of the United States. Truman made the plea amid the crisis of the Greek Civil War (1946–49). He argued that if Greece and Turkey did not receive the aid that they urgently needed, they
would inevitably fall to communism with grave consequences throughout the region. Because Turkey and Greece were historic rivals, it was necessary to help both equally even though the threat to Greece was more immediate. Historian Eric Foner argues the Truman Doctrine “set a precedent for American assistance to anticommunist regimes throughout the world, no matter how undemocratic, and for the creation of a set of global military alliances directed against the Soviet Union.”

For years, Britain had supported Greece, but was now near bankruptcy and was forced to radically reduce its involvement. In February 1947, Britain formally requested for the United States to take over its role in supporting the Greeks and their government. The policy won the support of Republicans who controlled Congress and involved sending $400 million in American money but no military forces to the region. The effect was to end the communist threat, and in 1952, both Greece and Turkey joined NATO, a military alliance, to guarantee their protection.

The Truman Doctrine was informally extended to become the basis of American Cold War policy throughout Europe and around the world. It shifted American foreign policy toward the Soviet Union from détente (a relaxation of tension) to a policy of containment of Soviet expansion as advocated by diplomat George Kennan. It was distinguished from rollback by implicitly tolerating the previous Soviet takeovers in Eastern Europe.

**Background: Greek Crisis**

The Greek Civil War was fought in Greece from 1946 to 1949 between the Greek government army (backed by the United Kingdom and the United States), and the Democratic Army of Greece (DSE, the military branch of the Greek Communist Party (KKE), backed by Yugoslavia and Albania as well as by Bulgaria. The
fighting resulted in the defeat of the Communist insurgents by the government forces.

In the second stage of the civil war in December 1944, the British helped prevent the seizure of Athens by the Greek Communist Party (KKE). In the third phase (1946–49), guerrilla forces controlled by the KKE fought against the internationally recognized Greek government which was formed after 1946 elections boycotted by the KKE. At this point, the British realized that the Greek leftists were being directly funded by Josip Broz Tito in neighboring Yugoslavia; the Greek communists received little help directly from the Soviet Union, while Yugoslavia provided support and sanctuary. By late 1946, Britain informed the United States that due to its own weakening economy, it could no longer continue to provide military and economic support to Greece.

In 1946–47, the United States and the Soviet Union moved from wartime allies to Cold War adversaries. Soviet imperialism in Eastern Europe, its delayed withdrawal from Iran, and the breakdown of Allied cooperation in Germany provided a backdrop of escalating tensions for the Truman Doctrine. To Harry S. Truman, the growing unrest in Greece began to look like a pincer movement against the oil-rich areas of the Middle East and the warm-water ports of the Mediterranean.

In February 1946, George Kennan, an American diplomat in Moscow, sent his famed “Long Telegram,” which predicted the Soviets would only respond to force and that the best way to handle them was through a long-term strategy of containment by stopping their geographical expansion. After the British warned that they could no longer help Greece and Prime Minister Konstantinos Tsaldaris’s visit to Washington in December 1946 to ask for American assistance, the U.S. State Department formulated a plan. Aid would be given to both Greece and Turkey to help cool the long-standing rivalry between them.

American policymakers recognized the instability of the region, fearing that if Greece was lost to communism, Turkey would not last long. If Turkey yielded to Soviet demands, the position of Greece
would be endangered. Fear of this regional domino effect threat guided the American decision. Greece and Turkey were strategic allies for geographical reasons as well, as the fall of Greece would put the Soviets on a dangerous flank for the Turks and strengthen the Soviet Union's ability to cut off allied supply lines in the event of war.

Long-Term Policy and Metaphor

The Truman Doctrine underpinned American Cold War policy in Europe and around the world. In the words of historian James T. Patterson, “The Truman Doctrine was a highly publicized commitment of a sort the administration had not previously undertaken. Its sweeping rhetoric, promising that the United States should aid all ‘free people’ being subjugated, set the stage for innumerable later ventures that led to globalistic commitments. It was in these ways a major step.”

The doctrine endured, historian Dennis Merill argues, because it addressed a broader cultural insecurity about modern life in a globalized world. It dealt with Washington’s concern over communism’s domino effect, it enabled a media-sensitive presentation of the doctrine that won bipartisan support, and it mobilized American economic power to modernize and stabilize unstable regions without direct military intervention. It brought nation-building activities and modernization programs to the forefront of foreign policy.

The Truman Doctrine became a metaphor for emergency aid to keep a nation from communist influence. Truman used disease imagery not only to communicate a sense of impending disaster in the spread of communism but also to create a “rhetorical vision” of containing it by extending a protective shield around non-communist countries throughout the world. It echoed the “quarantine the aggressor” policy Truman’s predecessor, Franklin
D. Roosevelt, sought to impose to contain German and Japanese expansion in 1937. The medical metaphor extended beyond the immediate aims of the Truman Doctrine in that the imagery combined with fire and flood imagery evocative of disaster provided the United States with an easy transition to direct military confrontation in later years with communist forces in Korea and Vietnam. By ideological differences in life or death terms, Truman was able to garner support for this communism-containing policy.

Truman Doctrine On March 12, 1947, President Harry S. Truman appeared before a joint session of Congress and laid out his vision on containment which came to be known as the Truman Doctrine.

Attributions

- The Truman Doctrine
In June 1947, in accordance with the Truman Doctrine, the United States enacted the Marshall Plan. This was a pledge of economic assistance for all European countries willing to participate, including the Soviet Union, who refused and created their own Molotov plan for the Eastern Bloc.

**Learning Objective**

Distinguish between the Marshall Plan and the Molotov Plan

**Key Points**

- In early 1947, Britain, France, and the United States unsuccessfully attempted to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union for a plan envisioning an economically self-sufficient Germany.
- In June 1947, in accordance with the Truman
Doctrine, the United States enacted the Marshall Plan, a pledge of economic assistance for all European countries willing to participate, including the Soviet Union.

- The years 1948 to 1952 saw the fastest period of growth in European history; industrial production increased by 35%, some of which has been attributed to the Marshall Plan aid.
- The Soviet Union refused the aid because Stalin believed that economic integration with the West would allow Eastern Bloc countries to escape Soviet control.
- In response, the Soviet Union created the Molotov Plan, later expanded into the COMECON, a system of bilateral trade agreements and an economic alliance between socialist countries in the Eastern Bloc.

**Key Terms**

**Molotov Plan**

The system created by the Soviet Union in 1947 to provide aid to rebuild the countries in Eastern Europe that were politically and economically aligned to the Soviet Union.

**National Security Act of 1947**

A bill that brought about a major restructuring of the United States government’s military and intelligence
agencies following World War; it established the National Security Council, a central place of coordination for national security policy in the executive branch, and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the U.S.'s first peacetime intelligence agency

**Marshall Plan**

An American initiative to aid Western Europe in which the United States gave more than $12 billion in economic support to help rebuild Western European economies after the end of World War II.

---

**Overview**

In early 1947, Britain, France, and the United States unsuccessfully attempted to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union for an economically self-sufficient Germany, including a detailed accounting of the industrial plants, goods, and infrastructure already removed by the Soviets. In June 1947, in accordance with the Truman Doctrine, the United States enacted the Marshall Plan, a pledge of economic assistance for all European countries willing to participate, including the Soviet Union.

The plan's aim was to rebuild the democratic and economic systems of Europe and counter perceived threats to Europe's balance of power, such as communist parties seizing control through revolutions or elections. The plan also stated that European prosperity was contingent upon German economic recovery. One month later, Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947, creating a unified Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the National Security Council (NSC). These would become the main bureaucracies for U.S. policy in the Cold War.
Stalin believed that economic integration with the West would allow Eastern Bloc countries to escape Soviet control, and that the U.S. was trying to buy a pro-U.S. realignment of Europe. Stalin therefore prevented Eastern Bloc nations from receiving Marshall Plan aid. The Soviet Union’s alternative to the Marshall plan, purported to involve Soviet subsidies and trade with central and eastern Europe, became known as the Molotov Plan (later institutionalized in January 1949 as the COMECON). Stalin was also fearful of a reconstituted Germany; his vision of a post-war Germany did not include the ability to rearm or pose any kind of threat to the Soviet Union.

In early 1948, following reports of strengthening “reactionary elements”, Soviet operatives executed a coup d’état in Czechoslovakia, the only Eastern Bloc state that the Soviets had permitted to retain democratic structures. The public brutality of the coup shocked Western powers and set in a motion a brief scare that swept away the last vestiges of opposition to the Marshall Plan in the United States Congress.

The twin policies of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan led to billions in economic and military aid for Western Europe, Greece, and Turkey. With U.S. assistance, the Greek military won its civil war. Under the leadership of Alcide De Gasperi the Italian Christian Democrats defeated the powerful Communist-Socialist alliance in the elections of 1948. At the same time, there was increased intelligence and espionage activity, Eastern Bloc defections, and diplomatic expulsions.

**Marshall Plan**

The Marshall Plan (officially the European Recovery Program, ERP) was an American initiative to aid Western Europe, in which the United States gave over $12 billion (approximately $120 billion in value as of June 2016) in economic support to help rebuild Western
European economies after the end of World War II. The plan was in operation for four years beginning April 8, 1948. The goals of the United States were to rebuild war-devastated regions, remove trade barriers, modernize industry, make Europe prosperous again, and prevent the spread of communism. The Marshall Plan required a lessening of interstate barriers, saw a decrease in regulations, and encouraged an increase in productivity, labor union membership, and the adoption of modern business procedures.

The Marshall Plan aid was divided among the participant states on a per capita basis. A larger amount was given to the major industrial powers, as the prevailing opinion was that their resuscitation was essential for general European revival. Somewhat more aid per capita was also directed towards the Allied nations, with less for those that had been part of the Axis or remained neutral. The largest recipient of Marshall Plan money was the United Kingdom (receiving about 26% of the total), followed by France (18%) and West Germany (11%). Some 18 European countries received Plan benefits. Although offered participation, the Soviet Union refused Plan benefits and blocked benefits to Eastern Bloc countries such as East Germany and Poland.

The years 1948 to 1952 saw the fastest period of growth in European history. Industrial production increased by 35%. Agricultural production substantially surpassed pre-war levels. The poverty and starvation of the immediate postwar years disappeared, and Western Europe embarked upon an unprecedented two decades of growth during which standards of living increased dramatically. There is some debate among historians over how much this should be credited to the Marshall Plan. Most reject the idea that it alone miraculously revived Europe, as evidence shows that a general recovery was already underway. Most believe that the Marshall Plan sped this recovery but did not initiate it. Many argue that the structural adjustments that it forced were of great importance.

The political effects of the Marshall Plan may have been just as important as the economic ones. Marshall Plan aid allowed the
nations of Western Europe to relax austerity measures and rationing, reducing discontent and bringing political stability. The communist influence on Western Europe was greatly reduced, and throughout the region communist parties faded in popularity in the years after the Marshall Plan.

Marshall Plan: One of a number of posters created to promote the Marshall Plan in Europe. Note the pivotal position of the American flag.
Molotov Plan

The Molotov Plan was the system created by the Soviet Union in 1947 to provide aid to rebuild the countries in Eastern Europe that were politically and economically aligned with the Soviet Union. It can be seen as the USSR's version of the Marshall Plan, which for political reasons the Eastern European countries would not be able to join without leaving the Soviet sphere of influence. Soviet foreign minister Vyacheslav Molotov rejected the Marshall Plan (1947), proposing the Molotov Plan – the Soviet-sponsored economic grouping which was eventually expanded to become the COMECON. The Molotov plan was symbolic of the Soviet Union's refusal to accept aid from the Marshall Plan or allow any of their satellite states to do so because of their belief that the Plan was an attempt to weaken Soviet interest in their satellite states through the conditions imposed and by making beneficiary countries economically dependent on the United States.

The plan was a system of bilateral trade agreements that established COMECON to create an economic alliance of socialist countries. This aid allowed countries in Europe to stop relying on American aid, and therefore allowed Molotov Plan states to reorganize their trade to the USSR instead. The plan was in some ways contradictory, however, because at the same time the Soviets were giving aid to Eastern bloc countries, they were demanding that countries who were members of the Axis powers pay reparations to the USSR.

Attributions

- The Marshall Plan and Molotov Plan
1982 | The Marshall Plan and Molotov Plan

In June 1948, Stalin instituted the Berlin Blockade, one of the first major crises of the Cold War, preventing food, materials, and supplies from arriving in West Berlin. The United States and several other countries responded with the massive “Berlin airlift,” supplying West Berlin with food and other provisions.

**Learning Objective**

Review the reasons for the Berlin Blockade

**Key Points**

- As part of the economic rebuilding of Germany, in early 1948 representatives of a number of Western European governments and the United States announced an agreement for a merger of western German areas into a federal governmental system.
- In addition, in accordance with the Marshall Plan, they began to reindustrialize and rebuild the German economy, including the introduction of a new
Deutsche Mark currency to replace the old Reichsmark currency the Soviets had debased.

- Shortly thereafter, Stalin instituted the Berlin Blockade (June 24, 1948 – May 12, 1949), one of the first major crises of the Cold War, preventing food, materials and supplies from arriving in West Berlin.
- The United States, Britain, France, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and several other countries began the massive “Berlin airlift”, supplying West Berlin with food and other provisions.
- By the end of August, after two months the Airlift was succeeding; daily operations flew more than 1,500 flights a day and delivered more than 4,500 tons of cargo, enough to keep West Berlin supplied.
- In May 1949, Stalin backed down and lifted the blockade.

**Key Terms**

**Berlin airlift**

In response to the Berlin Blockade, the Western Allies organized this project to carry supplies to the people of West Berlin by air.

**Potsdam Agreement**

The 1945 agreement between three of the Allies of World War II, United Kingdom, United States, and USSR, for the military occupation and reconstruction
of Germany. It included Germany's demilitarization, reparations, and the prosecution of war criminals.

Overview

The Berlin Blockade (June 24, 1948 – May 12, 1949) was one of the first major international crises of the Cold War. During the multinational occupation of post–World War II Germany, the Soviet Union blocked the Western Allies’ railway, road, and canal access to the sectors of Berlin under Western control. The Soviets offered to drop the blockade if the Western Allies withdrew the newly introduced Deutsche mark from West Berlin.

In response, the Western Allies organized the Berlin airlift to carry supplies to the people of West Berlin, a difficult feat given the city's population. Aircrews from the United States Air Force, the British Royal Air Force, the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Royal Australian Air Force, the Royal New Zealand Air Force, and the South African Air Force flew over 200,000 flights in one year, providing the West Berliners up to 8,893 tons of necessities each day, such as fuel and food. The Soviets did not disrupt the airlift for fear this might lead to open conflict.

By the spring of 1949, the airlift was clearly succeeding, and by April it was delivering more cargo than was previously transported into the city by rail. On May 12, 1949, the USSR lifted the blockade of West Berlin. The Berlin Blockade highlighted the competing ideological and economic visions for postwar Europe.
Background

From July 17 to August 2, 1945, the victorious Allied Powers reached the Potsdam Agreement on the fate of postwar Europe, calling for the division of defeated Germany into four temporary occupation zones (thus reaffirming principles laid out earlier by the Yalta Conference). These zones were located roughly around the then-current locations of the Allied armies. Also divided into occupation zones, Berlin was located 100 miles inside Soviet-controlled eastern Germany. The United States, United Kingdom, and France controlled western portions of the city, while Soviet troops controlled the eastern sector.

In a June 1945 meeting, Stalin informed German communist leaders that he expected to slowly undermine the British position within their occupation zone, that the United States would withdraw within a year or two, and that nothing would then stand in the way of a united Germany under communist control within the Soviet orbit. Stalin and other leaders told visiting Bulgarian and Yugoslavian delegations in early 1946 that Germany must be both Soviet and communist.

Creation of an economically stable western Germany required reform of the unstable Reichsmark German currency introduced after the 1920s German inflation. The Soviets had debased the Reichsmark by excessive printing, resulting in Germans using cigarettes as a de facto currency or for bartering. The Soviets opposed western plans for a reform. They interpreted this new currency as an unjustified, unilateral decision.

On June 18, the United States, Britain, and France announced that on June 21 the Deutsche Mark would be introduced, but the Soviets refused to permit its use as legal tender in Berlin. The Allies had already transported 2.5 million Deutsche Marks into the city and it quickly became the standard currency in all four sectors. Against the wishes of the Soviets, the new currency, along with the Marshall Plan that backed it, appeared to have the potential to revitalize
Germany. Stalin looked to force the Western nations to abandon Berlin.

The Blockade

The day after the June 18, 1948 announcement of the new Deutsche Mark, Soviet guards halted all passenger trains and traffic on the autobahn to Berlin, delayed Western and German freight shipments, and required that all water transport secure special Soviet permission. On June 21, the day the Deutsche Mark was introduced, the Soviet military halted a United States military supply train to Berlin and sent it back to western Germany. On June 22, the Soviets announced that they would introduce a new currency in their zone.

On June 24, the Soviets severed land and water connections between the non-Soviet zones and Berlin. That same day, they halted all rail and barge traffic in and out of Berlin. On June 25, the Soviets stopped supplying food to the civilian population in the non-Soviet sectors of Berlin. Motor traffic from Berlin to the western zones was permitted, but this required a 14.3-mile detour to a ferry crossing because of alleged “repairs” to a bridge. They also cut off Berlin’s electricity using their control over the generating plants in the Soviet zone.

At the time, West Berlin had 36 days’ worth of food, and 45 days’ worth of coal. Militarily, the Americans and British were greatly outnumbered because of the postwar reduction in their armies. The United States, like other western countries, had disbanded most of its troops and was largely inferior in the European theater. The entire United States Army was reduced to 552,000 men by February 1948. Military forces in the western sectors of Berlin numbered only 8,973 Americans, 7,606 British, and 6,100 French. Soviet military forces in the Soviet sector that surrounded Berlin totaled 1.5 million. The two United States regiments in Berlin could have provided little resistance against a Soviet attack. Believing that Britain, France, and
the United States had little option than to acquiesce, the Soviet Military Administration in Germany celebrated the beginning of the blockade.

**Berlin Airlift**

Although the ground routes were never negotiated, the same was not true of the air. On November 30, 1945, it was agreed in writing that there would be three 20-mile-wide air corridors providing free access to Berlin. Additionally, unlike a force of tanks and trucks, the Soviets could not claim that cargo aircraft were some sort of military threat. In the face of unarmed aircraft refusing to turn around, the only way to enforce the blockade would have been to shoot them down. An airlift would force the Soviet Union to either shoot down unarmed humanitarian aircraft, thus breaking their own agreements, or back down.

Enforcing this would require an airlift that really worked. If the supplies could not be flown in fast enough, Soviet help would eventually be needed to prevent starvation. The American military government, based on a minimum daily ration of 1,990 calories, set a total of daily supplies at 646 tons of flour and wheat, 125 tons of cereal, 64 tons of fat, 109 tons of meat and fish, 180 tons of dehydrated potatoes, 180 tons of sugar, 11 tons of coffee, 19 tons of powdered milk, 5 tons of whole milk for children, 3 tons of fresh yeast for baking, 144 tons of dehydrated vegetables, 38 tons of salt, and 10 tons of cheese. In all, 1,534 tons were required each day to sustain the more than two million people of Berlin. Additionally, for heat and power, 3,475 tons of coal and gasoline were also required daily.

During the first week, the airlift averaged only ninety tons a day, but by the second week it reached 1,000 tons. This likely would have sufficed had the effort lasted only a few weeks as originally believed. The Communist press in East Berlin ridiculed the project.
It derisively referred to “the futile attempts of the Americans to save face and to maintain their untenable position in Berlin.”

But by the end of August, after two months, the Airlift was succeeding; daily operations flew more than 1,500 flights a day and delivered more than 4,500 tons of cargo, enough to keep West Berlin supplied.

As the tempo of the Airlift grew, it became apparent that the Western powers might be able to pull off the impossible: indefinitely supplying an entire city by air alone. In response, starting on August 1, the Soviets offered free food to anyone who crossed into East Berlin and registered their ration cards there, but West Berliners overwhelmingly rejected Soviet offers of food.

The Soviets had an advantage in conventional military forces, but were preoccupied with rebuilding their war-torn economy and society. The U.S. had a stronger navy and air force as well as nuclear weapons. Neither side wanted a war; the Soviets did not disrupt the airlift.
Berlin Airlift: Berliners watch a Douglas C-54 Skymaster land at Tempelhof Airport, 1948 End of the Blockade On April 15, 1949 the Russian news agency TASS reported a willingness by the Soviets to lift the blockade. The next day the U.S. State Department stated the “way appears clear” for the blockade to end. Soon afterwards, the four powers began serious negotiations, and a settlement was reached on Western terms. On May 4, 1949, the Allies announced an agreement to end the blockade in eight days’ time. Berlin Airlift Monument in Berlin-Tempelhof displays the names of the 39 British and 31 American airmen who lost their lives during the operation.
Similar monuments can be found at the military airfield of Wietzenbruch near the former RAF Celle and at Rhein-Main Air Base. The Soviet blockade of Berlin was lifted at one minute after midnight on May 12, 1949. A British convoy immediately drove through to Berlin, and the first train from West Germany reached Berlin at 5:32 a.m. Later that day an enormous crowd celebrated the end of the blockade. General Clay, whose retirement had been announced by US President Truman on May 3, was saluted by 11,000 US soldiers and dozens of aircraft. Once home, Clay received a ticker-tape parade in New York City, was invited to address the US Congress, and was honored with a medal from President Truman. 

Attributions
214. NATO and the Warsaw Pact

32.3.4: NATO and the Warsaw Pact

Britain, France, the United States, Canada, and eight other western European countries established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. In 1955, the Soviet Union responded by created the Warsaw Pact.

Learning Objective

Compare the two networks established by NATO and the Warsaw Pact

Key Points

- The Treaty of Brussels was signed on March 17, 1948 between Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, as an expansion to the preceding year’s defense pledge, the Dunkirk Treaty signed between Britain and France; it is considered a precursor to NATO.
• The North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington, D.C. on April 4, 1949, thereby establishing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a mutual defense treaty between 12 nations.
• NATO was little more than a political association until the Korean War (1950–1953) galvanized the organization’s member states.
• In 1954, the Soviet Union suggested it should join NATO to preserve peace in Europe, but the NATO countries, fearful that the Soviet Union’s motive was to weaken the alliance, ultimately rejected this proposal.
• The Warsaw Pact was created in reaction to the integration of West Germany into NATO in 1955 and represented a Soviet counterweight to NATO, composed of the Soviet Union and seven other Soviet satellite states in Central and Eastern Europe.
• For 36 years, NATO and the Warsaw Pact never directly waged war against each other in Europe; the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective allies implemented strategic policies aimed at the containment of each other in Europe while working and fighting for influence within the wider Cold War on the international stage.
Key Terms

North Atlantic Treaty
A mutual defense treaty signed in Washington on April 4, 1949 that established NATO.

1948 Czechoslovak coup d'état
An event in February 1948 in which the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, with Soviet backing, assumed undisputed control over the government of Czechoslovakia, marking the onset of four decades of Communist dictatorship in the country.

Treaty of Brussels
A treaty signed on March 17, 1948, between Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom as an expansion to the preceding year’s defense pledge, the Dunkirk Treaty signed between Britain and France; a mutual defense treaty.

NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an intergovernmental military alliance based on the North Atlantic Treaty signed on April 4, 1949. The organization constitutes a system of collective defense whereby its member states agree to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party.

NATO was little more than a political association until the Korean War galvanized the organization’s member states and an integrated military structure was built up under the direction of two U.S.
supreme commanders. The course of the Cold War led to a rivalry with nations of the Warsaw Pact, which formed in 1955. Doubts over the strength of the relationship between the European states and the United States ebbed and flowed, along with doubts over the credibility of the NATO defense against a prospective Soviet invasion—doubts that led to the development of the independent French nuclear deterrent and the withdrawal of France from NATO's military structure in 1966 for 30 years.

The Treaty of Brussels, signed on March 17, 1948 by Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, and the United Kingdom, is considered the precursor to the NATO agreement. The treaty and the Soviet Berlin Blockade led to the creation of the Western European Union's Defense Organization in September 1948. However, participation of the United States was thought necessary both to counter the military power of the USSR and prevent the revival of nationalist militarism. In addition, the 1948 Czechoslovak coup d'état by the Communists had overthrown a democratic government and British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin reiterated that the best way to prevent another Czechoslovakia was to evolve a joint Western military strategy.

In 1948, European leaders met with U.S. defense, military, and diplomatic officials at the Pentagon under U.S. Secretary of State George C. Marshall's orders, exploring a framework for a new and unprecedented association. Talks for a new military alliance resulted in the North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington, D.C. on April 4, 1949. It included the five Treaty of Brussels states plus the United States, Canada, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland. The first NATO Secretary General, Lord Ismay, stated in 1949 that the organization's goal was “to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down.”

The members agreed that an armed attack against any one of them in Europe or North America would be considered an attack against them all. Consequently, they agreed that if an armed attack occurred, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense, would assist the member being attacked,
taking such action as it deemed necessary including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. The treaty does not require members to respond with military action against an aggressor. Although obliged to respond, they maintain the freedom to choose the method by which they do so.

The outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950 was crucial for NATO as it raised the apparent threat of all Communist countries working together and forced the alliance to develop concrete military plans. Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) was formed to direct forces in Europe and began work under Supreme Allied Commander Dwight D. Eisenhower in January 1951. In September 1950, the NATO Military Committee called for an ambitious buildup of conventional forces to meet the Soviets, subsequently reaffirming this position at the February 1952 meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon.

In 1954, the Soviet Union suggested that it should join NATO to preserve peace in Europe. The NATO countries, fearing that the Soviet Union’s motive was to weaken the alliance, ultimately rejected this proposal.

The incorporation of West Germany into the organization on May 9, 1955 was described as “a decisive turning point in the history of our continent” by Halvard Lange, Foreign Affairs Minister of Norway at the time. A major reason for Germany’s entry into the alliance was that without German manpower, it would have been impossible to field enough conventional forces to resist a Soviet invasion. One of its immediate results was the creation of the Warsaw Pact, signed on May 14, 1955 by the Soviet Union, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and East Germany as a formal response to this event, thereby delineating the two opposing sides of the Cold War.
North Atlantic Treaty: the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1949 and was ratified by the United States that August. The Warsaw Pact The Warsaw Pact, formally the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance, was a collective defense treaty among the Soviet Union and seven other Soviet satellite states in Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War. The Warsaw Pact was the military complement to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CoMEcon), the regional economic organization for the communist states of Central and Eastern Europe. The Warsaw Pact was created in reaction to the integration of West Germany into NATO in 1955 per the Paris Pacts of 1954, but it is also considered to have been
motivated by Soviet desires to maintain control over military forces in Central and Eastern Europe. The Soviets wanted to keep their part of Europe and not let the Americans take it from them. Ideologically, the Soviet Union arrogated the right to define socialism and communism and act as the leader of the global socialist movement. A corollary to this idea was the necessity of intervention if a country appeared to be violating core socialist ideas and Communist Party functions, which was explicitly stated in the Brezhnev Doctrine. Geostrategic principles also drove the Soviet Union to prevent invasion of its territory by Western European powers. The eight member countries of the Warsaw Pact pledged the mutual defense of any member who was attacked. Relations among the treaty signatories were based upon mutual non-intervention in the internal affairs of the member countries, respect for national sovereignty, and political independence. However, almost all governments of those member states were indirectly controlled by the Soviet Union. While the Warsaw Pact was established as a balance of power or counterweight to NATO, there was no direct confrontation between them. Instead, the conflict was fought on an ideological basis. Both NATO and the Warsaw Pact led to the expansion
Eisenhower’s secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, initiated a “New Look” for the Cold War containment strategy, calling for a greater reliance on nuclear weapons against U.S. enemies in wartime, and promoted the doctrine of “massive retaliation,” threatening a severe response to any Soviet aggression.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze the risks and rewards of the competition for atomic weapons

**Key Points**

- In 1953, changes in political leadership on both
sides shifted the dynamic of the Cold War, with the death of Joseph Stalin and the ascendency of Nikita Khrushchev in the USSR and the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower to the Presidency of the United States.

- The New Look was the name given to the national security policy of the United States during the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which reflected Eisenhower's concern for balancing the Cold War military commitments of the United States with the nation's financial resources, thereby reducing emphasis on ground troops and increasing focus on nuclear proliferation.

- The most prominent of the doctrines to emerge from this policy was “massive retaliation,” which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles announced early in 1954. This policy stated that in the event of an attack from an aggressor, a state would massively retaliate with force disproportionate to the size of the attack, thus deterring an enemy state from initially attacking.

- Krushchev developed a similar policy in the USSR, aimed at cutting military spending while creating a nuclear program to match the U.S., but while the Soviets acquired atomic weapons in 1949, it took years for them to reach parity with the United States.

- An important part of the Cold War nuclear competition was the concept of mutual assured destruction (MAD), in which a full-scale use of nuclear weapons by two or more opposing sides would cause the complete annihilation of both the attacker and the defender.

- MAD is based on the theory of deterrence, which
holds that the threat of using strong weapons against the enemy prevents the enemy's use of those same weapons.

Key Terms

**mutually assured destruction**
A doctrine of military strategy and national security policy in which a full-scale use of nuclear weapons by two or more opposing sides would cause the complete annihilation of both the attacker and the defender.

**“New Look”**
The name given to the national security policy of the United States during the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It reflected Eisenhower’s concern for balancing the Cold War military commitments of the United States with the nation’s financial resources. The policy emphasized reliance on strategic nuclear weapons to deter potential threats, both conventional and nuclear, from the Eastern Bloc of nations headed by the Soviet Union.

**massive retaliation**
A military doctrine and nuclear strategy in which a state commits itself to retaliate in much greater force in the event of an attack.
Background: Political Changes in the U.S. and USSR

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was sworn in as U.S. President in 1953, the Democrats lost their two-decades-long control of the U.S. presidency. Under Eisenhower, however, the nation’s Cold War policy remained essentially unchanged. Whilst a thorough rethinking of foreign policy was launched (known as “Operation Solarium”), the majority of emerging ideas (such as a “rollback of Communism” and the liberation of Eastern Europe) were quickly regarded as unworkable. An underlying focus on the containment of Soviet communism remained to inform the broad approach of U.S. foreign policy.

While the transition from the Truman to the Eisenhower presidencies was a conservative-moderate in character, the change in the Soviet Union was immense. With the death of Joseph Stalin (who led the Soviet Union from 1928 and through the Great Patriotic War) in 1953, his former right-hand man Nikita Khrushchev was named First Secretary of the Communist Party.

During a subsequent period of collective leadership, Khrushchev gradually consolidated his power. At a speech to the closed session of the Twentieth Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, February 25, 1956, Nikita Khrushchev shocked his listeners by denouncing Stalin’s personality cult and the many crimes that occurred under Stalin’s leadership. Although the contents of the speech were secret, it was leaked to outsiders, shocking both Soviet allies and Western observers. Khrushchev was later named premier of the Soviet Union in 1958.

The impact on Soviet politics was immense. The speech stripped Khrushchev’s remaining Stalinist rivals of their legitimacy in a single stroke, dramatically boosting the First Party Secretary’s power domestically. Khrushchev was then able to ease restrictions, freeing some dissidents and initiating economic policies that emphasized commercial goods rather than just coal and steel production.
American Nuclear Strategy

Along with these major political changes in the U.S. and USSR, the central strategic components of competition between East and West shifted as well. When Eisenhower entered office in 1953, he was committed to two possibly contradictory goals: maintaining — or even heightening — the national commitment to counter the spread of Soviet influence and satisfying demands to balance the budget, lower taxes, and curb inflation. The most prominent of the doctrines to emerge from this goal was “massive retaliation,” which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles announced early in 1954. Eschewing the costly, conventional ground forces of the Truman administration and wielding the vast superiority of the U.S. nuclear arsenal and covert intelligence, Dulles defined this approach as “brinksmanship” in a January 16, 1956, interview with Life: pushing the Soviet Union to the brink of war in order to exact concessions. The aim of massive retaliation is to deter another state from initially attacking. In the event of an attack from an aggressor, a state would massively retaliate with force disproportionate to the size of the attack, which would likely involve the use of nuclear weapons on a massive scale.

This new national security policy approach, reflecting Eisenhower's concern for balancing the Cold War military commitments of the United States with the nation's financial resources, was called the “New Look.” The policy emphasized reliance on strategic nuclear weapons to deter potential threats, both conventional and nuclear, from the Eastern Bloc of nations headed by the Soviet Union.

Thus, the administration increased the number of nuclear warheads from 1,000 in 1953 to 18,000 by early 1961. Despite overwhelming U.S. superiority, one additional nuclear weapon was produced each day. The administration also exploited new technology. In 1955 the eight-engine B-52 Stratofortress bomber,
the first true jet bomber designed to carry nuclear weapons, was
developed.

President Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles: Secretary of State John
Foster Dulles, right, shown here with President Eisenhower in 1956,
became identified with the doctrine of “massive retaliation.”

Soviet Nuclear Strategy

In 1960 and 1961, Khrushchev tried to impose the concept of nuclear
deterrence on the military. Nuclear deterrence holds that the
reason for having nuclear weapons is to discourage their use by a
potential enemy. With each side deterred from war because of the
threat of its escalation into a nuclear conflict, Khrushchev believed,
“peaceful coexistence” with capitalism would become permanent
and allow the inherent superiority of socialism to emerge in
economic and cultural competition with the West.

Khrushchev hoped that exclusive reliance on the nuclear
firepower of the newly created Strategic Rocket Forces would
remove the need for increased defense expenditures. He also sought to use nuclear deterrence to justify his massive troop cuts; his downgrading of the Ground Forces, traditionally the “fighting arm” of the Soviet armed forces; and his plans to replace bombers with missiles and the surface fleet with nuclear missile submarines. However, during the Cuban missile crisis the USSR had only four R-7 Semyorkas and a few R-16s intercontinental missiles deployed in vulnerable surface launchers. In 1962 the Soviet submarine fleet had only eight submarines with short-range missiles which could be launched only from submarines that surfaced and lost their hidden submerged status.

Khrushchev’s attempt to introduce a nuclear “doctrine of deterrence” into Soviet military thought failed. Discussion of nuclear war in the first authoritative Soviet monograph on strategy since the 1920s, Marshal Vasilii Sokolovskii’s “Military Strategy,” focused upon the use of nuclear weapons for fighting rather than for deterring a war. Should such a war break out, both sides would pursue the most decisive aims with the most forceful means and methods. Intercontinental ballistic missiles and aircraft would deliver massed nuclear strikes on the enemy’s military and civilian objectives. The war would assume an unprecedented geographical scope, but Soviet military writers argued that the use of nuclear weapons in the initial period of the war would decide the course and outcome of the war as a whole. Both in doctrine and in strategy, the nuclear weapon reigned supreme.

Mutual Assured Destruction

An important part of the Cold War nuclear competition was the concept of mutual assured destruction (MAD). Mutual assured destruction or mutually assured destruction is a doctrine of military strategy and national security policy in which full-scale use of nuclear weapons by two or more opposing sides would cause the
complete annihilation of both the attacker and the defender. It is based on the theory of deterrence, which holds that the threat of using strong weapons against the enemy prevents the enemy’s use of those same weapons.

While the Soviets acquired atomic weapons in 1949, it took years for them to reach parity with the United States. In the meantime, the Americans developed the hydrogen bomb, which the Soviets matched during the era of Khrushchev. New methods of delivery such as Submarine-launched ballistic missiles and Intercontinental ballistic missiles with MIRV warheads meant that each superpower could easily devastate the other, even after attack by an enemy.

The strategy of MAD was fully declared in the early 1960s by United States Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. In McNamara’s formulation there was the very real danger that a nation with nuclear weapons could attempt to eliminate another nation’s retaliatory forces with a surprise, devastating first strike and theoretically “win” a nuclear war relatively unharmed. True second-strike capability could only be achieved when a nation had a guaranteed ability to fully retaliate after a first-strike attack.

The United States had achieved an early form of second-strike capability by fielding continual patrols of strategic nuclear bombers with a large number of planes always in the air on their way to or from fail-safe points close to the borders of the Soviet Union. This meant the United States could still retaliate even after a devastating first-strike attack. The tactic was expensive and problematic because of the high cost of keeping enough planes in the air at all times and the possibility they would be shot down by Soviet anti-aircraft missiles before reaching their targets. In addition, as the idea of a missile gap existing between the U.S. and the Soviet Union developed, there was increasing priority given to ICBMs over bombers.
Attributions

- The Atomic Race
The Space Race

32.4.2: The Space Race

One of the most important forms of non-violent competition between the U.S. and the USSR during the Cold War was the Space Race, with the Soviets taking an early lead in 1957 with the launching of Sputnik, the first artificial satellite, followed by the first manned flight.

Learning Objective

Characterize the Space Race

Key Points

- The Space Race, the competition between the U.S. and USSR for supremacy in space flight capability, had its origins in the missile-based nuclear arms race between the two nations following World War II.
- The technological superiority required for such supremacy was seen as necessary for national security and symbolic of ideological superiority.
- The Space Race spawned pioneering efforts to
launch artificial satellites, unmanned space probes of the Moon, Venus, and Mars, and human space flight in low Earth orbit and to the Moon.

• The Soviets earned an early lead in the Space Race in 1957 with the launching of Sputnik, the first artificial satellite, followed by the first manned flight.
• The success of the Soviet space program was a great shock to the United States, which believed it was ahead technologically; the ability to launch objects into orbit was especially ominous because it showed Soviet missiles could target anywhere on the planet.
• American President John F. Kennedy launched an unprecedented effort, promising that by the end of the 1960s Americans would land a man on the moon. They did so with Apollo 11, beating the Soviets to one of the more important objectives in the space race.

Key Terms

Sputnik 1
The first artificial Earth satellite; the Soviet Union launched it into an elliptical low Earth orbit on October 4, 1957.

Yuri Gagarin
A Russian Soviet pilot and cosmonaut. He was the first human to journey into outer space when his
Vostok spacecraft completed an orbit of the Earth on April 12, 1961.

**Apollo 11**

The first space flight that landed humans on the Moon

---

**Overview**

The Space Race was a 20th-century competition between two Cold War rivals, the Soviet Union (USSR) and the United States (U.S.), for supremacy in space flight capability. It had its origins in the missile-based nuclear arms race between the two nations following World War II, aided by captured German missile technology and personnel from their missile program. The technological superiority required for such supremacy was seen as necessary for national security and symbolic of ideological superiority. The Space Race spawned pioneering efforts to launch artificial satellites, unmanned space probes of the Moon, Venus, and Mars, and human space flight in low Earth orbit and to the Moon.

The competition began on August 2, 1955, when the Soviet Union responded to the US announcement four days earlier of intent to launch artificial satellites for the International Geophysical Year by declaring they would also launch a satellite “in the near future.” The Soviet Union beat the U.S. to this with the October 4, 1957 orbiting of Sputnik 1, and later beat the U.S. to the first human in space, Yuri Gagarin, on April 12, 1961. The race peaked with the July 20, 1969, U.S. landing of the first humans on the Moon with Apollo 11. The USSR tried but failed manned lunar missions, and eventually cancelled them and concentrated on Earth orbital space stations.

A period of détente followed with the April 1972 agreement on
First Satellite: Sputnik

In 1955, with both the United States and the Soviet Union building ballistic missiles that could be used to launch objects into space, the “starting line” was drawn for the Space Race. In separate public announcements four days apart, both nations declared they would launch artificial Earth satellites by 1957 or 1958.

In February 1957, chief Soviet rocket scientist Sergei Korolev sought and received permission from the Council of Ministers to create a prosteishy sputnik (PS-1), or “simple satellite.”

Korolev was buoyed by the first successful launches of his R-7 rocket in August and September, which paved the way for him to launch his sputnik. On Friday, October 4, 1957, at exactly 10:28:34 pm Moscow time, the R-7 with the now named Sputnik 1 satellite lifted off the launch pad, placing the artificial “moon” into orbit a few minutes later. This “fellow traveler,” as the name is translated in English, was a small, beeping ball less than two feet in diameter and weighing less than 200 pounds. But the celebrations were muted at the launch control center until the down-range far east tracking station at Kamchatka received the first distinctive beep ... beep ... beep sounds from Sputnik 1’s radio transmitters, indicating that it was en route to completing its first orbit.

The Soviet success raised a great deal of concern and fear in the United States. The USSR used ICBM technology to launch Sputnik into space. This essentially gave the Soviets two propaganda victories at once (sending the satellite into space and proving the
distance capabilities of their missiles). This proved that the Soviets had rockets capable of sending nuclear weapons from Russia to Europe and even North America. This was the most immediate threat posed by the launch of Sputnik 1. Not only did the Soviet Union have this ability, the United States did not. America, a land with a history of geographical security, suddenly seemed vulnerable. Overall, what caused the fear for the American people was not the satellite itself but more so the rocket that put Sputnik into orbit.

On January 31, 1958, nearly four months after the launch of Sputnik 1, von Braun and the United States successfully launched its first satellite on a four-stage Juno I rocket derived from the US Army’s Redstone missile, at Cape Canaveral.

Sputnik 1: Soviet Union achieved an early lead in the space race by launching the first artificial satellite Sputnik 1 (replica) in 1957.
First Human in Space: Yuri Gagarin

By 1959, American observers believed the Soviet Union would be the first to get a human into space because of the time needed to prepare for Mercury’s first launch. On April 12, 1961, the USSR surprised the world again by launching Yuri Gagarin into a single orbit around the Earth in a craft they called Vostok 1. They dubbed Gagarin the first cosmonaut, roughly translated from Russian and Greek as “sailor of the universe.” Although he had the ability to take over manual control of his capsule in an emergency by opening an envelope he had in the cabin that contained a code that could be typed into the computer, it was flown in automatic mode as a precaution; medical science at that time did not know what would happen to a human in the weightlessness of space. Vostok 1 orbited the Earth for 108 minutes and made its reentry over the Soviet Union, with Gagarin ejected from the spacecraft at 23,000 feet and landing by parachute.

Gagarin became a national hero of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc, and a worldwide celebrity. Moscow and other cities in the USSR held mass demonstrations, second in scale only to the World War II Victory Parade of 1945.

Race to the Moon

Before Gagarin’s flight, U.S. President John F. Kennedy’s support for America’s manned space program was lukewarm. Jerome Wiesner of MIT, who served as a science advisor to presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and opposed manned space exploration, remarked, “If Kennedy could have opted out of a big space program without hurting the country in his judgement, he would have.” Gagarin’s flight changed this; now Kennedy sensed the humiliation and fear of the American public over the Soviet lead. Kennedy ultimately
decided to pursue what became the Apollo program, and on May 25 took the opportunity to ask for Congressional support in a Cold War speech titled “Special Message on Urgent National Needs.” Khrushchev responded to Kennedy’s implicit challenge with silence, refusing to publicly confirm or deny if the Soviets were pursuing a “Moon race.” As later disclosed, they did so in secret over the next nine years.

After Kennedy’s death, President Johnson steadfastly pursued the Gemini and Apollo programs, promoting them as Kennedy’s legacy to the American public.

In 1967, both nations faced serious challenges that brought their programs to temporary halts. Both had been rushing at full-speed toward the first piloted flights of Apollo and Soyuz without paying due diligence to growing design and manufacturing problems. The results proved fatal to both pioneering crews.

The United States recovered from the Apollo 1 fire, fixing the fatal flaws in an improved version of the Block II command module. The US proceeded with unpiloted test launches of the Saturn V launch vehicle (Apollo 4 and Apollo 6) and the Lunar Module (Apollo 5) during the latter half of 1967 and early 1968.

Unknown to the Americans, the Soviet Moon program was in deep trouble. After two successive launch failures of the N1 rocket in 1969, Soviet plans for a piloted landing suffered delay. The launch pad explosion of the N-1 on July 3, 1969 was a significant setback.


The trip to the Moon took just over three days. After achieving orbit, Armstrong and Aldrin transferred into the Lunar Module named *Eagle*, and after a landing gear inspection by Collins remaining in the Command/Service Module *Columbia* began their
descent. After overcoming several computer overload alarms caused by an antenna switch left in the wrong position and a slight downrange error, Armstrong took over manual flight control at about 590 feet and guided the Lunar Module to a safe landing spot at 20:18:04 UTC, July 20, 1969. The first humans on the Moon waited six hours before leaving their craft. At 02:56 UTC, July 21, Armstrong became the first human to set foot on the Moon. The first step was witnessed by at least one-fifth of the population of Earth, or about 723 million people. His first words when he stepped off the LM’s landing footpad were, “That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.”

Buzz Salutes the US Flag: Buzz Aldrin during the first Moon walk in 1969. After Neil Armstrong was the first person to walk on the Moon, Aldrin joined him on the surface almost 20 minutes later. Altogether, they spent just under two and one-quarter hours outside their craft. Armstrong took this photo.
Attributions
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217. Influence Abroad

32.4.3: Influence Abroad

The United States and the Soviet Union increasingly competed for influence by proxy in the Third World as decolonization gained momentum in the 1950s and early 1960s.

