

FRENCH REVOLUTION-I

BACKGROUND OF THE REVOLUTION

Objectives:

1. *To understand the nature of the Ancient Regime that existed in France on the eve of the French Revolution of 1789.*
2. *To have an insight into the political, social and economic conditions in France which ultimately led to the Revolution of 1789.*

1.1. Introduction Towards the end of the eighteenth century, an uprising staged by the French people against the autocracy and aristocracy, which came to be known as the French Revolution, shook Europe. The French Revolution brought about a major transformation of the society and political system in France that lasted from 1789 to 1799. During the course of the Revolution, France was temporarily transformed from an absolute monarchy, where the king monopolized power, to a republic of theoretically free and equal citizens. The effects of the French Revolution were widespread, both inside and outside of France, and the Revolution ranks as one of the most important events in the history of Europe.

During the ten years of the Revolution, France first transformed and then dismantled the *Ancient Regime* (Old Order), the political and social system that existed in France before 1789, and replaced it with a series of different governments. Although none of these governments lasted more than four years, the many initiatives they enacted permanently altered France's political system. These initiatives included the drafting of several bills of rights and constitutions, the establishment of legal equality among all citizens, experiments with representative democracy, the incorporation of the church into the state, and the reconstruction of state administration and the law code.

Many of these changes were adopted elsewhere in Europe as well. Change was a matter of choice in some places, but in others it was imposed by the French army during the French Revolutionary Wars (1792-1797) and the Napoleonic Wars (1799-1815). To later generations of Europeans and non-Europeans, who sought to overturn their political and social systems, the French Revolution provided the most influential model of popular insurrection until the Russian Revolution of 1917.

- 1.2 **Background of the French Revolution of 1789:** Historians are not unanimous regarding the factors that brought about the Revolution of 1789 in France. To some extent at least, the Revolution broke out not because France was backward but because the country's economic and intellectual development was not matched by social and political change that was taking place in France. In the fixed order of the *ancient regime* most bourgeoisie were unable to exercise political and social influence in the state. King Louis XIV, by consolidating absolute monarchy had destroyed the roots of feudalism, yet outward feudal forms persisted and became increasingly burdensome.

Lord Chesterfield described the conditions in France on the eve of the Revolution in the following words: "A monarchy that was despotic and weak; a corrupt and worldly church; a nobility increasingly parasitical; a bankrupt exchequer; and irritated bourgeois; and oppressed peasantry; financial, administrative and economic anarchy, a nation strained and divided by misgovernment and mutual suspicion." Such was the background that existed in France prior to the Revolution of 1789.

1.2.1 **Political Background:**

1.2.1. a. Ancient Regime (Old Order): In order to understand the factors that were responsible for the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789, it is important to examine the conditions and institutions that existed in France prior to the Revolution. These conditions and institutions were collectively known as the *Ancient Regime*. *Ancient Regime* means Old Rule or Old Order in French language. In English the term refers primarily to the political and social system that was established in France under the Valois and Bourbon dynasties. More generally it means any regime which includes the defining features such as: a feudal system under the control of a powerful absolute monarchy supported by the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and the explicit consent of the established Church. This was how Europe had been organized since at least the eighth century. The term *Ancient Regime* is from The Age of Enlightenment (first appeared in print in English in 1794). Similar to other sweeping criticisms of the past, such as the term 'Dark Ages', the concept of *Ancient Regime* was used as an expression of disapproval for the way things were done, and carried an implied approval of a 'New Order'. No one alive during the *Ancient regime* considered himself as living under an 'Old Order'. The term was created by Enlightenment era authors to promote a new cause and discredit the existing order.

As defined by the creators of the term, the *Ancient Regime* developed out of the French monarchy of the Middle Ages, and was swept away centuries later by the French Revolution of 1789. Europe's other *Ancient Regimes* had similar origins, but diverse ends; some gradually became constitutional monarchies, others were torn down by wars and revolutions. Power in the *Ancient Regime* relied on three pillars: the monarchy, the clergy and the aristocracy. Society was divided into three classes known as estates: the clergy, the nobility and the commoners.

1.2.1. b. Royal Absolutism: The politico-social system which existed in France throughout the rule of the Valois and Bourbon dynasties, was half way between feudalism and modernity. France was ruled by a powerful absolute monarch who relied on the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. The absolute monarchy had the explicit support of the established Church. This period in the history of France is often said to have begun with the French renaissance during the reign of Francis I (1515-1547), and to have reached its peak under Louis XIV (1643-1715). As the Italian Renaissance began to fade, France became the cultural capital of Europe. Eventually, however, financial difficulties and excesses of the rulers led to the decline and eventual collapse of the monarchy by the end of the eighteenth century.

The system of *Ancient Regime* culminated in the monarch, the lofty and glittering head of the state. The king claimed to rule by the will of God and not by the consent of the people (Theory of the Divine Right of Kings). Thus, the kings claimed to be responsible to no one but God. The French Kings ruled in an absolute manner. They exercised unlimited powers. They were the chief legislators, executive and dispensers of justice. They imposed taxes and spent money as they pleased. They declared wars and made peace as they wished. They denied certain basic rights to their subjects. Heavy censorship denied freedom of speech and press. Arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, exile or even execution was the hallmarks of the royal absolutism in France.