Learning Objective

Describe some of the ways in which the U.S. and the USSR competed for influence outside of Europe

Key Points

- The Korean War marked a shift in the focal point of the Cold War, from postwar Europe to East Asia and other Third World nations, as proxy battles for ideological supremacy.
- By the early 1950s, the NATO alliance had already integrated Western Europe into the system of mutual defense pacts, providing safeguards against subversion or neutrality in the bloc. The Marshall Plan had bolstered economic recovery, so the U.S.
was less concerned with losing Western Europe to Soviet influence.

- Following a series of waves of African and Asian decolonization following the Second World War and the emergence of left-leaning leaders in Latin America, the U.S. focused on the Third World.
- In such an international setting, the Soviet Union propagated a role as the leader of the “anti-imperialist” camp, currying favor in the Third World as a staunch opponent of colonialism.
- The Eisenhower administration attempted to formalize its alliance system through a series of pacts, with East Asian allies joining the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) while friends in Latin America were placed in the Organization of American States.
- Many Third World nations, however, did not want to align themselves with either of the superpowers, and the Non-Aligned Movement, led by India, Egypt, and Austria, attempted to unite the third world against what was seen as imperialism by both the East and the West.
- Throughout much of Latin America, reactionary oligarchies ruled through their alliances with the military elite and United States, but by the 1960s, Marxists gained increasing influence throughout the regions, prompting fears in the United States that Latin American instability posed a threat to U.S. national security.
- This era also saw battles for ideological alignment in the Congo, Indonesia, and Iran.
Key Terms

**John Foster Dulles**
Served as U.S. Secretary of State under Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower from 1953 to 1959 and was a significant figure in the early Cold War era, advocating an aggressive stance against Communism throughout the world.

**decolonization**
The undoing of colonialism, the withdrawal from its colonies of a colonial power; the acquisition of political or economic independence by such colonies. The term refers particularly to the dismantlement, in the years after World War II of the colonial empires established prior to World War I throughout the world. This means not only the complete “removal of the domination of non-indigenous forces” within the geographical space and institutions of the colonized, but also to the “decolonizing of the mind” from the colonizer’s ideas of the colonized as inferior.

**Non-Aligned Movement**
A group of states that are not formally aligned with or against any major power bloc, especially during the Cold War.

Overview

The Korean War marked a shift in the focal point of the Cold War
from postwar Europe to East Asia. After this point, proxy battles in the Third World became an important arena of superpower competition.

The Eisenhower administration adjusted U.S. policy to the impact of decolonization, shifting the focus away from war-torn Europe. By the early 1950s, the NATO alliance had integrated Western Europe into the system of mutual defense pacts, providing safeguards against subversion or neutrality in the bloc. The Marshall Plan had rebuilt a functioning Western economic system, thwarting the electoral appeal of the radical left. When economic aid ended the dollar shortage and stimulated private investment for postwar reconstruction, sparing the U.S. from a crisis of over-production and maintaining demand for U.S. exports, the Eisenhower administration began to focus on other regions.

The combined effects of two great European wars weakened the political and economic domination of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East by European powers. This led to a series of waves of African and Asian decolonization following the Second World War; a world dominated for more than a century by Western imperialist colonial powers was transformed into a world of emerging African, Middle Eastern, and Asian nations. The sheer number of nation states increased drastically.

The Cold War placed immense pressure on developing nations to align with one of the superpower factions. Both promised substantial financial, military, and diplomatic aid in exchange for an alliance, in which issues like corruption and human rights abuses were overlooked or ignored. When an allied government was threatened, the superpowers were often prepared and willing to intervene.

In such an international setting, the Soviet Union propagated a role as the leader of the “anti-imperialist” camp, currying favor in the Third World as being a more staunch opponent of colonialism than many independent nations in Africa and Asia. Khrushchev broadened Moscow’s policy by establishing new relations with India and other key non-aligned, non-communist states throughout the
Third World. Many countries in the emerging non-aligned movement developed a close relation with Moscow.

In an exercise of the new “rollback” policies, acting on the doctrines of Dulles, Eisenhower thwarted Soviet intervention, using the CIA to overthrow unfriendly governments. In the Arab world, the focus was pan-Arab nationalism. U.S. companies had already invested heavily in the region, which contained the world’s largest oil reserves. The U.S. was concerned about the stability and friendliness of governments in the region, upon which the health of the U.S. economy increasingly grew to depend.

Defense Pacts

The Eisenhower administration attempted to formalize its alliance system through a series of pacts. Its East Asian allies were joined into the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) while friends in Latin America were placed in the Organization of American States. The ANZUS alliance was signed between the Australia, New Zealand, and the US. None of these groupings was as successful as NATO had been in Europe.

John Foster Dulles, a rigid anti-communist, focused aggressively on Third World politics. He intensified efforts to integrate the entire noncommunist Third World into a system of mutual defense pacts, traveling almost 500,000 miles to cement new alliances. Dulles initiated the Manila Conference in 1954, resulting in the SEATO pact that united eight nations (either located in Southeast Asia or with interests there) in a neutral defense pact. This treaty was followed in 1955 by the Baghdad Pact, later renamed the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), uniting the “northern tier” countries of the Middle East—Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan—in a defense organization.

Many Third World nations did not want to align themselves with either of the superpowers. The non-aligned movement, led by India,
Egypt, and Austria, attempted to unite the third world against what was seen as imperialism by both the East and the West.

Dulles, along with most U.S. foreign policy-makers of the era, considered many Third World nationalists and “revolutionaries” as essentially under the influence, if not control, of the Warsaw Pact.

**Latin America**

The Eisenhower-Dulles approach to foreign policy sought to overthrow unfriendly governments in a covert way.

Throughout much of Latin America, reactionary oligarchies ruled through their alliances with the military elite and United States. Although the nature of the U.S. role in the region was established many years before the Cold War, the Cold War gave U.S. interventionism a new ideological tinge. By the mid-20th century, much of the region passed through a higher state of economic development, which bolstered the power and ranks of the lower classes. This made calls for social change and political inclusion more pronounced, posing a challenge to the strong U.S. influence over the region’s economies. By the 1960s, Marxists gained increasing influence throughout the regions, prompting fears in the United States that Latin American instability posed a threat to U.S. national security.

Throughout the Cold War years, the U.S. acted as a barrier to socialist revolutions and targeted populist and nationalist governments aided by the communists. The CIA overthrew other governments suspected of turning pro-communist, such as Guatemala in 1954 under Jacobo Arbenz Guzman. The CIA Operation PBSUCCESS eventually led to the 1954 coup that removed Arbenz from power. The operation drew on a plan first considered in 1951 to oust Arbenz, named Operation PBFORTUNE. Arbenz, who was supported by some local communists, was ousted shortly after he had redistributed 178,000 acres of United Fruit Company land in
Guatemala. United Fruit had long monopolized the transportation and communications region there along with the main export commodities, and played a major role in Guatemalan politics. Arbenz was out shortly afterwards, and Guatemala came under control of a repressive military regime.

Future Latin American revolutionaries shifted to guerrilla tactics, particularly following the Cuban Revolution. Arbenz fell when his military had deserted him. Since then, some future Latin American social revolutionaries and Marxists, most notably Fidel Castro and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, made the army and governments parts of a single unit and eventually set up single-party states. Overthrowing such regimes would require a war rather than a simple CIA operation, the landing of Marines, or a crude invasion scheme like the Bay of Pigs Invasion.

Africa

One of the first decolonized nations to request Eastern aid was the Democratic Republic of the Congo under Patrice Lumumba. A large number of United Nations peacekeepers from NATO nations and other NATO allies had been in the Congo since independence was established from Belgium in 1960. The U.S. used them to shut down air traffic and prevent Eastern arms and troops from getting into the country. However, some Eastern weapons managed to get in from other countries. The peacekeepers decided to remove Lumumba and backed Colonel Joseph Mobutu in a coup in which Lumumba was killed. The Congolese crisis had the effect of alienating from both the West and the East some in the third world who saw the East as weak and impotent and the West unethical and unscrupulous.

**Middle East**

In 1953, President Eisenhower's CIA implemented Operation Ajax, a covert operation aimed at the overthrow of the Iranian prime
minister, Mohammad Mosaddegh. The popularly elected and non-aligned Mosaddegh had been a Middle Eastern nemesis of Britain since nationalizing the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1951. Winston Churchill told the United States that Mosaddegh was “increasingly turning towards communism.” The pro-Western shah, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, assumed control as an autocratic monarch. The shah’s policies included banning the communist Tudeh Party and general suppression of political dissent by SAVAK, the shah’s domestic security and intelligence agency.

Attributions

- Influence Abroad
32.4.4: The Propaganda War

Soviet propaganda was disseminated through tightly controlled media outlets in the Eastern Bloc. The U.S. tried to counter this with Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, dedicated to bringing about the peaceful demise of the communist system in the Eastern Bloc by providing an alternative to the controlled and party-dominated domestic press.

**Learning Objective**

Give examples of propaganda used by both parties to the Cold War

**Key Points**

- Media in the Eastern Bloc was an organ of the state, completely reliant on and subservient to the communist party. Radio and television organizations were typically state-owned while print media was usually owned by political organizations, mostly the local communist parties, and was largely used for
disseminating propaganda against capitalism and the West.

- State and party ownership of print, television, and radio media was used to control information and society in light of Eastern Bloc leaderships viewing even marginal groups of opposition intellectuals as a potential threat to the bases underlying Communist power therein.

- Circumvention of dissemination controls occurred to some degree through samizdat (underground publications produced and disseminated by hand) and limited reception of western radio and television broadcasts.

- Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) is a United States government-funded broadcasting organization that provides news, information, and analysis to countries “where the free flow of information is either banned by government authorities or not fully developed,” and was used especially during the Cold War as a counter to communist propaganda and controlled media in the Eastern Bloc.

- RFE played a critical role in Cold War-era Eastern Europe; unlike government-censored programs, RFE publicized anti-Soviet protests and nationalist movements, influencing major events such as the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.
Key Terms

**propaganda**

Information, especially of a biased or misleading nature, used to promote a political cause or point of view; the psychological mechanisms of influencing and altering the attitude of a population toward a specific cause, position or political agenda in an effort to form a consensus to a standard set of beliefs.

**samizdat**

A key form of dissident activity across the Soviet bloc in which individuals reproduced censored and underground publications by hand and passed the documents from reader to reader. This grassroots practice to evade official Soviet censorship was fraught with danger, as harsh punishments were meted out to people caught possessing or copying censored materials.

**Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty**

A United States government-funded broadcasting organization that provides news, information, and analysis to countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East “where the free flow of information is either banned by government authorities or not fully developed.”
Overview

Media in the Eastern Bloc was an organ of the state, completely reliant on and subservient to the communist party. Radio and television organizations were typically state-owned, while print media was usually owned by political organizations, mostly by local communist parties. Soviet propaganda used Marxist philosophy to attack capitalism, claiming labor exploitation and war-mongering imperialism were inherent in the system.

Along with the broadcasts of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Voice of America to Central and Eastern Europe, a major propaganda effort begun in 1949 was Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, dedicated to bringing about the peaceful demise of the communist system in the Eastern Bloc. Radio Free Europe attempted to achieve these goals by serving as a surrogate home radio station, an alternative to the controlled and party-dominated domestic press. Radio Free Europe was a product of some of the most prominent architects of America’s early Cold War strategy, especially those who believed that the Cold War would eventually be fought by political rather than military means, such as George F. Kennan.

Propaganda in the Eastern Bloc

Eastern Bloc media and propaganda was controlled directly by each country’s Communist party, which controlled the state media, censorship, and propaganda organs. State and party ownership of print, television, and radio media was used to control information and society in light of Eastern Bloc leaderships viewing even marginal groups of opposition intellectuals as a potential threat to the bases underlying Communist power therein.

The ruling authorities viewed media as a propaganda tool and
widely practiced censorship to exercise almost full control over information dissemination. The press in Communist countries was an organ of and completely reliant on the state. Until the late 1980s, all Eastern Bloc radio and television organizations were state-owned and tightly controlled.

In each country, leading bodies of the ruling Communist Party exercised hierarchical control of the censorship system. Each Communist Party maintained a department of its Central Committee apparatus to supervise media. Censors employed auxiliary tools such as: the power to launch or close down any newspaper, radio or television station, licensing of journalists through unions, and the power of appointment. Party bureaucrats held all leading editorial positions.

Circumvention of censorship occurred to some degree through samizdat (underground publications produced and disseminated by hand) and limited reception of western radio and television broadcasts. In addition, some regimes heavily restricted the flow of information from their countries to outside of the Eastern Bloc by regulating the travel of foreigners and segregating approved travelers from the domestic population.
Soviet Censorship: Nikolai Yezhov, the young man strolling with Joseph Stalin to his right, was shot in 1940. He was edited out from a photo by Soviet censors. Such retouching was a common occurrence during Stalin’s reign.
Radio Free Europe

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) is a United States government-funded broadcasting organization that provides news, information, and analysis to countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East “where the free flow of information is either banned by government authorities or not fully developed.”

During the Cold War, Radio Free Europe (RFE) was broadcast to Soviet satellite countries and Radio Liberty (RL) targeted the Soviet Union. RFE was founded as an anti-communist propaganda source in 1949 by the National Committee for a Free Europe. RL was founded two years later and the two organizations merged in 1976. Communist governments frequently sent agents to infiltrate RFE’s headquarters. Radio transmissions into the Soviet Union were regularly jammed by the KGB. RFE/RL received funds from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) until 1972. During RFE’s earliest years of existence, the CIA and U.S. Department of State issued broad policy directives, and a system evolved where broadcast policy was determined through negotiation between them and RFE staff.

Radio Free Europe was created and grew in its early years through the efforts of the National Committee for a Free Europe (NCFE), an anti-communist CIA front organization formed by Allen Dulles in New York City in 1949. The United States funded a long list of projects to counter the Communist appeal among intellectuals in Europe and the developing world. RFE was developed out of a belief that the Cold War would eventually be fought by political rather than military means. American policymakers such as George Kennan and John Foster Dulles acknowledged that the Cold War was essentially a war of ideas. The implementation of surrogate radio stations was a key part of the greater psychological war effort.

RFE played a critical role in Cold War-era Eastern Europe. Unlike government-censored programs, RFE publicized anti-Soviet protests and nationalist movements. Its audience increased
substantially following the failed Berlin riots of 1953 and the highly publicized defection of Józef Światło. Its Hungarian service’s coverage of Poland’s Poznań riots in 1956 arguably served as an inspiration for the Hungarian revolution.

During the Revolution of 1956 RFE broadcasts encouraged rebels to fight and suggested that Western support was imminent. These RFE broadcasts violated Eisenhower’s policy which determined that the United States would not provide military support for the Revolution. In the wake of this scandal a number of changes were implemented at RFE, including the establishment of the Broadcast Analysis Division to ensure that broadcasts were accurate and professional while maintaining the journalists’ autonomy.

Attributions

- The Propaganda War
  - “Eastern Bloc media and propaganda.”
  - “Screen Shot 2016-11-10 at 3.55.37 PM.png.”
32.5: Crisis Points of the Cold War

32.5.1: The 1956 Suez Crisis

The Suez Crisis was a mostly failed invasion of Egypt in late 1956 by Israel followed by the United Kingdom and France. The aims were to regain Western control of the Suez Canal and remove Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser from power.

Learning Objective

Explain the events of the 1956 Suez Crisis

Key Points

- The Middle East, directly south of the Soviet Union, was an area of extreme importance and also great instability during the Cold War.
The Suez Crisis was an invasion of Egypt in late 1956 by Israel followed by the United Kingdom and France. The aims were to regain Western control of the Suez Canal and remove Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser from power.

The invasion was poorly planned and Eisenhower persuaded the United Kingdom and France to retreat, which was an international embarrassment for the latter countries and emboldened the USSR and Egypt.

As a result of the conflict, the United Nations created the UNEF Peacekeepers to police the Egyptian–Israeli border, and British Prime Minister Anthony Eden resigned.

The Suez stalemate was a turning point heralding an ever-growing rift between the Atlantic Cold War allies, who were becoming far less of a united monolith than in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War.

Key Terms

Gamal Abdel Nasser
The second President of Egypt, serving from 1956 until his death, who led the 1952 overthrow of the monarchy and introduced far-reaching land reforms the following year.
**Suez Canal**

An artificial sea-level waterway in Egypt connecting the Mediterranean Sea to the Red Sea through the Isthmus of Suez, which offers watercraft a shorter journey between the North Atlantic and northern Indian oceans via the Mediterranean and Red seas by avoiding the South Atlantic and southern Indian oceans, reducing the journey by approximately 4,300 miles.

**Overview**

The Suez Crisis, also named the Tripartite Aggression and the Kadesh Operation, was an invasion of Egypt in late 1956 by Israel, followed by the United Kingdom and France. The aims were to regain Western control of the Suez Canal and remove Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser from power. After the fighting started, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Nations forced the three invaders to withdraw. The episode humiliated Great Britain and France and strengthened Nasser.

On October 29, Israel invaded the Egyptian Sinai. Britain and France issued a joint ultimatum to cease fire, which was ignored. On November 5, Britain and France landed paratroopers along the Suez Canal. The Egyptian forces were defeated, but did block the canal to all shipping. It became clear that the Israeli invasion and the subsequent Anglo-French attack were planned beforehand by the three countries.

The three allies attained a number of their military objectives, but the Canal was now useless and heavy pressure from the United States and the USSR forced them to withdraw. U.S. President
Dwight D. Eisenhower had strongly warned Britain not to invade; he now threatened serious damage to the British financial system. Historians conclude the crisis “signified the end of Great Britain’s role as one of the world’s major powers.” Peden in 2012 stated, “The Suez Crisis is widely believed to have contributed significantly to Britain’s decline as a world power.” The Suez Canal was closed from October 1956 until March 1957. Israel fulfilled some of its objectives, such as attaining freedom of navigation through the Straits of Tiran.

As a result of the conflict, the United Nations created the UNEF Peacekeepers to police the Egyptian-Israeli border, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden resigned, Canadian Minister of External Affairs Lester Pearson won the Nobel Peace Prize, and the USSR may have been emboldened to invade Hungary.
Nationalization of the Suez Canal: Statue of Ferdinand de Lesseps (a Frenchman who built the Suez Canal) was removed following the nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956.

The Suez Crisis in the Context of the Cold War
War

The Middle East during the Cold War was of extreme importance and also great instability. The region lay directly south of the Soviet Union, which traditionally had great influence in Turkey and Iran. The area also had vast reserves of oil, not crucial for either superpower in the 1950s (which each held large oil reserves on its own), but essential for the rapidly rebuilding American allies Europe and Japan.

The original American plan for the Middle East was to form a defensive perimeter along the north of the region. Thus Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan signed the Baghdad Pact and joined CENTO. The Eastern response was to seek influence in states such as Syria and Egypt. Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria made arms deals to Egypt and Syria, giving Warsaw Pact members a strong presence in the region. Egypt, a former British protectorate, was one of the region's most important prizes with its large population and political power throughout the region. British forces were thrown out by General Gamal Abdel Nasser in 1956, when he nationalized the Suez Canal. Syria was a former French protectorate.

Eisenhower persuaded the United Kingdom and France to retreat from a badly planned invasion with Israel launched to regain control of the canal from Egypt. While the Americans were forced to operate covertly so as not to embarrass their allies, the Eastern Bloc nations made loud threats against the “imperialists” and worked to portray themselves as the defenders of the Third World. Nasser was later lauded around the globe, especially in the Arab world. While both superpowers courted Nasser, the Americans balked at funding the massive Aswan High Dam project. The Warsaw Pact countries happily agreed, however, and signed a treaty of friendship and cooperation with the Egyptians and the Syrians.

Thus the Suez stalemate was a turning point heralding an ever-growing rift between the Atlantic Cold War allies, which were becoming far less of a united monolith than they were in the
immediate aftermath of the Second World War. Italy, France, Spain, West Germany, Norway, Canada, and Britain also developed their own nuclear forces as well as a Common Market to be less dependent on the United States. Such rifts mirror changes in global economics. American economic competitiveness faltered in the face of the challenges of Japan and West Germany, which recovered rapidly from the wartime decimation of their respective industrial bases. The 20th-century successor to the UK as the “workshop of the world,” the United States found its competitive edge dulled in the international markets while it faced intensified foreign competition at home. Meanwhile, the Warsaw Pact countries were closely allied both militarily and economically. All Warsaw Pact nations had nuclear weapons and supplied other countries with weapons, supplies, and economic aid.

Attributions

- The 1956 Suez Crisis
The Hungarian Uprising

32.5.2: The Hungarian Uprising

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 occurred shortly after Khrushchev arranged the removal of Hungary’s Stalinist leader Mátyás Rákosi, but the new regime was soon crushed by the Soviet army.

Learning Objective

Examine the circumstances surrounding the Hungarian uprising

Key Points

- The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 occurred shortly after Khrushchev arranged the removal of Hungary’s Stalinist leader Mátyás Rákosi.
- In response to a popular uprising, the new regime formally disbanded the secret police, declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, and pledged to re-establish free elections.
- In response, the Soviet army invaded and crushed
the revolution.

• Thousands of Hungarians were arrested, imprisoned, and deported to the Soviet Union, and approximately 200,000 Hungarians fled Hungary in the chaos.

• Hungarian leader Imre Nagy and others were executed following secret trials.

Key Terms

Mátyás Rákosi
A Jewish Hungarian communist politician, the leader of Hungary's Communist Party from 1945 to 1956, and the de facto ruler of Communist Hungary from 1949 to 1956. An ardent Stalinist, his government was a satellite of the Soviet Union.

Titoists
People who follow the policies and practices associated with Josip Broz Tito during the Cold War, characterized by an opposition to the Soviet Union.

Overview

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 or the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 was a nationwide revolt against the government of the Hungarian
People's Republic and its Soviet-imposed policies, lasting from October 23 until November 10, 1956. Though initially leaderless, it was the first major threat to Soviet control since the USSR’s forces drove out Nazi Germany from its territory at the end of World War II and broke into Central and Eastern Europe.

The revolt began as a student demonstration, which attracted thousands marching through central Budapest to the Parliament building, calling out on the streets using a van with loudspeakers via Radio Free Europe. A student delegation that entered the radio building to try to broadcast the students’ demands was detained. When the delegation’s release was demanded by the demonstrators outside, they were fired upon by the State Security Police (ÁVH) from within the building. One student died and was wrapped in a flag and held above the crowd. This was the start of the revolution. As the news spread, disorder and violence erupted throughout the capital.

The revolt spread quickly across Hungary and the government collapsed. Thousands organized into militias, battling the ÁVH and Soviet troops. Pro-Soviet communists and ÁVH members were often executed or imprisoned and former political prisoners were released and armed. Radical impromptu workers’ councils wrested municipal control from the ruling Hungarian Working People’s Party and demanded political changes. A new government formally disbanded the ÁVH, declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, and pledged to re-establish free elections. By the end of October, fighting had almost stopped and a sense of normality began to return.

After announcing a willingness to negotiate a withdrawal of Soviet forces, the Politburo changed its mind and moved to crush the revolution. On November 4, a large Soviet force invaded Budapest and other regions of the country. The Hungarian resistance continued until November 10. More than 2,500 Hungarians and 700 Soviet troops were killed in the conflict, and 200,000 Hungarians fled as refugees. Mass arrests and denunciations continued for months thereafter. By January 1957, the new Soviet-installed
government had suppressed all public opposition. These Soviet actions, while strengthening control over the Eastern Bloc, alienated many Western Marxists, leading to splits and/or considerable losses of membership for Communist Parties in the West.

Public discussion about this revolution was suppressed in Hungary for more than 30 years. Since the thaw of the 1980s, it has been a subject of intense study and debate. At the inauguration of the Third Hungarian Republic in 1989, October 23 was declared a national holiday.
Hungary became a communist state under the severely authoritarian leadership of Mátyás Rákosi. Under Rákosi’s reign, the
Security Police (ÁVH) began a series of purges, first within the Communist Party to end opposition to Rákosi’s reign. The victims were labeled as “Titoists,” “western agents,” or “Trotskyists” for as insignificant a crime as spending time in the West to participate in the Spanish Civil War. In total, about half of all the middle and lower level party officials—at least 7,000 people—were purged.

From 1950 to 1952, the Security Police forcibly relocated thousands of people to obtain property and housing for the Working People’s Party members and to remove the threat of the intellectual and “bourgeois” class. Thousands were arrested, tortured, tried, and imprisoned in concentration camps, deported to the east, or executed, including ÁVH founder László Rajk. In a single year, more than 26,000 people were forcibly relocated from Budapest. As a consequence, jobs and housing were very difficult to obtain. The deportees generally experienced terrible living conditions and were interned as slave labor on collective farms. Many died as a result of poor living conditions and malnutrition.

The Rákosi government thoroughly politicized Hungary’s educational system to supplant the educated classes with a “toiling intelligentsia.” Russian language study and Communist political instruction were made mandatory in schools and universities nationwide. Religious schools were nationalized and church leaders were replaced by those loyal to the government. In 1949 the leader of the Hungarian Catholic Church, Cardinal József Mindszenty, was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment for treason. Under Rákosi, Hungary’s government was among the most repressive in Europe.

The Crushed Uprising

After Stalinist dictator Mátyás Rákosi was replaced by Imre Nagy following Stalin’s death and Polish reformist Władysław Gomułka was able to enact some reformist requests, large numbers of
protesting Hungarians compiled a list of Demands of Hungarian Revolutionaries of 1956, including free secret-ballot elections, independent tribunals, and inquiries into Stalin and Rákosi Hungarian activities. Under the orders of Soviet defense minister Georgy Zhukov, Soviet tanks entered Budapest. Protester attacks at the Parliament forced the collapse of the government.

The new government that came to power during the revolution formally disbanded the Hungarian secret police, declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, and pledged to re-establish free elections. The Soviet Politburo thereafter moved to crush the revolution with a large Soviet force invading Budapest and other regions of the country. Approximately 200,000 Hungarians fled Hungary, some 26,000 Hungarians were put on trial by the new Soviet-installed János Kádár government and, of those, 13,000 were imprisoned. Imre Nagy was executed along with Pál Maléter and Miklós Gimes after secret trials in June 1958. By January 1957, the Hungarian government had suppressed all public opposition. These Hungarian government’s violent oppressive actions alienated many Western Marxists, yet strengthened communist control in all the European communist states, cultivating the perception that communism was both irreversible and monolithic.

Attributions

- The Hungarian Uprising
221. The Korean War

32.5.3: The Korean War

One of the most significant impacts of the U.S. policy of containment was the outbreak of the Korean War, when the U.S. came to aid of South Korea against the communist North Korea.

Learning Objective

Connect the Korean War to the overarching narrative of the Cold War

Key Points

- Korea was divided at the end of World War II along the 38th parallel into Soviet and U.S. occupation zones, in which a communist government was installed in the North by the Soviets and an elected government in the South came to power after UN-supervised elections in 1948.
- In June 1950, Kim Il-sung's North Korean People's Army invaded South Korea.
- Fearing that communist Korea under a Kim Il Sung
dictatorship could threaten Japan and foster other communist movements in Asia, Truman committed U.S. forces and obtained help from the United Nations to counter the North Korean invasion.

- After a Chinese invasion to assist the North Koreans, fighting stabilized along the 38th parallel, which separated the Koreas and devolved into a war of attrition.
- The Korean Armistice Agreement was signed in July 1953 after the death of Stalin, but no official peace treaty was ever signed and technically North and South Korea are still at war.

Key Terms

cult of personality
When an individual uses mass media, propaganda, or other methods to create an idealized, heroic, and at times worshipful image, often through unquestioning flattery and praise.

war of attrition
A military strategy in which a belligerent attempts to win a war by wearing down the enemy to the point of collapse through continuous losses in personnel and material.

proxy war
A conflict between two states or non-state actors in
which neither entity directly engages the other. While this can encompass a breadth of armed confrontation, its core definition hinges on two separate powers utilizing external strife to somehow attack the interests or territorial holdings of the other. This frequently involves both countries fighting their opponent’s allies or assisting their allies in fighting their opponent.

Overview

In June 1950, Kim Il-sung’s North Korean People’s Army invaded South Korea. Joseph Stalin “planned, prepared, and initiated” the invasion, creating “detailed [war] plans” that were communicated to the North Koreans. To Stalin’s surprise, the UN Security Council backed the defense of South Korea. Fearing that communist Korea under a Kim Il Sung dictatorship could threaten Japan and foster other communist movements in Asia, Truman committed U.S. forces and obtained help from the United Nations to counter the North Korean invasion. The Soviets boycotted UN Security Council meetings while protesting the Council’s failure to seat the People’s Republic of China and thus did not veto the Council’s approval of UN action to oppose the North Korean invasion. A joint UN force of personnel from South Korea, the United States, Britain, Turkey, Canada, Australia, France, the Philippines, the Netherlands, Belgium, New Zealand, and other countries joined to stop the invasion.

After the first two months of the conflict, South Korean forces were on the point of defeat, forced back to the Pusan Perimeter. In September 1950, an amphibious UN counter-offensive was launched at Inchon and cut off many of the North Korean troops. Those
that escaped envelopment and capture were rapidly forced back north all the way to the border with China at the Yalu River or into the mountainous interior. At this point, in October 1950, Chinese forces crossed the Yalu and entered the war. Chinese intervention triggered a retreat of UN forces that continued until mid-1951.

After these reversals of fortune, which saw Seoul change hands four times, the last two years of conflict became a war of attrition, with the front line close to the 38th parallel. The war in the air, however, was never a stalemate. North Korea was subject to a massive bombing campaign. Jet fighters confronted each other in air-to-air combat for the first time in history, and Soviet pilots covertly flew in defense of their communist allies.

The fighting ended on July 27, 1953, when an armistice was signed. The agreement created the Korean Demilitarized Zone to separate North and South Korea and allowed the return of prisoners. In North Korea, Kim Il-sung created a highly centralized and brutal dictatorship, according himself unlimited power and generating a formidable cult of personality. However, no peace treaty has been signed, and the two Koreas are technically still at war. Periodic clashes, many of which are deadly, have continued to the present.

The Korean War is seen as one of the most significant impacts of the containment policy of the U.S. government, aimed at preventing the spread of communism, and was one of the major proxy wars of the Cold War.

**Background**

Korea was ruled by Japan from 1910 until the closing days of World War II. In August 1945, the Soviet Union declared war on Japan as a result of an agreement with the United States and liberated Korea north of the 38th parallel. U.S. forces subsequently moved into the south. By 1948, as a product of the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States, Korea was split into two
regions with separate governments. Both governments claimed to be the legitimate government of Korea and neither side accepted the border as permanent. The civil war escalated into open warfare when North Korean forces—supported by the Soviet Union and China—moved to the south to unite the country on June 25, 1950.

In early 1950, the United States made its first commitment to form a peace treaty with Japan that would guarantee long-term U.S. military bases. Some observers (including George Kennan) believed that the Japanese treaty led Stalin to approve a plan to invade U.S.-supported South Korea on June 25, 1950.

In the Context of the Cold War

Among other effects, the Korean War galvanized NATO to develop a military structure. Public opinion in countries involved, such as Great Britain, was divided for and against the war. Many feared an escalation into a general war with Communist China and even nuclear war. The strong opposition to the war often strained Anglo-American relations. For these reasons, British officials sought a speedy end to the conflict, hoping to unite Korea under United Nations auspices and withdrawal of all foreign forces.

The war was a political disaster for the Soviet Union. Its central objective, the unification of the Korean peninsula under the Kim Il-Sung regime, was not achieved. Boundaries of both parts of Korea remained practically unchanged. Relations with communist ally China were seriously and permanently spoiled, leading to the Sino-Soviet split that lasted until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

The United States' strong resistance to the invasion may have prevented a Soviet intervention in Yugoslavia during the Tito-Stalin split. The war, meanwhile, united the countries within the capitalist bloc: the Korean War accelerated the conclusion of a peace agreement between the U.S. and Japan, the warming of West Germany's relations with other western countries, and creation of
military and political blocs ANZUS (1951) and SEATO (1954). However, because of the war, the authority of the Soviets grew, evident in their readiness to interfere in developing countries of the Third World, many of which went down the socialist path of development after the Korean War after selecting the Soviet Union as their patron.

The U.S. entered the Korean War to defend South Korea from a communist invasion. However, the success of the Inchon landing inspired the U.S. and the United Nations to adopt a rollback strategy to overthrow the Communist North Korean regime, thus allowing nationwide elections under U.N. auspices. General Douglas MacArthur advanced across the 38th parallel into North Korea. The Chinese sent in a large army and defeated the U.N. forces, pushing them below the 38th parallel. Although the Chinese had been planning to intervene for months, this action was interpreted by Truman's supporters as a response to U.S. forces crossing the 38th parallel. This interpretation allowed the episode to confirm the wisdom of containment doctrine as opposed to rollback. The Communists were later pushed back to around the original border. Truman blamed MacArthur's focus on victory and adopted a "limited war" policy. His focus shifted to negotiating a settlement, finally reached in 1953. For his part, MacArthur denounced Truman's "no-win policy."
Attributions

- **The Korean War**
The Building of the Berlin Wall

32.5.4: The Building of the Berlin Wall

The Berlin Wall was a barrier that divided Germany from 1961 to 1989, aimed at preventing East Germans from fleeing to stop economically disastrous migration of workers.

Learning Objective

Deconstruct Soviet Union’s reasons for building the Berlin Wall

Key Points

- Berlin was divided between East and West since the end of World War II, with the Western powers occupying the Western portion and the Soviet Union occupying the East.
- After increasing tensions between the Soviets and the Western powers during the first 15 years of the Cold War, the Soviet Union decided to build a
physical barrier between East and West Berlin, thereby creating a real counterpoint to the symbolic “Iron Curtain” that had divided East and West since 1945.

- The main purpose of the Wall was to prevent East Germans from fleeing, thus stopping an economically disastrous migration of workers.
- The Berlin Wall was officially referred to as the “Anti-Fascist Protective Wall” by East German authorities, implying that the NATO countries and West Germany in particular were considered “fascists” by East German propaganda.
- With the closing of the East-West sector boundary in Berlin, the vast majority of East Germans could no longer travel or emigrate to West Germany, and Berlin soon went from the easiest place to make an unauthorized crossing between East and West Germany to the most difficult.
- Many families were split, while East Berliners employed in the West were cut off from their jobs.

**Key Terms**

**Checkpoint Charlie**

The name given by the Western Allies to the best-known Berlin Wall crossing point between East Berlin and West Berlin during the Cold War.
Inner German border

The border between the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East Germany) and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG, West Germany) from 1949 to 1990. Not including the similar but physically separate Berlin Wall, the border was 866 miles long and ran from the Baltic Sea to Czechoslovakia.

German Democratic Republic

A state in the Eastern Bloc during the Cold War period. From 1949 to 1990, it administered the region of Germany occupied by Soviet forces at the end of World War II.

Overview

The Berlin Wall was a barrier that divided Germany from 1961 to 1989. Constructed by the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East Germany) starting on August 13, 1961, the Wall completely cut off West Berlin from surrounding East Germany and from East Berlin until government officials opened it in November 1989. Its demolition officially began on June 13, 1990 and was completed in 1992. The barrier included guard towers placed along large concrete walls, which circumscribed a wide area (later known as the “death strip”) that contained anti-vehicle trenches, “fakir beds,” and other defenses. The Eastern Bloc claimed that the Wall was erected to protect its population from fascist elements conspiring to prevent the “will of the people” in building a socialist state in East Germany. In practice, the Wall prevented the massive emigration and
defection that had marked East Germany and the communist Eastern Bloc during the post-World War II period.

The Berlin Wall was officially referred to as the “Anti-Fascist Protective Wall” by GDR authorities, implying that the NATO countries and West Germany in particular were considered “fascists” by GDR propaganda. The West Berlin city government sometimes referred to it as the “Wall of Shame”—a term coined by mayor Willy Brandt—while condemning the Wall’s restriction on freedom of movement. Along with the separate and much longer Inner German border (IGB), which demarcated the border between East and West Germany, it came to symbolize a physical marker of the “Iron Curtain” that separated Western Europe and the Eastern Bloc during the Cold War.

Before the Wall’s erection, 3.5 million East Germans circumvented Eastern Bloc emigration restrictions and defected from the GDR, many by crossing over the border from East Berlin into West Berlin. From there, they could travel to West Germany and other Western European countries. Between 1961 and 1989, the Wall prevented almost all such emigration. During this period, around 5,000 people attempted to escape over the Wall, with an estimated death toll ranging from 136 to more than 200 in and around Berlin.
Effects of the Berlin Wall

With the closing of the East-West sector boundary in Berlin, the vast majority of East Germans could no longer travel or emigrate to West Germany. Berlin soon went from the easiest place to make an unauthorized crossing between East and West Germany to the most difficult. Many families were split, and East Berliners employed in the West were cut off from their jobs. West Berlin became an isolated exclave in a hostile land. West Berliners demonstrated against the Wall, led by their Mayor Willy Brandt, who strongly criticized the United States for failing to respond. Allied intelligence agencies had hypothesized about a wall to stop the flood of refugees, but the main candidate for its location was around the perimeter of the city. In 1961, Secretary of State Dean Rusk
proclaimed, “The Wall certainly ought not to be a permanent feature of the European landscape. I see no reason why the Soviet Union should think it is ... to their advantage in any way to leave there that monument to communist failure.”

United States and UK sources expected the Soviet sector to be sealed off from West Berlin, but were surprised how long they took to do so. They considered the Wall an end to concerns about a GDR/Soviet retaking or capture of the whole of Berlin; the Wall would presumably have been an unnecessary project if such plans were afloat. Thus, they concluded that the possibility of a Soviet military conflict over Berlin had decreased.

The East German government claimed that the Wall was an “anti-fascist protective rampart” intended to dissuade aggression from the West. Another official justification was the activities of Western agents in Eastern Europe. The Eastern German government also claimed that West Berliners were buying state-subsidized goods in East Berlin. East Germans and others greeted such statements with skepticism, as most of the time the border was closed for citizens of East Germany traveling to the West but not for residents of West Berlin travelling East. The construction of the Wall caused considerable hardship to families divided by it. Most people believed that the Wall was mainly a means of preventing the citizens of East Germany from entering or fleeing to West Berlin.

Defection Attempts

During the years of the Wall, around 5,000 people successfully defected to West Berlin. The number of people who died trying to cross the Wall or as a result of the Wall's existence has been disputed. The most vocal claims by Alexandra Hildebrandt, Director of the Checkpoint Charlie Museum and widow of the Museum’s founder, estimated the death toll to be well above 200.

The East German government issued shooting orders to border
guards dealing with defectors, though these are not the same as “shoot to kill” orders. GDR officials denied issuing the latter. In an October 1973 order later discovered by researchers, guards were instructed that people attempting to cross the Wall were criminals and needed to be shot: “Do not hesitate to use your firearm, not even when the border is breached in the company of women and children, which is a tactic the traitors have often used.”

Early successful escapes involved people jumping the initial barbed wire or leaping out of apartment windows along the line, but these ended as the Wall was fortified. East German authorities no longer permitted apartments near the Wall to be occupied, and any building near the Wall had its windows boarded and later bricked up. On August 15, 1961, Conrad Schumann was the first East German border guard to escape by jumping the barbed wire to West Berlin.

On 22 August 1961, Ida Siekmann was the first casualty at the Berlin Wall: she died after she jumped out of her third floor apartment at 48 Bernauer Strasse. The first person to be shot and killed while trying to cross to West Berlin was Günter Litfin, a 24-year-old tailor. He attempted to swim across the Spree Canal to West Germany on August 24, 1961, the same day that East German police received shoot-to-kill orders to prevent anyone from escaping.

East Germans successfully defected by a variety of methods: digging long tunnels under the Wall, waiting for favorable winds and taking a hot air balloon, sliding along aerial wires, flying ultralights and, in one instance, simply driving a sports car at full speed through the basic initial fortifications. When a metal beam was placed at checkpoints to prevent this kind of defection, up to four people (two in the front seats and possibly two in the boot) drove under the bar in a sports car that had been modified to allow the roof and windscreen to come away when it made contact with the beam. They lay flat and kept driving forward. The East Germans then built zig-zagging roads at checkpoints.
Attributions

• The Building of the Berlin Wall
The Cuban Missile Crisis, when the U.S. Navy set up a blockade to halt Soviet nuclear weapons on their way to Cuba, brought the world closer to nuclear war than ever before.

### Learning Objective
Assess the severity of the Cuban Missile Crisis

### Key Points
- Continuing to seek ways to oust Castro following the failed Bay of Pigs Invasion, Kennedy and his administration experimented with ways of covertly facilitating the overthrow of the Cuban government.
- In February 1962, Khrushchev learned of the American plans to assassinate Fidel Castro; preparations to install Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba were undertaken in response.
- Alarmed, Kennedy considered various reactions, and ultimately responded to the installation of
nuclear missiles in Cuba with a naval blockade and presented an ultimatum to the Soviets.

- Khrushchev backed down from a confrontation, and the Soviet Union removed the missiles in return for an American pledge not to invade Cuba again.
- The tense few days after the American blockade and before the resolution was reached, later called the Cuban Missile Crisis, brought the world closer to nuclear war than ever before.
- The aftermath of the crisis led to the first efforts in the nuclear arms race at nuclear disarmament and improving relations.

Key Terms

Bay of Pigs Invasion
A failed military invasion of Cuba undertaken by the CIA-sponsored paramilitary group Brigade 2506 on April 17, 1961.

Fidel Castro
A Cuban politician and revolutionary who governed the Republic of Cuba as Prime Minister from 1959 to 1976 and then as President from 1976 to 2008. Politically a Marxist–Leninist and Cuban nationalist, he also served as the First Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba from 1961 until 2011. Under his administration Cuba became a one-party communist
state; industry and business were nationalized and state socialist reforms implemented throughout society.

**Moscow–Washington hotline**

A system that allows direct communication between the leaders of the United States and the USSR, established in 1963 after the Cuban Missile Crisis to prevent another dangerous confrontation.

---

**Overview**

The Cuban Missile Crisis was a 13-day (October 16-28, 1962) confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning American ballistic missile deployment in Italy and Turkey with consequent Soviet ballistic missile deployment in Cuba. Televised worldwide, this event was the closest the Cold War came to escalating into a full-scale nuclear war.

In response to the failed Bay of Pigs Invasion of 1961 and the presence of American Jupiter ballistic missiles in Italy and Turkey, Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev decided to agree to Cuba’s request to place nuclear missiles in Cuba to deter future harassment of Cuba. An agreement was reached during a secret meeting between Khrushchev and Fidel Castro in July 1962 and construction of a number of missile launch facilities started later that summer.

The 1962 midterm elections were underway in the U.S. and the White House had denied charges that it was ignoring dangerous Soviet missiles 90 miles from Florida. These missile preparations were confirmed when an Air Force U-2 spy plane produced clear photographic evidence of medium-range (SS-4) and intermediate-range (R-14) ballistic missile facilities. The United States established
a military blockade to prevent further missiles from entering Cuba. It announced that they would not permit offensive weapons to be delivered to Cuba and demanded that the weapons already in Cuba be dismantled and returned to the USSR.

After a long period of tense negotiations, an agreement was reached between President John F. Kennedy and Khrushchev on October 27. Publicly, the Soviets would dismantle their offensive weapons in Cuba and return them to the Soviet Union, subject to United Nations verification, in exchange for a U.S. public declaration and agreement never to invade Cuba without direct provocation. Secretly, the United States agreed that it would dismantle all U.S.-built Jupiter MRBMs, which were deployed in Turkey and Italy against the Soviet Union unbeknownst to the public.

When all offensive missiles and Ilyushin Il-28 light bombers were withdrawn from Cuba, the blockade was formally ended on November 20, 1962. The negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union pointed out the necessity of a quick, clear, and direct communication line between Washington and Moscow. As a result, the Moscow–Washington hotline was established. A series of agreements sharply reduced U.S.–Soviet tensions during the following years.

Background

The United States was concerned about an expansion of Communism, and a Latin American country allying openly with the USSR was regarded as unacceptable given the U.S.–Soviet enmity since the end of World War II. Such an involvement would also directly defy the Monroe Doctrine, a U.S. policy which, while limiting the United States’ involvement in European colonies and European affairs, held that European powers ought not to have involvement with states in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States had been embarrassed publicly by the failed
Bay of Pigs Invasion in April 1961, launched under President John F. Kennedy by CIA-trained forces of Cuban exiles. Afterward, former President Eisenhower told Kennedy that “the failure of the Bay of Pigs will embolden the Soviets to do something that they would otherwise not do.” The half-hearted invasion left Soviet premier Nikita Khrushchev and his advisers with the impression that Kennedy was indecisive and, as one Soviet adviser wrote, “too young, intellectual, not prepared well for decision making in crisis situations ... too intelligent and too weak.” U.S. covert operations continued in 1961 with the unsuccessful Operation Mongoose.

In May 1962, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was persuaded to counter the United States’ growing lead in developing and deploying strategic missiles by placing Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Cuba, despite the misgivings of the Soviet Ambassador in Havana, Alexandr Ivanovich Alexeyev, who argued that Castro would not accept the deployment of these missiles. Khrushchev faced a strategic situation where the U.S. was perceived to have a “splendid first strike” capability that put the Soviet Union at a huge disadvantage.

Khrushchev also wanted to bring West Berlin—the American/British/French-controlled democratic enclave within Communist East Germany—into the Soviet orbit. The East Germans and Soviets considered western control over a portion of Berlin a grave threat to East Germany. For this reason among others, Khrushchev made West Berlin the central battlefield of the Cold War. Khrushchev believed that if the U.S. did nothing over the missile deployments in Cuba, he could muscle the West out of Berlin using said missiles as a deterrent to western counter-measures in Berlin. If the U.S. tried to bargain with the Soviets after becoming aware of the missiles, Khrushchev could demand trading the missiles for West Berlin. Since Berlin was strategically more important than Cuba, the trade would be a win for Khrushchev.

Khrushchev was also reacting in part to the nuclear threat of obsolescent Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missiles that the U.S. installed in Turkey in April 1962.
American Blockade and Deepening Crisis

Kennedy met with members of Executive Committee of the National Security Council (EXCOMM) and other top advisers on October 21, considering two remaining options after ruling out diplomacy with the Soviets and full-on invasion: an air strike primarily against the Cuban missile bases or a naval blockade of Cuba. McNamara supported the naval blockade as a strong but limited military action that left the U.S. in control. However, the term “blockade” was problematic. According to international law a blockade is an act of war, but the Kennedy administration did not think that the USSR would be provoked to attack by a mere blockade. Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations wrote a position paper that helped Kennedy to differentiate between what they termed a “quarantine” of offensive weapons and a blockade of all materials, claiming that a classic blockade was not the original intention.

On October 22, President Kennedy addressed the nation, saying:

To halt this offensive buildup, a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba is being initiated. All ships of any kind bound for Cuba, from whatever nation or port, will, if found to contain cargoes of offensive weapons, be turned back. This quarantine will be extended, if needed, to other types of cargo and carriers. We are not at this time, however, denying the necessities of life as the Soviets attempted to do in their Berlin blockade of 1948.

The crisis continued unabated, and on the evening of October 24, the Soviet news agency TASS broadcast a telegram from Khrushchev to President Kennedy in which Khrushchev warned that the United States’s “outright piracy” would lead to war. However, this was followed by a telegram from Khrushchev to Kennedy in which Khrushchev stated, “if you weigh the present situation with a cool head without giving way to passion, you will
understand that the Soviet Union cannot afford not to decline the despotic demands of the USA” and that the Soviet Union views the blockade as “an act of aggression” and their ships will be instructed to ignore it.

The U.S. requested an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council on October 25. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson confronted Soviet Ambassador Valerian Zorin in an emergency meeting of the Security Council, challenging him to admit the existence of the missiles. The next day at 10 p.m. EST, the U.S. raised the readiness level of SAC forces to DEFCON 2, indicating “next step to nuclear war,” and one step away from “nuclear war imminent.” For the only confirmed time in U.S. history, while B-52 bombers went on continuous airborne alert, B-47 medium bombers were dispersed to various military and civilian airfields and prepared for takeoff, fully equipped with nuclear warheads, on 15 minutes’ notice.

At this point, the crisis was ostensibly at a stalemate. The USSR had shown no indication that they would back down and in fact made several comments to the contrary. The U.S. had no reason to believe otherwise and was in the early stages of preparing for an invasion along with a nuclear strike on the Soviet Union in case it responded militarily as expected.

Crisis Resolution

The crisis continued with Cuba preparing for invasion until October 27 when, after much deliberation between the Soviet Union and Kennedy’s cabinet, Kennedy secretly agreed to remove all missiles set in southern Italy and in Turkey, the latter on the border of the Soviet Union, in exchange for Khrushchev’s removal of all missiles in Cuba. At 9 a.m. EST on October 28, a new message from Khrushchev was broadcast on Radio Moscow in which he stated that “the Soviet government, in addition to previously issued instructions on the
cessation of further work at the building sites for the weapons, has
issued a new order on the dismantling of the weapons which you
describe as ‘offensive’ and their crating and return to the Soviet
Union.” Kennedy immediately responded, issuing a statement calling
the letter “an important and constructive contribution to peace.” He
continued this with a formal letter:

I consider my letter to you of October twenty-seventh and
your reply of today as firm undertakings on the part of
both our governments which should be promptly carried
out … The US will make a statement in the framework of
the Security Council in reference to Cuba as follows: it will
declare that the United States of America will respect the
inviolability of Cuban borders, its sovereignty, that it take
the pledge not to interfere in internal affairs, not to intrude
themselves and not to permit our territory to be used as a
bridgehead for the invasion of Cuba, and will restrain those
who would plan to carry an aggression against Cuba, either
from US territory or from the territory of other countries
neighboring to Cuba.

The compromise embarrassed Khrushchev and the Soviet Union
because the withdrawal of U.S. missiles from Italy and Turkey was
a secret deal between Kennedy and Khrushchev. Khrushchev went
to Kennedy thinking that the crisis was getting out of hand. The
Soviets were seen as retreating from circumstances they had
started. Khrushchev’s fall from power two years later was in part
because of the Politburo embarrassment at both Khrushchev’s
eventual concessions to the U.S. and his ineptitude in precipitating
the crisis in the first place. According to Dobrynin, the top Soviet
leadership took the Cuban outcome as “a blow to its prestige
bordering on humiliation.”
Cuban Missile Crisis: A U.S. Navy P-2H Neptune of VP-18 flying over a Soviet cargo ship with crated Il-28s on deck during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Attributions

• The Cuban Missile Crisis
PART XI
CH. 30 THE LONG DECADE (1989-2001)
37.1: European Unification

37.1.1: The European Coal and Steel Community

The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was born from the desire to prevent future European conflicts following the devastation of World War II.

**Learning Objective**

Connect the establishment of the ECSC to WWII.

**Key Points**

- The European Coal and Steel Community was formally established in 1951 by the Treaty of Paris, signed by Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.
- The ECSC was first proposed by French foreign minister Robert Schuman on May 9, 1950, to prevent
further war between France and Germany.

- The declared aim of the ECSC was to make future wars among the European nations unthinkable due to higher levels of regional integration, with the ECSC as the first step towards that integration.
- The ECSC enjoyed substantial public support, gaining strong majority votes in all 11 chambers of the parliaments of the six member states as well as approval among associations and European public opinion.
- The first institutions of the ECSC would ultimately form the blueprint for today’s European Commission, European Parliament, the Council of the European Union, and the European Court of Justice.

Key Term

**supranationalism**

A type of multinational political union where negotiated power is delegated to an authority by governments of member states.

The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was an international organization unifying certain continental European countries after World War II. It was formally established in 1951 by the Treaty of Paris, signed by Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. The ECSC was the first
international organization based on the principles of supranationalism, and would ultimately pave the way for the European Union.

Flag of the European Coal and Steel Community

History The ECSC was first proposed by French foreign minister Robert Schuman on May 9, 1950, to prevent further war between France and Germany. His declared aim was to make future wars among the European nations unthinkable due to higher levels of regional integration, with the ECSC as the first step towards that integration. The treaty would create a common market for coal and steel among its member states, which served to neutralize competition between European nations over natural resources used for wartime mobilization, particularly in the Ruhr. The Schuman Declaration that created the
ECSC had several distinct aims: It would mark the birth of a united Europe. It would make war between member states impossible. It would encourage world peace. It would transform Europe incrementally, leading to the democratic unification of two political blocks separated by the Iron Curtain. It would create the world’s first supranational institution. It would create the world’s first international anti-cartel agency. It would create a common market across the Community. It would, starting with the coal and steel sector, revitalize the entire European economy by similar community processes. It would improve the world economy as well as the economies of developing countries, such as those in Africa. Political Pressures In West Germany, Schuman kept close contact with the new generation of democratic politicians. Karl Arnold, the Minister President of North Rhine-Westphalia, the province that included the coal and steel producing Ruhr, was initially spokesman for German foreign affairs. He gave a number of speeches and broadcasts on a supranational coal and steel community at the same time as Schuman began to propose the Community in 1948 and 1949. The Social Democratic Party of Germany (German: Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, SPD),
in spite of support from unions and other socialists in Europe, decided it would oppose the Schuman plan. Kurt Schumacher’s personal distrust of France, capitalism, and Konrad Adenauer aside, he claimed that a focus on integration would override the SPD’s prime objective of German reunification and thus empower ultra-nationalist and Communist movements in democratic countries. He also thought the ECSC would end any hopes of nationalizing the steel industry and encourage the growth of cartel activity throughout a newly conservative-leaning Europe. Younger members of the party like Carlo Schmid were, however, in favor of the Community and pointed to the long tradition of socialist support for a supranational movement. In France, Schuman gained strong political and intellectual support from all sectors, including many non-communist parties. Charles de Gaulle, then out of power, had been an early supporter of linking European economies on French terms and spoke in 1945 of a “European confederation” that would exploit the resources of the Ruhr. However, he opposed the ECSC, deriding it as an unsatisfactory approach to European unity. He also considered the French government’s approach to integration too weak and feared the ECSC would be hijacked by other
nation’s concerns. De Gaulle felt that the ECSC had insufficient supranational authority because the Assembly was not ratified by a European referendum, and he did not accept Raymond Aron’s contention that the ECSC was intended as a movement away from U.S. domination. Consequently, de Gaulle and his followers in the Rally of the French People (RPF) voted against ratification in the lower house of the French Parliament. Despite these reservations and attacks from the extreme left, the ECSC found substantial public support. It gained strong majority votes in all 11 chambers of the parliaments of the six member states, as well as approval among associations and European public opinion. The 100-article Treaty of Paris, which established the ECSC, was signed on April 18, 1951, by “the inner six”: France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. On August 11, 1952, the United States was the first non-ECSC member to recognize the Community and stated it would now deal with the ECSC on coal and steel matters, establishing its delegation in Brussels. First Institutions The ECSC was run by four institutions: a High Authority composed of independent appointees, a Common Assembly composed of national parliamentarians, a Special
Council composed of national ministers, and a Court of Justice. These would ultimately form the blueprint for today’s European Commission, European Parliament, the Council of the European Union, and the European Court of Justice.

Luxembourg (City) Main Building of the BCEE: The main building of the BCEE in Luxembourg City was home to the former seat of the ECSC’s High Authority. The High Authority (now the European Commission) was the first-ever supranational body that served as the Community’s executive. The President was elected by the eight other members. The nine members were appointed by member states (two for the larger three states, one for the smaller three), but represented the common interest
rather than their own states’ concerns. The member states’ governments were represented by the Council of Ministers, the presidency of which rotated between each state every three months in alphabetical order. The Council of Ministers’ task was to harmonize the work of national governments with the acts of the High Authority and issue opinions on the work of the Authority when needed. The Common Assembly, now the European Parliament, was composed of 78 representatives. The Assembly exercised supervisory powers over the executive. The representatives were to be national MPs elected by their Parliaments to the Assembly, or directly elected. The Assembly was intended as a democratic counter-weight and check to the High Authority. It had formal powers to sack the High Authority following investigations of abuse.

Attributions
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The European Economic Community blossomed from the desire to further regional integration following the successful establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the transition from the ECSC to the EEC

**Key Points**

- The European Economic Community (EEC) was a regional organization that aimed to integrate its member states economically. It was created by the Treaty of Rome of 1957.
- Some important accomplishments of the EEC included the establishment in 1962 of common price levels for agricultural products and the removal of internal tariffs between member nations on certain
products in 1968.

- Disagreements arose between member states regarding infringements of sovereignty and financing of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).
- On July 1, 1967, the Merger Treaty came into force, combining the institutions of the ECSC and EURATOM into the EEC. Collectively, they were known as the European Communities.
- The 1960s saw the first attempts at enlargement, which over time led to a desire to increase areas of cooperation. As a result, the Single European Act was signed by foreign ministers in February 1986.

**Key Terms**

**sovereignty**

The full right and power of a governing body to govern itself without interference from outside sources or bodies. In political theory, sovereignty is a substantive term designating supreme authority over some polity. It is a basic principle underlying the dominant Westphalian model of state foundation.

**supranationalism**

A type of multinational political union in which negotiated power is delegated to an authority by governments of member states.
The European Economic Community (EEC) was a regional organization that aimed to integrate its member states economically. It was created by the Treaty of Rome of 1957. Upon the formation of the European Union (EU) in 1993, the EEC was incorporated and renamed as the European Community (EC). In 2009, the EC's institutions were absorbed into the EU's wider framework and the community ceased to exist.

Background

In 1951, the Treaty of Paris was signed, creating the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). This was an international community based on supranationalism and international law, designed to facilitate European economic growth and prevent future conflicts by integrating its members. With the aim of furthering regional integration, two additional communities were proposed: a European Defence Community and a European Political Community. While the treaty for the latter was drawn up by the Common Assembly, the ECSC parliamentary chamber, the proposed defense community was rejected by the French Parliament. ECSC President Jean Monnet, a leading figure behind the communities, resigned from the High Authority in protest and began work on alternative communities based on economic integration rather than political integration.

After the Messina Conference in 1955, Paul Henri Spaak was given the task of preparing a report on the idea of a customs union. Together with the Ohlin Report, the so-called Spaak Report would provide the basis for the Treaty of Rome. In 1956, Spaak led the Intergovernmental Conference on the Common Market and Euratom at the Val Duchesse castle. The conference led to the signature on March 25, 1957, of the Treaty of Rome, establishing a European Economic Community.
Creation and Early Years

The resulting communities were the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM, or sometimes EAEC). The EEC created a customs union while EURATOM promoted cooperation in the sphere of nuclear power. One of the first important accomplishments of the EEC was the establishment in 1962 of common price levels for agricultural products. In 1968, internal tariffs between member nations were removed on certain products. The formation of these communities was met with protest due to a fear that state sovereignty would be infringed. Another crisis was triggered in regards to proposals for the financing of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), which came into force in 1962. The transitional period whereby decisions were made by unanimity had come to an end, and majority voting in the Council had taken effect. Then-French President Charles de Gaulle's opposition to supranationalism and fear of the other members challenging the CAP led to an empty-chair policy in which French representatives were withdrawn from the European institutions until the French veto was reinstated. Eventually, the Luxembourg Compromise of January 29, 1966, instituted a gentlemen's agreement permitting members to use a veto on issues of national interest.
Charles De Gaulle: French President Charles de Gaulle vetoed British membership, held back the development of Parliament’s powers, and was at the centre of the empty-chair crisis of 1965. On July 1, 1967, the Merger Treaty came into force, combining the institutions of the ECSC and
EURATOM into that of the EEC. Collectively, they were known as the European Communities. The Communities still had independent personalities although they were increasingly integrated. Future treaties granted the Community new powers beyond simple economic matters, edging closer to the goal of political integration and a peaceful, united Europe.

Enlargement and Elections The 1960s saw the first attempts at enlargement. In 1961, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, and the United Kingdom applied to join the three Communities. However, President Charles de Gaulle saw British membership as a Trojan horse for U.S. influence and vetoed membership, and the applications of all four countries were suspended. The four countries resubmitted their applications on May 11, 1967, and with Georges Pompidou succeeding Charles de Gaulle as French president in 1969, the veto was lifted. Negotiations began in 1970 under the pro-European government of UK Prime Minister Sir Edward Heath, who had to deal with disagreements relating to the CAP and the UK’s relationship with the Commonwealth of Nations. Nevertheless, two years later the accession treaties were signed and Denmark, Ireland, and the UK joined the Community effective January 1, 1973. The Norwegian people
finally rejected membership in a referendum on September 25, 1972.

Expansion of the European Communities, 1973-1992: Countries colored green represent founding members of the EEC, and blue countries represent members added later. The Treaties of Rome stated that the European Parliament must be directly elected; however, this required the Council to agree on a common voting system first. The Council procrastinated on the issue and the Parliament remained appointed. Charles de Gaulle was particularly active in blocking the development of the Parliament, with it only being granted budgetary powers following his resignation. Parliament
pressed for agreement and on September 20, 1976, the Council agreed part of the necessary instruments for election, deferring details on electoral systems that remain varied to this day. In June 1979, during the tenure of President Jenkins, European Parliamentary elections were held. The new Parliament, galvanized by a direct election and new powers, started working full-time and became more active than previous assemblies. Towards Maastricht Greece applied to join the Community on June 12, 1975, following the restoration of its democracy. Greece joined the Community effective January 1, 1981. Similarly, and after their own democratic restorations, Spain and Portugal applied to the communities in 1977 and joined together on January 1, 1986. In 1987, Turkey formally applied to join the Community and began the longest application process for any country. With the prospect of further enlargement and a desire to increase areas of cooperation, the Single European Act was signed by foreign ministers in February 1986. This single document dealt with the reform of institutions, extension of powers, foreign policy cooperation, and the single European market. It came into force on July 1, 1987. The act was followed by work on what would become the Maastricht Treaty, which was
agreed to on December 10, 1991, signed the following year, and came into force on November 1, 1993, establishing the European Union.
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Although the European Union was formed to increase cooperation among member states, the desire to retain national control over certain policy areas made some institutions more intergovernmental than supranational in nature.

**Learning Objective**

Compare the European Union to its predecessors

**Key Terms**

**Schengen Area**

An area composed of 26 European states that have officially abolished passport and any other type of border control at their mutual borders. The area mostly functions as a single country for international travel purposes with a common visa policy.

**supranational**

A type of multinational political union where negotiated power is delegated to an authority by
Examples

- The European Union (EU) is a politico-economic union of 28 member states located primarily in Europe.
- The EU operates through a hybrid system of supranational and intergovernmental decision-making.
- The EU traces its origins from the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC), formed by the Inner Six countries in 1951 and 1958, respectively.
- The European Union was formally established when the Maastricht Treaty came into force on November 1, 1993. The treaty established the three pillars of the European Union: the European Communities pillar, which included the European Community (EC), the ECSC, and the EURATOM; the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) pillar; and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) pillar.
- The creation of the pillar system was the result of some member states wanting to extend the EEC while others felt those areas were too critical to their sovereignty to be managed by a supranational mechanism.
- The Maastricht, or convergence, criteria established minimum requirements for EU member states to enter the third stage of European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and adopt the euro as their currency. The four criteria impose controls over inflation, public debt and the public deficit, exchange rate stability, and the convergence of interest rates.
- On December 1, 2009, the Lisbon Treaty entered into force and reformed many aspects of the EU, including its legal structure.
During the 2010s, the cohesion of the EU has been tested by several issues, including a debt crisis in some of the Eurozone countries, increasing migration from the Middle East, and the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the EU.

The European Union (EU) is a politico-economic union of 28 member states located primarily in Europe. It has an area of 4,324,782 km$^2$ (1,669,808 sq mi) and an estimated population of over 510 million. The EU has developed an internal single market through a standardized system of laws that apply in all member states. EU policies aim to ensure the free movement of people, goods, services, and capital within the internal market, enact legislation in justice and home affairs, and maintain common policies on trade, agriculture, fisheries, and regional development. Within the Schengen Area, passport controls have been abolished. A monetary union was established in 1999 and came into full force in 2002, and is composed of 19 EU member states which use the euro currency.

The EU operates through a hybrid system of supranational and intergovernmental decision-making. The seven principal decision-making bodies—known as the institutions of the European Union—are the European Council, the Council of the European Union, the European Parliament, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, and the European Court of Auditors.

The EU traces its origins from the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC), formed by the Inner Six countries in 1951 and 1958, respectively. The Community and its successors have grown in size by the accession of new member states and in power by the addition of policy areas to its remit.
Maastricht Treaty

The European Union was formally established when the Maastricht Treaty—whose main architects were Helmut Kohl and François Mitterrand—came into force on November 1, 1993. The treaty established the three pillars of the European Union: the European Communities pillar, which included the European Community (EC), the ECSC, and the EURATOM; the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) pillar; and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) pillar. The first pillar handled economic, social, and economic policies. The second pillar handled foreign policy and military matters, and the third pillar coordinated member states’ efforts in the fight against crime.

All three pillars were the extensions of existing policy structures. The European Community pillar was a continuation of the EEC. Additionally, coordination in foreign policy had taken place since the 1970s under the European Political Cooperation (EPC), first written into treaties by the Single European Act. While the JHA extended cooperation in law enforcement, criminal justice, asylum, and immigration as well as judicial cooperation in civil matters, some of these areas were already subject to intergovernmental cooperation under the Schengen Implementation Convention of 1990.

The creation of the pillar system was the result of the desire by many member states to extend the EEC to the areas of foreign policy, military, criminal justice, and judicial cooperation. This desire was met with misgivings by some member states, notably the United Kingdom, who thought some areas were too critical to their sovereignty to be managed by a supranational mechanism. The agreed compromise was that instead of completely renaming the European Economic Community as the European Union, the treaty would establish a legally separate European Union comprising the European Economic Community and entities overseeing intergovernmental policy areas such as foreign policy, military,
criminal justice, and judicial cooperation. The structure greatly limited the powers of the European Commission, the European Parliament, and the European Court of Justice.

**Euro Convergence Criteria**

*Euro banknotes (2002): The euro was introduced in 2002, replacing 12 national currencies.*

The Maastricht, or convergence, criteria established the minimum requirements for EU member states to enter the third stage of European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and adopt the euro as their currency. The four criteria are defined in article 121 of the treaty establishing the European Community. They impose control over inflation, public debt and the public deficit, exchange rate stability, and the convergence of interest rates. The purpose of this
criteria was to maintain price stability within the Eurozone even with the inclusion of new member states.

- Inflation rates: No more than 1.5 percentage points higher than the average of the three best performing (lowest inflation) member states of the EU.
- Government finance:

1. Annual government deficit: The ratio of the annual government deficit to gross domestic product (GDP) must not exceed 3% at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If not, it must reach a level close to 3%. Only exceptional and temporary excesses would be granted for exceptional cases.
2. Government debt: The ratio of gross government debt to GDP must not exceed 60% at the end of the preceding fiscal year. Even if the target cannot be achieved due to specific conditions, the ratio must have sufficiently diminished and be approaching the reference value at a satisfactory pace. As of the end of 2014, of the countries in the Eurozone, only Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Luxembourg, and Finland still met this target.

- Exchange rate: Applicant countries should have joined the exchange-rate mechanism (ERM II) under the European Monetary System (EMS) for two consecutive years and should not have devalued its currency during the period.
- Long-term interest rates: The nominal long-term interest rate must not be more than 2 percentage points higher than in the three lowest-inflation member states.
On December 1, 2009, the Lisbon Treaty reformed many aspects of the EU. In particular, it changed the legal structure, merging the three pillars system into a single legal entity provisioned with a legal personality; created a permanent President of the European Council; and strengthened the position of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. During the 2010s, the cohesion of the EU has been tested by several issues, including a debt crisis in some of the Eurozone countries, increasing migration from the Middle East, and the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the EU. As of December 2016, the UK has not yet initiated formal withdrawal procedures.
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37.2: Fall of the Soviet Union

37.2.1: The Soviet Union’s Aging Leadership

The aging Soviet leadership of the 1980s was ill-equipped to deal with ongoing economic stagnation and worsening foreign conflicts such as the Soviet-Afghan War.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the leadership problem facing the Soviet Union in the 1980s

**Key Points**

- The transition period that separated the Brezhnev and Gorbachev eras resembled the former much more than the latter, although hints of reform emerged as early as 1983.
- Andropov maneuvered his way into power both
through his KGB connections and by gaining the support of the military by promising not to cut defense spending, despite the heavy toll it exacted on the ailing Soviet economy.

- Andropov began a thorough house-cleaning throughout the party and state bureaucracy, but his ability to reshape the top leadership was constrained by his own advanced age and poor health as well as the influence of his rival, Konstantin Chernenko.

- Andropov's domestic policy leaned heavily towards restoring discipline and order to Soviet society. He eschewed radical political and economic reforms, promoting instead a degree of candor in politics and mild economic experiments.

- In foreign affairs, Andropov continued Brezhnev's policies, causing US-Soviet relations to deteriorate rapidly.

- Chernenko succeeded Andropov in 1984, bringing about a number of significant policy changes, including more investment in consumer goods and services and in agriculture. Chernenko also called for a reduction in the Communist Party's micromanagement of the economy. However, KGB repression of Soviet dissidents increased and personnel changes and investigations into corruption undertaken under Andropov came to an end.

- During this period of Soviet leadership, fighting in the Soviet-Afghan War intensified, compounding Soviet economic stagnation and further entangling the USSR in a war it didn't seem they could successfully win.
Examples

Key Term

**Goulash Communism**

The variety of communism as practiced in the Hungarian People’s Republic from the 1960s until the Central European collapse of communism in 1989. With elements of free market economics and an improved human rights record, it represented a quiet deviation from the Soviet principles applied to Hungary in the previous decade. The name is a semi-humorous metaphor derived from the popular Hungarian dish. Goulash is made with an assortment of unlike ingredients, representing how Hungarian communism was a mixed ideology and no longer strictly adhered to Marxist-Leninist interpretations as in the past.

By 1982, the stagnation of the Soviet economy was evidenced by the fact that the Soviet Union had been importing grain from the U.S. throughout the 1970s. However, the conditions that led to economic stagnation, primarily the huge rate of defense spending that consumed the budget, were so firmly entrenched within the economic system that any real turnaround seemed impossible. The transition period that separated the Brezhnev and Gorbachev eras resembled the former much more than the latter, although hints of reform emerged as early as 1983.
Brezhnev died on November 10, 1982. Two days passed between his death and the announcement of the election of Yuri Andropov as the new General Secretary, suggesting that a power struggle had occurred in the Kremlin. Andropov maneuvered his way into power both through his KGB connections and by gaining the support of the
military by promising not to cut defense spending. For comparison, some of his rivals, such as Konstantin Chernenko, were skeptical of continued high military spending. At age 69, he was the oldest person ever appointed as General Secretary and 11 years older than Brezhnev when he acquired that post. In June 1983, he assumed the post of chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, thus becoming the ceremonial head of state. It had taken Brezhnev 13 years to acquire this post.

Andropov began a thorough house-cleaning throughout the party and state bureaucracy, a decision made easy by the fact that the Central Committee had an average age of 69. He replaced more than one-fifth of the Soviet ministers and regional party first secretaries, and more than one-third of the department heads within the Central Committee apparatus. As a result, he replaced the aging leadership with younger, more vigorous administrators. But Andropov's ability to reshape the top leadership was constrained by his own age and poor health and the influence of his rival (and longtime ally of Leonid Brezhnev) Konstantin Chernenko, who previously supervised personnel matters in the Central Committee.

Andropov's domestic policy leaned heavily towards restoring discipline and order to Soviet society. He eschewed radical political and economic reforms, promoting instead a small degree of candor in politics and mild economic experiments similar to those associated with the late Premier Alexei Kosygin's initiatives in the mid-1960s. In tandem with these economic experiments, Andropov launched an anti-corruption drive that reached high into the government and party ranks. Unlike Brezhnev, who possessed several mansions and a fleet of luxury cars, Andropov lived a modest life. While visiting Budapest in early 1983, he expressed interest in Hungary's Goulash Communism and that the sheer size of the Soviet economy made strict top-down planning impractical. 1982 had witnessed the country's worst economic performance since World War II, with real GDP growth at almost zero percent, necessitating real change, and fast.

In foreign affairs, Andropov continued Brezhnev's policies. U.S.-
Soviet relations deteriorated rapidly beginning in March 1983, when President Ronald Reagan dubbed the Soviet Union an “evil empire”. The official press agency TASS accused Reagan of “thinking only in terms of confrontation and bellicose, lunatic anti-communism”. Further deterioration occurred as a result of the September 1, 1983, Soviet shoot-down of Korean Air Lines Flight 007 near Moneron Island, carrying 269 people including a sitting U.S. congressman, Larry McDonald, as well as by Reagan’s stationing of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Additionally, in Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua, and elsewhere, the U.S. began undermining Soviet-supported governments by supplying arms to anti-communist resistance movements.

Andropov’s health declined rapidly during the tense summer and fall of 1983, and he became the first Soviet leader to miss the anniversary celebrations of the 1917 revolution. He died in February 1984 of kidney failure after disappearing from public view for several months. His most significant legacy to the Soviet Union was his discovery and promotion of Mikhail Gorbachev.

Chernenko Interregnum

At 71, Konstantin Chernenko was in poor health, suffering from emphysema, and unable to play an active role in policy-making when he was chosen after lengthy discussion to succeed Andropov. But Chernenko’s short time in office did bring about some significant policy changes, including more investment in consumer goods and services and in agriculture. He also called for a reduction in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union’s (CPSU) micromanagement of the economy. However, KGB repression of Soviet dissidents increased and personnel changes and investigations into corruption undertaken under Andropov came to an end. In February 1983, Soviet representatives withdrew from the World Psychiatric Organization in protest of its continued
complaints about the use of psychiatry to suppress dissent. This policy was underlined in June when Vladimir Danchev, a broadcaster for Radio Moscow, referred to the Soviet troops in Afghanistan as “invaders” while conducting English-language broadcasts. After refusing to retract this statement, he was sent to a mental institution for several months.

Soviet-Afghan War

Andropov played a dominant role in the decision to intervene militarily in Afghanistan on December 24, 1979, insisting on the invasion although he knew that the international community would find the USSR culpable. The decision to intervene led to the Soviet-Afghan War, which continued once Andropov became the leader of the USSR. By this time, Andropov felt the invasion might have been a mistake and halfheartedly explored options for a negotiated withdrawal. The Soviets had not foreseen taking such an active role in fighting the mujahideen rebels and attempted to downplay their involvement in relation to that of the Afghan army. However, the arrival of Soviet troops had the opposite effect on the Afghan people, incensing rather than pacifying and causing the mujahideen to gain in strength and numbers.

During the Chernenko interregnum, fighting in Afghanistan intensified. Once it became apparent that the Soviets could not take a backseat in the conflict, they followed three main strategies aimed at quelling the uprising. Intimidation was the first strategy, in which the Soviets would use airborne attacks as well as armored ground attacks to destroy villages, livestock, and crops in trouble areas. Locals were forced to either flee their homes or die as daily Soviet attacks made it impossible to live in these areas. By forcing the people of Afghanistan to flee their homes, the Soviets hoped to deprive the guerrillas of resources and safe havens. The second strategy consisted of subversion, which entailed sending spies to
join resistance groups and report information as well as bribing local tribes or guerrilla leaders into ceasing operations. Finally, the Soviets used military forays into contested territories to root out the guerrillas and limit their options. Classic search and destroy operations were implemented and once villages were occupied by Soviet forces, inhabitants who remained were frequently interrogated and tortured for information, or killed.
Tanks and Helicopters during the Soviet-Afghan War: Soviet ground forces in action while conducting an offensive operation against the Islamist resistance.

In the mid-1980s, the Afghan resistance movement, assisted by the U.S., Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the UK, Egypt, China, and others,
contributed to Moscow’s high military costs and strained international relations. The U.S. viewed the struggle in Afghanistan as an integral Cold War struggle and the CIA provided assistance to anti-Soviet forces via Pakistani intelligence services in a program called Operation Cyclone. The mujahideen favored sabotage operations. The more common types of sabotage included damaging power lines, knocking out pipelines and radio stations, and blowing up government office buildings, air terminals, hotels, cinemas, and so on. They concentrated on both civilian and military targets, knocking out bridges, closing major roads, attacking convoys, disrupting the electric power system and industrial production, and attacking police stations and Soviet military installations and air bases. They assassinated government officials and Marxist People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) members, and laid siege to small rural outposts.
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Gorbachev launched perestroika to rescue the Soviet economy from stagnation, but did not intend to abandon the centrally planned economy entirely.

**Learning Objective**

Explain Gorbachev’s reasons for launching perestroika

**Key Points**

- Gorbachev's primary goal as general secretary was to revive the Soviet economy after the stagnant Brezhnev and interregnum years.
- Gorbachev soon came to believe that fixing the Soviet economy would be nearly impossible without also reforming the political and social structure of the Communist nation.
- The purpose of reform was to prop up the centrally...
planned economy—not to transition to market socialism.

• Gorbachev initiated his new policy of perestroika (literally “restructuring” in Russian) and its attendant radical reforms in 1986. Policy reforms included the Law on State Enterprise, the Law on Cooperatives, and the opening of the Soviet economy to foreign investment.

• Unfortunately, Gorbachev’s economic changes did not do much to restart the country’s sluggish economy.

• In 1988, Gorbachev introduced glasnost, which gave the Soviet people freedoms that they had not previously known, including greater freedom of speech.

• In June 1988, at the CPSU’s Party Conference, Gorbachev launched radical reforms meant to reduce party control of the government apparatus, proposing a new executive in the form of a presidential system as well as a new legislative element.

**Key Terms**

**glasnost**

Roughly translating to “openness”, reforms to the political and judicial system made in the 1980s that ensured greater freedoms for the public and the press as well as increased government transparency.
perestroika

Literally “restructuring” in Russian, a political movement for reform within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union during the 1980s, widely associated with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was the eighth and final leader of the Soviet Union, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) from 1985 until 1991, when the party was dissolved. Gorbachev’s primary goal as general secretary was to revive the Soviet economy after the stagnant Brezhnev and interregnum years. In 1985, he announced that the economy was stalled and that reorganization was needed, proposing a vague program of reform that was adopted at the April Plenum of the Central Committee. His reforms called for fast-paced technological modernization and increased industrial and agricultural productivity. He also tried to make the Soviet bureaucracy more efficient.

Gorbachev soon came to believe that fixing the Soviet economy would be nearly impossible without also reforming the political and social structure of the Communist nation. He started by making personnel changes, most notably replacing Andrei Gromyko with Eduard Shevardnadze as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Gromyko had served at his post for 28 years and was considered a member of the old Soviet guard. Although Shevardnadze was comparatively inexperienced in diplomacy, he, like Gorbachev, had a background in managing an agricultural region of the Soviet Union (Georgia), which entailed weak links to the military-industrial complex, sharing Gorbachev’s outlook on governance.

The purpose of reform was to prop up the centrally planned economy—not to transition to market socialism. Speaking in late summer 1985 to the secretaries for economic affairs of the central
committees of the East European communist parties, Gorbachev said: “Many of you see the solution to your problems in resorting to market mechanisms in place of direct planning. Some of you look at the market as a lifesaver for your economies. But, comrades, you should not think about lifesavers but about the ship, and the ship is socialism.”

Mikhail Gorbachev in 2010.
Gorbachev initiated his new policy of perestroika (literally “restructuring” in Russian) and its attendant radical reforms in 1986. They were sketched, but not fully spelled out, at the XXVIIth Party Congress in February–March 1986. The “reconstruction” was proposed in an attempt to overcome economic stagnation by creating a dependable and effective mechanism for accelerating economic and social progress. In July 1987, the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union passed the Law on State Enterprise. The law stipulated that state enterprises were free to determine output levels based on demand from consumers and other enterprises. Enterprises had to fulfill state orders, but could dispose of the remaining output as they saw fit. However, the state still held control over the means of production for these enterprises, limiting their ability to enact full-cost accountability. Enterprises bought input from suppliers at negotiated contract prices. Under the law, enterprises became self-financing; that is, they had to cover expenses (wages, taxes, supplies, and debt service) through revenues. No longer was the government to rescue unprofitable enterprises that faced bankruptcy. Finally, the law shifted control over the enterprise operations from ministries to elected workers’ collectives.

The Law on Cooperatives, enacted in May 1988, was perhaps the most radical of the economic reforms introduced in the early part of the Gorbachev era. For the first time since Vladimir Lenin’s New Economic Policy was abolished in 1928, the law permitted private ownership of businesses in the services, manufacturing, and foreign-trade sectors. The law initially imposed high taxes and employment restrictions, but it later revised these to avoid discouraging private-sector activity.

The most significant of Gorbachev’s reforms in the foreign economic sector allowed foreigners to invest in the Soviet Union in joint ventures with Soviet ministries, state enterprises, and
 cooperatives. The original version of the Soviet Joint Venture Law, which went into effect in June 1987, limited foreign shares of a Soviet venture to 49 percent and required that Soviet citizens occupy the positions of chairman and general manager. After potential Western partners complained, the government revised the regulations to allow majority foreign ownership and control. Under the terms of the Joint Venture Law, the Soviet partner supplied labor, infrastructure, and a potentially large domestic market. The foreign partner supplied capital, technology, entrepreneurial expertise, and high-quality products and services.

Gorbachev's economic changes did little to restart the country's sluggish economy in the late 1980s. The reforms decentralized economic activity to a certain extent, but price controls remained, as did the ruble's inconvertibility and most government controls over the means of production. By 1990, the government had virtually lost control over economic conditions. Government spending increased sharply as more unprofitable enterprises required state support and consumer price subsidies continued. Tax revenues declined because local governments withheld tax revenues from the central government in a climate of growing regional autonomy. The elimination of central control over production decisions, especially in the consumer goods sector, led to the breakdown in traditional supply-demand relationships without contributing to the formation of new ones. Thus, instead of streamlining the system, Gorbachev's decentralization caused new production bottlenecks.

**Glasnost**

In 1988, Gorbachev introduced glasnost, which gave the Soviet people freedoms they had not previously known, including greater freedom of speech. The press became far less controlled, and thousands of political prisoners and many dissidents were released as part of a wider program of de-Stalinization. Gorbachev's goal
in glasnost was to pressure conservatives within the CPSU who opposed his policies of economic restructuring, believing that through varying ranges of openness, debate, and participation, the Soviet people would support his reform initiatives. At the same time, he exposed his plans to more public criticism.

In June 1988, at the CPSU’s Party Conference, Gorbachev launched radical reforms to reduce party control of the government apparatus. He proposed a new executive in the form of a presidential system as well as a new legislative element, the Congress of People’s Deputies. Elections to the Congress of People’s Deputies were held throughout the Soviet Union in March and April 1989. This was the first free election in the Soviet Union since 1917. Gorbachev became Chairman of the Supreme Soviet (or head of state) on May 25, 1989.
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229. Unrest in the Soviet Union

37.2.3: Unrest in the Soviet Union

The increased freedoms of glasnost allowed opposition groups to make political gains against the centralized Soviet government in Moscow.

**Learning Objective**

Analyze the reasons for the uprisings that broke out across the Soviet Union in the late 1980s

**Key Points**

- By the late 1980s, people in the Caucasus and Baltic states were demanding more autonomy from Moscow, and the Kremlin was losing some of its control over certain regions and elements in the Soviet Union.
- The Chernobyl disaster in April 1986 had major political and social effects that catalyzed the
revolutions of 1989.

- Under glasnost, the Soviet media began to expose numerous social and economic problems in the Soviet Union that the government had long denied and covered up, such as poor housing, food shortages, alcoholism, widespread pollution, creeping mortality rates, the second-rate position of women, and the history of state crimes against the population.
- Political openness continued to produce unintended consequences as nationalists swept the board in regional elections.
- Starting in the mid-1980s, the Baltic states used the reforms provided by glasnost to assert their rights to protect their environment (for example during the Phosphorite War) and historic monuments, and later, their claims to sovereignty and independence.
- Momentum towards full-blown revolution began in Poland where by early April 1989, numerous reforms and freedoms for opposition groups had been obtained.
- Revolutionary momentum, encouraged by the peaceful transition underway in Poland, continued in Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Romania.
- The Soviet Union was dissolved by the end of 1991, resulting in 14 countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan) declaring their independence in the course of the years 1990–1991.
Key Terms

**glasnost**
Roughly translating to “openness”, this term refers to the reforms the political and judicial system made in the 1980s that ensured greater freedoms for the public and the press and increased government transparency.

**sovereignty**
The full right and power of a governing body to govern itself without interference from outside sources or bodies. In political theory, sovereignty is a substantive term designating supreme authority over some polity. It is a basic principle underlying the dominant Westphalian model of state foundation.

The Revolutions of 1989 were part of a revolutionary wave in the late 1980s and early 1990s that resulted in the end of communist rule in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond.

**Leadup to Revolution**

By the late 1980s, people in the Caucasus and Baltic states were demanding more autonomy from Moscow, and the Kremlin was losing some of its control over certain regions and elements in the Soviet Union. In November 1988, Estonia issued a declaration of sovereignty, which eventually led to other states doing the same.
The Chernobyl disaster in April 1986 had major political and social effects that catalyzed the revolutions of 1989. It is difficult to establish the total economic cost of the disaster. According to Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet Union spent 18 billion rubles (the equivalent of USD $18 billion at the time) on containment and decontamination, virtually bankrupting itself. One political result of the disaster was the greatly increased significance of the Soviet policy of glasnost. Under glasnost, relaxation of censorship resulted in the Communist Party losing its grip on the media, and Soviet citizens were able to learn significantly more about the past and the outside world.

The Soviet media began to expose numerous social and economic problems in the Soviet Union that the government had long denied and covered up, such as poor housing, food shortages, alcoholism, widespread pollution, creeping mortality rates, the second-rate position of women, and the history of state crimes against the
Although Nikita Khrushchev denounced Stalin’s personality cult as early as the 1950s, information about the true proportions of his atrocities had still been suppressed. These revelations had a devastating effect on those who believed in state communism and had never been exposed to this information, as the driving vision of society was built on a foundation of falsehood and crimes against humanity. Additionally, information about the higher quality of life in the United States and Western Europe and about Western pop culture were exposed to the Soviet public for the first time.

Political openness continued to produce unintended consequences. In elections to the regional assemblies of the Soviet Union’s constituent republics, nationalists swept the board. As Gorbachev weakened the system of internal political repression, the ability of the USSR's central government to impose its will on the USSR's constituent republics was largely undermined. During the 1980s, calls for greater independence from Moscow’s rule grew louder. This was especially marked in the Baltic Republics of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, which had been annexed into the Soviet Union by Joseph Stalin in 1940. Nationalist sentiment also took hold in other Soviet republics such as Ukraine, Georgia, and Azerbaijan.

Starting in the mid-1980s, the Baltic states used the reforms provided by glasnost to assert their rights to protect their environment (for example during the Phosphorite War) and their historic monuments, and, later, their claims to sovereignty and independence. When the Balts withstood outside threats, they exposed an irresolute Kremlin. Bolstering separatism in other Soviet republics, the Balts triggered multiple challenges to the Soviet Union. The rise of nationalism under glasnost also reawakened simmering ethnic tensions throughout the union. For example, in February 1988, Nagorno-Karabakh, a predominantly ethnic Armenian region in Azerbaijan, passed a resolution calling for unification with Armenia, which sparked the Nagorno-Karabakh War.
Collapse (Summer 1989 to Fall 1991)

Momentum toward full-blown revolution began in Poland in 1989. During the Polish United Workers’ Party’s (PZPR) plenary session of January 16-18, 1989, General Wojciech Jaruzelski and his ruling formation overcame the Central Committee's resistance by threatening to resign. As a result, the communist party decided to allow relegalization of the independent trade union Solidarity and approach its leaders for formal talks. From February 6 to April 4, 94 sessions of talks between 13 working groups, known as the Round Table Talks, resulted in political and economic compromise reforms. The talks resulted in the Round Table Agreement, by which political power would be vested in a newly created bicameral legislature and a president who would be the chief executive.

By April 4, 1989, numerous reforms and freedoms for the opposition were obtained. Solidarity, now in existence as the Solidarity Citizens’ Committee, would again be legalized as a trade union and allowed to participate in semi-free elections. The election had restrictions imposed designed to keep the communists in power, since only 35% of the seats in the Sejm, the key lower chamber of parliament, would be open to Solidarity candidates. The remaining 65% was reserved for candidates from the PZPR and its allies (the United People’s Party, the Alliance of Democrats, and the PAX Association). Since the Round Table Agreement mandated only reform (not replacement) of socialism in Poland, the communist party thought of the election as a way of neutralizing political conflict and staying in power while gaining legitimacy to carry out economic reforms. However, the negotiated social policy determinations by economists and trade unionists during the Round Table talks were quickly rejected by both the Party and the opposition.

A systemic transformation was made possible by the Polish legislative elections of June 4, 1989, which coincided with the bloody crackdown on the Tienanmen Square protesters in China. When
polling results were released, a political earthquake erupted: Solidarity's victory surpassed all predictions. Solidarity candidates captured all seats they were allowed to compete for in the Sejm, while in the newly established Senate they captured 99 out of the 100 available seats (the other seat went to an independent, who later switched to Solidarity). At the same time, many prominent PZPR candidates failed to gain even the minimum number of votes required to capture the seats that were reserved for them. The communists suffered a catastrophic blow to their legitimacy as a result.

Revolutionary momentum, encouraged by the peaceful transition underway in Poland, continued in Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. A common feature among these countries was the extensive use of campaigns of civil resistance, demonstrating popular opposition to the continuation of one-party rule and contributing to the pressure for change. Romania was the only Eastern Bloc country whose people overthrew its Communist regime violently. The Tienanmen Square protests of 1989 failed to stimulate major political changes in China, but powerful images of courageous defiance during that protest helped to spark a precipitation of events in other parts of the globe. Hungary dismantled its section of the physical Iron Curtain, leading to a mass exodus of East Germans through Hungary that destabilized East Germany. This led to mass demonstrations in cities such as Leipzig and subsequently to the fall of the Berlin Wall, which served as the symbolic gateway to German reunification in 1990.

The Soviet Union was dissolved by the end of 1991, resulting in 14 countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan) declaring their independence from the Soviet Union in 1990–91. Lithuania was the first Union Republic to declare independence from the dissolving Soviet Union in the Act of the Re-Establishment of the State of Lithuania, signed by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania on March 11, 1990. The Act of the Re-Establishment of the
State of Lithuania served as a model and inspiration to other Soviet republics. However, the issue of independence was not immediately settled and recognition by other countries was uncertain. The rest of the Soviet Union, which constituted the bulk of the area, became Russia in December 1991.