1.2.1. c. Nature of the Bourbon Rulers: The Bourbon dynasty ruled France for about two centuries from 1589 to 1792. France attained the height of glory under Louis XIV. He was known as the 'Grand Monarch' and 'Sun King'. He believed in the divine sanction of absolutism. He used to say "I am the State." Further he claimed: "The sovereign authority is vested in my person, the legislative powers exist in myself alone...My people are one only with me; national rights and national interests are necessarily combined with my own and only rest in my hands." In order to manifest his power and glory, Louis XIV led the nation in dangerous and expensive wars against his neighbours and undertook construction of magnificent buildings to beautify the capital city of Paris. Thus, his

expensive wars and lavish style of living weakened France financially as well as politically.

More than any other construction of the age, the Palace of Versailles, built by Louis XIV embodied the spirit of absolute monarchy. The magnificent halls, ornate rooms and beautiful gardens surrounding the royal residence added to the grandeur of the Versailles Palace. The aristocracy of France assembled day and night to do homage to the great ruler of France. The court of Versailles which dazzled Europe was comprised of 18,000 people. Out of these 16,000 were attached to the personal service of the king and his family and 2,000 were the courtiers, the favoured guests and nobles. The royal stables contained 1900 horses and more than 200 carriages. In 1789, the total cost of the Versailles extravaganza was \$ 20,000,000.

Yet, Versailles which symbolized the glory of the *Ancient Regime* was also the mark of its decline. Its cost to the French nation was too much. Besides, it created a barrier between monarchy and its subjects.

Louis XIV, the Grand Monarch left a legacy of financial bankruptcy for his successors. While on deathbed, he is said to have advised his successor Louis XV, his great grand son, in these words: "My child,...endeavour to live at peace with your neighbours, do not imitate my fondness for war, not the exorbitant expenditure which I have incurred...Endeavour to relieve the people at the earliest possible moment and thus accomplish what unfortunately, I am unable to do myself."

Louis XV (1715-1774) succeeded his great grand father at the age of five. The first part of the long reign of 59 years falls into the period of Regency (1715-1723) during which period his great uncle, the Duke of Orleans ruled in his name. The confusion and disorder of the Regency was followed by almost two decades of orderly rule and material prosperity under the leadership of the aged Cardinal Fleury (1723-1743). From 1743 until his death in 1774, Louis XV tried to exercise direct control over the government which ultimately led to the instability of the monarchy.

Louis XV displayed an apathy and indifference to the affairs of the state. He was concerned primarily with the pursuit of pleasure and all his life he sought to escape from boredom. Thus, he tried to seek happiness in mad and vicious rounds of pleasure, in hunting, in gambling, in lust, in moving his court from one palace to another, in gratifying the whims and fancies of his numerous mistresses and favourites.

For more than thirty years Louis XV continued through his shameful policies the worst features of the *Ancient Regime*. He also followed a disastrous foreign policy that culminated in the humiliation of the Seven years War (1756-63). His government became increasingly inefficient which was controlled by his mistresses. His enormous court incurred heavy expenditure on the state treasury. All these developments opened the gates of the deluge that swept over France. Louis XV escaped the disaster. However, he could not prevent the progress of new political and social philosophy that repudiated the theory and practice of the irresponsible and arbitrary royal absolutism. The Austrian ambassador at Paris, Comte de Mercy writing to Empress Marie Theresa outlined the conditions in France at the end of Louis XV's reign in these words: "At court, there is nothing but confusion, scandals and injustice. No attempt has been made to carry out good principles of government; everything has been left to chance; the shameful state of the nation's affairs has caused unspeakable disgust and discouragement, while intrigues of those who remain on the scene only increase the disorder. Sacred duties have been left undone, and infamous behaviour tolerated."

The reign of Louis XV ended in 1774 with his death. To his successor he left a heritage of military defeat, financial bankruptcy, parliamentary opposition and intellectual resistance to the existing political and social regime. According to Dr. G.P. Gooch, "The legacy of Louis XV to his countrymen was an ill-governed, discontented, frustrated France. Viewed from a distance, the *Ancient Regime* appeared as solid as the Bastille, but its walls were crumbling for lack of repairs and the foundations showed signs of giving way. The absolute monarchy, the privileged nobles, the intolerant church, the close corporation parlements, had all become unpopular, and the army once the glory of France, was tarnished by the rout at Rossbach. Though there was little thought of republicanism, the mystique of monarchy had almost evaporated."

In 1774, following the death of Louis XV, his grandson, Louis XVI (1774-93) became the king of France at the age of twenty. The new king was an honest and energetic young man who tried to attend to the state affairs. But he tried to avoid difficulties and lacked the capacity to enforce his own judgment. His irresolution made him a blind follower of his advisors, particularly his Queen Marie Antoinette. She was the daughter of Marie Theresa, Empress of Austro-Hungarian Empire. Marie Antoinette was beautiful, gracious and vivacious. She had a strong will, a power of quick decision and a spirit of initiative. However, she lacked in wisdom and breadth of judgment. She did not understand the temperament of the French people and the spirit of the times. Being born in a royal family she could not understand the point of view of the underprivileged. She was extravagant, proud, willful, impatient and fond of pleasure. She

was the centre of a group of greedy persons, who were opposed to all reforms. She excelled in intrigues and was responsible for the many sufferings that befell both the ruler and the ruled during the closing years of the eighteenth century.