Communism was abandoned in Albania and Yugoslavia between 1990 and 1992. By 1992, Yugoslavia split into the five successor states of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Macedonia, Slovenia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which was later renamed Serbia and Montenegro and eventually split into two separate states. Serbia then further split with the breakaway of the partially recognized state of Kosovo. Czechoslovakia was dissolved three years after the end of Communist rule, splitting peacefully into the Czech Republic and Slovakia in 1992. The impact was felt in dozens of Socialist countries. Communism was abandoned in countries such as Cambodia, Ethiopia, Mongolia (which democratically re-elected a Communist government that ran the country until 1996), and South Yemen. The collapse of Communism (and of the Soviet Union) led commentators to declare the end of the Cold War.

During the adoption of varying forms of market economies, there was initially a general decline in living standards. Political reforms were varied, but in only five countries were Communist parties able to keep for themselves a monopoly on power: China, Cuba, North Korea, Laos, and Vietnam. Many Communist and Socialist organisations in the West turned their guiding principles over to social democracy. Communist parties in Italy and San Marino suffered, and the renewal of the Italian political class took place in the early 1990s. The European political landscape was drastically changed, with numerous Eastern Bloc countries joining NATO and the European Union, resulting in stronger economic and social integration.

Attributions
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230. Fall of the Berlin Wall

37.2.4: Fall of the Berlin Wall

A relaxing of Eastern bloc border defenses initiated a chain of events that pressured the East German government into opening crossing points between East and West Berlin to political refugees, precipitating the eventual fall of the Berlin Wall.

**Learning Objective**

Detail the events leading up to the fall of the Berlin Wall

**Key Points**

- The Berlin Wall was a barrier that divided Berlin from 1961 to 1989. When Hungary disabled its physical border defenses with Austria on August 19, 1989, it initiated a chain of events that would eventually precipitate the fall of the Berlin Wall.
- A slew of border crossings and protests ensued in the Peaceful Revolution of late 1989.
- To ease the difficulties posed by these large masses of people, the Politburo led by East Germany’s leader
Egon Krenz decided on November 9, 1989, to allow refugees to exit directly via crossing points between East and West Germany, including between East and West Berlin.

- Günter Schabowski, the party boss in East Berlin and the spokesman for the SED Politburo, announced the new regulations, but mistakenly said they were effectively immediately rather than the next day.
- East Germans began gathering at the Wall, demanding that border guards open the gates. Finally, at 10:45 pm, Harald Jäger, the commander of the Bornholmer Straße border crossing, yielded, allowing the guards to open the checkpoints and people to pass through with little to no identity checking.
- Television coverage of citizens demolishing sections of the Wall on November 9 was soon followed by the East German regime announcing ten new border crossings, including the historically significant locations of Potsdamer Platz, Glienicker Brücke, and Bernauer Straße.
- On June 13, 1990, the East German military officially began dismantling the Wall, beginning in Bernauer Straße and around the Mitte district.
- On July 1, 1990, the day East Germany adopted West German currency, all de jure border controls ceased, although the inter-German border was meaningless for some time before that.
Key Terms

**fakir beds**
Essentially, a bed of nails used as a deterrent to vehicle or foot crossing of an expanse.

**defection**
In politics, a person who gives up allegiance to one state in exchange for allegiance to another in a way that is considered illegitimate by the first state.

The Berlin Wall was a barrier that divided Berlin from 1961 to 1989. Constructed by the German Democratic Republic (GDR, or East Germany) beginning August 13, 1961, the Wall completely cut off West Berlin by land from East Germany and East Berlin. The barrier included guard towers placed along large concrete walls, which circumscribed a wide area that contained anti-vehicle trenches, fakir beds, and other defenses. The Eastern Bloc claimed the Wall was erected to protect its population from fascist elements conspiring to prevent grassroots socialist state-building in East Germany. But in practice, the Wall served to prevent massive emigration and defection that plagued East Germany and the communist Eastern Bloc during the post-World War II period.
The Fall of the Wall

When Hungary disabled its physical border defenses with Austria on August 19, 1989, it initiated a chain of events that would eventually precipitate the fall of the Berlin Wall. In September 1989, more than 13,000 East German tourists escaped through Hungary to Austria. The Hungarians prevented many more East Germans from crossing the border and returned them to Budapest. Those East Germans then flooded the West German embassy and refused to return to East Germany. The East German government responded to this by disallowing any further travel to Hungary, but allowed those already there to return to East Germany.

Soon, a similar pattern began to emerge out of Czechoslovakia. This time, however, the East German authorities allowed people to leave, provided that they did so by train through East Germany.
This was followed by mass demonstrations within East Germany itself. Initially, protesters were mostly people wanting to leave to the West, chanting “Wir wollen raus!” ("We want out!"). Then protesters began to chant “Wir bleiben hier!” (“We are staying here!”). This was the start of what East Germans call the Peaceful Revolution of late 1989. Protest demonstrations grew considerably by early November, and the movement neared its height on November 4, when half a million people gathered to demand political change at the Alexanderplatz demonstration, East Berlin’s large public square and transportation hub.

The longtime leader of East Germany, Erich Honecker, resigned on October 18, 1989, and was replaced by Egon Krenz the same day. Honecker predicted in January of that year that the Wall would stand for 50 or 100 more years if the conditions that caused its construction did not change. The wave of refugees leaving East Germany for the West kept increasing. By early November, refugees were finding their way to Hungary via Czechoslovakia or the West German Embassy in Prague. This was tolerated by the new Krenz government due to long-standing agreements with the communist Czechoslovak government allowing free travel across their common border. However, this movement grew so large it caused difficulties for both countries. The Politburo led by Krenz thus decided on November 9 to allow refugees to exit directly via crossing points between East and West Germany, including between East and West Berlin. Later the same day, the ministerial administration modified the proposal to include private, round-trip travel. The new regulations were to take effect the next day.

Günter Schabowski, the party boss in East Berlin and the spokesman for the SED Politburo, had the task of announcing the new regulations but had not been involved in the discussions about the new regulations and was been fully updated. Shortly before a press conference on November 9, he was handed a note announcing the changes but given no further instructions on how to handle the information. These regulations had only been completed a few hours earlier and were to take effect the following day to allow time...
to inform the border guards. But this starting time delay was not communicated to Schabowski. At the end of the press conference, Schabowski read out loud the note he had been given. One of the reporters, ANSA’s Riccardo Ehrman, asked when the regulations would take effect. After a few seconds’ hesitation, Schabowski stated based on assumption that it would be immediate. After further questions from journalists, he confirmed that the regulations included border crossings through the Wall into West Berlin, which he had not mentioned until then.

Excerpts from Schabowski’s press conference were the lead story on West Germany’s two main news programs that night, meaning that the news was also broadcast to nearly all of East Germany. East Germans began gathering at the Wall at the six checkpoints between East and West Berlin, demanding that border guards immediately open the gates. The surprised and overwhelmed guards made many hectic telephone calls to their superiors about the problem. At first, they were ordered to find the more aggressive people gathered at the gates and stamp their passports with a special stamp that barred them from returning to East Germany—in effect, revoking their citizenship. However, this still left thousands demanding to be let through.

It soon became clear that no one among the East German authorities would take personal responsibility for issuing orders to use lethal force, so the vastly outnumbered soldiers had no way to hold back the huge crowd of East German citizens. Finally, at 10:45 pm, Harald Jäger, the commander of the Bornholmer Straße border crossing, yielded, allowing the guards to open the checkpoints and people to pass through with little to no identity checking. As the Ossis (“Easterners”) swarmed through, they were greeted by Wessis (“Westerners”) waiting with flowers and champagne amid wild rejoicing. Soon afterward, a crowd of West Berliners jumped on top of the Wall and were joined by East German youngsters. They danced together to celebrate their new freedom.
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Demolition

Television coverage of citizens demolishing sections of the Wall on November 9 was soon followed by the East German regime announcing ten new border crossings, including the historically significant locations of Potsdamer Platz, Glienicker Brücke, and Bernauer Straße. Crowds gathered on both sides of the historic crossings waiting for hours to cheer the bulldozers that tore down portions of the Wall to reinstate ancient roads. While the Wall officially remained guarded at a decreasing intensity, new border crossings continued for some time, including the Brandenburg Gate on December 22, 1989. Initially the East German military attempted to repair damage done by “Wall peckers,” but gradually these attempts ceased and guards became more lax, tolerating the
demolitions and unauthorized border crossings through holes in the Wall.

West Germans and West Berliners were allowed visa-free travel starting December 23. Until that point, they were only able to visit East Germany and East Berlin under restrictive conditions that involved applying for a visa several days or weeks in advance and the obligatory exchange of at least 25 Deutsche Marks per day of their planned stay, which hindered spontaneous visits. Thus, in the weeks between November 9 and December 23, East Germans could actually travel more freely than Westerners.

On June 13, 1990, the East German military officially began dismantling the Wall, beginning in Bernauer Straße and around the Mitte district. From there, demolition continued through Prenzlauer Berg/Gesundbrunnen, Helligensee, and throughout the city of Berlin until that December. Various military units dismantled the Berlin/Brandenberg border wall, completing the job in November 1991. Virtually every road that was severed by the Berlin Wall was reconstructed and reopened by August 1, 1990.

On July 1, the day East Germany adopted West German currency, all *de jure* border controls ceased, although the inter-German border was meaningless for some time before that. The fall of the Wall marked the first critical step towards German reunification, which formally concluded a mere 339 days later on October 3, 1990, with the dissolution of East Germany and the official reunification of the German state along the democratic lines of the West German government.

**Attributions**

- **Fall of the Berlin Wall**
Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.
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An unintended consequence of the expanding reform within the USSR was the destruction of the very system it was designed to save.

**Learning Objective**

Summarize the chain of events that resulted in the dissolution of the USSR

**Key Points**

- Since 1985, General Secretary Gorbachev instituted liberalizing policies broadly referred to as glasnost and perestroika. As a result of his push towards liberalization, dissidents were welcomed back in the USSR and pro-independence movements became more vocal in the regional republics.
- Gorbachev continued to radically expand the scope of glasnost during the late 1980s, stating that no subject was off limits for open discussion in the
On March 17, 1991, in a Union-wide referendum, 76.4% of voters endorsed retention of a reformed Soviet Union.

On June 12, 1991, Boris Yeltsin won 57% of the popular vote in democratic elections for the newly created post of President of the Russian SFSR, defeating Gorbachev’s preferred candidate. In his election campaign, Yeltsin criticized the “dictatorship of the center”.

Faced with growing separatism, Gorbachev sought to restructure the Soviet Union into a less-centralized state. On August 20, 1991, the Russian SFSR was scheduled to sign a New Union Treaty that would have converted the Soviet Union into a federation of independent republics with a common president, foreign policy, and military. But more radical reformists were increasingly convinced that a rapid transition to a market economy was required.

On August 19, 1991, Gorbachev’s vice president, Gennady Yanayev, Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Defense Minister Dmitry Yazov, KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, and other senior officials acted to prevent the union treaty from being signed by forming the “General Committee on the State Emergency”, which put Gorbachev under house arrest and cut off his communications.

After three days, the coup collapsed. The organizers were detained and Gorbachev returned as president, albeit with his power depleted.

On August 24, 1991, Gorbachev dissolved the Central Committee of the CPSU, resigned as the...
party's general secretary, and dissolved all party units in the government. Five days later, the Supreme Soviet indefinitely suspended all CPSU activity on Soviet territory, effectively ending Communist rule in the Soviet Union and dissolving the only remaining unifying force in the country. The Soviet Union collapsed with dramatic speed in the last quarter of 1991.

- Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia underwent a radical transformation, moving from a centrally planned economy to a globally integrated market economy. Corrupt and haphazard privatization processes turned major state-owned firms over to politically connected “oligarchs,” which left equity ownership highly concentrated.

**Key Terms**

**perestroika**

Literally “restructuring” in Russian, a political movement for reform within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union during the 1980s, widely associated with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

**glasnost**

Roughly translating to “openness,” the reforms to the political and judicial system in the 1980s that ensured greater freedoms for the public and the press as well as
increased government transparency.

The Soviet Union was dissolved on December 26, 1991, as a result of declaration no. 142-H of the Supreme Soviet. The declaration acknowledged the independence of the former Soviet republics and created the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), although five of the signatories ratified it much later or not at all. On the previous day, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, the eighth and final leader of the Soviet Union, resigned, declared his office extinct, and handed over its powers – including control of the Soviet nuclear missile launching codes – to Russian President Boris Yeltsin. That evening at 7:32, the Soviet flag was lowered from the Kremlin for the last time and replaced with the pre-revolutionary Russian flag. From August to December of 1991, all individual republics, including Russia itself, seceded from the union. The week before the union’s formal dissolution, 11 republics signed the Alma-Ata Protocol formally establishing the CIS and declaring that the Soviet Union had ceased to exist. The Revolutions of 1989 and the dissolution of the USSR signaled the end of the Cold War and left the United States as the world’s only superpower.

Moscow’s Crisis

Since 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the USSR, instituted liberalizing policies broadly referred to as glasnost and perestroika. As a result of his push towards liberalization, dissidents were welcomed back in the USSR following prolonged exile and pro-independence movements were becoming more vocal in the
regional republics. At the January 28–30, 1987, Central Committee plenum, Gorbachev suggested a new policy of “Demokratizatsiya” throughout Soviet society. He proposed that future Communist Party elections should offer a choice between multiple candidates, elected by secret ballot. However, the CPSU delegates at the Plenum watered down Gorbachev’s proposal, and democratic choice within the Communist Party was never significantly implemented.

Gorbachev continued to radically expand the scope of glasnost during the late 1980s, stating that no subject was off limits for open discussion in the media. Even so, the cautious Soviet intelligentsia took almost a year to begin pushing the boundaries to see if he meant what he said. For the first time, the Communist Party leader appealed over the heads of Central Committee members for the people’s support in exchange for expansion of liberties. The tactic proved successful – within two years political reform could no longer be sidetracked by Party conservatives. An unintended consequence was that expanding the scope of reform would ultimately destroy the very system it was designed to save.

On January 14, 1991, Nikolai Ryzhkov resigned from his post as Chairman of the Council of Ministers, or premier of the Soviet Union, and was succeeded by Valentin Pavlov in the newly-established post of Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. On March 17, 1991, in a Union-wide referendum, 76.4% of voters endorsed retention of a reformed Soviet Union. The Baltic republics, Armenia, Georgia, and Moldova, boycotted the referendum, as did Checheno-Ingushetia (an autonomous republic within Russia that had a strong desire for independence, and by now referred to itself as Ichkeria). In each of the other nine republics, a majority of the voters supported the retention of a reformed Soviet Union. On June 12, 1991, Boris Yeltsin won 57% of the popular vote in democratic elections for the newly-created post of President of the Russian SFSR, defeating Gorbachev’s preferred candidate, Ryzhkov, who won 16% of the vote. In his election campaign, Yeltsin criticized the “dictatorship of the center,” but did not yet suggest that he would introduce a market economy.
August Coup

Faced with growing separatism, Gorbachev sought to restructure the Soviet Union into a less centralized state. On August 20, 1991, the Russian SFSR was scheduled to sign a New Union Treaty that would have converted the Soviet Union into a federation of independent republics with a common president, foreign policy, and military. It was strongly supported by the Central Asian republics, which needed the economic advantages of a common market to prosper. However, it would have meant some degree of continued Communist Party control over economic and social life.

More radical reformists were increasingly convinced that a rapid transition to a market economy was required, even if the eventual outcome meant the disintegration of the Soviet Union into several independent states. Independence also accorded with Yeltsin's desires as president of the Russian Federation, as well as those of regional and local authorities to get rid of Moscow's pervasive control. In contrast to the reformers' lukewarm response to the treaty, the conservatives and Russian nationalists of the USSR – still strong within the CPSU and the military – were opposed to weakening the Soviet state and its centralized power structure.

On August 19, 1991, Gorbachev's vice president, Gennady Yanayev, Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Defense Minister Dmitry Yazov, KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, and other senior officials acted to prevent the union treaty from being signed by forming the “General Committee on the State Emergency”, which put Gorbachev – on holiday in Foros, Crimea – under house arrest and cut off his communications. The coup leaders issued an emergency decree suspending political activity and banning most newspapers. Coup organizers expected some popular support but found that public sympathy in large cities and in the republics was largely against them, manifested by public demonstrations, especially in Moscow. Russian SFSR President Yeltsin condemned the coup and garnered popular support.
Thousands of Muscovites came out to defend the White House (the Russian Federation's parliament and Yeltsin's office), the symbolic seat of Russian sovereignty at the time. The organizers tried but ultimately failed to arrest Yeltsin, who rallied opposition to the coup with speech-making atop a tank. The special forces dispatched by the coup leaders took up positions near the White House, but members refused to storm the barricaded building. The coup leaders also neglected to jam foreign news broadcasts, so many Muscovites watched it unfold live on CNN. Even the isolated Gorbachev was able to stay abreast of developments by tuning into BBC World Service on a small transistor radio.

After three days, on August 21, 1991, the coup collapsed. The organizers were detained and Gorbachev returned as president, albeit with his power much depleted.
On August 24, 1991, Gorbachev dissolved the Central Committee of the CPSU, resigned as the party's general secretary, and dissolved all party units in the government. Five days later, the Supreme Soviet indefinitely suspended all CPSU activity on Soviet territory, effectively ending Communist rule in the Soviet Union and dissolving the only remaining unifying force in the country. The Soviet Union collapsed with dramatic speed in the last quarter of 1991. Between August and December, ten republics declared their independence, largely out of fear of another coup. By the end of September, Gorbachev no longer had the authority to influence events outside of Moscow. He was challenged even there by Yeltsin, who had begun taking over what remained of the Soviet government, including the Kremlin.

On September 17, 1991, General Assembly resolution numbers 46/4, 46/5, and 46/6 admitted Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the United Nations, conforming to Security Council resolution numbers 709, 710, and 711, passed on September 12 without a vote. The final round of the Soviet Union's collapse began with a Ukrainian popular referendum on December 1, 1991, in which 90 percent of voters opted for independence. The secession of Ukraine, the second-most powerful republic, ended any realistic chance of Gorbachev keeping the Soviet Union together even on a limited scale. The leaders of the three principal Slavic republics, Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus (formerly Byelorussia), agreed to discuss possible alternatives to the union.

On December 8, the leaders of Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus secretly met in Belavezhskaya Pushcha, in western Belarus, and signed the Belavezha Accords, which proclaimed the Soviet Union had ceased to exist and announced formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) as a looser association to take its place. They also invited other republics to join the CIS. Gorbachev called it an unconstitutional coup. However, by this time there was no longer
any reasonable doubt that, as the preamble of the Accords put it, “the USSR, as a subject of international law and a geopolitical reality, is ceasing its existence.” On December 12, the Supreme Soviet of the Russian SFSR formally ratified the Belavezha Accords and renounced the 1922 Union Treaty. It also recalled the Russian deputies from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. In effect, the largest and most powerful republic had seceded from the Union. Later that day, Gorbachev hinted for the first time that he was considering stepping down.

Doubts remained over whether the Belavezha Accords had legally dissolved the Soviet Union since they were signed by only three republics. However, on December 21, 1991, representatives of 11 of the 12 remaining republics – all except Georgia – signed the Alma-Ata Protocol, which confirmed the dissolution of the Union and formally established the CIS. They also recognized and accepted Gorbachev’s resignation. While Gorbachev hadn’t made any formal plans to leave his position yet, he did tell CBS News that he would resign as soon as he saw that the CIS was indeed a reality.

In a nationally televised speech early in the morning of December 25, 1991, Gorbachev resigned as president of the USSR – or, as he put it, “I hereby discontinue my activities at the post of President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.” He declared the office extinct, and all of its powers, including control of the nuclear arsenal, were ceded to Yeltsin. A week earlier, Gorbachev met with Yeltsin and accepted the fait accompli of the Soviet Union’s dissolution. On the same day, the Supreme Soviet of the Russian SFSR adopted a statute to change Russia’s legal name from “Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic” to “Russian Federation,” showing that it was now a sovereign state. On the night of December 25, at 7:32 p.m. Moscow time, after Gorbachev left the Kremlin the Soviet flag was lowered for the last time and the Russian tricolor was raised in its place, symbolically marking the end of the Soviet Union. On that same day, the President of the United States George H.W. Bush held a brief televised speech officially recognizing the independence of the 11 remaining republics.

2148 | Dissolution of the USSR
On December 26, the upper chamber of the Union’s Supreme Soviet voted both itself and the Soviet Union out of existence. The lower chamber, the Council of the Union, had been out of commission since December 12, when the recall of Russian deputies left it without a quorum. The following day Yeltsin moved into Gorbachev’s former office, though Russian authorities had taken over the suite two days earlier. By the end of 1991, the few remaining Soviet institutions that had not been taken over by Russia ceased operation, and individual republics assumed the central government’s role.

The Alma-Ata Protocol addressed issues such as UN membership following dissolution. Notably, Russia was authorized to assume the Soviet Union’s UN membership, including its permanent seat on the Security Council. The Soviet Ambassador to the UN delivered a letter signed by Russian President Yeltsin to the UN Secretary General dated December 24, 1991, informing him that by virtue of the Alma-Ata Protocol, Russia was the successor state to the USSR. After being circulated among the other UN member states and with no objections being raised, the statement was accepted on December 31, 1991.

The Transition to a Market Economy, 1991-1998

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia radically transformed from a centrally planned economy to a globally integrated market economy. Corrupt and haphazard privatization processes turned major state-owned firms over to politically connected “oligarchs”, which left equity ownership highly concentrated. Yeltsin’s program of radical, market-oriented reform
came to be known as a “shock therapy.” It was based on the recommendations of the IMF and a group of top American economists, including Larry Summers. The result was disastrous, with real GDP falling by more than 40% by 1999, the occurrence of hyperinflation, which wiped out personal savings, and crime and destitution spreading rapidly. Difficulties in collecting government revenues amid the collapsing economy and a dependence on short-term borrowing to finance budget deficits led to the 1998 Russian financial crisis.

Also during this time, Russia became the largest borrower from the International Monetary Fund with loans totaling $20 billion. The IMF was the subject of criticism for lending so much as Russia introduced little of the reforms promised in exchange for money, especially as critics suspected a large part of these funds could have been diverted or even used to fund illegal enterprises.
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34.1: The Ottoman Empire

34.1.1: Decline of the Ottoman Empire

After a long decline since the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire came to an end in the aftermath of its defeat in World War I when it was dismantled by the Allies after the war ended in 1918.

Learning Objective

Explain why the Ottoman Empire lost power and prestige

Key Points

- The Ottoman Empire was founded by Osman I in the 14th century and reached its apex under Suleiman the Magnificent in the 16th century, stretching from the Persian Gulf in the east to Hungary in the northwest and from Egypt in the south to the Caucasus in the north.
In the 19th century, the empire faced challenges in defending itself against foreign invasion and occupation; it ceased to enter conflicts on its own and began to forge alliances with European countries such as France, the Netherlands, Britain, and Russia.

During the Tanzimat period of modernization, the government’s series of constitutional reforms led to a fairly modern conscripted army, banking system reforms, the decriminalization of homosexuality, and the replacement of religious law with secular law and guilds with modern factories.

The Ottoman Empire had long been the “sick man of Europe” and after a series of Balkan wars by 1914 was driven out of nearly all of Europe and North Africa.

The Second Constitutional Era began after the Young Turk Revolution (July 3, 1908) with the sultan’s announcement of the restoration of the 1876 constitution and the reconvening of the Ottoman Parliament. This marked the beginning of the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.

The empire entered WWI as an ally of Germany, and its defeat and the occupation of part of its territory by the Allied Powers in the aftermath of the war resulted in its partitioning and the loss of its Middle Eastern territories, which were divided between the United Kingdom and France.

The successful Turkish War of Independence against the occupying Allies led to the emergence of the Republic of Turkey in the Anatolian heartland and the abolition of the Ottoman monarchy and caliphate.
**Key Terms**

**Turkish War of Independence**
A war fought between the Turkish nationalists and the proxies of the Allies – namely Greece on the Western front, Armenia on the Eastern, France on the Southern and with them, the United Kingdom and Italy in Constantinople (now Istanbul) – after some parts of Turkey were occupied and partitioned following the Ottoman Empire’s defeat in World War I. It resulted in the founding of the Republic of Turkey in the Anatolian heartland and the abolition of the Ottoman monarchy and caliphate.

**Tanzimat**
Literally meaning “reorganization,” a period of reformation in the Ottoman Empire that began in 1839 and ended with the First Constitutional Era in 1876. This era was characterized by various attempts to modernize the Ottoman Empire and secure its territorial integrity against nationalist movements from within and aggressive powers from outside of the state.

**Young Turks**
A political reform movement in the early 20th century that consisted of Ottoman exiles, students, civil servants, and army officers. They favored the replacement of the Ottoman Empire’s absolute monarchy with a constitutional government. Later, their leaders led a rebellion against the absolute rule of Sultan Abdul Hamid II in the 1908 Young Turk Revolution. With this revolution, they helped to
establish the Second Constitutional Era in 1908, ushering in an era of multi-party democracy for the first time in the country’s history.

Overview: The Ottoman Empire

The Ottoman Empire, also known as the Turkish Empire, was founded at the end of the 13th century in northwestern Anatolia in the vicinity of Bilecik and Söğüt by the Oghuz Turkish tribal leader Osman. After 1354, the Ottomans crossed into Europe, and with the conquest of the Balkans the Ottoman Beylik was transformed into a transcontinental empire. The Ottomans ended the Byzantine Empire with the 1453 conquest of Constantinople by Mehmed the Conqueror.

During the 16th and 17th centuries, at the height of its power under the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent, the Ottoman Empire was a multinational, multilingual empire controlling much of Southeast Europe, Western Asia, the Caucasus, North Africa, and the Horn of Africa. At the beginning of the 17th century, the empire contained 32 provinces and numerous vassal states. Some were later absorbed into the Ottoman Empire, while others were granted various types of autonomy during the course of centuries.

With Constantinople as its capital and control of lands around the Mediterranean basin, the Ottoman Empire was at the center of interactions between the Eastern and Western worlds for six centuries. The Ottomans consequently suffered severe military defeats in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, which prompted them to initiate a comprehensive process of reform and modernization known as the Tanzimat. The empire allied with
Germany in the early 20th century and joined World War I with the imperial ambition of recovering its lost territories.

The Empire’s defeat and the occupation of part of its territory by the Allied Powers in the aftermath of World War I resulted in its partitioning and the loss of its Middle Eastern territories, which were divided between the United Kingdom and France. The successful Turkish War of Independence against the occupying Allies led to the emergence of the Republic of Turkey in the Anatolian heartland and the abolition of the Ottoman monarchy and caliphate.

Decline and Modernization

Beginning in the late 18th century, the Ottoman Empire faced challenges defending itself against foreign invasion and occupation. In response to these threats, the empire initiated a period of tremendous internal reform which came to be known as the Tanzimat. This succeeded in significantly strengthening the Ottoman central state, despite the empire’s precarious international position. Over the course of the 19th century, the Ottoman state became increasingly powerful and rationalized, exercising a greater degree of influence over its population than in any previous era. The process of reform and modernization in the empire began with the declaration of the Nizam-ı Cüdet (New Order) during the reign of Sultan Selim III (r. 1789-1807) and was punctuated by several reform decrees, such as the Hatt-ı Şerif of Gülhane in 1839 and the Hatt-ı Hümayun in 1856. By the end of this period in 1908, the Ottoman military was somewhat modernized and professionalized according to the model of Western European Armies.

During the Tanzimat period, the government’s series of constitutional reforms led to a fairly modern conscripted army, banking system reforms, the decriminalization of homosexuality,
and the replacement of religious law with secular law and guilds with modern factories.

Defeat and Dissolution

The defeat and dissolution of the Ottoman Empire (1908–1922) began with the Second Constitutional Era, a moment of hope and promise established with the Young Turk Revolution. It restored the Ottoman constitution of 1876 and brought in multi-party politics with a two-stage electoral system (electoral law) under the Ottoman parliament. The constitution offered hope by freeing the empire's citizens to modernize the state's institutions, rejuvenate its strength, and enable it to hold its own against outside powers. Its guarantee of liberties promised to dissolve inter-communal tensions and transform the empire into a more harmonious place.

Instead, this period became the story of the twilight struggle of the Empire. The Second Constitutional Era began after the Young Turk Revolution (July 3, 1908) with the sultan's announcement of the restoration of the 1876 constitution and the reconvening of the Ottoman Parliament. This era is dominated by the politics of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) and the movement that would become known as the Young Turks. Although it began as a uniting progressive party, the CUP splintered in 1911 with the founding of the opposition Freedom and Accord Party (Liberal Union or Entente), which poached many of the more liberal Deputies from the CUP. The remaining CUP members, who now took a more dominantly nationalist tone in the face of the enmity of the Balkan Wars, dueled Freedom and Accord in a series of power reversals that ultimately led to the CUP seizing power from the Freedom and Accord in the 1913 Ottoman coup d'état and establishing total dominance over Ottoman politics until the end of World War I.

The Young Turk government had signed a secret treaty with
Germany and established the Ottoman-German Alliance in August 1914, aimed against the common Russian enemy but aligning the Empire with the German side. The Ottoman Empire entered World War I after the Goeben and Breslau incident, in which it gave safe harbor to two German ships that were fleeing British ships. These ships, officially transferred to the Ottoman Navy, but effectively still under German control, attacked the Russian port of Sevastopol, thus dragging the Empire into the war on the side of the Central Powers in the Middle Eastern theater.

The Ottoman involvement World War I in the Middle Eastern ended with the the Arab Revolt in 1916. This revolt turned the tide against the Ottomans at the Middle Eastern front, where they initially seemed to have the upper hand during the first two years of the war. When the Armistice of Mudros was signed on October 30, 1918, the only parts of the Arabian peninsula still under Ottoman control were Yemen, Asir, the city of Medina, portions of northern Syria, and portions of northern Iraq. These territories were handed over to the British forces on January 23, 1919. The Ottomans were also forced to evacuate the parts of the former Russian Empire in the Caucasus (in present-day Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan), which they had gained towards the end of World War I after Russia’s retreat from the war with the Russian Revolution in 1917.

Under the terms of the Treaty of Sèvres, the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire was solidified. The new countries created from the former territories of the Ottoman Empire currently number 39.

The occupations of Constantinople and Smyrna mobilized the Turkish national movement, which ultimately won the Turkish War of Independence. The formal abolition of the Ottoman Sultanate was performed by Grand National Assembly of Turkey on November 1, 1922. The Sultan was declared persona non grata and exiled from the lands that the Ottoman Dynasty ruled since 1299.
The Dissolution of the the Ottoman Empire: Mehmed VI, the last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, leaving the country after the abolition of the Ottoman sultanate, November 17, 1922

Attributions

• Decline of the Ottoman Empire
34.1.2: European Influence on the Ottomans

The “Eastern Question” refers to the strategic competition, often involving armed conflicts, between the European Powers during the slow, steady disintegration of the Ottoman Empire.

**Learning Objective**

List a few ways in which Europeans pressured the Ottomans for various concessions

**Key Points**

- The “Eastern Question” refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers (especially Russia, Britain, and France) in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries.
- Characterized as the “sick man of Europe,” the...
relative weakening of the Ottoman Empire’s military strength in the second half of the eighteenth century threatened to undermine the fragile balance of power in Europe after the Napoleonic Wars.

- During the Greek War of Independence, Russia established major influence and power over the Ottoman Empire.
- The Crimean War (1853–1856) was part of this long-running contest between the major European powers for influence over territories of the Empire and focused on the rights of Christian minorities in the Holy Land, which was a part of the Ottoman Empire.
- The continuing collapse of the Ottoman Empire led to two wars in the Balkans, in 1912 and 1913, which in turn was a prelude to world war.

Key Terms

Greek War of Independence
A successful war of independence waged by the Greek revolutionaries between 1821 and 1832 against the Ottoman Empire. The Greeks were later assisted by the Russian Empire, Great Britain, the Kingdom of France, and several other European powers, while the Ottomans were aided by their vassals, the eyalets of Egypt, Algeria, and Tripolitania, and the Beylik of Tunis.
**Concert of Europe**

A system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s.

**Crimean War**

A military conflict fought from October 1853 to March 1856 in which the Russian Empire lost to an alliance of France, Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and Sardinia. The immediate cause involved the rights of Christian minorities in the Holy Land, which was a part of the Ottoman Empire.

**Eastern Question**

In diplomatic history, this refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries.

---

**The Eastern Question**

The Ottoman Empire was a crucial part of the European states system and actively played a role in their affairs, due in part to their coterminous periods of development. In diplomatic history, the “Eastern Question” refers to the strategic competition and political considerations of the European Great Powers in light of the
political and economic instability in the Ottoman Empire from the late 18th to early 20th centuries. Characterized as the “sick man of Europe,” the empire’s weakened military in the second half of the 18th century threatened to undermine the fragile balance of power largely shaped by the Concert of Europe. The Eastern Question encompassed myriad interrelated elements: Ottoman military defeats, Ottoman institutional insolvency, the ongoing Ottoman political and economic modernization program, the rise of ethno-religious nationalism in its provinces, and Great Power rivalries.

The Eastern Question is normally dated to 1774, when the Russo-Turkish War (1768–74) ended in defeat for the Ottomans. As the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire was thought to be imminent, the European powers engaged in a power struggle to safeguard their military, strategic, and commercial interests in the Ottoman domains. Imperial Russia stood to benefit from the decline of the Ottoman Empire; on the other hand, Austria-Hungary and Great Britain deemed the preservation of the Empire to be in their best interests. The Eastern Question was put to rest after World War I, one of the outcomes of which was the collapse and division of the Ottoman holdings.

**Russian Influence on the Ottomans**

The Eastern Question became a major European issue when the Greeks declared independence from the Ottomans in 1821. It was at about this time that the phrase “Eastern Question” was coined. Ever since the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, there were rumors that the Emperor of Russia sought to invade the Ottoman Empire, and the Greek Revolt seemed to make an invasion even more likely. The British foreign minister, Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh, as well as the Austrian foreign minister, Metternich, counselled the Emperor of Russia, Alexander I, not to enter the war. Instead, they pleaded that he maintain the Concert of Europe (the spirit of broad
collaboration in Europe which had persisted since Napoleon's defeat).

As the war continued into 1829, Russia gained a firm advantage over the Ottoman Empire. By prolonging hostilities further, however, Russia would have invited Austria to enter the war, causing considerable suspicion in Britain. Therefore, for the Russians to continue with the war in hopes of destroying the Ottoman Empire would have been inexpedient. At this stage, the King of France, Charles X, proposed the partition of the Ottoman Empire among Austria, Russia, and others, but his scheme was presented too late to produce a result.

Thus, Russia was able to secure neither a decisive defeat nor a partition of the Ottoman Empire and chose instead to degrade it to a mere dependency. In 1829, the Emperor of Russia concluded the Treaty of Adrianople with the Sultan; his empire was granted additional territory along the Black Sea, Russian commercial vessels were granted access to the Dardanelles, and the commercial rights of Russians in the Ottoman Empire were enhanced. The Greek War of Independence was terminated shortly thereafter as Greece was granted independence by the Treaty of Constantinople in 1832.
“The Russian Menace”: a Serio-Comic War Map for the Year 1877.” An English cartoon from 1877 showing Russia as a monstrous octopus devouring neighbouring lands, especially the Ottoman Empire. During much of the 19th century, Russia had considerable influence over the Ottomans. The Crimean War The Crimean War (1853–1856) was part of this long-running contest between the major European powers for influence over territories of the declining Ottoman Empire. It ended when the Russian Empire lost to an alliance of France, Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and Sardinia. The immediate cause was the rights of Christian minorities in the Holy Land, part of the Ottoman Empire. The French promoted the rights of Roman Catholics while Russia promoted those of the Eastern
Orthodox Church. The longer-term causes were the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the unwillingness of Britain and France to allow Russia to gain territory and power at Ottoman expense. The conflict began during the 1850s with a religious dispute. Under treaties negotiated during the 18th century, France was the guardian of Roman Catholics in the Ottoman Empire while Russia was the protector of Orthodox Christians. For several years, however, Catholic and Orthodox monks had disputed possession of the Church of the Nativity and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Palestine. During the early 1850s, the two sides made demands which the Sultan could not possibly satisfy simultaneously. In 1853, the Sultan adjudicated in favor of the French, despite the vehement protestations of the local Orthodox monks. Germany and the Ottoman Empire Germany drew away from Russia and became closer to Austria-Hungary, with whom she concluded the Dual Alliance in 1879. Germany also closely allied with the Ottoman Empire and reorganized the Ottoman military and financial system; in return, it received several commercial concessions, including permission to build the Baghdad Railway, which secured them access to several important economic markets and had the
potential for German entry into the Persian Gulf area controlled by Britain. Germany was driven not only by commercial interests, but also by an imperialistic and militaristic rivalry with Britain. Meanwhile, Britain agreed to the Entente Cordiale with France in 1904, thereby resolving differences between the two countries over international affairs. Britain also reconciled with Russia in 1907 with the Anglo-Russian Entente. Balkan Wars The continuing collapse of the Ottoman Empire led to two wars in the Balkans, in 1912 and 1913, which were a prelude to world war. By 1900 nation states had formed in Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, and Serbia, but many of their ethnic compatriots lived under the control of the Ottoman Empire. In 1912, these countries formed the Balkan League. There were three main causes of the First Balkan War. The Ottoman Empire was unable to reform itself, govern satisfactorily, or deal with the rising ethnic nationalism of its diverse peoples. Second, the Great Powers quarreled among themselves and failed to ensure that the Ottomans would carry out the needed reforms. This led the Balkan states to impose their own solution. Most important, the members of the Balkan League were confident that it could defeat the Turks. Their prediction was accurate, as Constantinople
called for terms after six weeks of fighting. The First Balkan War broke out when the League attacked the Ottoman Empire on October 8, 1912 and was ended seven months later by the Treaty of London. After five centuries, the Ottoman Empire lost virtually all of its possessions in the Balkans. 

Attributions:

234. Ataturk and Turkish Independence

34.1.3: Ataturk and Turkish Independence

The occupation of the Ottoman Empire by the Allies in the aftermath of World War I prompted the establishment of the Turkish national movement under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal. This led to the Turkish War of Independence, which resulted in the establishment of the Republic of Turkey.

Learning Objective

Outline the path taken to a Turkish state and the role played by Ataturk

Key Points

- After the Armistice of Mudros ended the Middle Eastern theater of World War I, the Allied forces began a process of occupying the defeated Ottoman Empire.
- The occupation of Istanbul and Izmir by the Allies
in the aftermath of WWI prompted the establishment of the Turkish National Movement under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, a military commander who had distinguished himself during the Battle of Gallipoli.

- The Turkish revolutionaries in the National Movement rebelled against the occupation and partitioning established by the Treaty of Sèvres, a conflict which became the Turkish War of Independence (May 19, 1919 – July 24, 1923).

- After the end of the Turkish-Armenian, Franco-Turkish, and Greco-Turkish fronts of the War of Independence, the Treaty of Sèvres was abandoned and the Treaties of Kars (October 1921) and Lausanne (July 1923) were signed.

- The Allies left Anatolia and Eastern Thrace, and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey decided on the establishment of a Republic in Turkey, which was declared on October 29, 1923.

- Mustafa Kemal (later given the honorific Atatürk meaning “Father of the Turks”) became the first President of Turkey and embarked upon a program of political, economic, and cultural reforms, seeking to transform the former Ottoman Empire into a modern and secular nation-state.
Key Terms

Atatürk’s Reforms
A series of political, legal, religious, cultural, social, and economic policy changes that were designed to convert the new Republic of Turkey into a secular, modern nation-state and implemented under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in accordance with Kemalist ideology. Central to these reforms were the belief that Turkish society would have to Westernize itself both politically and culturally in order to modernize.

The Turkish War of Independence
A war fought between the Turkish nationalists and the proxies of the Allies – namely Greece on the Western front, Armenia on the Eastern, France on the Southern and with them, the United Kingdom and Italy in Constantinople (now Istanbul) – after some parts of Turkey were occupied and partitioned following the Ottoman Empire’s defeat in World War I. It led to the founding of the Republic of Turkey.

Turkish National Movement
Encompasses the political and military activities of the Turkish revolutionaries that resulted in the creation and shaping of the modern Republic of Turkey, as a consequence of the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I and the subsequent occupation of Constantinople and partitioning of the Ottoman Empire by the Allies under the terms of the Armistice of Mudros.
Mustafa Kemal

A Turkish army officer, revolutionary, and founder of the Republic of Turkey, serving as its first President from 1923 until his death in 1938. His surname, Atatürk (meaning “Father of the Turks”), was granted to him in 1934 and forbidden to any other person by the Turkish parliament.

Overview

The occupation of some parts of the country by the Allies in the aftermath of World War I prompted the establishment of the Turkish National Movement. Under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal, a military commander who distinguished himself during the Battle of Gallipoli, the Turkish War of Independence was waged with the aim of revoking the terms of the Treaty of Sèvres. By September 18, 1922, the occupying armies were expelled. On November 1, the newly founded parliament formally abolished the Sultanate, thus ending 623 years of Ottoman rule. The Treaty of Lausanne of July 24, 1923, led to the international recognition of the sovereignty of the newly formed “Republic of Turkey” as the successor state of the Ottoman Empire, and the republic was officially proclaimed on October 29, 1923, in the new capital of Ankara. Mustafa Kemal became the republic’s first President of Turkey.
Background: Allied Occupation of Ottoman Empire

On October 30, 1918, the Armistice of Mudros was signed between the Ottoman Empire and the Allies of World War I, bringing hostilities in the Middle Eastern theater of World War I to a close. The treaty granted the Allies the right to occupy forts controlling the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus and the right to occupy “in case of disorder” any territory in case of a threat to security. Somerset Arthur Gough-Calthorpe—the British signatory of the Mudros Armistice—stated the Triple Entente’s public position that they had no intention to dismantle the government of the Ottoman Empire or place it under military occupation by “occupying Constantinople.” However, dismantling the Ottoman government and partitioning the Ottoman Empire among the Allied nations was an objective of the Entente since the start of the war.

On November 13, 1918, a French brigade entered the city to begin the Occupation of Constantinople and its immediate dependencies, followed by a fleet consisting of British, French, Italian, and Greek ships deploying soldiers on the ground the next day. A wave of seizures by the Allies took place in the following months.

Turkish National Movement

The Turkish National Movement encompasses the political and military activities of the Turkish revolutionaries that resulted in the creation and shaping of the modern Republic of Turkey as a consequence of the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I and the subsequent occupation of Constantinople and partitioning of the Ottoman Empire by the Allies under the terms of the Armistice of Mudros.
The national forces were united around the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the authority of the Grand National Assembly set up in Ankara, which pursued the Turkish War of Independence. The movement gathered around a progressively defined political ideology generally termed “Kemalism.” Its basic principles stress the Republic, a form of government representing the power of the electorate, secular administration (laïcité), nationalism, a mixed economy with state participation in many sectors (as opposed to state socialism), and national modernization.

**Turkish War of Independence**

The Turkish War of Independence (May 19, 1919 – July 24, 1923) was fought between the Turkish nationalists and the proxies of the Allies – namely Greece on the Western front, Armenia on the Eastern, France on the Southern and with them, the United Kingdom and Italy in Constantinople (now Istanbul) – after some parts of Turkey were occupied and partitioned following the Ottoman Empire's defeat in World War I. Few of the present British, French, and Italian troops were deployed or engaged in combat.

After a series of battles during the Greco-Turkish war, the Greek army advanced as far as the Sakarya River, just eighty kilometers west of the GNA. On August 5, 1921, Mustafa Kemal was promoted to commander in chief of the forces by the GNA. The ensuing Battle of Sakarya was fought from August 23 to September 13, 1921 and ended with the defeat of the Greeks. After this victory, on September 19, 1921, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was given the rank of Mareşal and the title of Gazi by the Grand National Assembly. The Allies, ignoring the extent of Kemal’s successes, hoped to impose a modified version of the Treaty of Sèvres as a peace settlement on Ankara, but the proposal was rejected. In August 1922, Kemal launched an all-out attack on the Greek lines at Afyonkarahisar in the Battle of Dumlupınar and Turkish forces regained control of Smyrna on
September 9, 1922. The next day, Mustafa Kemal sent a telegram to the League of Nations saying that the Turkish population was so worked up that the Ankara Government would not be responsible for massacres.

By September 18, 1922, the occupying armies were expelled, and the Ankara-based Turkish regime, which had declared itself the legitimate government of the country on April 23, 1920, started to formalize the legal transition from the old Ottoman into the new Republican political system. On November 1, 1922, the Turkish Parliament in Ankara formally abolished the Sultanate, ending 623 years of monarchical Ottoman rule. The Treaty of Lausanne of July 24, 1923, led to international recognition of the sovereignty of the newly formed “Republic of Turkey” as the successor state of the Ottoman Empire, and the republic was officially proclaimed on October 29, 1923, in Ankara, the country’s new capital. The Lausanne treaty stipulated a population exchange between Greece and Turkey in which 1.1 million Greeks left Turkey for Greece in exchange for 380,000 Muslims transferred from Greece to Turkey. On March 3, 1924, the Ottoman Caliphate was officially abolished and the last Caliph was exiled.
Turkish War of Independence: Clockwise from top left: Delegation gathered in Sivas Congress to determine the objectives of the National Struggle; Turkish people carrying ammunition to the front; Kuva-yi Milliye infantry; Turkish horse cavalry in chase; the Turkish army entering Izmir; last troops gathered in Ankara Ulus Square leaving for the front.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s Presidency

Mustafa Kemal became the republic’s first President of Turkey and subsequently introduced many radical reforms with the aim of founding a new secular republic from the remnants of its Ottoman past. The Turkish parliament presented Mustafa Kemal with the honorific surname “Atatürk” (Father of the Turks) in 1934. For the first 10 years of the new regime, the country saw a steady process of secular Westernization through Atatürk's Reforms, which included
the unification of education; the discontinuation of religious and other titles; the closure of Islamic courts and the replacement of Islamic canon law with a secular civil code modeled after Switzerland’s and a penal code modeled after Italy’s; recognition of the equality between the sexes and the granting of full political rights to women on December 5, 1934; the language reform initiated by the newly founded Turkish Language Association; replacement of the Ottoman Turkish alphabet with the new Turkish alphabet derived from the Latin alphabet; the dress law outlawing the fez; the law on family names; and many others.

Attributions

- Ataturk and Turkish Independence
In 1915, the Ottoman government decided to issue the Tehcir Law, which started the mass deportation of ethnic Armenians, particularly from the provinces close to the Ottoman-Russian front. This resulted in what became known as the Armenian Genocide.

**Learning Objective**

Deconstruct the arguments for and against referring to these events as a genocide

**Key Points**

- The ethnic cleansing of Armenians during the final years of the Ottoman Empire is widely considered a genocide, with an estimated 1.5 million victims. A wave of persecution in the years 1894 to 1896 eventually culminated in the events of the Armenian Genocide in 1915 and 1916.
- With World War I in progress, the Ottoman Empire accused the (Christian) Armenians as liable to ally
with Imperial Russia, and used this as a pretext to
deal with the entire Armenian population as an
enemy within their empire.

• In 1915, as the Russian Caucasus Army continued to
advance in eastern Anatolia, the Ottoman
government decided to issue the Tehcir Law, which
started the deportation of the ethnic Armenians,
particularly from the provinces close to the Ottoman-
Russian front. This resulted in what became known as
the Armenian Genocide.

• Widespread rape, mass burnings, drownings, and
other atrocities were an integral part of the genocide.

• Governments of Republic of Turkey have since
consistently rejected charges of genocide, typically
arguing either that those Armenians who died were
simply in the way of a war or that killing Armenians
was justified by their individual or collective support
for the enemies of the Ottoman Empire.

• There have been several movements, largely led by
the Armenian Diaspora, to official recognize the
events of 1915-1916 as a genocide (a termed coined in
1943 in response to these same events). Though this
has received widespread academic and political
support, it remains controversial.
Key Terms

Red Sunday
An event during the Armenian Genocide in which leaders of the Armenian community in the Ottoman capital of Constantinople, and later other locations, were arrested and moved to two holding centers near Ankara. The order to do so was given by Minister of the Interior Talaat Pasha on April 24, 1915. On that night, the first wave of 235 to 270 Armenian intellectuals of Constantinople were arrested. Eventually, arrests and deportations totaled 2,345.

genocide
The United Nations Genocide Convention defines this as “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group.” The term was coined in response to the mass deportation and killing of Armenians by the Ottomans.

Tehcir Law
A law passed by the Ottoman Parliament on May 27, 1915, authorizing the deportation of the Ottoman Empire’s Armenian population. The resettlement campaign resulted in the deaths of anywhere between 800,000 and more than 1.8 million civilians in what is commonly referred to as the Armenian Genocide.
Overview

The Armenian Genocide was the Ottoman government's systematic extermination of 1.5 million Armenians, mostly Ottoman citizens within the Ottoman Empire and its successor state, the Republic of Turkey. The starting date is conventionally considered April 24, 1915, the day that Ottoman authorities rounded up, arrested, and deported 235 to 270 Armenian intellectuals and community leaders from Constantinople to Ankara, the majority of whom were eventually murdered. The genocide was carried out during and after World War I and implemented in two phases: the wholesale killing of the able-bodied male population through massacre and subjection of army conscripts to forced labor, followed by the deportation of women, children, the elderly, and the infirm on death marches to the Syrian desert. Driven forward by military escorts, the deportees were deprived of food and water and subjected to periodic robbery, rape, and massacre. Other indigenous and Christian ethnic groups such as the Assyrians and the Ottoman Greeks were similarly targeted for extermination by the Ottoman government in the Assyrian genocide and the Greek genocide, and their treatment is considered by some historians to be part of the same genocidal policy. Most Armenian diaspora communities around the world came into being as a direct result of the genocide.

Raphael Lemkin was explicitly moved by the Armenian annihilation to define systematic and premeditated exterminations within legal parameters and coin the word genocide in 1943. The Armenian Genocide is acknowledged as one of the first modern genocides, with scholars noting the organized manner in which the Armenians were eliminated. This is the second most-studied case of genocide after the Holocaust.

Turkey, the successor state of the Ottoman Empire, denies the word genocide as an accurate term for the mass killings of Armenians that began under Ottoman rule in 1915. Recently, it has been faced with repeated calls to join the 29 countries that have
officially recognized the mass killings as genocide, along with most genocide scholars and historians.

Deportations, Death Marches, Rape, and Mass Burnings

By 1914, Ottoman authorities had already begun a propaganda drive to present Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire as a threat to security. An Ottoman naval officer in the War Office described the planning:

In order to justify this enormous crime the requisite propaganda material was thoroughly prepared in Istanbul. [It included such statements as] ‘the Armenians are in league with the enemy. They will launch an uprising in Istanbul, kill off the Ittihadist leaders and will succeed in opening up the straits [of the Dardanelles].’

On the night of April 23–24, 1915, known as Red Sunday, the Ottoman government rounded up and imprisoned an estimated 250 Armenian intellectuals and community leaders of the Ottoman capital, Constantinople, and later those in other centers, who were moved to two holding centers near Ankara. This date coincided with Allied troop landings at Gallipoli after unsuccessful Allied naval attempts to break through the Dardanelles to Constantinople in February and March 1915.

On May 29, 1915, the CUP Central Committee passed the Temporary Law of Deportation (“Tehcir Law”), giving the Ottoman government and military authorization to deport anyone it “sensed” as a threat to national security.

With the implementation of Tehcir Law, the confiscation of Armenian property and the slaughter of Armenians that ensued upon its enactment outraged much of the western world. While
the Ottoman Empire's wartime allies offered little protest, a wealth of German and Austrian historical documents has since come to attest to the witnesses' horror at the killings and mass starvation of Armenians. In the United States, The New York Times reported almost daily on the mass murder of the Armenian people, describing the process as “systematic”, “authorized” and “organized by the government.” Theodore Roosevelt would later characterize this as “the greatest crime of the war.”

The Armenians were marched out to the Syrian town of Deir ez-Zor and the surrounding desert. There is no evidence that the Ottoman government provided the extensive facilities and supplies that would have been necessary to sustain the life of hundreds of thousands of Armenian deportees during their forced march to the Syrian desert or after. By August 1915, The New York Times repeated an unattributed report that “the roads and the Euphrates are strewn with corpses of exiles, and those who survive are doomed to certain death. It is a plan to exterminate the whole Armenian people.” Authorities were completely aware that by abandoning the Armenian deportees in the desert they were condemning them to certain death.

Rape was an integral part of the genocide; military commanders told their men to “do to [the women] whatever you wish,” resulting in widespread sexual abuse. Deportees were displayed naked in Damascus and sold as sex slaves in some areas, including Mosul according to the report of the German consul there. This constituted an important source of income for accompanying soldiers and resulted in the deaths of girls and women left behind.

Eitan Belkind was a Nili member who infiltrated the Ottoman army as an official, assigned to the headquarters of Kemal Pasha. He claims to have witnessed the burning of 5,000 Armenians.

Lt. Hasan Maruf of the Ottoman army describes how a village’s population was taken together and burned. The Commander of the Third Army Vehib’s 12-page affidavit, dated December 5, 1918, was presented in the Trabzon trial series (March 29, 1919) included in the Key Indictment. It reported a mass burning of the population of an
entire village near Muş: “The shortest method for disposing of the women and children concentrated in the various camps was to burn them.” Vahakn Dadrian wrote that 80,000 Armenians in 90 villages across the Muş plain were burned in “stables and haylofts.”

While there is no consensus as to how many Armenians lost their lives during the Armenian Genocide, there is general agreement among western historians that more than 500,000 Armenians died between 1914 and 1918. Other estimates vary between 800,000 and 1,500,000.

Armenian Genocide: “Those who fell by the wayside. Scenes like this were common all over the Armenian provinces in the spring and summer months of 1915. Death in its several forms—massacre, starvation, exhaustion—destroyed the larger part of the refugees. The Turkish policy was that of extermination under the guise of deportation.”

Controversy and Terminology According to
Kemal Çiçek, the head of the Armenian Research Group at the Turkish Historical Society, in Turkey there is no official thesis on the Armenian issue. The Republic of Turkey’s formal stance is that the deaths of Armenians during the “relocation” or “deportation” cannot aptly be deemed “genocide,” a position with a plethora of diverging justifications: that the killings were not deliberate or systematically orchestrated; that the killings were justified because Armenians posed a Russian-sympathizing threat as a cultural group; that the Armenians merely starved to death; or various characterizations of marauding “Armenian gangs.” As a response to continued denial by the Turkish state, many activists from Armenian Diaspora communities have pushed for formal recognition of the Armenian genocide from various governments around the world. Twenty-nine countries and forty-three U.S. states have adopted resolutions acknowledging the Armenian Genocide as a bona fide historical event. On March 4, 2010, a U.S. congressional panel narrowly voted that the incident was indeed genocide; within minutes the Turkish government issued a statement critical of “this resolution which accuses the Turkish nation of a crime it has not committed.” The Armenian Genocide is widely corroborated by international
genocide scholars. The International Association of Genocide Scholars, consisting of the world’s foremost experts on genocide, unanimously passed a formal resolution affirming the factuality of the Armenian Genocide. The Armenian Genocide happened before the term “genocide” was coined. English-language words and phrases used by contemporary accounts to characterize the event include “massacres,” “atrocities,” “annihilation,” “holocaust,” “the murder of a nation,” “race extermination,” and “a crime against humanity.” Armenians After the Genocide: Diaspora Following the breakup of the Russian Empire in the aftermath of World War I, Armenia was briefly an independent republic from 1918 to 1920. In late 1920, the communists came to power following an invasion of Armenia by the Red Army, and in 1922, Armenia became part of the Transcaucasian SFSR of the Soviet Union, later forming the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (1936 to September 21, 1991). In 1991, Armenia declared independence from the USSR and established the second Republic of Armenia. The modern Armenian diaspora was formed largely after World War I as a result of the Armenian Genocide. After the fall of the Ottoman Empire, Turkish nationalists led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk took the region of
Western Armenia. As a result of the Armenian Genocide, approximately half a million Armenians were forced to flee to different parts of the world and created new Armenian communities far from their native land. Through marriage and procreation, the number of Armenians in the diaspora who trace their lineage to those Armenians who survived and fled Western Armenia is now several million. Since the breakup of the Soviet Union, approximately one million Armenians have joined the diaspora largely as a result of difficult economic conditions in Armenia. 

Attributions


34.2: Partition of the Ottoman Empire

34.2.1: The Sykes-Picot Agreement

The partitioning of the Ottoman Empire was planned in several secret agreements made by the Allies early in the course of World War I, notably the Sykes-Picot Agreement in 1916.

Learning Objective
Describe the Sykes-Picot Agreement

Key Points

- The Sykes–Picot Agreement was a secret 1916 agreement between Great Britain and France, with Russia assenting, that defined their mutually agreed spheres of influence and control in Southwestern
Asia, under control of the declining Ottoman Empire.

- The agreement allocated to Britain control of areas between the Mediterranean Sea and the River Jordan, Jordan, and southern Iraq; France got control of southeastern Turkey, northern Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon; and Russia received Istanbul, the Turkish Straits, and Armenia.

- The agreement is seen by many as a turning point in Western and Arab relations, still mentioned when considering the region and its present-day conflicts.

- Many historians consider the borders created by the Sykes-Picot Agreement “artificial” and argue they have given rise to many conflicts in the region.

**Key Terms**

**T. E. Lawrence**

A British author, archaeologist, military officer, and diplomat. He was renowned for his liaison role during the Sinai and Palestine Campaign and the Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. The breadth and variety of his activities and associations, and his ability to describe them vividly in writing, earned him international fame as Lawrence of Arabia—a title used for the 1962 film based on his wartime activities.
**Triple Entente**

The understanding linking the Russian Empire, the French Third Republic, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland after the signing of the Anglo-Russian Entente on August 31, 1907. The understanding between the three powers, supplemented by agreements with Japan and Portugal, constituted a powerful counterweight to the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Kingdom of Italy, though Italy did not side with Germany and Austria during World War I.

**Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant**

A jihadist unrecognised state and militant group that follows a fundamentalist doctrine of Sunni Islam. This group has been designated a terrorist organization by the United Nations and many individual countries. It is widely known for its videoed beheadings of both soldiers and civilians, including journalists and aid workers, and destruction of cultural heritage sites. The United Nations holds them responsible for human rights abuses and war crimes, and Amnesty International charged the group with ethnic cleansing on a “historic scale” in northern Iraq.

The Sykes–Picot Agreement, officially known as the Asia Minor Agreement, was a secret 1916 agreement between Great Britain and France, to which the Russian Empire assented. The agreement defined their mutually agreed spheres of influence and control in Southwestern Asia. The agreement was based on the premise that the Triple Entente would succeed in defeating the Ottoman Empire during World War I. The negotiations leading to the agreement occurred between November 1915 and March 1916, and it was
signed May 16, 1916. The deal was exposed to the public in 1917. The agreement is still mentioned when considering the region and its present-day conflicts.

The agreement allocated to Britain control of areas roughly comprising the coastal strip between the Mediterranean Sea and the River Jordan, Jordan, southern Iraq, and an additional small area that included the ports of Haifa and Acre, to allow access to the Mediterranean. France got control of southeastern Turkey, northern Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. Russia received Istanbul, the Turkish Straits and Armenia. The controlling powers were left free to determine state boundaries within their areas. Further negotiation was expected to determine international administration pending consultations with Russia and other powers, including Hussein bin Ali, Sharif of Mecca.

Given Ottoman defeat in 1918 and the subsequent partitioning of the Ottoman Empire, the agreement effectively divided the Ottoman Arab provinces outside the Arabian peninsula into areas of British and French control and influence. An international administration was proposed for Palestine as part of the Acre-Haifa zone, intended to be an British enclave in northern Palestine to enable access to the Mediterranean. The British gained control of the territory in 1920 and ruled it as Mandatory Palestine from 1923 until 1948. They also ruled Mandatory Iraq from 1920 until 1932, while the French Mandate for Syria and the Lebanon lasted from 1923 to 1946.

The terms were negotiated by British diplomat Mark Sykes and a French counterpart, François Georges-Picot. The Tsarist government was a minor party to the Sykes-Picot agreement; when the Bolsheviks published the agreement on November 23, 1917, after the Russian Revolution, “the British were embarrassed, the Arabs dismayed and the Turks delighted.”

The agreement is seen by many as a turning point in Western and Arab relations. It negated the UK’s promises to Arabs made through Colonel T. E. Lawrence for a national Arab homeland in the area
of Greater Syria in exchange for supporting the British against the Ottoman Empire.

Sykes-Picot Agreement: Map of Sykes-Picot Agreement showing Eastern Turkey in Asia, Syria, and Western Persia, and areas of control and influence agreed between the British and the French. It was an enclosure in Paul Cambon’s letter to Sir Edward Grey, May 9, 1916.

Consequences Leading up to the centenary of Sykes-Picot in 2016, great interest was generated among the media and academia in the long-term effects of the agreement. It is frequently cited as having created “artificial” borders in the Middle
East, “without any regard to ethnic or sectarian characteristics, [which] has resulted in endless conflict.” The extent to which Sykes-Picot actually shaped the borders of the modern Middle East is disputed, and scholars often attribute instability in the region to other factors. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) claims one of the goals of its insurgency is to reverse the effects of the Sykes–Picot Agreement. “This is not the first border we will break, we will break other borders,” a jihadist from the ISIL warned in a 2014 video titled End of Sykes–Picot. ISIL’s leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, in a July 2014 speech at the Great Mosque of al-Nuri in Mosul, vowed that “this blessed advance will not stop until we hit the last nail in the coffin of the Sykes-Picot conspiracy.” Franco-German geographer Christophe Neff wrote that the geopolitical architecture founded by the Sykes–Picot Agreement disappeared in July 2014 and with it the relative protection of religious and ethnic minorities in the Middle East. He claimed further that ISIL affected the geopolitical structure of the Middle East in summer 2014, particularly in Syria and Iraq. Former French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin presented a similar geopolitical analysis in an editorial contribution for the French
237. The United Kingdom in the Middle East

34.2.2: The United Kingdom in the Middle East

During the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire, the British promised the international Zionist movement their support in recreating the historic Jewish homeland in Palestine via the Balfour declaration, a move that created much political conflict, still present today.

**Learning Objective**

Demonstrate how British interests in the Middle East affected the development of the region

**Key Points**

- After secret talks and agreements leading up to and during World War I, at the end of the war the Allies founded the League of Nations, which divided the Ottoman Empire into spheres of influence and legal mandates.
• The Sykes-Picot Agreement, one of the major secret agreements during the war, allocated to Britain control of the coastal strip between the Mediterranean Sea and the River Jordan, Jordan, southern Iraq, and an additional small area that included the ports of Haifa and Acre to allow access to the Mediterranean.
• The explicit aims of the British and the other allies, was “the complete and final liberation of the peoples who have for so long been oppressed by the Turks.”
• Key to these discussions, especially for the British, was the fate of Palestine and the Jewish people.
• During World War I, Britain produced three contrasting statements regarding its ambitions for Palestine, which created conflict at the time and ever since.
• Mandatory Palestine became the resulting political entity, under the rule of Britain until 1948.

**Key Terms**

**Balfour Declaration**

A letter dated November 1917 from the United Kingdom’s Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour to Walter Rothschild, 2nd Baron Rothschild, a leader of the British Jewish community, for transmission to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland. It stated British support for “a national home for the Jewish
people…”

**League of Nations**

An intergovernmental organization founded on January 10, 1920 as a result of the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War. It was the first international organization whose principal mission was to maintain world peace. Its primary goals, as stated in its Covenant, included preventing wars through collective security and disarmament and settling international disputes through negotiation and arbitration. Other issues in this and related treaties included labor conditions, just treatment of native inhabitants, human and drug trafficking, the arms trade, global health, prisoners of war, and protection of minorities in Europe.

**Zionism**

The national movement of the Jewish people that supports the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland in the territory defined as the historic Land of Israel (roughly corresponding to Palestine, Canaan, or the Holy Land). It emerged in the late 19th century in Central and Eastern Europe as a national revival movement in reaction to anti-Semitic and exclusionary nationalist movements in Europe. Soon after this, most leaders of the movement associated the main goal with creating the desired state in Palestine, then controlled by the Ottoman Empire.

**Mandatory Palestine**

A geopolitical entity under British administration, carved out of Ottoman Southern Syria after World War I. British civil administration in Palestine operated from
During World War I, continued Arab disquiet over Allied intentions led in 1918 to the British “Declaration to the Seven” and the “Anglo-French Declaration,” the latter promising “the complete and final liberation of the peoples who have for so long been oppressed by the Turks, and the setting up of national governments and administrations deriving their authority from the free exercise of the initiative and choice of the indigenous populations.”

The British were awarded three mandated territories by the League of Nations after WWI: Palestine, Mesopotamia (later Iraq), and control of the coastal strip between the Mediterranean Sea and the River Jordan. A son of Sharif Hussein (who helped lead the Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Empire), Faisal, was installed as King of Iraq, with Transjordan providing a throne for another of Hussein’s sons, Abdullah. Mandatory Palestine was placed under direct British administration, and the Jewish population was allowed to increase, initially under British protection. Most of the Arabian peninsula fell to another British ally, Ibn Saud, who created the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1932.

United Kingdom and Palestine

British support for an increased Jewish presence in Palestine, though ideistically embedded in 19th-century evangelical Christian feelings that the country should play a role in Christ’s Second Coming, was primarily geopolitical. Early British political support was precipitated in the 1830s and 1840s as a result of the Eastern Crisis after Muhammad Ali occupied Syria and Palestine. Though these calculations had lapsed as Theodor Herzl’s attempts
to obtain international support for his project failed, WWI led to renewed strategic assessments and political bargaining regarding the Middle and Far East.

Zionism was first discussed at the British Cabinet level on November 9, 1914, four days after Britain's declaration of war on the Ottoman Empire. David Lloyd George, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, “referred to the ultimate destiny of Palestine.” In a discussion after the meeting with fellow Zionist and President of the Local Government Board Herbert Samuel, Lloyd George assured him that “he was very keen to see a Jewish state established in Palestine.” He spoke of Zionist aspirations for a Jewish state in Palestine and of Palestine's geographical importance to the British Empire. Samuel wrote in his memoirs: “I mentioned that two things would be essential—that the state should be neutralized, since it could not be large enough to defend itself, and that the free access of Christian pilgrims should be guaranteed. ... I also said it would be a great advantage if the remainder of Syria were annexed by France, as it would be far better for the state to have a European power as neighbour than the Turk.”

James Balfour of the Balfour Declaration declared that: “The four Great Powers are committed to Zionism. And Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long traditions, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desires and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land.”

During WWI, Britain produced three contrasting but feasibly compatible statements about their ambitions for Palestine. Through British intelligence officer T. E. Lawrence (aka: Lawrence of Arabia), Britain supported the establishment of a united Arab state covering a large area of the Arab Middle East in exchange for Arab support of the British during the war. Thus, the United Kingdom agreed in the McMahon–Hussein Correspondence that it would honor Arab independence if they revolted against the Ottomans, but the two sides had different interpretations of this agreement. In the end the UK and France divided up the area under the Sykes–Picot
Agreement, an act of betrayal in the eyes of the Arabs. Further confusing the issue was the Balfour Declaration of 1917, promising British support for a Jewish “national home” in Palestine.

At the war’s end the British and French set up a joint “Occupied Enemy Territory Administration” in what had been Ottoman Syria. The British achieved legitimacy for their continued control by obtaining a mandate from the League of Nations in June 1922. The formal objective of the League of Nations Mandate system was to administer parts of the defunct Ottoman Empire, which had been in control of the Middle East since the 16th century, “until such time as they are able to stand alone.” The civil Mandate administration was formalized with the League of Nations’ consent in 1923 under the British Mandate for Palestine, which covered two administrative areas. The land west of the Jordan River, known as Mandatory Palestine, was under direct British administration until 1948. The land east of the Jordan, a semi-autonomous region known as Transjordan under the rule of the Hashemite family from the Hijaz, gained independence in 1946.

In a 2002 interview with New Statesman, British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw observed “A lot of the problems we are having to deal with now, I have to deal with now, are a consequence of our colonial past... The Balfour Declaration and the contradictory assurances which were being given to Palestinians in private at the same time as they were being given to the Israelis—again, an interesting history for us but not an entirely honourable one.”
Mandatory Palestine: The formal transfer of Jerusalem to British rule. A native priest reads the proclamation from the steps of the Tower of David. 


The United Kingdom in the Middle East
34.2.3: France in the Middle East

After World War I, Syria and Lebanon became a French protectorate under the League of Nations Mandate System, a move that was met immediately with armed resistance from Arab nationalists.

**Learning Objective**

Connect French politics in the Middle East to the present day

**Key Points**

- After WWI, Syria and Lebanon became a French protectorate (thinly disguised as a League of Nations Mandate).
- French control was met immediately with armed resistance, so to combat Arab nationalism France divided the Mandate area into Lebanon and four sub-states.
- Although there were uprisings in the respective states, the French purposefully gave different ethnic
and religious groups in the Levant their own lands in the hopes of prolonging their rule, keeping the resistance to French rule divided and fragmented.

- With the fall of France in 1940 during World War II, Syria came under the control of the Vichy Government until the British and Free French invaded and occupied the country in July 1941.
- Syria proclaimed its independence again in 1941 but was not recognized as an independent republic until January 1, 1944.
- France bombed Damascus and tried to arrest its democratically elected leaders, but continuing pressure from Syrian nationalist groups and the British forced the French to evacuate their last troops on April 17, 1946.

**Key Terms**

**League of Nations mandate**

The legal status for certain territories transferred from the control of one country to another following World War I, or the legal instruments that contained the internationally agreed-upon terms for administering the territory on behalf of the League of Nations. Two governing principles formed the core of this system: non-annexation of the territory and its administration as a “sacred trust of civilisation” to develop the territory for the benefit of its native
Franco-Syrian War

A war that took place during 1920 between the Hashemite rulers of the newly established Arab Kingdom of Syria and France. During a series of engagements that climaxed in the Battle of Maysalun, French forces defeated the forces of the Hashemite monarch King Faisal and his supporters, entering Damascus on July 24, 1920. A new pro-French government was declared in Syria on July 25.

French Mandate for Syria and the Lebanon

Officially, the Mandate for Syria and the Lebanon (1923–1946), was a League of Nations mandate founded after the First World War for partitioning of the Ottoman Empire concerning Syria and the Lebanon. The Mandate system was considered the antithesis to colonialism, with the governing country acting as a trustee until the inhabitants were able to stand on their own. At that point, the Mandate would terminate and an independent state would be born.

When first arriving in Lebanon, the French were received as liberators by the Christian community, but as they entered Syria, they were faced with a strong resistance, and thus the mandate region was subdivided into six states: Damascus (1920), Aleppo (1920), Alawites (1920), Jabal Druze (1921), the autonomous Sanjak of Alexandretta (1921, modern-day Hatay), and the State of Greater Lebanon (1920), which became later the modern country of Lebanon.

The drawing of those states was based in part on the sectarian makeup of Syria. However, nearly all the Syrian sects were hostile
to the French mandate and the division it created, and there were numerous revolts in all of the Syrian states. Maronite Christians of Mount Lebanon, on the other hand, were a community with a dream of independence that was realized under the French; therefore, Greater Lebanon was the exception to the newly formed states.

Although there were uprisings in the respective states, the French purposefully gave different ethnic and religious groups in the Levant their own lands in the hopes of prolonging their rule. During this time of world decolonization, the French hoped to focus on fragmenting the various groups in the region, so the local population would not focus on a larger nationalist movement to dispose of colonial rule. In addition, administration of colonial governments was heavily dominated by the French. Local authorities were given very little power and did not have the authority to independently decide policy. The small amount of power that local leaders had could easily be overruled by French officials. The French did everything possible to prevent people in the Levant from developing self-sufficient governing bodies. In 1930, France extended its constitution on to Syria.
Rise in Conflict

With the defeat of Ottomans in Syria, British troops under General Sir Edmund Allenby entered Damascus in 1918 accompanied by troops of the Arab Revolt led by Faisal, son of Sharif Hussein of Mecca.

The new Arab administration formed local governments in the major Syrian cities, and the pan-Arab flag was raised all over Syria. The Arabs hoped, with faith in earlier British promises, that the new state would include all the Arab lands stretching from Aleppo in northern Syria to Aden in southern Yemen.

However, in accordance with the secret Sykes–Picot Agreement between Britain and France, General Allenby assigned the Arab administration only the interior regions of Syria (the eastern zone).
On October 8, French troops disembarked in Beirut and occupied the Lebanese coastal region south to Naqoura (the western zone), replacing British troops there. The French immediately dissolved the local Arab governments in the region.

France demanded full implementation of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, with Syria under its control. On November 26, 1919, British forces withdrew from Damascus to avoid confrontation, leaving the Arab government to face France.

Unrest erupted in Syria when Faisal accepted a compromise with French Prime Minister Clemenceau and Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann over Jewish immigration to Palestine. Anti-Hashemite manifestations broke out and Muslim inhabitants in and around Mount Lebanon revolted with fear of being incorporated into a new, mainly Christian state of Greater Lebanon. Part of France’s claim to these territories in the Levant was that France was a protector of the minority Christian communities.

On April 25, 1920, the supreme inter-Allied council that was formulating the Treaty of Sèvres granted France the mandate of Syria (including Lebanon), and granted Britain the Mandate of Palestine (including Jordan) and Iraq. Syrians reacted with violent demonstrations, and a new government headed by Ali Rida al-Rikabi was formed on May 9, 1920. The new government decided to organize general conscription and began forming an army.

On July 14, 1920, General Gouraud issued an ultimatum to Faisal, giving him the choice between submission or abdication. Realizing that the power balance was not in his favor, Faisal chose to cooperate. However, the young minister of war, Youssef al-Azmeh, refused to comply. In the resulting Franco-Syrian War, Syrian troops under al-Azmeh met French forces under General Mariano Goybet at the Battle of Maysaloun. The French won the battle in less than a day. Azmeh died on the battlefield along with many of the Syrian troops. Goybet entered Damascus on July 24, 1920. The Mandate was written in London on July 24, 1922.
End of the Mandate

With the fall of France in 1940 during World War II, Syria came under the control of the Vichy Government until the British and Free French invaded and occupied the country in July 1941. Syria proclaimed its independence again in 1941 but it wasn't until January 1, 1944, that it was recognized as an independent republic.

On September 27, 1941, France proclaimed, by virtue of and within the framework of the Mandate, the independence and sovereignty of the Syrian State. The proclamation said “the independence and sovereignty of Syria and Lebanon will not affect the juridical situation as it results from the Mandate Act.”

There were protests in 1945 over the slow French withdrawal; the French responded to these protests with artillery. In an effort to stop the movement toward independence, French troops occupied the Syrian parliament in May 1945 and cut off Damascus's electricity. Training their guns on Damascus's old city, the French killed 400 Syrians and destroyed hundreds of homes. Continuing pressure from Syrian nationalist groups and the British forced the French to evacuate the last of its troops in April 1946, leaving the country in the hands of a republican government that was formed during the mandate.

Although rapid economic development followed the declaration of independence, Syrian politics from independence through the late 1960s were marked by upheaval. The early years of independence were marked by political instability.

Attributions

- France in the Middle East
  - “French Mandate for Syria and the Lebanon.”
    https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
French_Mandate_for_Syria_and_the_Lebanon. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0.

- “Partitioning of the Ottoman Empire.”
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The history of the discovery and production of oil in the Middle East exemplifies the “resource curse”: countries with an abundance of natural resources, specifically non-renewable resources like oil, tend to have less economic growth, less democracy, and worse development outcomes than countries with fewer natural resources.

Learning Objective

Analyze the consequences of the discovery of oil in the Middle East

Key Points

• In March of 1908, after years of difficult conditions and failure, geologist George Bernard Reynolds discovered oil in Persia (modern-day Iran).
• A year later, an oil company in the UK, Burmah Oil,
created a subsidiary company to develop oil production in Persia, the Anglo-Persian Oil Company (APOC), which started volume production of oil by 1913.

- Britain's Royal Navy was under the leadership of Winston Churchill, who wanted to shift its fuel source from coal to oil. The Navy thus became the company's major customer and a de facto hidden power behind its success.
- Iranian popular opposition to the APOC's royalty terms whereby Iran only received 16% of net profits was widespread and created political discontent throughout the country.
- In 1941, during World War II, Britain and the USSR invaded Iran, exiled Reza Shah, and put his son, Reza Pahlavi, who was friendlier to their interests, onto the throne.
- Following WWII, nationalistic sentiments were on the rise in the Middle East, most notably in Iran, and the Iranian parliament voted to nationalize the oil industry; at the same time, the public elected Mohammed Mossadegh as Prime Minister, causing the Abadan Crisis.
- Britain was unable to subvert Mossadegh, so British and American intelligence agencies orchestrated a coup d'état to overthrow him and bring Reza Pahlavi back onto the throne.
- By 1954, now with a pro-Western leader in place, oil production started again under the control of a new cartel named the “Seven Sisters,” completely based outside the Middle East.
“resource curse”

Also known as the paradox of plenty, refers to the fact that countries with an abundance of natural resources, specifically non-renewable resources like minerals and fuels, tend to have less economic growth, less democracy, and worse development outcomes than countries with fewer natural resources.

953 Iranian Coup

The overthrow of the Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddegh in favor of strengthening the monarchical rule of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi on August 19, 1953, orchestrated by the United Kingdom (under the name “Operation Boot”) and the United States (under the name “Operation Ajax”).

Red Line Agreement

The name given to an agreement signed by partners in the Turkish Petroleum Company (TPC) on July 31, 1928. The aim of the agreement was to formalize the corporate structure of TPC and bind all partners to a “self-denial clause” that prohibited any of its shareholders from independently seeking oil interests in the ex-Ottoman territory. It marked the creation of an oil monopoly, or cartel, of immense influence, spanning a vast territory.

Abadan Crisis

Occurred from 1951 to 1954 after Iran nationalized the Iranian assets of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company
(AIOC) and expelled Western companies from oil refineries in the city of Abadan.

The Anglo-Persian Oil Company

The history of the oil industry in Iran is representative of the effects of the discovery of oil in the Middle East, and a prime example of the “resource curse”: the paradox that countries with an abundance of natural resources, specifically non-renewable resources like minerals and fuels, tend to have less economic growth, less democracy, and worse development outcomes than countries with fewer natural resources. It is characterized by political and military conflict, in this case caused by British and American interests in the oil industry.

On April 14, 1909, one year after geologist George Bernard Reynolds discovered oil in Persia (modern-day Iran), Burmah Oil created the Anglo-Persian Oil Company (APOC) as a subsidiary and sold shares to the public.

Volume production of Persian oil products eventually started in 1913 from a refinery built at Abadan, for its first 50 years the largest oil refinery in the world. In 1913, shortly before World War I, APOC managers negotiated with a new customer, Winston Churchill, who was then First Lord of the Admiralty of Britain. Churchill, as a part of a three-year expansion program, sought to modernize Britain's Royal Navy by abandoning the use of coal-fired steamships and adopting oil as fuel for its ships instead. Although Britain had large reserves of coal, oil had advantages in better energy density, allowing a longer steaming range for a ship of the same bunker capacity. Further, Churchill wanted to free Britain from its reliance on the Standard Oil and Royal Dutch–Shell oil companies. In
exchange for secure oil supplies for its ships, the British government injected new capital into the company and in doing so, acquired a controlling interest in APOC. The contract that was set up between the British Government and APOC was to hold for 20 years. The British government also became a de facto hidden power behind the oil company.

During this period, Iranian popular opposition to the D’Arcy oil concession and royalty terms whereby Iran only received 16% of net profits was widespread. Since industrial development and planning and other fundamental reforms were predicated on oil revenues, the government’s lack of control over the oil industry served to accentuate the Iranian Government’s misgivings regarding the manner in which APOC conducted its affairs in Iran.

In 1923, Burmah employed Winston Churchill as a paid consultant to lobby the British government to allow APOC to have exclusive rights to Persian oil resources, which were subsequently granted. In 1933, APOC made an agreement with Iran’s Reza Shah, which promised to give laborers better pay and more chance for advancement and build schools, hospitals, roads, and a telephone system. These promises were not kept. In 1935 APOC changed its name to the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC).

Political Instability and Military Intervention

Following Germany’s invasion of the USSR in June 1941, Britain and the Soviet Union became allies. Britain and the USSR saw the newly opened Trans-Iranian Railway as an attractive route to transport supplies, including oil, from the Persian Gulf to the Soviet Union. Britain and the USSR used concessions extracted in previous interventions to pressure Iran (and, in Britain’s case, Iraq) into allowing the use of their territory for military and logistical
purposes. Increased tensions with Britain led to pro-German rallies in Tehran. In August 1941, because Reza Shah refused to expel all German nationals and come down clearly on the Allied side, Britain and the USSR invaded Iran, arrested the monarch, and sent him into exile to South Africa, taking control of Iran's communications and the coveted railway. They put Reza Shah's son Mohammad Reza Pahlavi onto the Iranian/Persian throne. The new Shah soon signed an agreement pledging full non-military logistical cooperation with the British and Soviets in exchange for full recognition of his country's independence and a promise to withdraw from Iran within six months of the war's conclusion.

Following World War II, nationalistic sentiments were on the rise in the Middle East, especially Iranian nationalism. AIOC and the pro-western Iranian government led by Prime Minister Ali Razmara initially resisted nationalist pressure to revise AIOC's concession terms further in Iran's favor. In May 1949, Britain offered a "supplemental oil agreement" to appease unrest in the country, but it did not satisfy Iranian nationalists since it did not give them the right to audit the AIOC's books. On March 7, 1951, Prime Minister Haj Haj Ali Razmara was assassinated by the Fadayan-e Islam. Fadayan-e Islam supported the demands of the National Front, which held a minority of seats in Parliament, to nationalize the assets of the British Anglo-Iranian Oil Company.

Later in March 1951, the Iranian parliament voted to nationalize the AIOC and its holdings, and shortly thereafter the Iranian public elected a champion of nationalization, Mohammed Mossadegh, Prime Minister. This led to the Abadan Crisis in which foreign countries agreed not to purchase Iranian oil under British pressure and the Abadan refinery was closed. AIOC withdrew from Iran and increased output of its other reserves in the Persian Gulf.

As the months went on, the crisis became acute. By mid-1952, an attempt by the Shah to replace Mossadegh backfired and led to riots against the Shah and perceived foreign intervention; Mossadegh returned with even greater power. At the same time, however, his coalition was weakening as Britain's boycott of Iranian oil eliminated
a major source of government revenue and strategically made Iranians poorer and thus unhappier by the day.

**1953 Iranian Coup**

Britain was unable to subvert Mossadegh as its embassy and officials had been evicted from Iran in October 1952. However, they successfully appealed to exaggerated anti-communist sentiments in the U.S., depicting both Mossadegh and Iran as unstable and likely to fall to communism as they weakened.

The anti-Mossadeq plan was orchestrated under the code-name “Operation Ajax” by the CIA, and “Operation Boot” by the British MI6. In August, the American CIA, with the help of bribes to politicians, soldiers, mobs, and newspapers and information from the British embassy and secret service, organized a riot which gave the Shah an excuse to remove Mossadeqh.

The Shah seized the opportunity and issued an edict forcefully removing the immensely popular and democratically-elected Mossadegh from power when General Fazlollah Zahedi led tanks to Mossadegh’s residence and arrested him. On December 21, 1953, he was sentenced to death, but his sentence was later commuted to three years' solitary confinement in a military prison followed by life in prison.
Iranian Coup: Tanks in the streets of Tehran after the coup, 1953 With a pro-Western Shah and the new pro-Western Prime Minister, Fazlollah Zahedi, Iranian oil began flowing again and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, which changed its name to British Petroleum in 1954, tried to return to its old position. However, public opinion was so opposed that the new government could not permit it. Under pressure from the U.S., British Petroleum was forced to accept membership in a consortium of companies that would bring Iranian oil back on the international market. It was incorporated in London in 1954 as a holding company called Iranian Oil Participants. This group of companies, all based outside the Middle East, came to be known as the “Seven Sisters” or the “Consortium for Iran” cartel and dominated the global petroleum industry from the mid-1940s.
to the 1970s. Until the oil crisis of 1973, the members of the Seven Sisters controlled around 85% of the world’s known oil reserves. Afterward, the oil industry began to nationalize throughout the Middle East. 

Attributions


Zionism, the national movement for a Jewish homeland that resulted in the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, has been controversial since its beginnings in the late 19th century.

Learning Objective

Explain the arguments for and against Zionism

Key Points

• After thousands of years of the Jewish diaspora, with Jews living as minorities in countries across the globe, a movement called Zionism, with the goal of establishing a Jewish homeland and sovereign state, emerged in the late 19th century.
• The political movement was formally established by
the Austro-Hungarian journalist Theodor Herzl in 1897 following the publication of his book *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State).

- The movement was energized by rising anti-Semitism in Europe and anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia and aimed at encouraging Jewish migration to Ottoman Palestine.
- The movement was eventually successful in establishing Israel on May 14, 1948, as the homeland for the Jewish people.
- Advocates of Zionism view it as a national liberation movement for the repatriation to their ancestral homeland of a persecuted people residing as minorities in a variety of nations.
- Critics of Zionism view it as a colonialist, racist, and exceptionalist ideology that led advocates to violence during Mandatory Palestine, followed by the exodus of Palestinians and the subsequent denial of their human rights.

**Key Terms**

**pogrom**

A violent riot aimed at the massacre or persecution of an ethnic or religious group, particularly one aimed at Jews. The term originally entered the English language to describe 19th and 20th century attacks on Jews in the Russian Empire.
Theodor Herzl  
An Austro-Hungarian journalist, playwright, political activist, and writer. He was one of the fathers of modern political Zionism. He formed the World Zionist Organization and promoted Jewish migration to Palestine in an effort to form a Jewish state (Israel).

Ashkenazi Jews  
A Jewish diaspora population who coalesced as a distinct community in the Holy Roman Empire around the end of the first millennium. The traditional diaspora language is Yiddish.

Zionism: A Jewish Homeland

Zionism is the national movement of the Jewish people that supports the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland in the territory defined as the historic Land of Israel (roughly corresponding to Palestine, Canaan, or the Holy Land).

After almost two millennia of the Jewish diaspora residing in various countries without a national state, the Zionist movement was founded in the late 19th century by secular Jews, largely as a response by Ashkenazi Jews to rising antisemitism in Europe, exemplified by the Dreyfus affair in France and the anti-Jewish pogroms in the Russian Empire. The political movement was formally established by the Austro-Hungarian journalist Theodor Herzl in 1897 following the publication of his book Der Judenstaat (The Jewish State). At that time, the movement sought to encourage Jewish migration to Ottoman Palestine.

Herzl considered antisemitism an eternal feature of all societies
in which Jews lived as minorities, and that only a separation could allow Jews to escape eternal persecution. “Let them give us sovereignty over a piece of the Earth’s surface, just sufficient for the needs of our people, then we will do the rest!” he proclaimed.

Herzl proposed two possible destinations to colonize, Argentina and Palestine. He preferred Argentina for its vast and sparsely populated territory and temperate climate, but conceded that Palestine would have greater attraction because of the historic ties of Jews with that area. He also accepted to evaluate Joseph Chamberlain’s proposal for possible Jewish settlement in Great Britain’s East African colonies.
book Der Judenstaat, he envisioned the founding of a future independent Jewish state during the 20th century. Although initially one of several Jewish political movements offering alternative responses to assimilation and antisemitism, Zionism expanded rapidly. In its early stages, supporters considered setting up a Jewish state in the historic territory of Palestine. After World War II and the destruction of Jewish life in Central and Eastern Europe where these alternative movements were rooted, Zionism became the dominant view about a Jewish national state. Creating an alliance with Great Britain and securing support for Jewish emigration to Palestine, Zionists also recruited European Jews to immigrate there, especially those who lived in areas of the Russian Empire where anti-semitism was prevalent. The alliance with Britain was strained as the latter realized the implications of the Jewish movement for Arabs in Palestine, but the Zionists persisted. The movement was eventually successful in establishing Israel on May 14, 1948, as the homeland for the Jewish people. The proportion of the world’s Jews living in Israel has steadily grown since the movement emerged. Until 1948, the primary goals of Zionism were the re-establishment of Jewish sovereignty in the
Land of Israel, in-gathering of the exiles, and liberation of Jews from the antisemitic discrimination and persecution they experienced during their diaspora. Since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, Zionism continues primarily to advocate on behalf of Israel and to address threats to its continued existence and security. Major aspects of the Zionist idea are represented in the Israeli Declaration of Independence: The Land of Israel was the birthplace of the Jewish people. Here their spiritual, religious and political identity was shaped. Here they first attained to statehood, created cultural values of national and universal significance and gave to the world the eternal Book of Books. After being forcibly exiled from their land, the people kept faith with it throughout their Dispersion and never ceased to pray and hope for their return to it and for the restoration in it of their political freedom. Impelled by this historic and traditional attachment, Jews strove in every successive generation to re-establish themselves in their ancient homeland. In recent decades they returned in their masses. Advocates of Zionism view it as a national liberation movement for the repatriation of a persecuted people residing as minorities in a variety of nations to their
ancestral homeland. Critics of Zionism view it as a colonialist, racist, and exceptionalist ideology that led advocates to violence during Mandatory Palestine, followed by the exodus of Palestinians and the subsequent denial of their human rights. Opposition and Controversy Zionism has been characterized as colonialism and criticized for promoting unfair confiscation of land, expelling and causing violence towards the Palestinians. Others view Zionism not as colonialist movement, but as a national movement that is contending with that of Palestine. David Hoffman rejected the claim that Zionism is a “settler-colonial undertaking” and instead characterized Zionism as a national program of affirmative action, adding that there is unbroken Jewish presence in Israel back to antiquity. The first Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, stated that “There will be no discrimination among citizens of the Jewish state on the basis of race, religion, sex, or class.” However, critics of Zionism consider it a racist movement. According to historian Avi Shlaim, throughout its history up to present day, Zionism “is replete with manifestations of deep hostility and contempt towards the indigenous population.” Some criticisms of Zionism claim that Judaism’s notion of the “chosen people” is the source of
racism in Zionism. In December 1973, the UN passed a series of resolutions condemning South Africa and included a reference to an “unholy alliance between Portuguese colonialism, Apartheid and Zionism.” At the time there was little cooperation between Israel and South Africa, although the two countries would develop a close relationship during the 1970s. Parallels have also been drawn between aspects of South Africa’s apartheid regime and certain Israeli policies toward the Palestinians that are seen as manifestations of racism in Zionist thinking. Some critics of anti-Zionism have argued that opposition to Zionism can be hard to distinguish from antisemitism, and that criticism of Israel may be used as an excuse to express viewpoints that might otherwise be considered antisemitic. On the other hand, anti-Zionist writers such as Noam Chomsky, Norman Finkelstein, Michael Marder, and Tariq Ali have argued that the characterization of anti-Zionism as antisemitic is inaccurate, that it sometimes obscures legitimate criticism of Israel’s policies and actions, and that it is sometimes used as a political ploy in order to stifle legitimate criticism of Israel. Some antisemites have alleged that Zionism was or is part of a Jewish plot to take control of the world. One particular version of these allegations, “The
The Partitioning of Palestine

34.3.2: The Partitioning of Palestine

The UN Partition Plan for Palestine was a proposal by the United Nations that recommended a partition of Mandatory Palestine into independent Arab and Jewish States. It was rejected by the Palestinians, leading to a civil war and the end of the British Mandate.

Learning Objective

Analyze the partitioning of Palestine

Key Points

- In 1923, the land of Palestine, previously under the control of the Ottoman Empire, was made a British Mandate by the League of Nations.
- During WWI, the British made conflicting promises to the Arab and Jewish populations of Palestine.
- In 1937, following a six-month-long Arab General
Strike, the British established the Peel Commission, which concluded that the Mandate was not working and proposed a partition of Palestine into independent Jewish and Arab States. The proposal was rejected by the Palestinians.

- At the beginning of WWII, in 1939, the British put a limit on the immigration of Jews into Palestine.
- After World War II, in August 1945 President Truman asked for the admission of 100,000 Holocaust survivors into Palestine, but the British maintained limits on Jewish immigration, which led to a new inquiry into partitioning Palestine.
- By 1947, the British announced their desire to terminate the Palestine Mandate and placed the Question of Palestine before the United Nations, which developed a non-binding recommendation for independent Arab and Jewish states.
- The proposal was rejected by the Palestinians and civil war broke out.

**Key Terms**

**Arab League**

A regional organization of Arab countries in and around North Africa, the Horn of Africa, and Arabia. It was formed in Cairo on March 22, 1945 with six members: Kingdom of Egypt, Kingdom of Iraq, Transjordan (renamed Jordan in 1949), Lebanon, Saudi
Arabia, and Syria.

**Peel Commission**
A British Royal Commission of Inquiry headed by Lord Peel, appointed in 1936 to investigate the causes of unrest in Mandatory Palestine. It was administered by Britain following the six-month-long Arab general strike in Mandatory Palestine.

**United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine**
A 1947 proposal by the United Nations that recommended a partition of Mandatory Palestine at the end of the British Mandate.

**Jihad**
An Islamic term referring to the religious duty of Muslims to maintain and spread the religion.

---

**Background and Early Proposals for Partition**

The British administration was formalized by the League of Nations under the Palestine Mandate in 1923 as part of the Partitioning of the Ottoman Empire following World War I. The Mandate reaffirmed the 1917 British commitment to the Balfour Declaration for the establishment in Palestine of a “National Home” for the Jewish people, with the prerogative to carry it out. A British census of 1918 estimated 700,000 Arabs and 56,000 Jews.

In 1937, following a six-month Arab General Strike and armed insurrection that aimed to pursue national independence and secure the country from foreign control, the British established the
Peel Commission. The Jewish population had been attacked during the Arab revolt, leading to the idea that the two populations could not be reconciled. The Commission concluded that the Mandate had become unworkable, and recommended Partition into an Arab state linked to Transjordan, a small Jewish state, and a mandatory zone.

To address problems arising from the presence of national minorities in each area, the Commission suggested a land and population transfer involving the transfer of some 225,000 Arabs living in the envisaged Jewish state and 1,250 Jews living in a future Arab state, a measure deemed compulsory “in the last resort.” The Palestinian Arab leadership rejected partition as unacceptable, given the inequality in the proposed population exchange and the transfer of one-third of Palestine, including most of its best agricultural land, to recent immigrants. The Jewish leaders, Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion, persuaded the Zionist Congress to lend provisional approval to the Peel recommendations as a basis for further negotiations. In a letter to his son in October 1937, Ben-Gurion explained that partition would be a first step to “possession of the land as a whole.”

The British Woodhead Commission was set up to examine the practicality of partition. The Peel plan was rejected and two possible alternatives were considered. In 1938 the British government issued a policy statement declaring that “the political, administrative and financial difficulties involved in the proposal to create independent Arab and Jewish States inside Palestine are so great that this solution of the problem is impracticable.” Representatives of Arabs and Jews were invited to London for the St. James Conference, which proved unsuccessful.

MacDonald White Paper of May 1939 declared that it was “not part of [the British government’s] policy that Palestine should become a Jewish State,” and sought to limit Jewish immigration to Palestine and restricted Arab land sales to Jews. However, the League of Nations commission held that the White Paper was in conflict with the terms of the Mandate as put forth in the past.
The outbreak of the Second World War suspended any further deliberations. The Jewish Agency hoped to persuade the British to restore Jewish immigration rights and cooperated with the British in the war against Fascism. Aliyah Bet was organized to spirit Jews out of Nazi-controlled Europe despite British prohibitions. The White Paper also led to the formation of Lehi, a small Jewish organization that opposed the British.

After World War II, in August 1945 President Truman asked for the admission of 100,000 Holocaust survivors into Palestine, but the British maintained limits on Jewish immigration in line with the 1939 White Paper. The Jewish community rejected the restriction on immigration and organized an armed resistance. These actions and United States pressure to end the anti-immigration policy led to the establishment of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. In April 1946, the Committee reached a unanimous decision for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish refugees from Europe into Palestine, a repeal of the White Paper restrictions of land sale to Jews, that the country be neither Arab nor Jewish, and the extension of U.N. Trusteeship. U.S. endorsed the Commission findings concerning Jewish immigration and land purchase restrictions, while the U.K. conditioned its implementation on U.S. assistance in case of another Arab revolt. In effect, the British continued to carry out White Paper policy. The recommendations triggered violent demonstrations in the Arab states and calls for a Jihad and an annihilation of all European Jews in Palestine.

United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine

By 1947, the British announced their desire to terminate the Palestine Mandate and placed the Question of Palestine before the United Nations, the successor to the League of Nations. The UN created UNSCOP (the UN Special Committee on Palestine) on May 15, 1947, with representatives from 11 countries. UNSCOP conducted
hearings and surveyed the situation in Palestine, then issued a report on August 31 recommending the creation of independent Arab and Jewish states, with Jerusalem placed under international administration.

On November 29, the UN General Assembly voted 33 to 13, with 10 abstentions, to adopt a resolution recommending the adoption and implementation of the Plan of Partition. The division was to take effect on the date of British withdrawal. The partition plan required that the proposed states grant full civil rights to all people within their borders regardless of race, religion, or gender. Both the United States and Soviet Union supported the resolution. The five members of the Arab League, who were voting members at the time, voted against the Plan.

The Jewish Agency, the Jewish state-in-formation, accepted the plan, and nearly all Jews in Palestine rejoiced at the news.

The partition plan was rejected out of hand by Palestinian Arab leadership and by most of the Arab population. Meeting in Cairo on November and December 1947, the Arab League adopted a series of resolutions endorsing a military solution to the conflict.

Britain announced that it would accept the partition plan, but refused to enforce it, arguing it was not accepted by the Arabs. Britain also refused to share the administration of Palestine with the UN Palestine Commission during the transitional period. In September 1947, the British government announced that the Mandate for Palestine would end at midnight on May 14, 1948.

Some Jewish organizations also opposed the proposal. Irgun leader Menachem Begin announced, “The partition of the Homeland is illegal. It will never be recognized. The signature by institutions and individuals of the partition agreement is invalid. It will not bind the Jewish people. Jerusalem was and will forever be our capital. Eretz Israel will be restored to the people of Israel. All of it. And for ever.” These views were publicly rejected by the majority of the nascent Jewish state.

Immediately after adoption of the Resolution by the General
Assembly, a civil war broke out and the UN plan was not implemented.
United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine 1947: A map of the UN plan for partitioning Palestine into independent Arab and Jewish States and a Special International Regime.
The proposed plan divided Palestine into three parts: an Arab State, a Jewish State and the City of Jerusalem, linked by extraterritorial crossroads. The proposed Arab State would include the central and part of western Galilee, with the town of Acre, the hill country of Samaria and Judea, an enclave at Jaffa, and the southern coast stretching from north of Isdud (now Ashdod) and encompassing what is now the Gaza Strip, with a section of desert along the Egyptian border. The proposed Jewish State would include the fertile Eastern Galilee, the Coastal Plain, stretching from Haifa to Rehovot and most of the Negev desert, including the southern outpost of Umm Rashrash (now Eilat). The Jerusalem Corpus Separatum included Bethlehem and the surrounding areas.
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The “Jewish state” is a political term used to describe the nation state of Israel, the homeland of the Jewish people, but the religious versus secular usage of the term and its possible exclusionary implications have been debated since the founding of Israel in 1948.

**Learning Objective**

Define and describe “the Jewish State”

**Key Points**

- Since the late 19th century with the rise of Zionism, there were waves of Jewish immigration to Palestine, but during WWII and the Holocaust, the urgency of Jewish migration out of Europe heightened in conflict with the limits placed on Jewish immigration to Palestine in 1939.
- After World War II, Britain found itself in intense conflict with the Jewish community over immigration, as well as continued conflict with the
On November 29, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a Partition Plan for Mandatory Palestine, which was rejected by the Palestinians and resulted in the outbreak of civil war.

On May 14, 1948, the day before the expiration of the British Mandate, David Ben-Gurion, the head of the Jewish Agency, declared “the establishment of a Jewish state in Eretz-Israel, to be known as the State of Israel.”

The following day, the armies of four Arab countries—Egypt, Syria, Transjordan, and Iraq—entered what had been British Mandatory Palestine, launching the 1948 Arab–Israeli War which continued for one year until a cease-fire.

The term “Jewish state” has been in common usage in the media since the establishment of Israel, and the term was used interchangeably with Israel.

Key Terms

Eretz-Israel

The traditional Jewish name for an area of indefinite geographical extension in the Southern Levant. Related biblical, religious, and historical English terms include the Land of Canaan, the Promised Land, the Holy Land, and Palestine.
Nuremberg Laws

Antisemitic laws in Nazi Germany introduced on September 15, 1935, by the Reichstag at a special meeting convened at the annual Nuremberg Rally of the Nazi Party (NSDAP). The two laws were the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, which forbade marriages and extramarital intercourse between Jews and Germans and the employment of German females under 45 in Jewish households, and the Reich Citizenship Law, which declared that only those of German or related blood were eligible to be Reich citizens. The remainder were classed as state subjects, without citizenship rights.

David Ben-Gurion

The primary founder of the State of Israel and the first Prime Minister of Israel. On May 14, 1948, he formally proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel and was the first to sign the Israeli Declaration of Independence, which he helped write. He led Israel during the 1948 Arab–Israeli War and united the various Jewish militias into the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). Subsequently, he became known as “Israel’s founding father.”

The Founding of Israel

In 1933, Hitler came to power in Germany, and in 1935 the Nuremberg Laws made German Jews (and later Austrian and Czech Jews) stateless refugees. Similar rules were applied by the many
Nazi allies in Europe. The subsequent growth in Jewish migration and the impact of Nazi propaganda aimed at the Arab world led to the 1936–1939 Arab revolt in Palestine. Britain established the Peel Commission to investigate the situation. The commission did not consider the situation of Jews in Europe, but called for a two-state solution and compulsory transfer of populations. Britain rejected this solution and instead implemented the White Paper of 1939. This planned to end Jewish immigration by 1944 and allow no more than 75,000 additional Jewish migrants. This was disastrous to European Jews, who were already gravely discriminated against and in need of refuge. The British maintained this policy until the end of the Mandate.

During World War II, as the horrors of the Holocaust became known, the Zionist leadership formulated the One Million Plan, a reduction from Ben-Gurion's previous target of two million immigrants. Following the end of the war, a massive wave of stateless Jews, mainly Holocaust survivors, began migrating to Palestine in small boats in defiance of British rules. The Holocaust united much of the rest of world Jewish community behind the Zionist project. The British either imprisoned these Jews in Cyprus or sent them to the British-controlled Allied Occupation Zones in Germany. The British, having faced the 1936–1939 Arab revolt against mass Jewish immigration into Palestine, were now facing opposition by Zionist groups in Palestine for subsequent restrictions.

After World War II, Britain found itself in intense conflict with the Jewish community over Jewish immigration limits, as well as continued conflict with the Arab community over limit levels. The Haganah, a Jewish paramilitary organization, prepared an armed struggle against British rule.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a Partition Plan for Mandatory Palestine. This specified borders for new Arab and Jewish states and an area of Jerusalem to be administered by the UN under an international regime.
of the British Mandate for Palestine was set for midnight on May 14, 1948, but the Palestinians rejected the plan.

On December 1, 1947, the Arab Higher Committee proclaimed a three-day strike, and Arab gangs began attacking Jewish targets. The Jews were initially on the defensive as civil war broke out, but in early April 1948 moved onto the offensive. The Arab Palestinian economy collapsed and 250,000 Palestinian Arabs fled or were expelled.

On May 14, 1948, the day before the expiration of the British Mandate, David Ben-Gurion, the head of the Jewish Agency, declared “the establishment of a Jewish state in Eretz-Israel, to be known as the State of Israel.” The only reference in the text of the Declaration to the borders of the new state is the use of the term Eretz-Israel (“Land of Israel”).

The following day, the armies of four Arab countries—Egypt, Syria, Transjordan, and Iraq—entered what had been British Mandatory Palestine, launching the 1948 Arab–Israeli War. Contingents from Yemen, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and Sudan also joined the war. The
The purpose of the invasion was to prevent the establishment of the Jewish state at inception, and some Arab leaders talked about driving the Jews into the sea. According to Benny Morris, Jews felt that the invading Arab armies aimed to slaughter the Jews. The Arab League stated that the invasion was to restore law and order and prevent further bloodshed.

After a year of fighting, a ceasefire was declared and temporary borders, known as the Green Line, were established. Jordan annexed what became known as the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and Egypt took control of the Gaza Strip. The United Nations estimated that more than 700,000 Palestinians were expelled by or fled from advancing Israeli forces during the conflict—what would become known in Arabic as the Nakba (“catastrophe”).

The Jewish State

The “Jewish state” is a political term used to describe the nation state of Israel. The state of Israel defined itself in its declaration of independence as a “Jewish state,” a term that appeared in the United Nations partition decision of 1947. The term has been in common usage in the media since the establishment of Israel and is used interchangeably with Israel.

Since its establishment, Israel has passed many laws which reflect on the Jewish identity and values of the majority (about 75% in 2016) of its citizens. However, the secular versus religious debate in Israel in particular has focused debate on the Jewish nature of the state. Another aspect of the debate is the status of minorities in Israel, most notably the Israeli Arab population.

There has been ongoing debate in Israel about whether the state should recognize more Jewish culture, encourage Judaism in schools, and enshrine certain laws of Kashrut and Shabbat observance. This debate reflects a historical divide within Zionism.
and among the Jewish citizens of Israel, which has large secular and traditional/Orthodox minorities as well as a majority that lies somewhere in between.

Secular Zionism, the historically dominant stream, is rooted in a concept of the Jews as a people with a right to self-determination, and to have a state where they would be unafraid of antisemitic attacks and live in peace.

The notion that Israel should be constituted in the name of and maintain a special relationship with a particular group of people, the Jewish people, has drawn much controversy vis-à-vis minority groups living in Israel – the large number of Muslim and Christian Palestinians residing in Israel and, to the extent that those territories are claimed to be governed as part of Israel and not as areas under military occupation, in the West Bank and Gaza. For example, the Israeli National Anthem, Hatikvah, refers to Jews by name as well as alluding to the concept of Zionism, and contains no mention of Palestinian Arab culture. This anthem therefore excludes non-Jews from its narrative of national identity. Similar criticism has been made of the Israeli flag which resembles the Tallit (a Jewish prayer shawl) and features a Star of David, universally acknowledged as a symbol of Judaism. Critics of Israel as a Jewish state, particularly a nation state, have suggested that it should adopt more inclusive and neutral symbolism.

Attributions The Jewish State “Zionism.”
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34.3.4: Palestinian Refugees

During the 1948 Palestine War, around 85% (720,000 people) of the Palestinian Arab population of what became Israel were expelled from their homes, fleeing to the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan.

**Learning Objective**

Trace the Palestinian refugee populations in places such as Jordan

**Key Points**

- During the Palestine War of 1948, the first phase of the Arab-Israeli War of 1948, 85% of the Palestinian Arab population fled from their homes in what became known as the Palestinian Exodus of 1948.
- There is heated debate among historians and politicians as to the causes of the Exodus, and the status of this debate has bearing on the claim of Palestinians to their land.
The expulsion of the Palestinians has since been described by some historians as ethnic cleansing, while others dispute this charge.

Displaced Palestinian Arabs, known as Palestinian refugees, were settled in Palestinian refugee camps throughout the Arab world, with most fleeing to the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan.

Most Arab nations denied citizenship to the Palestinian refugees, except in Jordan, where most have citizenship or the equivalent rights of citizens.

In a 2007 study, Amnesty International denounced the “appalling social and economic condition” of Palestinians in Lebanon.

**Key Terms**

**Palestinian Exodus of 1948**

Also known as the Nakba, this event occurred when more than 700,000 Palestinian Arabs fled or were expelled from their homes during the 1948 Palestine war.

**refugee**

A displaced person who has been forced to cross national boundaries and cannot return home safely because of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or
political opinion.

**Gaza Strip**
A small, self-governing Palestinian territory on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, bordering Egypt on the southwest for 6.8 miles and Israel on the east and north along a 32-mile border. Together with the West Bank, it comprises the territories claimed by the Palestinians as the State of Palestine.

**West Bank**
A landlocked territory near the Mediterranean coast of Western Asia, forming the bulk of the Palestinian territories. It shares a border with Jordan across the Jordan River.

**Palestinian Exodus of 1948**

During the 1947–1948 Civil War in Mandatory Palestine and the 1948 Arab–Israeli War that followed, around 750,000 Palestinian Arabs (85% of the population) fled or were expelled from their homes, out of approximately 1.2 million Arabs living in former British Mandate of Palestine. This event was known as the Nakba (Arabic for “disaster” or “catastrophe”).

This number did not include displaced Palestinians inside Israeli-held territory. More than 400 Arab villages and about ten Jewish villages and neighborhoods were depopulated during the Arab–Israeli conflict, most of during 1948. According to estimates based on earlier census, the total Muslim population in Palestine was 1,143,336 in 1947. After the war, around 156,000 Arabs remained in Israel and became Israeli citizens.
The causes of the exodus are a subject of fundamental disagreement between historians. Factors involved include Jewish military advances, destruction of Arab villages, psychological warfare, and fears of another massacre by Zionist militias after the Deir Yassin massacre, which caused many to leave out of panic; direct expulsion orders by Israeli authorities; the voluntary self-removal of the wealthier classes; collapse in Palestinian leadership and Arab evacuation orders; and an unwillingness to live under Jewish control.

In the years after, a series of laws passed by the first Israeli government prevented Arabs from returning to their homes or claiming their property. Most remained refugees, as do their descendants. The expulsion of the Palestinians has since been described by some historians as ethnic cleansing, while others dispute this charge.

The Palestinian refugee problem and debate about the Palestinian right of return are also major issues of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Palestinians and their supporters have staged annual demonstrations and commemorations on May 15 of each year, which is known to them as “Nakba Day.” The popularity and number of participants in these annual Nakba demonstrations has varied over time.
Life After the Exodus

Displaced Palestinian Arabs, known as Palestinian refugees, were settled in Palestinian refugee camps throughout the Arab world. Most fled to the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan. The United Nations established UNRWA as a relief and human development agency tasked with providing humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees. Arab nations refused to absorb Palestinian refugees, instead keeping them in refugee camps while insisting that they be allowed to return.

Refugee status was also passed to their descendants, who were also largely denied citizenship in Arab states except in Jordan. The Arab League instructed its members to deny Palestinians citizenship “to avoid dissolution of their identity and protect their right of return to their homeland.” More than 1.4 million Palestinians still live in 58 recognized refugee camps, while more than 5 million Palestinians live outside Israel and the Palestinian territories.

More than 2 million registered Palestine refugees live in Jordan. Most Palestine refugees in Jordan, but not all, have full citizenship. The percentage of Palestinian refugees living in refugee camps to those who settled outside the camps is the lowest of all UNRWA fields of operations. Palestine refugees are allowed access to public services and health care, as a result, refugee camps are becoming more like poor city suburbs than refugee camps. Most Palestine refugees moved out of the camps to other parts of the country. Following the capture of the West Bank by Israel in 1967, Jordan revoked the citizenship of thousands of Palestinians to thwart any attempt to permanently resettle from the West Bank to Jordan. West Bank Palestinians with family in Jordan or Jordanian citizenship were issued yellow cards guaranteeing them all the rights of Jordanian citizenship if requested.

100,000 Palestinians fled to Lebanon because of the 1948 Arab–Israeli War and were not allowed to return. As of January 2015, there are 452,669 registered refugees in Lebanon.
In a 2007 study, Amnesty International denounced the “appalling social and economic condition” of Palestinians in Lebanon. Until 2005, Palestinians were forbidden to work in over 70 jobs because they do not have Lebanese citizenship, but this was later reduced to around 20 as of 2007 after liberalization laws. In 2010, Palestinians were granted the same rights to work as other foreigners in the country.

Lebanon gave citizenship to about 50,000 Christian Palestinian refugees during the 1950s and 1960s. In the mid-1990s, about 60,000 Shiite Muslim refugees were granted citizenship. This caused protest from Maronite authorities, leading to citizenship being given to all Christian refugees who were not already citizens.
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The Six-Day War, which had its origins in the ongoing tense relations between Israel and its neighboring Arab nations, was a decisive victory for Israel, tripling its territory from before the war.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the events of the Six-Day War

**Key Points**

- Relations between Israel and its neighboring Arab nations had never fully normalized following the 1948 Arab–Israeli War, fought immediately after the Israel declared itself an independent nation-state.
- Issues such as the Palestinian refugee crisis and the Suez Crisis of 1956 created an antagonistic stance toward Israel throughout the Arab world, and by June 1967, tensions were at their height.
- In reaction to the mobilization of Egyptian forces along the Israeli border in the Sinai Peninsula, Israel
launched a series of preemptive airstrikes against Egyptian airfields, which destroyed nearly the entire Egyptian air force.

- Egypt, pretending they won the initial battles, convinced Jordan and then Syria to enter the war, which also resulted in Israeli victories.
- At the end of the war, six days later, Israel gained control of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria.
- Israeli morale and international prestige was greatly increased by the outcome of the war, but their over-confidence may have contributed to future military losses against Egypt in the Yom Kippur War of 1973.

**Key Terms**

**Yom Kippur War**

A war fought by a coalition of Arab states led by Egypt and Syria against Israel from October 6 to 25, 1973. The fighting mostly took place in the Sinai and the Golan Heights, territories that had been occupied by Israel since the Six-Day War of 1967. Egyptian President Anwar Sadat wanted also to reopen the Suez Canal. Neither specifically planned to destroy Israel, although the Israeli leaders could not be sure of that.
1948 Arab–Israeli War

A war between the State of Israel and a military coalition of Arab states, forming the second stage of the 1948 Palestine war. The ongoing civil war between the Jews and Arabs in Palestine transformed into an interstate conflict between Israel and the Arab states following the Israeli Declaration of Independence the previous day. A combined invasion by Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, together with expeditionary forces from Iraq, entered Palestine.

The Six-Day War, also known as the June War, 1967 Arab–Israeli War, or Third Arab–Israeli War, was fought between June 5 and 10, 1967, by Israel and the neighboring states of Egypt (known at the time as the United Arab Republic), Jordan, and Syria.

Relations between Israel and its neighbors had never fully normalized following the 1948 Arab–Israeli War. In the period leading up to June 1967, tensions became dangerously heightened. In reaction to the mobilization of Egyptian forces along the Israeli border in the Sinai Peninsula, Israel launched a series of preemptive airstrikes against Egyptian airfields. The Egyptians were caught by surprise, and nearly the entire Egyptian air force was destroyed with few Israeli losses, giving the Israelis air superiority. Simultaneously, the Israelis launched a ground offensive into the Gaza Strip and the Sinai, which again caught the Egyptians by surprise. After some initial resistance, Egyptian leader Gamal Abdel Nasser ordered the evacuation of the Sinai. Israeli forces rushed westward in pursuit of the Egyptians, inflicted heavy losses, and conquered the Sinai.

Nasser induced Syria and Jordan to begin attacks on Israel by using the initially confused situation to claim that Egypt defeated the Israeli air strike. Israeli counterattacks resulted in the seizure
of East Jerusalem and the West Bank from the Jordanians, while Israel's retaliation against Syria resulted in its occupation of the Golan Heights.

On June 11, a ceasefire was signed. Arab casualties were far heavier than those of Israel: fewer than a thousand Israelis were killed compared to over 20,000 from the Arab forces. Israel's military success was attributed to the element of surprise, an innovative and well-executed battle plan, and the poor quality and leadership of the Arab forces. As a result of the war, Israel gained control of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. Israeli morale and international prestige were greatly increased by the outcome of the war, and the area under Israeli control tripled. However, the speed and ease of Israel's victory would lead to a dangerous overconfidence within the ranks of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), contributing to initial Arab successes in the subsequent 1973 Yom Kippur War. The displacement of civilian populations resulting from the war would have long-term consequences, as 300,000 Palestinians fled the West Bank and about 100,000 Syrians left the Golan to become refugees. Across the Arab world, Jewish minority communities were expelled, with refugees going to Israel or Europe.
Results of the Six-Day War: Territory held by Israel before and after the Six Day War. Israel gained control of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. Origins of the Conflict The origins of
the Six-Day War include both longstanding and immediate issues. At this time, the earlier foundation of Israel, the resulting Palestinian refugee issue, and Israel’s participation in the invasion of Egypt during the Suez crisis of 1956 were significant grievances for the Arab world. Arab nationalists, led by Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser, continued to be hostile to Israel’s existence and made grave threats against its Jewish population. By the mid-1960s, relations between Israel and its Arab neighbors had deteriorated to the extent that a number of border clashes had taken place. In April 1967, Syria shot at an Israeli tractor plowing in the demilitarized zone, which escalated to a prewar aerial clash. In May 1967, following misinformation about Israeli intentions provided by the Soviet Union, Egypt expelled UN peacekeepers who had been stationed in the Sinai Peninsula since the Suez conflict, and announced a blockade of Israel’s access to the Red Sea (international waters) via the Straits of Tiran, which Israel considered an act of war. Tension escalated, with both sides’ armies mobilizing. Less than a month later, Israel launched a surprise strike which began the Six-Day War. Aftermath The political importance of the 1967 War was immense; Israel demonstrated that it was able
and willing to initiate strategic strikes that could change the regional balance. Egypt and Syria learned tactical lessons and would launch an attack in 1973 in an attempt to reclaim their lost territory. Following the war, Israel experienced a wave of national euphoria, and the press praised the military’s performance for weeks afterward. New “victory coins” were minted to celebrate. In addition, the world’s interest in Israel grew, and the country’s economy, which had been in crisis before the war, flourished due to an influx of tourists and donations, as well as the extraction of oil from the Sinai’s wells. In the Arab nations, populations of minority Jews faced persecution and expulsion following the Israeli victory. According to historian and ambassador Michael B. Oren: Mobs attacked Jewish neighborhoods in Egypt, Yemen, Lebanon, Tunisia, and Morocco, burning synagogues and assaulting residents. A pogrom in Tripoli, Libya, left 18 Jews dead and 25 injured; the survivors were herded into detention centers. Of Egypt’s 4,000 Jews, 800 were arrested, including the chief rabbis of both Cairo and Alexandria, and their property sequestered by the government. The ancient communities of Damascus and Baghdad were placed under house arrest, their leaders imprisoned and fined. A total of 7,000 Jews were expelled, many with merely a
satchel. Following the war, Israel made an offer for peace that included the return of most of the recently captured territories. According to Chaim Herzog: On June 19, 1967, the National Unity Government [of Israel] voted unanimously to return the Sinai to Egypt and the Golan Heights to Syria in return for peace agreements. The Golans would have to be demilitarized and special arrangement would be negotiated for the Straits of Tiran. The government also resolved to open negotiations with King Hussein of Jordan regarding the Eastern border. In September, the Khartoum Arab Summit resolved that there would be “no peace, no recognition and no negotiation with Israel.” However, as Avraham Sela notes, the Khartoum conference effectively marked a shift in the perception of the conflict by the Arab states away from one centered on the question of Israel’s legitimacy to one focusing on territories and boundaries. Attributions The Six-Day War “Origins of the Six-Day War.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origins_of_the_Six-Day_War. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “Six-Day War.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Six-Day_War. Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0. “Six_Day_War_Territories.svg.png.” https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/
File:Six_Day_War_Territories.svg. Wikimedia Commons CC BY-SA 3.0.
34.4: The Monarchies of the Middle East

34.4.1: Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia, an absolute monarchy organized around Sunni Islam and home to the second largest oil reserves in the world, has enjoyed friendly relations with the West, especially the United States.

**Learning Objective**

Review the history of the Saudi royal family and how they have stayed in power

**Key Points**

- Saudi Arabia, which was unified from four regions in 1932 by its first king, Ibn Saud, was once one of the...
poorest nations in the world, but quickly became one of the wealthiest in the Arab world after the discovery of massive oil reserves in 1938.

- Since then, its stated foreign policy objectives are to maintain its security and its paramount position on the Arabian Peninsula, and as the world's largest exporter of oil, to maintain cooperative relations with other oil-producing and major oil-consuming countries.
- Consequently, it has enjoyed good relations with the West, especially the United States, as a strategic energy and security ally.
- Saudi Arabia is an absolute hereditary monarchy, governed by a king, and the royal family dominates the political system.
- The royal family's vast numbers allow it to control most of the kingdom's important posts and be involved and present at all levels of government.
- The ultraconservative Wahhabi religious movement within Sunni Islam has been called “the predominant feature of Saudi culture,” with its global spread largely financed by the oil and gas trade.

**Key Terms**

**Sunni Islam**

The largest denomination of Islam. Its name comes from the word Sunnah, referring to the exemplary
behavior of the Islamic prophet Muhammad. The differences between this sect and Shia Muslims arose from a disagreement over the choice of Muhammad’s successor and subsequently acquired broader political significance, as well as theological and juridical dimensions.

**absolute monarchy**

A form of monarchy in which one ruler has supreme authority that is not restricted by any written laws, legislature, or customs. These are often, but not always, hereditary monarchies. In contrast, in constitutional monarchies, the head of state’s authority derives from and is legally bounded or restricted by a constitution or legislature.

Saudi Arabia, officially known as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, is an Arab state in Western Asia constituting the bulk of the Arabian Peninsula. The area of modern-day Saudi Arabia formerly consisted of four distinct regions: Hejaz, Najd, and parts of Eastern Arabia (Al-Ahsa), and Southern Arabia ('Asir). The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was founded in 1932 by Ibn Saud. He united the four regions into a single state through a series of conquests beginning in 1902 with the capture of Riyadh, the ancestral home of his family, the House of Saud. Saudi Arabia has since been an absolute monarchy, effectively a hereditary dictatorship governed along Islamic lines. The ultraconservative Wahhabi religious movement within Sunni Islam has been called “the predominant feature of Saudi culture,” with its global spread largely financed by the oil and gas trade. Saudi Arabia is sometimes called “the Land of the Two Holy Mosques” in reference to Al-Masjid al-Haram (in Mecca) and Al-Masjid an-Nabawi (in Medina), the two holiest places in Islam.

The new kingdom was one of the poorest countries in the world,
reliant on limited agriculture and pilgrimage revenues. In 1938, vast reserves of oil were discovered in the Al-Ahsa region along the coast of the Persian Gulf, and full-scale development of the oil fields began in 1941 under the U.S.-controlled Aramco (Arabian American Oil Company). Oil provided Saudi Arabia with economic prosperity and substantial political leverage internationally. Saudi Arabia has since become the world’s largest oil producer and exporter, controlling the world’s second largest oil reserves and the sixth largest gas reserves. The kingdom is categorized as a World Bank high-income economy with a high Human Development Index, and is the only Arab country to be part of the G-20 major economies. However, the economy of Saudi Arabia is the least diversified in the Gulf Cooperation Council, lacking any significant service or production sector (apart from the extraction of resources). The country has attracted criticism for its restrictions on women’s rights and usage of capital punishment.
Oil in Saudi Arabia: Dammam No. 7, the first commercial oil well in Saudi Arabia, struck oil on March 4, 1938. Saudi Arabia has since become the world's largest oil producer and exporter, controlling the world's second largest oil reserves, and the sixth largest gas reserves.

Politics: Absolute Monarchy

Saudi Arabia is an absolute monarchy. However, according to the Basic Law of Saudi Arabia adopted by royal decree in 1992, the king must comply with Sharia (Islamic law) and the Quran, while the Quran and the Sunnah (the traditions of Muhammad) are declared
to be the country's constitution. No political parties or national elections are permitted. Critics regard it as a totalitarian dictatorship.

In the absence of national elections and political parties, politics in Saudi Arabia takes place in two distinct arenas: within the royal family, the Al Saud, and between the royal family and the rest of Saudi society. Outside of the Al-Saud, participation in the political process is limited to a relatively small segment of the population and takes the form of the royal family consulting with the ulema, tribal sheikhs, and members of important commercial families on major decisions. This process is not reported by the Saudi media.

The king combines legislative, executive, and judicial functions and royal decrees form the basis of the country’s legislation. The king is also the prime minister and presides over the Council of Ministers (Majlis al-Wuzarāʾ), which comprises the first and second deputy prime ministers and other ministers.

The royal family dominates the political system. The family’s vast numbers allow it to control most of the kingdom's important posts and be involved and present at all levels of government. The number of princes is estimated to be at least 7,000, with most power and influence being wielded by the 200 or so male descendants of Ibn Saud. The key ministries are generally reserved for the royal family, as are the thirteen regional governorships. The royal family is politically divided by factions based on clan loyalties, personal ambitions, and ideological differences.

Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud, the first king of Saudi Arabia, ruled for 21 years. In 1953, Saud of Saudi Arabia succeeded as the king of Saudi Arabia upon his father's death, until 1964 when he was deposed in favor of his half brother Faisal of Saudi Arabia, after an intense rivalry, fueled by doubts in the royal family over Saud's competence. In 1975, Faisal was assassinated by his nephew, Prince Faisal bin Musaid, and was succeeded by his half-brother King Khalid. King Khalid died of a heart attack in June 1982. He was succeeded by his brother, King Fahd, who added the title “Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques” to his name in 1986 in response to considerable
fundamentalist pressure to avoid use of “majesty” in association with anything except God.

Fahd continued to develop close relations with the United States and increased the purchase of American and British military equipment. In response to civil unrest, a number of limited “reforms” were initiated by King Fahd. In March 1992, he introduced the “Basic Law”, which emphasized the duties and responsibilities of a ruler. In December 1993, the Consultative Council was inaugurated. It is composed of a chairman and 60 members—all chosen by the King to respond to dissent while making as few actual changes in the status quo as possible.

In 2005, King Fahd died and was succeeded by Abdullah, who continued the policy of minimum reform and clamping down on protests. The king introduced a number of economic reforms aimed at reducing the country’s reliance on oil revenue: limited deregulation, encouragement of foreign investment, and privatization. In 2015, Abdullah was succeeded as king by his half-brother Salman.

Foreign Relations

Saudi Arabia is a non-aligned state whose stated foreign policy objectives are to maintain its security and paramount position on the Arabian Peninsula, and as the world’s largest exporter of oil, to maintain cooperative relations with other oil-producing and major oil-consuming countries.

Saudi Arabian stated policy is focused on cooperation with the oil-exporting Gulf States, the unity of the Arab world, Islamic strength and solidarity, and support for the United Nations. In practice, the main concerns in recent years have been relations with the United States, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Iraq, the perceived threat from the Islamic Republic of Iran, the effect of oil pricing, and using its oil wealth to increase the influence of Islam.
and especially the conservative school of Islam supported by the country’s rulers.

United States recognized the government of King Ibn Saud in 1931. In the 1930s, oil exploration by Standard Oil commenced. There was no U.S. ambassador resident in Saudi Arabia until 1943, but as World War II progressed, the United States began to believe that Saudi oil was of strategic importance.

In 1951, under a mutual defense agreement, the U.S. established a permanent U.S. Military Training Mission in the kingdom and agreed to provide training support in the use of weapons and other security-related services to the Saudi armed forces. This agreement formed the basis of a longstanding security relationship. The United States is one of Saudi Arabia’s largest trading partners and closest allies, with full diplomatic relations since 1933 that remain strong today. However, Saudi Arabia’s relationship with the United States has been put under pressure since late 2013 after the United States backed from its intervention in the Syrian Civil War and thawed relations with Iran.

Attributions

- Saudi Arabia
  - “Foreign relations of Saudi Arabia.”
  - “Dammam_No._7_on_March_4,_1938.jpg.”
Jordan is a constitutional monarchy known as one of the safest and most hospitable countries in the region, accepting refugees from almost all surrounding conflicts as early as 1948, with an estimated 2.1 million Palestinians and 1.4 million Syrian refugees residing in there.

**Learning Objective**

Describe the Jordanian monarchy and some characteristics of the regime

**Key Points**

- Jordan is an Arab kingdom in the Middle East, strategically located at the crossroads of Asia, Africa, and Europe.
- Jordan is a constitutional monarchy, with a king (currently Abdullah II) and a prime minister.
- The king appoints and may dismiss all judges by decree, approves amendments to the constitution.
after passing by both parliaments, declares war, and acts as the supreme leader of the armed forces; the king may also dissolve parliament and dismiss the government at his discretion.

- Jordan is considered to be among the safest of Arab countries in the Middle East and has avoided long-term terrorism and instability.
- In the midst of surrounding turmoil, Jordan has been greatly hospitable, accepting refugees from almost all surrounding conflicts as early as 1948, with 2.1 million Palestinians and 1.4 million Syrian refugees residing in the country.
- Jordan is a key ally of the United States and UK, and together with Egypt is one of only two Arab nations to have signed peace treaties with Israel, Jordan’s direct neighbor.

**Key Terms**

**constitutional monarchy**

A form of monarchy in which the sovereign exercises authority in accordance with a written or unwritten constitution. It differs from absolute monarchy (in which a monarch holds absolute power), in that the monarchs are bound to exercise their powers and authorities within the limits prescribed by an established legal framework.
Organisation of Islamic Cooperation

An international organization founded in 1969 consisting of 57 member states, with a collective population of over 1.6 billion as of 2008. The organization states that it is “the collective voice of the Muslim world” and works to “safeguard and protect the interests of the Muslim world in the spirit of promoting international peace and harmony.”

Gulf War

A war waged by coalition forces from 34 nations led by the United States against Iraq in response to Iraq’s invasion and annexation of Kuwait.

Jordan, officially The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, is an Arab kingdom in Western Asia on the East Bank of the Jordan River. Jordan is bordered by Saudi Arabia to the east and south, Iraq to the northeast, Syria to the north, Israel, Palestine, and the Dead Sea to the west and the Red Sea to its extreme southwest. Jordan is strategically located at the crossroads of Asia, Africa, and Europe. The capital, Amman, is Jordan’s most populous city as well as the country’s economic, political, and cultural center.

What is now Jordan has been inhabited by humans since the Paleolithic period. Three stable kingdoms emerged there at the end of the Bronze Age: Ammon, Moab, and Edom. Later rulers include the Nabataean Kingdom, the Roman Empire, and the Ottoman Empire. After the Great Arab Revolt against the Ottomans in 1916 during World War I, the Ottoman Empire was partitioned by Britain and France. The Emirate of Transjordan was established in 1921 by then Emir Abdullah I and became a British protectorate. In 1946, Jordan became an independent state officially known as The Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan. Jordan captured the West Bank during the 1948 Arab–Israeli War and the name of the state was
changed to The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in 1949. Jordan is a founding member of the Arab League and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, and is one of two Arab states to have signed a peace treaty with Israel. The country is a constitutional monarchy, but the king holds wide executive and legislative powers.

Jordan is a relatively small, semi-arid, almost landlocked country with a population numbering at 9.5 million. Sunni Islam, practiced by around 92% of the population, is the dominant religion and coexists with an indigenous Christian minority. Jordan is considered among the safest Arab countries in the Middle East and has avoided long-term terrorism and instability. In the midst of surrounding turmoil, it has been greatly hospitable, accepting refugees from almost all surrounding conflicts as early as 1948, with an estimated 2.1 million Palestinians and 1.4 million Syrian refugees residing in the country. The kingdom is also a refuge to thousands of Iraqi Christians fleeing the Islamic State. While Jordan continues to accept refugees, the recent large influx from Syria placed substantial strain on national resources and infrastructure.

Jordan is classified as a country of “high human development” with an “upper middle income” economy. The Jordanian economy, one of the smallest in the region, is attractive to foreign investors because of its skilled workforce. The country is a major tourist destination, and attracts medical tourism to its well-developed health sector. Nonetheless, a lack of natural resources, large flow of refugees, and regional turmoil have crippled economic growth.

Politics of Jordan

Jordan is a constitutional monarchy, but the King holds wide executive and legislative powers. He serves as head of state and commander-in-chief and appoints the prime minister and heads of security directorates. The prime minister is free to choose his
own cabinet and regional governors. However, the king may dissolve parliament and dismiss the government.

The Parliament of Jordan consists of two chambers: the upper Senate and the lower House of Representatives. All 65 members of the Senate are directly appointed by the king, they are usually veteran politicians or held previous positions in the House of Representatives or government. The 130 members of the House of Representatives are elected through proportional representation in 23 constituencies on nationwide party lists for a 4-year election cycle. Minimum quotas exist in the House of Representatives for women (15 seats, though they won 20 seats in the 2016 election), Christians (9 seats), and Circassians and Chechens (3 seats). Three constituencies are allocated for the Bedouins of the northern, central, and southern Badias. The king appoints and may dismiss all judges by decree, approves amendments to the constitution after passing by both parliaments, declares war, and acts as the supreme leader of the armed forces. Cabinet decisions, court judgments, and the national currency are issued in his name. The Cabinet, led by a prime minister, was formerly appointed by the king, but following the 2011 Jordanian protests, King Abdullah agreed to an elected cabinet. The cabinet is responsible to the Chamber of Deputies on matters of general policy; a two-thirds vote of “no confidence” by the Chamber can force the cabinet to resign.

King Hussein ruled Jordan from 1953 to 1999, surviving a number of challenges to his rule, drawing on the loyalty of his military, and serving as a symbol of unity and stability for both the Jordanians and Palestinian communities in Jordan. King Hussein ended martial law in 1989 and ended suspension on political parties that was initiated following the loss of the West Bank to Israel and to preserve the status quo in Jordan. In 1989 and 1993, Jordan held free and fair parliamentary elections. Controversial changes in the election law led Islamist parties to boycott the 1997, 2011, and 2013 elections.

King Abdullah II succeeded his father Hussein following the latter's death in February 1999. Abdullah moved quickly to reaffirm Jordan’s peace treaty with Israel and its relations with the United
States. During his first year in power, he refocused the government’s agenda on economic reform.

Jordan’s continuing structural economic difficulties, burgeoning population, and open political environment led to the emergence of various political parties. Moving toward greater independence, Jordan’s parliament has investigated corruption charges against several regime figures and become the major forum in which differing political views, including those of political Islamists, are expressed.

On February 1, 2012, it was announced that King Abdullah had dismissed his government. This has been interpreted as a pre-emptive move in the context of the Tunisian Jasmine Revolution and unfolding events in nearby Egypt.
Abdullah of Jordan: The current King of Jordan is Abdullah II, who assumed the throne in 1999. Foreign Relations The kingdom has followed a pro-Western foreign policy and maintained close relations with the United States and the United Kingdom. During the first Gulf War (1990), these relations were damaged by Jordan’s neutrality and its maintenance of relations with Iraq. Later, Jordan restored its relations with Western countries through its participation in the enforcement of UN sanctions against Iraq and in the Southwest Asia peace process. After King Hussein’s death in 1999, relations between Jordan and the Persian Gulf countries greatly improved. Jordan is a key ally of the U.S. and UK and together with Egypt, is one of only two Arab nations to have signed peace treaties with Israel, Jordan’s direct neighbor. Jordan supports Palestinian statehood through the two-state solution. The ruling Hashemite family has had custodianship over holy sites in Jerusalem since the beginning of the 20th century, a position reinforced in the Israel-Jordan peace treaty. Turmoil in Jerusalem’s Al-Aqsa mosque between Israelis and Palestinians created tensions between Jordan and Israel concerning the former’s role in protecting the Muslim and Christian sites in Jerusalem. Jordan is a founding member of the
The Emirates of the Arabian Peninsula

34.4.3: The Emirates of the Arabian Peninsula

The emirates of the Middle East (the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Kuwait) are monarchies ruled by emirs and represent some of the wealthiest Arab nations.

**Learning Objective**

Compare and contrast the emirates of the Arabian Peninsula

**Key Points**

- Most emirates have either disappeared, been integrated in a larger modern state or changed their rulers' styles. True emirate-states have become rare, with only three in existence today.
- The United Arab Emirates is a federal state that comprises seven federal emirates, each administered by a hereditary emir. These form the electoral college.
for the federation’s President and Prime Minister.

• The UAE is criticized for its human rights record, including the specific interpretations of Sharia law used in its legal system that make flogging and stoning legal punishments.

• Qatar has the highest per capita income in the world, backed by the world’s third largest natural gas reserves and oil reserves.

• Kuwait is among the Middle East’s freest countries in terms of civil liberties and political rights, and Kuwaiti women are among the most emancipated in the Middle East.

• Unlike other Gulf states, Kuwait does not have Sharia courts.

Key Terms

Arab Spring

A revolutionary wave of both violent and non-violent demonstrations, protests, riots, coups, and civil wars in the Arab world that began on December 17, 2010, in Tunisia with the Tunisian Revolution, and spread through the Arab League and surrounding countries. Major insurgencies and civil wars in Iraq, Libya, Syria, and Yemen resulted, along with civil uprisings in Bahrain and Egypt; large street demonstrations in Algeria, Iran, Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Oman, and Sudan; and minor protests in Djibouti, Mauritania,
the Palestinian territories, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, and
the Western Sahara.

**Emirate**
A political territory is ruled by a dynastic Islamic
monarch-style emir. It also means principality.

**Apostasy**
A person's formal renunciation of a religion, also used
in the broader context of embracing an opinion
contrary to one's previous beliefs.

**Sharia law**
The religious law governing the members of the
Islamic faith. It is derived from the religious precepts of
Islam, particularly the Quran and the Hadith.

---

**United Arab Emirates**

The United Arab Emirates, or the UAE, is a federal absolute
monarchy in Western Asia at the southeast end of the Arabian
Peninsula and bordering seas in the Gulf of Oman, occupying the
Persian Gulf. It borders with Oman to the east and Saudi Arabia
to the south, although the United Arab Emirates shares maritime
borders with Qatar in the west and Iran in the north and sea borders
with Iraq, Kuwait, and Bahrain. In 2013, the UAE's population was 9.2
million, of which 1.4 million are Emirati citizens and 7.8 million are
expatriates.

The country is a federation of seven emirates that was established
on December 2nd, 1971. The constituent emirates are Abu Dhabi
(which serves as the capital), Ajman, Dubai, Fujairah, Ras al-
Khaimah, Sharjah, and Umm al-Quwain. Each emirate is governed by an absolute monarch; together, they jointly form the Federal Supreme Council. One of the monarchs is selected as the President of the United Arab Emirates. Although elected by the Supreme Council, the presidency and prime ministership are essentially hereditary. The emir of Abu Dhabi holds the presidency, and the emir of Dubai is prime minister.

Islam is the official religion of the UAE, and Arabic is the official language, although English and Indian dialects are widely spoken and are the languages of business and education, especially in Abu Dhabi and Dubai.

The UAE’s oil reserves are the seventh-largest in the world, while its natural gas reserves are the 17th-largest. Sheikh Zayed, ruler of Abu Dhabi and the first President of the UAE, oversaw the development of the Emirates and steered oil revenues into health care, education, and infrastructure. The UAE’s economy is the most diversified in the Gulf Cooperation Council, with its most populous city of Dubai an important global city and international aviation hub. Nevertheless, the country remains principally reliant on its export of petroleum and natural gas.

The UAE is criticized for its human rights record, including the specific interpretations of Sharia used in its legal system. Flogging and stoning have been legal punishments in the UAE, a requirement derived from Sharia law. Some domestic workers in the UAE are victims of Sharia judicial punishments such as flogging and stoning. The annual Freedom House report on Freedom in the World has listed the United Arab Emirates as “Not Free” every year since 1999, the first year for which records are available on their website. UAE has escaped the Arab Spring; however, more than 100 Emirati activists were jailed and tortured because they sought reforms. Since 2011, the UAE government has increasingly carried out forced disappearances. Many foreign nationals and Emirati citizens have been arrested and abducted by the state.
Burj Khalifa: Burj Khalifa, a skyscraper in Dubai, is the tallest human-made structure in the world. Qatar
Qatar is a sovereign country located in Western Asia, occupying the small Qatar Peninsula on the northeastern coast of the Arabian Peninsula. Its sole land border is with Saudi Arabia to the south, with the rest of its territory surrounded by the Persian Gulf. A strait in the Persian Gulf separates Qatar from the nearby island country of Bahrain, and maritime borders are shared with the United Arab Emirates and Iran. Following Ottoman rule, Qatar became a British protectorate in the early 20th century until gaining independence in 1971. Qatar has been ruled by the House of Thani since the early 19th century. Sheikh Jassim bin Mohammed Al Thani was the founder of the State of Qatar. Qatar is a hereditary monarchy and its head of state is Emir Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani. Whether it should be regarded as a constitutional or an absolute monarchy is a matter of opinion. In 2003, the constitution was overwhelmingly approved in a referendum, with almost 98% in favor. In 2013, Qatar’s total population was 1.8 million, with 278,000 Qatari citizens and 1.5 million expatriates. Qatar is a high-income economy and a developed country, backed by the world’s third largest natural gas reserves and oil reserves. The country has the highest per capita income in the world. Qatar is classified by the
UN as a country of very high human development and is the most advanced Arab state for human development. Qatar is a significant power in the Arab world, supporting several rebel groups during the Arab Spring both financially and through its globally expanding media group, Al Jazeera Media Network. For its size, Qatar wields disproportionate influence in the world, and has been identified as a middle power. Sharia law is the main source of Qatari legislation according to Qatar’s Constitution. In practice, Qatar’s legal system is a mixture of civil law and Sharia law. Sharia law is applied to laws pertaining to family law, inheritance, and several criminal acts (including adultery, robbery and murder). In some cases in Sharia-based family courts, a female’s testimony is worth half a man’s. Codified family law was introduced in 2006. Islamic polygamy is allowed in the country. Stoning is a legal punishment in Qatar, while apostasy is a crime punishable by the death penalty. Blasphemy is punishable by up to seven years in prison and proselytizing can be punished by up to 10 years in prison. Homosexuality is punishable by the death penalty.
Emirate of Qatar: Former Emir Hamad bin Khalifa Al Thani and U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry in 2013. Kuwait Kuwait is a country in Western Asia. Situated in the northern edge of Eastern Arabia at the tip of the Persian Gulf, it shares borders with Iraq and Saudi Arabia. As of 2016, Kuwait has a population of 4.2 million people; 1.3 million are Kuwaitis and 2.9 million are expatriates (70% of the population). Oil reserves were discovered in 1938. From 1946 to 1982, the country underwent large-scale modernization. In the 1980s, Kuwait experienced a period of geopolitical instability and an economic crisis following the stock market crash. In 1990, Kuwait was invaded by Iraq. The Iraqi occupation came to an end in 1991 after military intervention by coalition forces. At the end of the war, there were extensive efforts to revive the
File:Secretary_Kerry_Meets_With_Amir_Hamad_bin_Khalifa_al-Thani.jpg. Wikimedia Commons Public domain.
OPEC, whose members are largely from the Middle East, is an oil cartel created in 1960 to counterbalance the political and economic power of the mostly U.S.-based multinational oil companies known as the “Seven Sisters.”

**Learning Objective**

Explain what OPEC is and why it exists

**Key Points**

- Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) is an oil cartel, mostly made up of Middle Eastern nations, that aims “to coordinate and unify the petroleum policies of its member countries and ensure the stabilization of oil markets.”
- It was created in 1960, a year after the “Seven Sisters” multinational oil companies unilaterally reduced their posted prices for Venezuelan and Middle Eastern crude oil by 10 percent.
The 1973 oil crisis began in October of that year when the members of the Arab sub-group of OPEC proclaimed an oil embargo against the United States and other industrialized nations that supported Israel in the Yom Kippur War.

By the end of the embargo in March 1974, the price of oil had risen from US $3 per barrel to nearly $12 globally.

The embargo caused an oil crisis, with many short- and long-term effects on global politics and economics.

The 1979 (or second) oil crisis or oil shock occurred in the United States due to decreased oil output in the wake of the Iranian Revolution.

Key Terms

**Iranian Revolution**

The overthrow of the Pahlavi dynasty under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, who was supported by the United States, and its eventual replacement with an Islamic republic under the Grand Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, the leader of the revolution. This was supported by various leftist and Islamist organizations and Iranian student movements.

**Yom Kippur War**

A war fought by a coalition of Arab states led by

**cartel**

An agreement between competing firms to control prices or exclude entry of a new competitor in a market. It is a formal organization of sellers or buyers that agree to fix selling prices, purchase prices, or reduce production using a variety of tactics.

Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) is an intergovernmental organization of 13 nations, founded in 1960 in Baghdad by the first five members (Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela), and headquartered since 1965 in Vienna. As of 2015, the 13 countries accounted for an estimated 42 percent of global oil production and 73 percent of the world's “proven” oil reserves, giving OPEC a major influence on global oil prices that were previously determined by American-dominated multinational oil companies.

OPEC's stated mission is “to coordinate and unify the petroleum policies of its member countries and ensure the stabilization of oil markets, in order to secure an efficient, economic, and regular supply of petroleum to consumers, a steady income to producers, and a fair return on capital for those investing in the petroleum industry.” The organization is also a significant provider of information about the international oil market. As of December 2016, OPEC's members are Algeria, Angola, Ecuador, Gabon, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia (the de facto leader), United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela. Two-thirds of OPEC's oil production and reserves are in its six Middle Eastern countries that surround the oil-rich Persian Gulf.
The formation of OPEC marked a turning point toward national sovereignty over natural resources, and OPEC decisions have come to play a prominent role in the global oil market and international relations. The effect is particularly strong when wars or civil disorders lead to extended interruptions in supply. In the 1970s, restrictions in oil production led to a dramatic rise in oil prices and OPEC’s revenue and wealth, with long-lasting and far-reaching consequences for the global economy. In the 1980s, OPEC started setting production targets for its member nations; when the production targets are reduced, oil prices increase, most recently from the organization's 2008 and 2016 decisions to trim oversupply.

Economists often cite OPEC as a textbook example of a cartel that cooperates to reduce market competition, but whose consultations are protected by the doctrine of sovereign immunity under international law. In December 2014, “OPEC and the oil men” ranked as #3 on Lloyd’s list of “the top 100 most influential people in the shipping industry.” However, their influence on international trade is periodically challenged by the expansion of non-OPEC energy sources, and by the recurring temptation for individual OPEC countries to exceed production ceilings and pursue conflicting self-interests.

History

In 1949, Venezuela and Iran took the earliest steps in the direction of OPEC by inviting Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia to improve communication among petroleum-exporting nations as the world recovered from World War II. At the time, some of the world’s largest oil fields were just entering production in the Middle East. The United States had established the Interstate Oil Compact Commission to join the Texas Railroad Commission in limiting overproduction. The US was simultaneously the world’s largest producer and consumer of oil, and the world market was dominated
by a group of multinational companies known as the “Seven Sisters,” five of which were headquartered in the U.S. Oil-exporting countries were motivated to form OPEC as a counterweight to this concentration of political and economic power.

In February 1959, the multinational oil companies (MOCs) unilaterally reduced their posted prices for Venezuelan and Middle Eastern crude oil by 10 percent. In September 1960, the Baghdad Conference was held at the initiative of Tariki, Pérez Alfonzo, and Iraqi prime minister Abd al-Karim Qasim. Government representatives from Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela met in Baghdad to discuss ways to increase the price of crude oil produced by their countries and respond to unilateral actions by the MOCs. Despite strong U.S. opposition, according to historian Nathan Citiano, “[t]ogether with Arab and non-Arab producers, Saudi Arabia formed the Organization of Petroleum Export Countries (OPEC) to secure the best price available from the major oil corporations.”

In October 1973, the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC, consisting of the Arab majority of OPEC plus Egypt and Syria) declared significant production cuts and an oil embargo against the United States and other industrialized nations that supported Israel in the Yom Kippur War, an event known as the 1973 oil crisis. A previous embargo attempt was largely ineffective in response to the Six-Day War in 1967. However, in 1973, the result was a sharp rise in oil prices and OPEC revenues, from US$3/barrel to US$12/barrel, and an emergency period of energy rationing, intensified by panic reactions, declining U.S. oil production, currency devaluations, and a lengthy UK coal-miners dispute.

For a time, the UK imposed an emergency three-day workweek. Seven European nations banned non-essential Sunday driving. U.S. gas stations limited the amount of gasoline that could be dispensed, closed on Sundays, and restricted the days when gasoline could be purchased based on license plate numbers. Even after the embargo ended in March 1974 following intense diplomatic activity, prices continued to rise. The world experienced a global economic
recession, with unemployment and inflation surging simultaneously, steep declines in stock and bond prices, major shifts in trade balances and petrodollar flows, and a dramatic end to the post-WWII economic boom.

The 1973–1974 oil embargo had lasting effects on the United States and other industrialized nations, which established the International Energy Agency in response. Oil conservation efforts included lower speed limits on highways, smaller and more energy-efficient cars and appliances, year-round daylight saving time, reduced usage of heating and air-conditioning, better insulation, increased support of mass transit, national emergency stockpiles, and greater emphasis on coal, natural gas, ethanol, nuclear, and other alternative energy sources. These long-term efforts became effective enough that U.S. oil consumption would rise only 11 percent during 1980–2014, while real GDP rose 150 percent. But in the 1970s, OPEC nations demonstrated convincingly that their oil could be used as both a political and economic weapon against other nations, at least in the short term.
The 1979 oil crisis occurred in the United States due to decreased oil output in the wake of the Iranian Revolution. Despite the fact that global oil supply decreased by only ~4%, widespread panic resulted, driving the price far higher than justified by supply. The price of crude oil more than doubled to $39.50 per barrel over the next 12 months, and long lines once again appeared at gas stations as they had in the 1973 oil crisis.

In 1980, following the outbreak of the Iran–Iraq War, oil production in Iran nearly stopped, and Iraq’s oil production was severely cut as well. Economic recessions were triggered in the U.S. and other countries. Oil prices did not subside to pre-crisis levels until the mid-1980s.

After 1980, oil prices began a 20-year decline, eventually reaching 60 percent fall-off during the 1990s. As with the 1973 crisis, global politics and power balance were impacted. Oil exporters such as Mexico, Nigeria, and Venezuela expanded production; the USSR became the top world producer; North Sea and Alaskan oil flooded the market; and OPEC lost influence.

Attributions

- OPEC
34.5: Iran

34.5.1: Iran under the Shah

After the 1953 coup to overthrow Prime Minister Mosaddegh, the Shah of Iran became increasingly autocratic, and Iran entered a phase of close relations with the United States, modernization, and secularization – all of which contributed to the Shah's overthrow in 1979.

**Learning Objective**

Describe Iran's political climate under the governance of the Shah

**Key Points**

- In 1941, following an Anglo-Soviet invasion of Iran, Reza Shah was forced to abdicate in favor of his son, Mohammad Pahlavi; subsequently, Iran became a
major conduit for British and American aid to the Soviet Union until the end of the ongoing war.

- Mohammad Mosaddegh, elected as the prime minister in 1951, became enormously popular in Iran after he nationalized its petroleum industry and oil reserves.
- He was deposed in the 1953 Iranian coup d'état, which was supported by the American and British intelligence agencies (CIA and MI6), thereby increasing the Shah's power.
- After the coup, the Shah became increasingly autocratic and sultanistic, and Iran entered a phase of decades-long, controversial close relations with the United States and other foreign governments.
- While the Shah increasingly modernized Iran and claimed to retain it as a fully secular state, arbitrary arrests and torture by his secret police, the SAVAK, were used to crush all forms of political opposition.
- Mohammad Reza also introduced the White Revolution, a series of economic, social, and political reforms with the proclaimed intention of transforming Iran into a global power and modernizing the nation by nationalizing certain industries and granting women suffrage.
- Several factors contributed to strong opposition to the Shah among certain groups within Iran, the most significant of which were U.S. and UK support for his regime and clashes with Islamists and increased communist activity. By 1979, political unrest had transformed into a revolution which on January 17 forced him to leave Iran.
Key Terms

**Tudeh Party**
An Iranian communist party formed in 1941, with Soleiman Mohsen Eskandari as its head. It had considerable influence in its early years and played an important role during Mohammad Mosaddegh’s campaign to nationalize the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and his term as prime minister. The crackdown that followed the 1953 coup against Mosaddeq is said to have “destroyed” the party, although it continued.

**White Revolution**
A far-reaching series of reforms in Iran launched in 1963 by Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi and lasting until 1978. Mohammad Reza Shah’s reform program was built especially to weaken those classes that supported the traditional system. It consisted of several elements, including land reform, sale of some state-owned factories to finance this land reform, enfranchisement of women, nationalization of forests and pastures, formation of a literacy corps, and institution of profit-sharing schemes for workers in industry.

**Shah**
A title given to the emperors, kings, princes, and lords of Iran (historically known as Persia).
The Shah of Iran

Mohammad Reza Pahlavi was the Shah of Iran from September 16, 1941, until his overthrow by the Iranian Revolution on February 11, 1979. He came to power during World War II after an Anglo-Soviet invasion forced the abdication of his father, Reza Shah. During Mohammad Reza Shah's reign, the Iranian oil industry was briefly nationalized under the democratically elected Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddegh. Mosaddegh became enormously popular in Iran after he nationalized its petroleum industry and oil reserves. He was deposed in the 1953 Iranian coup d'état, an Anglo-American covert operation that marked the first time the United States had overthrown a foreign government during the Cold War.

Under Mohammad Reza's reign, Iran marked the anniversary of 2,500 years of continuous monarchy since the founding of the Persian Empire by Cyrus the Great. Concurrent with this celebration, Mohammad Reza changed the benchmark of the Iranian calendar from the hegira (the migration of the Islamic prophet Muhammad and his followers from Mecca to Medina in the year 622) to the beginning of the Persian Empire, measured from Cyrus the Great's coronation. Mohammad Reza also introduced the White Revolution, a series of economic, social, and political reforms with the proclaimed intention of transforming Iran into a global power and modernizing the nation by nationalizing certain industries and granting women suffrage. The core of this program was land reform. Modernization and economic growth proceeded at an unprecedented rate, fueled by Iran's vast petroleum reserves, the third-largest in the world.

A secular Muslim, Mohammad Reza gradually lost support from the Shi'a clergy of Iran as well as the working class, particularly due to his strong policy of modernization and secularization, conflict with the traditional class of merchants known as bazaari, relations with Israel, and corruption issues surrounding himself, his family, and the ruling elite. Various additional controversial policies were
enacted, including the banning of the communist Tudeh Party and a general suppression of political dissent by Iran's intelligence agency, SAVAK. According to official statistics, Iran had as many as 2,200 political prisoners in 1978, a number that multiplied rapidly as a result of the revolution.

Other factors contributed to strong opposition to the Shah among certain groups within Iran, most significantly U.S. and UK support for his regime, clashes with Islamists, and increased communist activity. By 1979, political unrest transformed into a revolution which on January 17 forced him to leave Iran. Soon thereafter, the Iranian monarchy was formally abolished, and Iran was declared an Islamic republic led by Ruhollah Khomeini. Facing likely execution should he return to Iran, he died in exile in Egypt, whose President, Anwar Sadat, had granted him asylum. Due to his status as the last de facto Shah of Iran, he is often known as simply “the Shah.”

Explanations for why Mohammad Reza was overthrown include his status as a dictator put in place by a non-Muslim Western power, the United States, whose foreign culture was seen as influencing that of Iran. Additional contributing factors included reports of oppression, brutality, corruption, and extravagance. Basic functional failures of the regime have also been blamed: economic bottlenecks, shortages, and inflation; the regime's over-ambitious economic program; the failure of its security forces to deal with protest and demonstration; and the overly centralized royal power structure. International policies pursued by the Shah to supplement national income with remarkable increases of oil prices through his leading role in the Organization of the Oil Producing Countries (OPEC) have been stressed as a major cause of a shift of Western interests and priorities. This was reflected in Western politicians and media, especially the administration of U.S. President Jimmy Carter, questioning human rights in Iran, as well as in strengthened economic ties between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia in the 1970s.
Relations with the United States

Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi maintained close ties with the United States during most of his reign. He pursued a Westernizing, modernizing economic policy and a strongly pro-Western foreign policy; he also made a number of visits to America, where he was regarded as a friend. The Shah's diplomatic foundation was the U.S.' guarantee that they would protect him, which enabled him to stand up to larger enemies. While the arrangement did not preclude other partnerships and treaties, it provided a somewhat stable environment in which Pahlavi could implement his reforms.

Iran's long border with America's Cold War rival, the Soviet Union, and its position as the largest, most powerful country in the oil-rich Persian Gulf, made it a “pillar” of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. Prior to the Iranian Revolution of 1979, many Iranian students and other citizens resided in the United States, and the country had a positive and welcoming attitude toward Americans.

In 1953, Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadeg was overthrown by a Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)-organized coup, in what political scientist Mark Gasiorowski called “a crucial turning point both in Iran's modern history and in U.S. Iran relations.” He explains that many Iranians argue that “the 1953 coup and the extensive U.S. support for the shah in subsequent years were largely responsible for the shah's arbitrary rule,” which led to the “deeply anti-American character” of the 1979 revolution.

Following the coup, the United States helped build up the Shah's regime. In the first three weeks, the American government gave Iran $68 million in emergency aid, and an additional $1.2 billion over the next decade. In this era that ensued until the fall of the shah in 1979, Iran was one of the United States' closest allies.

During his reign, the Shah received significant American support, frequently making state visits to the White House and earning praise from numerous American presidents. The Shah's close ties
to Washington and his Westernization policies soon angered some Iranians, especially the hardline Islamic conservatives.

Relations with United States: The Shah with John F. Kennedy and Robert McNamara in 1962. During the Shah’s rule, the United States and Iran were close allies. In 1953, the United States helped overthrow the Prime Minister in favor of increasing the Shah’s power.

Attributions

- Iran under the Shah

The Iranian Revolution refers to events involving the overthrow of the Pahlavi dynasty under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, who was supported by the United States, and its eventual replacement with an Islamic republic under the Grand Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, the leader of the revolution, supported by various leftist and Islamist organizations and Iranian student movements.

Learning Objective
Examine the reasons for the Iranian Revolution

Key Terms

**Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini**
An Iranian Shia Muslim religious leader, revolutionary, and politician. He was the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the leader of the 1979 Iranian Revolution that saw the overthrow of the Pahlavi monarchy and Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, the Shah of Iran. Following the revolution, he became the country’s Supreme Leader, a position created in the
constitution of the Islamic Republic as the highest-ranking political and religious authority of the nation, which he held until his death.

**Gharbzadegi**

A pejorative Persian term variously translated as “Westoxification,” “Westitis,” “Euromania,” or “Occidentosis.” It is used to refer to the loss of Iranian cultural identity through the adoption and imitation of Western models and Western criteria in education, the arts, and culture and the subsequent transformation of Iran into a passive market for Western goods and a pawn in Western geopolitics.

**Islamic Jurists**

Experts in fiqh, or Islamic jurisprudence and Islamic Law, the human understanding of the Sharia (believed by Muslims to represent divine law as revealed in the Quran and the Sunnah (the teachings and practices of the Islamic prophet Muhammad).

**Examples**

- The Iranian Revolution was a populist, nationalist and Shi’a Islamic revolution that replaced a dictatorial monarchy with a theocracy based on “Guardianship of the Islamic Jurists” (or velayat-e faqih).
- The reasons why the Shah (Mohammad Reza Pahlavi) was overthrown and replaced by an Islamic Republic are the subject of historical debate.
- The revolution was in part a conservative backlash against the westernization and secularization efforts of the Western-
backed Shah, and a more popular reaction to social injustice and other shortcomings of the regime.

- The Shah was perceived by many Iranians as beholden to – if not a puppet of – a non-Muslim Western power (the United States) whose culture was contaminating that of Iran.
- The first major demonstrations to overthrow Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi began in January 1978.
- The Shah fled Iran in January 1979 after strikes and demonstrations paralyzed the country, and on February 1, 1979, Ayatollah Khomeini returned to Tehran after 15 years of exile and was greeted by several million Iranians.
- The final collapse of the Pahlavi dynasty occurred shortly after on February 11, when Iran’s military declared itself “neutral” after guerrillas and rebel troops overwhelmed troops loyal to the Shah in armed street fighting.
- Iran officially became an Islamic Republic on April 1, 1979, when Iranians overwhelmingly approved a national referendum to make it so.
- The new theocratic Constitution — whereby Khomeini became Supreme Leader of the country — was approved in December 1979.

The Iranian Revolution, also known as the Islamic Revolution, was the revolution that transformed Iran from an absolute monarchy under Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi to an Islamic republic under Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, one of the leaders of the revolution and founder of the Islamic Republic. It began in January 1978 with the first major demonstrations and concluded with the approval of the new theocratic Constitution—whereby Ayatollah Khomeini became Supreme Leader of the country—in December 1979.

Demonstrations against the Shah commenced in October 1977, developing into a campaign of civil resistance that included both secular and religious elements and intensified in January 1978. Between August and December 1978, strikes and demonstrations paralyzed the country. The Shah left Iran for exile on January 16,
1979, as the last Persian monarch, leaving his duties to a regency council and an opposition-based prime minister. Ayatollah Khomeini was invited back to Iran by the government, and returned to Tehran to a greeting by several million Iranians. The royal reign collapsed shortly after on February 11, when guerrillas and rebel troops overwhelmed troops loyal to the Shah in armed street fighting, bringing Khomeini to official power. Iran voted by national referendum to become an Islamic Republic on April 1, 1979, and approved a new theocratic-republican constitution whereby Khomeini became Supreme Leader of the country in December 1979.

The revolution was unusual for the surprise it created throughout the world: it lacked many of the customary causes of revolution (defeat at war, a financial crisis, peasant rebellion, or disgruntled military), occurred in a nation that was enjoying relative prosperity, produced profound change at great speed, was massively popular, resulted in the exile of many Iranians, and replaced a pro-Western semi-absolute monarchy with an anti-Western authoritarian theocracy based on the concept of Guardianship of the Islamic Jurists (or velayat-e faqih). It was a relatively non-violent revolution and helped to redefine modern revolutions although there was violence in its aftermath.
Iranian Revolution: The Shah, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, left the country for exile in January 1979 after strikes and demonstrations paralyzed the country, and on February 1, 1979, Ayatollah Khomeini returned to Tehran to a greeting of several million Iranians. Causes of the Revolution

Reasons advanced for the occurrence of the revolution and its populist, nationalist and, later, Shi’a Islamic character include a conservative backlash against the Westernizing and secularizing efforts of the Western-backed Shah, a liberal backlash to social injustice, a rise in expectations created by the 1973 oil revenue windfall and an overly ambitious economic program, anger over a short, sharp economic contraction in 1977–78, and other shortcomings of the previous regime.

The Shah’s regime became increasingly oppressive, brutal, corrupt, and extravagant. It also suffered from basic functional failures that brought economic bottlenecks, shortages, and inflation. The Shah was perceived by many as beholden to – if not a puppet of – a non-Muslim Western power (the United States) whose
culture was affecting that of Iran. At the same time, support for the Shah may have waned among Western politicians and media – especially under the administration of U.S. President Jimmy Carter – as a result of the Shah’s support for OPEC petroleum price increases earlier in the decade. When President Carter enacted a policy that countries guilty of human rights violations would be deprived of American arms or aid, some Iranians gathered the courage to post open letters and petitions in the hope that the repression by the government might subside.

That the revolution replaced the monarchy of Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi with Islamism and Khomeini, rather than with another leader and ideology, is credited in part to the spread of the Shia version of the Islamic revival that opposed Westernization and saw Ayatollah Khomeini as following in the footsteps of the Shi’a Imam Husayn ibn Ali and the Shah in the role of Husayn’s foe, the hated tyrant Yazid I. Other factors include the underestimation of Khomeini’s Islamist movement by both the Shah’s reign – who considered them a minor threat compared to the Marxists and Islamic socialists – and by the secularist, opponents of the government, who thought the Khomeinists could be sidelined.

Ayatollah Khomeini and the Ideology of the Revolution

The post-revolutionary leader – Shia cleric Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini – first came to political prominence in 1963 when he led opposition to the Shah and his White Revolution. Khomeini was arrested in 1963 after declaring the Shah a “wretched miserable man” who had “embarked on the [path toward] destruction of Islam in Iran.” Three days of major riots throughout Iran followed, with 15,000 dead from police fire as reported by opposition sources. However, anti-revolutionary sources conjectured that just 32 were
killed. Khomeini was released after eight months of house arrest and continued his agitation, condemning Iran’s close cooperation with Israel and its capitulations and extension of diplomatic immunity to American government personnel in Iran. In November 1964, Khomeini was rearrested and sent into exile where he remained for 15 years, until the revolution.

In this interim period of “disaffected calm,” the budding Iranian revival began to undermine the idea of Westernization as progress that had been the basis of the Shah’s secular reign and form the ideology of the 1979 revolution. Jalal Al-e-Ahmad’s idea of Gharbzadegi – that Western culture was a plague or an intoxication to be eliminated – spread through the nation, along with Ali Shariati’s vision of Islam as the one true liberator of the Third World from oppressive colonialism, neo-colonialism, and capitalism and Morteza Motahhari’s popularized retellings of the Shia faith.

Most importantly, Khomeini preached that revolt and especially martyrdom, against injustice and tyranny was part of Shia Islam, and that Muslims should reject the influence of both liberal capitalism and communism, ideas that inspired the revolutionary slogan “Neither East, nor West – Islamic Republic!”

Away from public view, Khomeini developed the ideology of velayat-e faqih (guardianship of the jurist) as government, that Muslims – in fact everyone – required “guardianship,” in the form of rule or supervision by the leading Islamic jurist or jurists. Such rule was ultimately “more necessary even than prayer and fasting” in Islam, as it would protect Islam from deviation from traditional sharia law and in so doing eliminate poverty, injustice, and the “plundering” of Muslim land by foreign non-believers.
Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini – first came to political prominence in 1963 when he led opposition to the Shah and his White Revolution. After the revolution, Khomeini told questioners that “the religious dignitaries do not want to rule.”

Attributions

• The Iranian Revolution
  ◦ “Background and causes of the Iranian Revolution.”
251. The Islamic Republic of Iran

34.5.3: The Islamic Republic of Iran

After the 1979 Iranian Revolution, the Shah's pro-Western, autocratic monarchy was replaced by an Islamic Republic based on the principle of rule by Islamic jurists, which reversed most of the modernization and secularization of the prior regime.

Learning Objective

Compare the Islamic Republic with the government under the Shah

Key Points

- The 1979 Iranian Revolution brought about the Islamic Republic of Iran, marking a major shift in the country's political structure, foreign policy, legal system, and culture.
- The leader of the revolution and founder of the Islamic Republic, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, was
Iran’s supreme leader until his death in 1989; this era was dominated by the consolidation of the revolution into a theocratic republic under Khomeini and by the costly and bloody war with Iraq.

- While the revolution brought about some re-Islamization of Iran, particularly in terms of personal appearance—beards, hijab—it has not prompted a reversal of all modernization or a return to traditional patterns of family life.
- The new government began purging itself of the non-Islamist political opposition and of those Islamists who were not considered radical enough.
- The Leader of the Revolution (“Supreme Leader”), who is as much a religious leader as a political one, is responsible for delineation and supervision of the general policies of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
- On November 4, 1979, a group of Muslim students seized the United States Embassy and took 52 personnel and citizens hostage after the United States refused to return Mohammad Reza Pahlavi to Iran to face trial in the court of the new regime and all but certain execution. This event, known as the Iran hostage crisis, lasted 444 days.

**Key Terms**

**Iran hostage crisis**
A diplomatic standoff between Iran and the United States.
States in which 52 American diplomats and citizens were held hostage for 444 days from November 4, 1979, to January 20, 1981, after a group of Iranian students belonging to the Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Line, who supported the Iranian Revolution, took over the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. It is the longest hostage crisis in recorded history.

**Islamic Republic**

The name given to several states in countries ruled by Islamic laws. Despite the similar name, their governments and laws substantially differ. The term “Islamic republic” has come to mean several different things, some contradictory. To some Muslim religious leaders in the Middle East and Africa who advocate it, this type of state is under a particular Islamic form of government. They see it as a compromise between a purely Islamic caliphate and secular nationalism and republicanism. In their conception, the penal code of the state must be compatible with some or all laws of Sharia, and the state may not be a monarchy as many Middle Eastern states are presently.

**theocratic**

A form of government in which a deity is the source from which all authority derives. The civil leader is believed to have a personal connection with the civilization's religion or belief.
Impact and Aftermath of the Revolution

One of the most dramatic changes in government in Iran’s history was seen with the 1979 Iranian Revolution in which Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi was overthrown and replaced by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Autocratic monarchy was replaced by an Islamic Republic based on the principle of rule by Islamic jurists, (or “Velayat-e faqih”), where clerics serve as head of state and in many powerful governmental roles. A pro-Western, pro-American foreign policy was exchanged for one of “neither east nor west,” but rather radically Islamist. A rapidly modernizing, capitalist economy was replaced by populist economy and Islamic culture.

The leader of the revolution and founder of the Islamic Republic, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, was Iran’s supreme leader until his death in 1989. He was followed by Ali Khamenei. This era was dominated by the consolidation of the revolution into a theocratic republic under Khomeini, and by the costly and bloody war with Iraq.

The initial impact of the Islamic revolution around the world was tremendous. In the non-Muslim world it has changed the image of Islam, generating much interest in its politics and spirituality of Islam along with fear and mistrust. In the Mideast and Muslim world, particularly in its early years, it triggered enormous enthusiasm and redoubled opposition to western intervention and influence. Islamist insurgents rose in Saudi Arabia (the 1979 week-long takeover of the Grand Mosque), Egypt (the 1981 machine-gunning of the Egyptian President Sadat), Syria (the Muslim Brotherhood rebellion in Hama), and Lebanon (the 1983 bombing of the American Embassy and French and American peace-keeping troops).

The immediate nationwide uprisings against the new government began by the 1979 Kurdish rebellion with the Khuzestan uprisings, along with the uprisings in Sistan and Baluchestan Province and other areas. Over the next several years, these were violently
subdued by the new Islamic government. The new government began purging itself of non-Islamist political opposition, as well as of those Islamists who were not considered radical enough. Although both nationalists and Marxists initially joined with Islamists to overthrow the Shah, tens of thousands were executed by the new regime afterward.

On November 4, 1979, a group of Muslim students seized the United States Embassy and took 52 personnel and citizens hostage after the United States refused to return Mohammad Reza Pahlavi to Iran to face trial in the court of the new regime and all but certain execution. This 444-day event was known as the Iran hostage crisis. Attempts by the Jimmy Carter administration to negotiate for the release of the hostages, and a failed rescue attempt, helped force Carter out of office and brought Ronald Reagan to power. On Jimmy Carter’s final day in office, the last hostages were finally set free as a result of the Algiers Accords.

The Cultural Revolution began in 1980 with a three-year closure of
universities for inspection and cleanup in the cultural policy of the education and training system.

The Islamic revolutionary regime of Ayatollah Khomeini dramatically reversed the pro-Western foreign policy of the regime it overthrew. Since then, Iran has oscillated between the two opposing tendencies of revolutionary ardor (promoting the Islamic revolution and struggling against non-Muslim tendencies abroad) and moves towards pragmatism (economic development and normalization of foreign relations). Khomeini's 1989 fatwa call for the killing of British citizen Salman Rushdie for his allegedly blasphemous book, The Satanic Verses, demonstrated the willingness of the Islamic revolutionaries to sacrifice trade and other ties with western countries to threaten an individual citizen living thousands of miles away.

On the other hand, Khomeini's death in 1989 led to more pragmatic policies, with Presidents Hashemi Rafsanjani and Mohammad Khatami leading the charge for stable relations with the west and its own non-Revolutionary-Islamic neighbors such as Saudi Arabia. Following the 2005 election of President Mahmoud Ahmedinejad, Iran has returned to more a more hardline stance, frequently antagonizing the west and its neighbors while battling for control over the region.

While the revolution brought about some re-Islamization of Iran, particularly in terms of personal appearance—beards, hijab—it has not prompted a total reversal modernization or a return to traditional patterns of family life, such as polygamy and the extended family with numerous children). Despite the lowering of the legal age of marriage for women to 9 and the Ayatollah Khomeini's support for early marriage for females, the actual average age of marriage for women rose to 22 by 1996.
Government and Politics

The political system of the Islamic Republic is based on the 1979 Constitution and comprises several intricately connected governing bodies. The Leader of the Revolution ("Supreme Leader") is responsible for delineation and supervision of the general policies of the Islamic Republic of Iran. He is Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, controls the military intelligence and security operations, and has sole power to declare war or peace. The heads of the judiciary, state radio and television networks, the commanders of the police and military forces, and six of the twelve members of the Guardian Council are appointed by the Supreme Leader. The Assembly of Experts elects and dismisses the Supreme Leader on the basis of qualifications and popular esteem.

According to the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the powers of government in the Islamic Republic of Iran are vested in the legislature, the judiciary, and the executive powers, functioning under the supervision of the “Absolute Guardianship and the Leadership of the Ummah,” which refers to the Supreme Leader of Iran.

After the Supreme Leader, the Constitution defines the President of Iran as the highest state authority. The President is elected by universal suffrage for a term of four years and can only be re-elected for one term. Presidential candidates must be approved by the Guardian Council before running to ensure their allegiance to the ideals of the Islamic Revolution. The President is responsible for the implementation of the Constitution and the exercise of executive powers, except for matters directly related to the Supreme Leader.

While the revolution did not dismantle the Pahlavi judiciary in its entirety, it replaced, according to historian Ervand Abrahamian, secular-trained jurists “with seminary-educated ones, and codified more features of the sharia into state laws – especially the Law of Retribution.” Women judges were also removed. Between 1979 and
1982, the entire pre-Revolutionary judiciary was purged, and their duties replaced by “Revolutionary Tribunals” set up in every town. These tribunals ruled on “Islamic law,” but were in practice unfair and biased, with inexperienced and often incompetent judges. Many people were executed or given harsh punishments for both political and criminal acts. There were no appeals, and trials often lasted just minutes. In 1982, the regular court system was reinstated, but with the judges now trained in Islamic law.

Attributions

- The Islamic Republic of Iran
The Iran-Iraq War

34.5.4: The Iran-Iraq War

On September 22, 1980, the Iraqi army invaded the Iranian Khuzestan and the Iran-Iraq War began. This conflict is often compared to World War I for its similar fighting tactics and brutality.

Learning Objective

Analyze the reasons for the Iran-Iraq War

Key Points

• Shortly after the success of the revolution, revolutionary leader Ruhollah Khomeini began calling for Islamic revolutions across the Muslim world, including Iran's Arab neighbor Iraq, the one large state besides Iran in the Gulf with a Shia Muslim majority population.
• The war began with Iraq's invasion of Iran in an attempt by Iraq's dictator Saddam Hussein to take advantage of the perceived post-revolutionary chaos.
and military weakness, as well as the Revolution’s unpopularity with Western governments.

- The Iraqis used weapons of mass destruction, most notably mustard gas, against Iranian soldiers.
- Although the forces of Saddam Hussein made several early advances, by mid-1982 Iranian forces successfully managed to drive the Iraqi army back into Iraq.
- In July 1982, with Iraq thrown on the defensive, Iran invaded Iraq and conducted countless offensives in a bid to conquer territory and capture cities, such as Basra.
- The war continued until 1988 when the Iraqi army defeated the Iranian forces inside Iraq and pushed the remaining Iranian troops back across the border.
- Subsequently, Khomeini accepted a truce mediated by the UN.
- An estimated 200,000–240,000 Iranians and 105,000–200,000 Iraqis were killed during the war.

**Key Terms**

**weapons of mass destruction**

Nuclear, radiological, chemical, biological or other weapons that can kill and bring significant harm to a large number of humans or cause great damage to human-made structures (e.g. buildings), natural structures (e.g. mountains), or the biosphere. The
scope and usage of the term has evolved and been disputed, often signifying more politically than technically. It was originally coined in reference to aerial bombing with chemical explosives.

**Kurds**

An ethnic group in the Middle East, mostly inhabiting a contiguous area spanning adjacent parts of eastern and southeastern Turkey (Northern Kurdistan), western Iran (Eastern or Iranian Kurdistan), northern Iraq (Southern or Iraqi Kurdistan), and northern Syria (Western Kurdistan or Rojava). They are culturally and linguistically closely related to the Iranian peoples and are thus often classified as Iranian.

**sulfur mustard**

Commonly known as mustard gas, this cytotoxic and vesicant chemical warfare agent forms large blisters on exposed skin and in the lungs.

The Iran–Iraq War was an armed conflict between Iran and Iraq lasting from September 22, 1980, when Iraq invaded Iran, to August 1988. The war followed a long history of border disputes and was motivated by fears that the Iranian Revolution in 1979 would inspire insurgency among Iraq's long-suppressed Shi'i majority, as well as Iraq's desire to replace Iran as the dominant Persian Gulf state.

Although Iraq hoped to take advantage of Iran's revolutionary chaos and attacked without formal warning, it made only limited progress into Iran and was quickly repelled. Iran regained virtually all lost territory by June 1982. For the next six years, Iran was on the offensive. A number of proxy forces participated in the war, most notably the Iranian People's Mujahedin of Iran siding with Ba'athist Iraq and Iraqi Kurdish militias of the Kurdistan Democratic Party.
and Patriotic Union of Kurdistan siding with Iran—all suffering a major blow by the end of the conflict.

Despite United Nations Security Council calls for a ceasefire, hostilities continued until August 20, 1988. The war finally ended with United Nations Security Council Resolution 598, a UN-brokered ceasefire accepted by both sides. At the war’s conclusion, it took several weeks for the Armed Forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran to evacuate Iraqi territory and honor prewar international borders set by the 1975 Algiers Agreement. The last prisoners of war were exchanged in 2003.

The war cost both sides in lives and economic damage: about half a million Iraqi and Iranian soldiers and an equivalent number of civilians died, with many more injured; however, the war brought neither reparations nor changes in borders. The conflict has been compared to World War I in terms of the tactics used, including large-scale trench warfare with barbed wire stretched across trenches, manned machine gun posts, bayonet charges, human wave attacks across a no man’s land, and extensive use of chemical weapons such as sulfur mustard by the Iraqi government against Iranian troops, civilians, and Kurds. The world powers United States and the Soviet Union, together with many Western and Arab countries, provided military, intelligence, economic, and political support for Iraq.

At the time of the conflict, the United Nations Security Council issued statements that “chemical weapons had been used in the war.” UN statements never clarified that only Iraq was using chemical weapons, and according to retrospective authors “the international community remained silent as Iraq used weapons of mass destruction against Iranian[s] as well as Iraqi Kurds.” The Security Council did not identify Iraq as the aggressor of the war until December 11, 1991, 12 years after Iraq invaded Iran and 16 months after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.
Iran-Iraq War: Participation of child soldiers on Iranian front (top left); Bodies of Iranian civilians killed in the Iraqi invasion (top right); Port quarter view of USS Stark listing to port after being mistakenly struck by an Iraqi warplane (middle left); Pro-Iraq PMOI forces killed in Operation Mersad (middle right); Iraqi prisoners of war after the re-capture of Khorramshahr by Iranians (below left); ZU-23-2 being used by the Iranian Army (below right).

A photo collage of the Iran–Iraq War. Participation of child soldiers on Iranian front (top left); Bodies of Iranian civilians killed in the Iraqi invasion (top right); Port quarter view of USS Stark listing to port after being mistakenly struck by an Iraqi warplane (middle left); Pro-Iraq PMOI forces killed in Operation Mersad (middle right); Iraqi prisoners of war after the re-capture of Khorramshahr
by Iranians (below left); ZU-23-2 being used by the Iranian Army (below right).

Origins

Since the Ottoman–Persian Wars of the 16th and 17th centuries, Iran (known as “Persia” prior to 1935) and the Ottomans fought over Iraq (then known as Mesopotamia) and full control of the Shatt al-Arab until the signing of the Treaty of Zuhab in 1639, which established the final borders between the two countries. The Shatt al-Arab was considered an important channel for both states' oil exports, and in 1937, Iran and the newly independent Iraq signed a treaty to settle the dispute. In the same year, Iran and Iraq both joined the Treaty of Saadabad, and relations between the two states remained good for decades afterwards.

In April 1969, Iran abrogated the 1937 treaty over the Shatt al-Arab river, and as such ceased paying tolls to Iraq when its ships used the waterway. The Shah justified his move by arguing that almost all river borders around the world ran along the thalweg and claiming that because most of the ships that used the waterway were Iranian, the 1937 treaty was unfair to Iran. Iraq threatened war over the Iranian move, but when on April 24 1969, an Iranian tanker escorted by Iranian warships sailed down the river, Iraq—the militarily weaker state—did nothing. Iran's abrogation of the treaty marked the beginning of a period of acute Iraqi-Iranian tension that was to last until the 1975 Algiers Agreement.

In the 1975 Algiers Agreement, Iraq made territorial concessions—including the Shatt al-Arab waterway—in exchange for normalized relations. In return for Iraq recognizing that the frontier on the waterway ran along the entire thalweg, Iran ended its support of Iraq's Kurdish guerrillas. Iraqis viewed the Algiers Agreement as humiliating.

Tensions between Iraq and Iran were fueled by Iran’s Islamic
revolution and its appearance of being a Pan-Islamic force in contrast to Iraq's Arab nationalism. Despite Iraq's goals of regaining the Shatt al-Arab, the Iraqi government seemed to initially welcome Iran's Revolution, which overthrew Iran's Shah, seen as a common enemy. It is difficult to pinpoint when tensions began to build.

Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini called on Iraqis to overthrow the Ba'ath government, which was received with considerable anger in Baghdad. On July 17, 1979, despite Khomeini's call, Saddam gave a speech praising the Iranian Revolution and called for an Iraqi-Iranian friendship based on non-interference in each other's internal affairs. When Khomeini rejected Saddam's overture by calling for Islamic revolution in Iraq, Saddam was alarmed. Iran's new Islamic administration was regarded in Baghdad as an irrational, existential threat to the Ba'ath government, especially because the secular Ba'ath party discriminated against and posed a threat to the Shia movement in Iraq, whose clerics were Iran's allies within Iraq and whom Khomeini saw as oppressed.

Saddam's primary interest in war may have also stemmed from his desire to right the supposed “wrong” of the Algiers Agreement, in addition to finally achieving his desire of annexing Khuzestan and becoming the regional superpower. Saddam's goal was to replace Egypt as the “leader of the Arab world” and achieve hegemony over the Persian Gulf. He saw Iran's increased weakness due to revolution, sanctions, and international isolation.

A successful invasion of Iran would enlarge its petroleum reserves and make it the region's dominant power. With Iran engulfed in chaos, an opportunity for Iraq to annex the oil-rich Khuzestan Province materialized. In addition, Khuzestan's large ethnic Arab population would allow Saddam to pose as a liberator for Arabs from Persian rule. Fellow Gulf states such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait (despite being hostile to Iraq) encouraged Iraq to attack, as they feared that an Islamic revolution would take place within their own borders.
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34.6.1: Afghanistan and the Cold War

During the early Cold War, Afghanistan attempted to maintain a non-aligned status, receiving aid from both the Soviet Union and the United States, but ended up relying heavily on assistance from the Soviets.

Learning Objective

Detail how the Cold War spilled over into Afghanistan

Key Points

- In the late 19th century, Afghanistan became a buffer state in the “Great Game” between British India and the Russian Empire.
- Following the Third Anglo-Afghan War in 1919, King Amanullah unsuccessfully attempted to modernize
the country, but throughout the first half of the 20th century maintained good relations with the Soviets.

- Afghanistan remained neutral and was neither a participant in World War II nor aligned with either power bloc in the Cold War.
- However, it got caught up in the Cold War rivalry as both the Soviet Union and the United States vied for influence by supporting Afghanistan's infrastructure.
- In 1958, Afghanistan’s prime minister Daud Khan tried to create a treaty with America against the Soviet Union because he was frightened of a potential Soviet invasion and needed modern weapons.
- After the Americans turned down the Afghanistan government, the Soviet Union provided financial aid, military personal training, and modern weapons, such as AK-47s and rocket launchers.
- Prime Minister Daud Khan was forced to resign in 1963 because of the dependence he had created on the Soviet Union.

Key Terms

**Great Game**

A term used by historians to describe a political and diplomatic confrontation that existed for most of the 19th century between Britain and Russia over Afghanistan and neighboring territories in Central and Southern Asia. Russia was fearful of British commercial
and military inroads into Central Asia, and Britain was fearful of Russia adding “the jewel in the crown,” India, to the vast empire it was building in Asia. This resulted in an atmosphere of distrust and constant threat of war between the two empires.

Mohammed Zahir Shah

The last King of Afghanistan, reigning from November 8, 1933, until he was deposed on July 17, 1973. During his four decades of rule, he became a prominent Afghan figure worldwide, establishing friendly relations with many countries and modernizing his country.

Afghan-Soviet Relations

In the 19th century, Afghanistan served as a strategic buffer state between Czarist Russian and the British Empire in the subcontinent during the so-called Great Game. Around the 1830s, Imperial Russia wanted to conquer Afghanistan because of the potential economic profit.

Afghanistan’s relations with Moscow became more cordial after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. The Soviet Union was the first country to establish diplomatic relations with Afghanistan in 1919 after the Third Anglo-Afghan war and signed an Afghan-Soviet nonaggression pact in 1921, which also provided for Afghan transit rights through the Soviet Union. Early Soviet assistance included financial aid, aircraft and attendant technical personnel, and telegraph operators.

After the Third Anglo-Afghan War and the signing of the Treaty of Rawalpindi on August 19, 1919, King Amanullah Khan declared...
Afghanistan a sovereign and fully independent state. He moved to end his country's traditional isolation by establishing diplomatic relations with the international community and following a 1927–28 tour of Europe and Turkey, introduced several reforms intended to modernize his nation. A key force behind these reforms was Mahmud Tarzi, an ardent supporter of the education of women. He fought for Article 68 of Afghanistan's 1923 constitution, which made elementary education compulsory. Slavery was abolished in 1923.

Some of the reforms that were actually put in place, such as the abolition of the traditional burqa for women and the opening of a number of coeducational schools, quickly alienated many tribal and religious leaders. Faced with overwhelming armed opposition, Amanullah Khan was forced to abdicate in January 1929 after Kabul fell to rebel forces led by Habibullah Kalakani. Prince Mohammed Nadir Shah, Amanullah's cousin, in turn defeated and killed Kalakani in November 1929 and was declared King Nadir Shah. He abandoned the reforms of Amanullah Khan in favor of a more gradual approach to modernization but was assassinated in 1933 by Abdul Khaliq, a Hazara school student.

Mohammed Zahir Shah, Nadir Shah’s 19-year-old son, succeeded to the throne and reigned from 1933 to 1973. Until 1946, Zahir Shah ruled with the assistance of his uncle, who held the post of Prime Minister and continued the policies of Nadir Shah. Another of Zahir Shah’s uncles, Shah Mahmud Khan, became Prime Minister in 1946 and began an experiment allowing greater political freedom, but reversed the policy when it went further than he expected. He was replaced in 1953 by Mohammed Daoud Khan, the king's cousin and brother-in-law. Daoud Khan sought a closer relationship with the Soviet Union and a more distant one towards Pakistan. Afghanistan remained neutral and was neither a participant in World War II nor aligned with either power bloc in the Cold War. However, it was a beneficiary of the latter rivalry as both the Soviet Union and the United States vied for influence by building Afghanistan’s main highways, airports, and other vital infrastructure. On per capita
basis, Afghanistan received more Soviet development aid than any other country.

Zahir Shah, the last king of Afghanistan, who reigned from 1933 to 1973.
Relations During the Cold War

The Cold War spanned from the 1950s to the 1990s and was full of conflict between America and Russia. The main superpowers waged war through proxies, or super allies, because any direct conflict with each other could result in nuclear war. The Cold War shaped the Russian mindset about developing countries.

Afghan-American relations became important during the start of the Cold War. In 1958, Prime Minister Daoud Khan became the first Afghan to speak before the United States Congress in Washington, DC. His presentation focused on a number of issues but most importantly underscored the importance of U.S.-Afghan relations. While in Washington, Daoud met with President Dwight Eisenhower, signed an important cultural exchange agreement, and reaffirmed personal relations with Vice President Nixon that began during the latter’s trip to Kabul in 1953.

At that time, the United States declined Afghanistan’s request for defense cooperation but extended an economic assistance program focused on the development of Afghanistan’s physical infrastructure—roads, dams, and power plants. Later, U.S. aid shifted from infrastructure projects to technical assistance programs to develop the skills needed to build a modern economy. Contacts between the United States and Afghanistan increased during the 1950s, especially during the Cuban Revolution between 1953 and 1959. While the Soviet Union was supporting Cuba’s Fidel Castro, the United States was focusing on Afghanistan for strategic purposes: to counter the spread of communism and the strength of the Soviet Union into South Asia, particularly the Persian Gulf.

At the beginning of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1953, the Soviet government had three main long-term objectives. The first was to threaten the Iranian oilfields or put themselves in a position to do so in the coming years. The second was to strengthen influence in the Indian Peninsula. The last goal was to divert western weapons to unproductive areas.
Leading up to the Soviet intervention in the 1970s, Afghanistan’s policy was that of non-alignment, meaning they did not want a superpower ally. However, they still remained on good terms with both America and the Soviet Union. In 1958, Khan tried to create a treaty with America against the Soviet Union because he was frightened of a potential Soviet invasion and needed modern weapons. After the Americans turned down the Afghanistan government, Afghanistan asked U.S.S.R. for aid. With this agreement, the Soviet Union provided financial aid, military personal training, and modern weapons, such as AK-47s and rocket launchers. Daud Khan was forced to resign in 1963 because of the dependence he created on the Soviet Union.
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34.6.2: Rise of Anti-Soviet Sentiment

Mohammad Sardar Daoud Khan, who was the former Prime Minister of Afghanistan, seized power in a 1973 coup and became Afghanistan's first president, making plans to diminish the nation's relationships with the Soviet Union and instead forge closer contacts with the West.

**Learning Objective**

Connect Soviet involvement in Afghanistan to the rise of anti-Soviet efforts

**Key Points**

- In 1973, while King Zahir Shah was on an official overseas visit, Mohammad Sardar Daoud Khan, a former Prime Minister of Afghanistan, launched a bloodless coup and became the first President of Afghanistan.
• In opposition to his foreign policy as Prime Minister, Daoud sought to distance himself from the Soviets and forge closer relations with the West, especially the United States.
• President Daoud met Leonid Brezhnev on a state visit to Moscow from April 12 to 15, 1977, and told the latter that Afghanistan would remain free, and that the Soviet Union would never be allowed to dictate how the country should be governed.
• Daoud tried to modernize and improve the economy of Afghanistan, but made little progress.
• The PDPA, a Soviet-backed communist party, seized power in a military coup in 1978 best known as the Saur Revolution.
• Although supported by the Soviets, the actions taken by the leaders of the PDPA further strained relations with the USSR, which eventually led to their planning an military intervention.

Key Terms

Mohammad Sardar Daoud Khan
The Prime Minister of Afghanistan from 1953 to 1963 who later became the first President of Afghanistan. He overthrew the Musahiban monarchy of his first cousin Mohammed Zahir Shah and declared himself as the first President of Afghanistan from 1973 until his assassination in 1978 as a result of the Saur Revolution.
led by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). He was known for his progressive policies, his efforts for the improvement of women’s rights, and for initiating two five-year modernization plans that increased the labor force by about 50 percent.

**Leonid Brezhnev**

The General Secretary of the Central Committee (CC) of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), presiding over the country from 1964 until his death in 1982. His 18-year term as General Secretary was second only to that of Joseph Stalin in duration. During his rule, the global influence of the Soviet Union grew dramatically, in part because of the expansion of the Soviet military during this time. His tenure as leader was marked by the beginning of an era of economic and social stagnation in the Soviet Union.

**Saur Revolution**

A revolution led by the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) against the rule of self-proclaimed Afghan President Mohammed Daoud Khan on April 27–28, 1978. It led to civil war and the intervention of the Soviet Union.

**Republic of Afghanistan**

Amid charges of corruption and malfeasance against the royal family and poor economic conditions created by the severe 1971–72 drought, former Prime Minister Mohammad Sardar Daoud Khan seized power in a non-violent coup on July 17, 1973, while Zahir
Shah was receiving treatment for eye problems and therapy for lumbago in Italy. Daoud abolished the monarchy, abrogated the 1964 constitution, and declared Afghanistan a republic with himself as its first President and Prime Minister. To counteract his previous mishaps as Prime Minister, Daud led Afghanistan back towards independence and non-alignment. Additionally, Daud sent troops as well as diplomats to surrounding nations to build up foreign relations and decrease Afghanistan’s dependence on the Soviet Union.

President Daoud met Leonid Brezhnev on a state visit to Moscow from April 12 to 15, 1977. Daoud asked for a private meeting with the Soviet leader to discuss the increased pattern of Soviet actions in Afghanistan. In particular, he discussed the intensified Soviet attempt to unite the two factions of the Afghan communist parties, Parcham and Khalq. Brezhnev described Afghanistan’s non-alignment as important to the USSR and essential to the promotion of peace in Asia, but warned him about the presence of experts from NATO countries stationed in the northern parts of Afghanistan. Daoud bluntly replied that Afghanistan would remain free, and that the Soviet Union would never be allowed to dictate how the country should be governed.

After returning to Afghanistan, Daoud made plans to diminish his government’s relationships with the Soviet Union, and instead forge closer contacts with the West as well as oil-rich Saudi Arabia and Iran. Afghanistan signed a cooperative military treaty with Egypt and by 1977, the Afghan military and police force were being trained by Egyptian Armed forces. This angered the Soviet Union because Egypt took the same route in 1974 and distanced itself from the Soviets.

During Daoud’s presidency, relations with the Soviet Union continually deteriorated. The Soviets saw his shift to a more Western-friendly leadership as dangerous, including criticism of Cuba’s membership in the Non-aligned Movement and the expulsion of Soviet military and economic advisers. The suppression of political opposition furthermore turned the Soviet-backed
People's Democratic Party (PDPA), an important ally in the 1973 coup against the king, against him.

In 1976, Daoud established a seven-year economic plan for the country. He started military training programs with India and commenced economic development talks with Imperial Iran. Daoud also turned his attention to oil-rich Middle Eastern nations such as Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, and others for financial assistance.

Daoud had however achieved little of what he had set out to accomplish in 1978. The Afghan economy hadn't made any real progress and the Afghan standard of living had not risen. Daoud also garnered much criticism for his single party constitution in 1977, which alienated him from his political supporters. By this time, the two main factions of the PDPA, previously locked in a power struggle, had reached a fragile agreement for reconciliation. Communist-sympathizing army officials were already planning a move against the government. According to Hafizullah Amin, who became Afghan head of state in 1979, the PDPA started plotting the coup in 1976, two years before it materialized.

Saur Revolution

In April 1978, the communist PDPA seized power in Afghanistan in the Saur Revolution. Within months, opponents of the communist government launched an uprising in eastern Afghanistan that quickly expanded into a civil war waged by guerrilla mujahideen against government forces countrywide. The Pakistani government provided these rebels with covert training centers, while the Soviet Union sent thousands of military advisers to support the PDPA government. Meanwhile, increasing friction between the competing factions of the PDPA — the dominant Khalq and the more moderate Parcham — resulted in the dismissal of Parchami cabinet members and the arrest of Parchami military officers under the pretext of a Parchami coup.
In September 1979, Nur Muhammad Taraki, the leader of PDPA, was assassinated in a coup within the PDPA orchestrated by fellow Khalq member Hafizullah Amin, who assumed the presidency. During his short stay in power (104 days), Amin became committed to establishing a collective leadership. When Taraki was ousted, Amin promised “from now on there will be no one-man government ...” Attempting to pacify the population, he released a list of 18,000 people who had been executed and blamed the executions on Taraki. Amin was disliked by the Afghan people. During his rule, opposition to the communist regime increased and the government lost control over the countryside. The state of the Afghan military deteriorated under Amin; due to desertions, the number of military personnel in the Afghan army decreased from 100,000 in the immediate aftermath of the Saur Revolution to somewhere between 50,000 and 70,000.

Meanwhile in the Soviet Union, the Special Commission of the Politburo on Afghanistan, consisting of Yuri Andropov, Andrei Gromyko, Dmitriy Ustinov, and Boris Ponomarev, wanted to end the impression that the Soviet government supported Amin’s leadership and policies.

Amin remained trustful of the Soviet Union until the very end, despite the deterioration of official relations with the Soviet Union. When the Afghan intelligence service handed Amin a report that the Soviet Union would invade the country and topple him, Amin claimed the report was a product of imperialism.
Saur Revolution: The day after the Marxist revolution on April 28, 1978.

Attributions

• Rise of Anti-Soviet Sentiment
  ◦ “Day_after_Saur_revolution.JPG.”
The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan

34.6.3: The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan

On December 27, 1979, Soviet Union forces stormed the Tajbeg Palace in Afghanistan and killed Afghan President Hafizullah Amin, then installed Babrak Karmal as Amin's successor.

Learning Objective

Review the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the challenges it faced

Key Points

- The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was formed after the Saur Revolution on April 27, 1978.
- By mid-1978, a rebellion started, with rebels attacking the local military garrison in the Nuristan region of eastern Afghanistan. Civil war soon spread throughout the country.
- In September 1979, Deputy Prime Minister
Hafizullah Amin seized power, arresting and killing President Taraki.

- Based on information from the KGB, Soviet leaders felt that Prime Minister Hafizullah Amin's actions had destabilized the situation in Afghanistan and the USSR started to discuss how to respond.
- Deteriorating relations and worsening rebellions led the Soviet government, under leader Leonid Brezhnev, to deploy the 40th Army on December 24, 1979; arriving in the capital Kabul, they staged a coup, killing president Amin and installing Soviet loyalist Babrak Karmal from a rival faction.
- The Soviets did not foresee taking such an active role in fighting the rebels; however, their arrival had the opposite effect as it incensed instead of pacified the people, causing the mujahideen rebels to gain strength and numbers.
- The fighting became the Soviet-Afghan War, which lasted for over nine years and was often brutal, with the mujahideen staging guerrilla-style tactics with weapons supplied by the U.S. and other allies.
- The UN, along with much of the international community, was highly critical of the Soviet actions.

**Key Terms**

**Babrak Karmal**

An Afghan politician installed as president of
Afghanistan by the USSR when they invaded in 1979. Policy failures and the stalemate that ensued after the Soviet intervention led the Soviet leadership to become highly critical of his leadership. Under Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet Union deposed him and replaced him with Mohammad Najibullah.

KGB
The main security agency for the Soviet Union from 1954 until its break-up in 1991, acting as internal security, intelligence, and secret police.

People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA)
A socialist party established on January 1, 1965. While a minority, the party helped former prime minister of Afghanistan, Mohammed Daoud Khan, overthrow his cousin, Mohammed Zahir Shah, and established the Republic of Afghanistan. Later in 1978 this party, with help from the Afghan National Army, seized power from Daoud in what is known as the Saur Revolution.

Background

Prior to the arrival of Soviet troops, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) took power after a 1978 coup, installing Nur Mohammad Taraki as president. The party initiated a series of radical modernization reforms throughout the country that were deeply unpopular, particularly among the more traditional rural population and the established power structures. The government vigorously suppressed any opposition and arrested thousands, executing as many as 27,000 political prisoners. Anti-government
armed groups were formed, and by April 1979 large parts of the
country were in open rebellion. The government itself was highly
unstable with in-party rivalry, and in September 1979 the president
was deposed by followers of Hafizullah Amin, who then became
president.

Based on information from the KGB, Soviet leaders felt that Prime
Minister Hafizullah Amin’s actions had destabilized the situation
in Afghanistan. Following his initial coup against and killing of
President Taraki, the KGB station in Kabul warned Moscow that
Amin’s leadership would lead to “harsh repressions, and as a result,
the activation and consolidation of the opposition.”

Despite earlier commitments to not intervene in Afghanistan, as
the situation continued to deteriorate from May–December 1979,
Moscow changed its mind on dispatching Soviet troops. The
reasons for this turnabout are not entirely clear, and several
speculative arguments include the grave internal situation and
inability for the Afghan government to quell the rebellion; the
effects of the Iranian Revolution that brought an Islamic theocracy
into power, leading to fears that religious fanaticism would spread
through Afghanistan and into Soviet Muslim Central Asian republics;
and the deteriorating ties with the United States. Conservatives
believe that this process was reflective of growing Soviet political
influence in the world and that Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in
December 1979 was an attempt to preserve, stabilize, and militarily
intervene on behalf of the communist regime and thus improve
their own political standing.

Soviet Invasion and Coup d’état

On October 31, 1979, Soviet informants to the Afghan Armed Forces,
under orders from the inner circle of advisers under Soviet premier
Brezhnev, relayed information for them to undergo maintenance
cycles for their tanks and other crucial equipment. Meanwhile,
telecommunications links to areas outside of Kabul were severed, isolating the capital. With a deteriorating security situation, large numbers of Soviet Airborne Forces joined stationed ground troops and began to land in Kabul on December 25. Simultaneously, Amin moved the offices of the president to the Tajbeg Palace, believing this location to be more secure from possible threats. According to Colonel General Tukharinov and Merimsky, Amin was fully informed of the military movements, having requested Soviet military assistance to northern Afghanistan on December 17. His brother and General Dmitry Chiangov met with the commander of the 40th Army before Soviet troops entered the country to work out their initial routes and locations.

On December 27, 1979, 700 Soviet troops dressed in Afghan uniforms, including KGB and GRU special forces officers, occupied major governmental, military, and media buildings in Kabul, including their primary target – the Tajbeg Presidential Palace.

That operation began at 7 p.m. when the KGB-led Soviet Zenith Group destroyed Kabul's communications hub, paralyzing Afghan military command. At 7:15, the assault on Tajbeg Palace began; as planned, president Hafizullah Amin was killed. Simultaneously, other objectives were occupied. The operation was fully complete by the morning of December 28, 1979.

A Soviet-organized government, led by Parcham's Babrak Karmal but inclusive of both factions, filled the vacuum. Soviet troops were deployed to stabilize Afghanistan under Karmal in substantial numbers, although the Soviet government did not expect to do most of the fighting in Afghanistan. As a result, however, the Soviets were now directly involved in what had been a domestic war.
International Reaction

Foreign ministers from 34 Islamic nations adopted a resolution that condemned the Soviet intervention and demanded “the immediate, urgent and unconditional withdrawal of Soviet troops” from the Muslim nation of Afghanistan. The UN General Assembly passed a resolution protesting the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan by a vote of 104–18. According to political scientist Gilles Kepel, the Soviet intervention or “invasion” was “viewed with horror” in the West, considered a “fresh twist” on the geo-political “Great Game” of the 19th Century in which Britain feared that Russia sought access to the Indian Ocean and posed “a threat to Western security,” explicitly violating “the world balance of power agreed upon at Yalta” in 1945.
War Continues

Soviet troops occupied the cities and main arteries of communication, while the mujahideen waged guerrilla war in small groups in the almost 80 percent of the country that escaped government and Soviet control. Soviets used their air power to deal harshly with both rebels and civilians, leveling villages to deny safe haven to the enemy, destroying vital irrigation ditches, and laying millions of land mines.

The Soviets did not foresee taking on such an active role in fighting the rebels and attempted to downplay their involvement as light assistance to the Afghan army. However, the arrival of the Soviets had the opposite effect as it incensed instead of pacified the people, causing the mujahideen to gain in strength and numbers. Originally the Soviets thought their forces would strengthen the backbone of the Afghan army and provide assistance by securing major cities, lines of communication, and transportation. The Afghan army forces had a high desertion rate and were loath to fight, especially since the Soviet forces pushed them into infantry roles while they manned the armored vehicles and artillery.

The mujahideen favored sabotage operations such as damaging power lines, knocking out pipelines and radio stations, and blowing up government office buildings, air terminals, hotels, cinemas, and so on. In the border region with Pakistan, the mujahideen would often launch 800 rockets per day. Between April 1985 and January 1987, they carried out over 23,500 shelling attacks on government targets. They concentrated on both civilian and military targets, knocking out bridges, closing major roads, attacking convoys, disrupting the electric power system and industrial production, and attacking police stations and Soviet military installations and air bases. They assassinated government officials and PDPA members and laid siege to small rural outposts.

By the mid-1980s, the Soviet contingent was increased to 108,800 and fighting increased throughout the country, but the military
and diplomatic cost of the war to the USSR was high. By mid-1987 the Soviet Union, now under reformist leader Mikhail Gorbachev, announced it would start withdrawing its forces. The final troop withdrawal started on May 15, 1988, and ended on February 15, 1989. Due to its length, it has sometimes been referred to as the “Soviet Union's Vietnam War” by the Western media, and is thought to be a contributing factor to the fall of the Soviet Union.
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256. The United States and the Mujahideen

34.6.4: The United States and the Mujahideen

The United States viewed the conflict in Afghanistan as an integral Cold War struggle, and the CIA provided assistance to anti-Soviet mujahideen rebels through the Pakistani intelligence services in a program called Operation Cyclone.

Learning Objective

Discuss the ties between the United States and the mujahideen

Key Points

- Although U.S. President Jimmy Carter’s focus was more on Iran during the months before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, he initiated a covert program through the CIA to financially support the Afghan rebels, the mujahideen, in July 1979.
- After the Soviet invasion in December 1979, which
was a surprise to Carter, the CIA expanded the program, code-named Operation Cyclone, and began providing weapons along with money to the mujahideen through the Pakistani intelligence services.

- Operation Cyclone was one of the longest and most expensive covert CIA operations ever undertaken. More than $20 billion in U.S. funds was funneled into the country to train and arm Afghan resistance groups.
- The U.S.-built Stinger antiaircraft missile, supplied to the mujahideen in very large numbers beginning in 1986, struck a decisive blow to the Soviets.
- The Stingers were so renowned and deadly that in the 1990s, the United States conducted a “buy-back” program to keep unused missiles from falling into the hands of anti-American terrorists, an effort which was covertly renewed in the early 2000s.
- Conspiracy theorists have alleged that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were beneficiaries of CIA assistance, a claim which is refuted by many experts.

Key Terms

**Reagan Doctrine**

A strategy orchestrated and implemented by the United States under the Reagan Administration to overwhelm the global influence of the Soviet Union in
an attempt to end the Cold War. Under this doctrine, the United States provided overt and covert aid to anti-communist guerrillas and resistance movements to “roll back” Soviet-backed communist governments in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

**Operation Cyclone**

The code name for the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) program to arm and finance the Jihadi warriors, mujahideen, in Afghanistan from 1979 to 1989, prior to and during the military intervention by the USSR in support of its client, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

**mujahideen**

The term for one engaged in Jihad. In English usage, it originally referred to the guerrilla type military outfits led by the Muslim Afghan warriors in the Soviet--War, but now may refer to jihadist outfits in other countries.

U.S. Response to Afghan-Soviet War

American President Jimmy Carter was surprised by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, as the consensus of the U.S. intelligence community during 1978 and 1979—reiterated as late as September 29, 1979—was that “Moscow would not intervene in force even if it appeared likely that the Khalq government was about to collapse.” Indeed, Carter’s diary entries from November 1979 until the Soviet invasion in late December contain only two short references to Afghanistan, and are instead preoccupied with the ongoing hostage
crisis in Iran. Despite the focus on Iran, Carter had authorized a collaboration between the CIA and Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), and through the ISI, the CIA began providing $500,000 worth of non-lethal assistance to the mujahideen on July 3, 1979—several months before the Soviet invasion.

In the aftermath of the invasion, Carter was determined to respond vigorously to what he considered a dangerous provocation. In a televised speech, he announced sanctions on the Soviet Union, promised renewed aid to Pakistan, and committed the United States to the Persian Gulf’s defense. Carter also called for a boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow, which raised a bitter controversy.

The thrust of U.S. policy for the duration of the war was determined by Carter in early 1980 when he initiated a program to arm the mujahideen through Pakistan’s ISI and secured a pledge from Saudi Arabia to match U.S. funding for this purpose. U.S. support for the mujahideen accelerated under Carter’s successor, Ronald Reagan, at a final cost to U.S. taxpayers of some $3 billion.

**Operation Cyclone**

Operation Cyclone was the code name for the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) covert program to arm and finance the Jihadi warriors, mujahideen, in Afghanistan from 1979 to 1989, prior to and during the military intervention by the USSR in support of its client, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The program leaned heavily toward supporting militant Islamic groups that were favored by the regime of Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq in neighboring Pakistan, rather than less ideological Afghan resistance groups that had been fighting the Marxist-oriented Democratic Republic of Afghanistan regime since before the Soviet intervention. Operation Cyclone was one of the longest and most expensive covert CIA operations ever undertaken. Funding began with $20–$30 million per year in 1980.
and rose to $630 million per year in 1987. Funding continued after 1989 as the mujahideen battled the forces of Mohammad Najibullah’s PDPA during the civil war in Afghanistan (1989–1992).

President Reagan greatly expanded the program as part of the Reagan Doctrine of aiding anti-Soviet resistance movements abroad. To execute this policy, Reagan deployed CIA Special Activities Division paramilitary officers to equip the mujahideen forces against the Soviet Army. Although the CIA and Texas Congressman Charlie Wilson received the most attention for their roles, the key architect of the strategy was Michael G. Vickers, a young CIA paramilitary officer working for Gust Avrakotos, the CIA’s regional head who had a close relationship with Wilson. Vicker's strategy was to use a broad mix of weapons, tactics, logistics, and training programs to enhance the rebels' ability to fight a guerrilla war against the Soviets. Reagan’s program assisted in ending the Soviet’s occupation in Afghanistan.

The United States offered two packages of economic assistance and military sales to support Pakistan's role in the war against the Soviet troops in Afghanistan. The first six-year assistance package (1981–87) amounted to $3.2 billion, equally divided between economic assistance and military sales. The U.S. also sold 40 F-16 aircraft to Pakistan during 1983–87 at a cost of $1.2 billion outside the assistance package. The second six-year assistance package (1987–93) amounted to $4.2 billion. Out of this, $2.28 billion was allocated for economic assistance in the form of grants or loan that carried the interest rate of 2–3 percent. The rest of the allocation ($1.74 billion) was in the form of credit for military purchases. More than $20 billion in U.S. funds was funneled into the country to train and arm the Afghan resistance groups. The support proved vital to the mujahideen’s efforts against the Soviets.

The U.S.-built Stinger antiaircraft missile, supplied to the mujahideen in very large numbers beginning in 1986, struck a decisive blow to the Soviet war effort as it allowed the lightly armed Afghans to effectively defend against Soviet helicopter landings in strategic areas. The Stingers were so renowned and deadly that in
the 1990s, the United States conducted a “buy-back” program to keep unused missiles from falling into the hands of anti-American terrorists. This program may have been covertly renewed following the U.S. intervention in Afghanistan in late 2001 out of fear that remaining Stingers could be used against U.S. forces in the country.

The Soviets were unable to quell the insurgency and withdrew from Afghanistan in 1989, precipitating the dissolution of the Soviet Union. However, the decision to route U.S. aid through Pakistan led to massive fraud as weapons sent to Karachi were frequently sold on the local market rather than delivered to the Afghan rebels. Karachi soon “became one of the most violent cities in the world.” Pakistan also controlled which rebels received assistance. Of the seven mujahideen groups supported by Zia’s government, four espoused Islamic fundamentalist beliefs—and these fundamentalists received most of the funding.

Conspiracy theorists have alleged that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were beneficiaries of CIA assistance. This is refuted by experts such as Steve Coll—who notes that declassified CIA records and interviews with CIA officers do not support such claims—and Peter Bergen, who concludes: “The theory that bin Laden was created by the CIA is invariably advanced as an axiom with no supporting evidence.” U.S. funding went to the Afghan mujahideen, not the Arab volunteers who arrived to assist them.
Reagan and the Mujahideen: President Reagan meeting with Afghan mujahideen leaders in the Oval Office in 1983
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The Taliban is a Sunni Islamic fundamentalist movement that rose to power in Afghanistan after the Soviets withdrew in 1989 and ruled from 1996-2001, enforcing a strict interpretation of Islamic law that resulted in the brutal treatment of many Afghans, especially women.

**Learning Objective**

Generalize how the conflict in Afghanistan led to the rise of Islamism and the Taliban

**Key Points**

- In 1989, with mounting international pressure and military losses against the Afghan rebels, the Soviet Union withdrew from Afghanistan, ending the Soviet-Afghan War.
- Fighting in Afghanistan continued, with the Afghan government under the leadership of President Mohammad Najibullah launching attacks against the rebels without international support.
• Afghanistan descended into political chaos and an estimated 25,000 people died during this period.
• Southern and eastern Afghanistan were under the control of local commanders and in 1994, the Taliban, a Sunni Islamic fundamentalist political movement, took control of southern Afghanistan and forced the surrender of dozens of local leaders.
• In 1996, the Taliban seized Kabul (the capital) and established the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, imposing a strict form of Sharia, which resulted in the brutal treatment of many Afghans, especially women, including sex trafficking and massacres.
• In 2001, the Taliban was overthrown and a new government established, but Afghanistan remains one of the poorest countries in the world due to a lack of foreign investment, government corruption, and the continued Taliban insurgency.

Key Terms

Taliban

A Sunni Islamic fundamentalist political movement in Afghanistan currently waging war (an insurgency, or jihad) within that country. From 1996 to 2001, it held power in Afghanistan and enforced a strict interpretation of Sharia, or Islamic law, of which the international community and leading Muslims have been highly critical.
Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan

An Islamic state established in September 1996 when the Taliban began its rule of Afghanistan after the fall of Kabul. At its peak, the Taliban established control over approximately 90% of the country, whereas parts of the northeast were held by the Northern Alliance. The regime ended on December 9, 2001, forced out by the Northern Alliance backed by U.S. air forces.

Al Qaeda

A militant Sunni Islamist multi-national organization founded in 1988 by Osama bin Laden, Abdullah Azzam, and several other Arab volunteers who fought against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s.

Osama bin Laden

The founder of al-Qaeda, the organization that claimed responsibility for the September 11 attacks on the United States, along with numerous other mass-casualty attacks worldwide.

Soviet Withdrawal From Afghanistan

Faced with mounting international pressure and numerous casualties, the Soviets withdrew in 1989 but continued to support Afghan President Mohammad Najibullah until 1992. Following the Soviet withdrawal, some of the foreign volunteers (including Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda) and young Afghan refugees, went on to continue violent jihad in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and abroad. According to political scientist Mohammed H. Hafez, some of the
thousands of Afghan Arabs who left Afghanistan went on to become “capable leaders, religious ideologues and military commanders,” who played “vital roles” as insurgents or terrorists in places such as Algeria, Egypt, Bosnia, and Chechnya. Tens of thousands of Afghan refugee children in Pakistan were educated in madrasas “in a spirit of conservatism and religious rigor,” explains political scientist Gilles Kepel, and went on to fill the ranks and leadership of the Taliban in Afghanistan and Sipah-e-Sahaba in Pakistan. When the Soviet Union fell shortly after its withdrawal from Afghanistan, the volunteers were overjoyed, believing that—in the words of Osama bin Laden—the credit for “the dissolution of the Soviet Union ... goes to God and the mujahideen in Afghanistan ... the US had no mentionable role.”

Continued Civil War

From 1989 until 1992, Najibullah’s government tried to solve the ongoing civil war with economic and military aid, but without Soviet troops on the ground. Pakistan’s spy agency (ISI), headed by Hamid Gul at the time, was interested in a trans-national Islamic revolution that would cover Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia. For this purpose, Pakistan masterminded an attack on Jalalabad for the mujahideen to establish its own government in Afghanistan. Najibullah tried to build support for his government by portraying his government as Islamic, and in the 1990 constitution the country officially became an Islamic state and all references of communism were removed. Nevertheless, Najibullah did not win any significant support, and with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991, he was left without foreign aid. This coupled with the internal collapse of his government led to his ousting from power in April 1992. After the fall of Najibullah’s government, the post-communist Islamic State of Afghanistan was established by the Peshawar Accord, a peace and power-sharing agreement under which all the
Afghan parties were united in April 1992, except for the Pakistani supported Hezb-e Islami of Gulbuddin Hekmatyar. Hekmatyar started a bombardment campaign against the capital city Kabul, which marked the beginning of a new phase in the war.

Due to the sudden initiation of the war, working government departments, police units, and a system of justice and accountability for the newly created Islamic State of Afghanistan did not have time to form. Atrocities were committed by individuals of the different armed factions while Kabul descended into lawlessness and chaos. For civilians there was little security from murder, rape, and extortion. An estimated 25,000 people died during the most intense period of bombardment by Hekmatyar’s Hezb-i Islami and the Junbish-i Milli forces of Abdul Rashid Dostum, who created an alliance with Hekmatyar in 1994. Half a million people fled Afghanistan.

Southern and eastern Afghanistan were under the control of local commanders such as Gul Agha Sherzai and others. In 1994, the Taliban (a movement originating from Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam-run religious schools for Afghan refugees in Pakistan) also developed in Afghanistan as a political-religious force. The Taliban first took control of southern Afghanistan in 1994 and forced the surrender of dozens of local Pashtun leaders.

In late 1994, forces of military commander Ahmad Shah Massoud held on to Kabul. Rabbani’s government took steps to reopen courts, restore law and order, and initiate a nationwide political process with the goal of national consolidation and democratic elections. Massoud invited Taliban leaders to join the process but they refused.
Afghan Civil War: A totally destroyed section of Kabul during the civil war in 1993.

Taliban Takes Power

The Taliban's early victories in late 1994 were followed by a series of defeats that resulted in heavy losses. The Taliban attempted to capture Kabul in early 1995 but were repelled by forces under Massoud. In September 1996 as the Taliban, with military support from Pakistan and financial support from Saudi Arabia, prepared for another major offensive, Massoud ordered a full retreat from Kabul. The Taliban seized Kabul in the same month and established the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan. They imposed a strict form of Sharia, similar to that found in Saudi Arabia.

The Taliban have been condemned internationally for the harsh enforcement of their interpretation of Islamic Sharia law, which has resulted in the brutal treatment of many Afghans, especially women. During their rule from 1996 to 2001, the Taliban and their allies committed massacres against Afghan civilians, denied UN food supplies to 160,000 starving civilians, and conducted a policy of
scorched earth, burning vast areas of fertile land and destroying tens of thousands of homes. In its post-9/11 insurgency, the group has been accused of using terrorism as a specific tactic to further their ideological and political goals. Several Taliban and al-Qaeda commanders also ran a network of human trafficking, abducting women and selling them into sex slavery in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

After the fall of Kabul to the Taliban, Massoud and Dostum formed the Northern Alliance. The Taliban defeated Dostum’s forces during the Battles of Mazar-i-Sharif (1997–98). Pakistan’s Chief of Army Staff, Pervez Musharraf, began sending thousands of Pakistanis to help the Taliban defeat the Northern Alliance. From 1996 to 2001, the al-Qaeda network of Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri was also operating inside Afghanistan. From 1990 to September 2001, around 400,000 Afghans died in the internal mini-wars.

Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan: Map of the situation in Afghanistan in late 1996; Massoud (red), Dostum (green) and Taliban (yellow) territories.
The map shows that the southern two thirds of Afghanistan was Taliban territory. The remaining third of the country was divided between Dostums territory in the northwest and Massouds territory in the northeast. The Dostums territory and Massouds territory together comprised the Northern Alliance.

On September 9, 2001, Massoud was assassinated by two Arab suicide attackers in Panjshir province of Afghanistan. Two days later, the September 11 attacks were carried out in the United States. The U.S. government suspected Osama bin Laden as the perpetrator of the attacks, and demanded that the Taliban hand him over. After refusing to comply, the October 2001 Operation Enduring Freedom was launched. During the initial invasion, U.S. and UK forces bombed al-Qaeda training camps. The United States began working with the Northern Alliance to remove the Taliban from power.

**Fall of the Taliban: Continued Insurgency**

In December 2001, after the Taliban government was overthrown and the new Afghan government under President Hamid Karzai was formed, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) was established by the UN Security Council to assist the Karzai administration and provide basic security. Taliban forces also began regrouping inside Pakistan, while more coalition troops entered Afghanistan and began rebuilding the war-torn country.

Shortly after their fall from power, the Taliban began an insurgency to regain control of Afghanistan. Over the next decade, ISAF and Afghan troops led many offensives against the Taliban but failed to fully defeat them. Afghanistan remains one of the poorest countries in the world due to a lack of foreign investment, government corruption, and the Taliban insurgency.
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- **Emergence of Extremism**
Module Overview

Module 1 contains the following content – all original by author or contained in the Lumen textbook.

Textbook Reading – Chapter 20

Discussion for Chapter 20

This discussion will be based on the textbook reading for the chapter. For your initial post in this discussion please answer the following questions: “Do you agree more with Thomas Hobbes or John Locke regarding the natural state of man? Why?”

Initial posts must be at least 200 words in length and have at least one quote from the textbook.

After posting your initial post you are required to reply to at least one other student. Replies must be at least 100 words in length and have at least one new quote from the textbook (not a quote you used in your initial post and not a quote that is in the post you are replying to).

All posts must be made by the deadline for the discussion forum to receive full credit.

SS112 Discussion prompts by John McLean are licensed under CC-BY 4.0

Short Essay for Chapter 20:

Submit your short essay for Module #1 here. The question for this essay is: “Out of all the Enlightenment Philosophers discussed in this chapter who had the most influential ideas? Who had the most radical? Which individual do you think had the best ideas and why?”

This essay must be at least 500 words in length and have at least one quote from the textbook to receive full credit.

SS112 Short Essays by John McLean are licensed under CC-BY 4.0
Quiz: All quiz questions are original. The course map links to the quiz.
PART XV

MODULE #2: THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTS
Module 2 contains the following content – all original by author or contained in the Lumen textbook.

Textbook Reading – Chapter 21

Discussion Forum:

This discussion will be based on the textbook reading for the chapter. For your initial post in this discussion please answer the following questions: “What is your opinion of Enlightened Despots like Frederick the Great or Catherine the Great described in this chapter? Do you think their reforms represented a significant step forward for their countries? Or, as absolute rulers who never supported democracy, was their impact on all the citizens (rich and poor alike) of their countries limited?”

After posting your initial post you are required to reply to at least one other student. Replies must be at least 100 words in length and have at least one new quote from the textbook (not a quote you used in your initial post and not a quote that is in the post you are replying to).

All posts must be made by the deadline for the discussion forum to receive full credit.

SS112 Discussion prompts by John McLean are licensed under CC-BY 4.0

Short Essay:

Submit your short essay for Module #2 here. The question for this essay is: “Which of the Enlightened Despots listed in this chapter do you think had the biggest positive impact on their country? Which specific policies of that ruler do you think were the most important and why?”

This essay must be at least 500 words in length and have at least one quote from the textbook to receive full credit.

SS112 Short Essays by John McLean are licensed under CC-BY 4.0
Quiz: All quiz questions are original and the quiz is linked on the course map.
PART XXVI
RESEARCH PAPER
ASSIGNMENT
History of Western Civilizations II online

Research Paper overview, Spring 2018–worth 25% of final grade
due Sun. May 13th by 11:55pm.

For History of Western Civilizations II in the Spring 2018 semester, you will be required to do a 1500 word research paper. For this paper you will choose one of the topics we covered in class and provide more detailed information about that topic. You can choose from the following topics:

1. The Enlightenment
2. The French Revolution
3. The Industrial Revolution
4. The causes of World War I
5. The causes of World War II
6. The Cold War

For the topic you choose you must discuss the following in your paper:
- the background causes of your topic; why it occurred
- where and when it occurred
- how regular people were affected in their everyday lives
- what were the long term impacts of the event

You can discuss more areas than these, but you must cover at least these areas.

Sources

For the topic you choose, your textbook readings can be background information for your paper, but since this is a research paper, you must find and use at least 3 sources from the HCCC Library. The textbook does not count as one of the three required
sources! These required sources can be books or e-books from the library, or articles from online library databases. In the learning module folder I have posted links to the Herkimer Library databases. Please use these databases to find at least 3 sources. If you want to use more sources than this, that's fine, but you have to have at least these three from the Herkimer library. Please note: You cannot use any random website! Any online articles you use must be from the Herkimer Library databases.

In the final paper I will be looking for lots of quotes from your sources that illustrate the three topics you are writing on. A good rule of thumb is you should have at least 3 quotes from 3 separate sources not counting the textbook (so at least 9 in total) if you want to get an A on this paper.

The final paper must be at least 1500 words long. The paper can be longer, but shorter papers will be penalized. I will read and briefly comment on rough drafts if you email them to me.

Papers will be graded based on the following criteria: First, there should be an introductory paragraph where you briefly talk about the topic you picked and what you plan to cover. Second, in the body of the paper, you should have at least a paragraph on each of the areas listed above, for example why it occurred, where and when, etc. In these paragraphs you should have a lot of quotes from your sources with citations showing where the quotes came from. Finally, you should have a conclusion were you sum everything up. I will take off if there are many grammar and spelling errors; you also need to have a works cited page at the end where you list all the sources you used.

Since the paper is due on the last day of class, no late papers will be accepted.

If you have any questions, let me know via email. Good luck!

SS112 Research Paper by John McLean is licensed under CC-BY 4.0