1.2.1. d. Inefficient and Corrupt Administrative System: Under Louis XV and Louis XVI, the French administrative system became thoroughly inefficient and corrupt. The king was the head of the state and the head of the administrative structure. He had the authority to appoint ministers and other administrative officials. Ministers were appointed on the basis of their noble birth or favouritism and not because of ability or merit. This led inefficiency and corruption in the administration. Various departments of the administration had ill-defined and overlapping jurisdictions. At different times France had been divided into districts under bailiffs, into provinces under governors, into intendancies under intendants. Besides, there were judicial, educational and ecclesiastic districts. The conflict of jurisdiction added to the difficulties and problems of the people.

Prior to the Revolution of 1789, France was divided into 34 Intendancies. These Intendancies were placed under Intendants. They were selected at first from the ranks of the bourgeois. They were made an integral part of the machinery of the local government. These Intendants possessed great authority. They had the right to administer justice in all Royal Courts. They verified accounts of their subordinate financial administrators. They also attended to the assessment and levy of direct taxes. They controlled movement of the army, organized regular recruitment for the army and directed the Municipal police. The Intendants received their authority directly from the Councils. Legally, the Councils and the Ministers had only an advisory capacity. They were responsible only to the King.

There was neither a representative assembly nor a written constitution to limit the authority of the administrators. Conflict of jurisdiction and rivalries among the administrators, the absence of an executive head in their own midst to formulate long-term policies and projects, overlapping non-differentiated departments and tradition of graft and irresponsible, high-handed procedures taxed the patience of even the most conscious and determined servant of the state.

According to the absolutist theory, all justice in France came from the Monarch, whose officials administered it in his name in the many Royal Courts of Justice, which were established throughout the country. However, the legal system in France was full of confusion. There was no uniform law for the whole country. Different laws were in force in different part of the country. It was

estimated that there were as many as 400 different systems of law in the country. The laws were written in Latin, and thus, they were beyond the comprehension of the common people. The laws were cruel and unjust. Severe punishments were prescribed for ordinary offences. There was no regular criminal procedure. Arbitrary arrest and imprisonment were common. Any influential person could get a letter of cachet issued against the person whom he wanted to punish and the person concerned could be detained in prison for an indefinite period without any trial. There were royal courts, military courts, church courts and courts of finance. Their overlapping jurisdiction added to the confusion and injustice. Thus, the common people in France suffered due to lack of uniform laws and arbitrary administration of justice. There was no guarantee of personal liberty.

The French Kings ruled France without summoning the legislature known as the Estates General since 1614. Louis XIV even abolished the parlement of Paris. The French parlements were high courts of great antiquity. They had the power to review the judgments given in the inferior courts. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, there were thirteen such parlements in France. Each parlement consisted of rich magistrates whose office had become hereditary in course of time. Parlements claimed and exercised certain political powers. They had the right of registering royal edicts and ordinances. They could defer the registration and thereby bring pressure on the King. In 1771, Louis XV abolished these parlements. But they were revived by Louis XVI in 1774.

1.2.2. Social Conditions: The social conditions in France on the eve of the French Revolution of 1789 were antiquated, irrational and oppressive. The French society was based upon the principle of inequality. The French society comprising of around 25 million people was divided into three classes also known as the estates. The clergy constituted the first estate, the nobility, the second estate and the commoners, the third estate.

1.2.2. a. Privileges of the Clergy and the Nobility: The clergy and the nobility comprised one per cent of the total population of France on the eve of the French Revolution of 1789. These two estates being the privileged classes: (1) owned most of the land in France; (2) collected special feudal and church dues from the commoners; (3) were exempted from most of the taxes; (4) were the friends and ministers of the King; and (5) were granted special favours while administering the law.

The clergy of the Roman Catholic Church was rich and powerful. The higher clergy was comprised of the archbishops, bishops and the abbots. They lived luxuriously in their palaces and monasteries. The Church owned nearly a fifth of the land in France. The Church

land yielded a large amount of revenue. In addition, the clergy collected *tithes* (One-tenth of the total produce) on agricultural products. A large part of the Church income went to the higher clergy numbering around five to six thousand. Many of the higher clergy resided at the Royal Court. On the other hand, the large number of the lower clergy, who did the real work were deprived of many of the privileges enjoyed by the higher clergy. While the higher clergy belonged to the nobility, the lower clergy usually came from the third estate.

The nobility of France occupied a peculiar position in the French society. It was no longer the landed nobility of the feudal days; neither were they nobility of office. They merely claimed their position by virtue of their birth and enjoyed certain privileges. They were called the 'Grand Nobles'. About a thousand of them lived at Versailles as courtiers. The country nobles lived on their estates in the provinces. The new nobles were not nobles of birth but men from the middle class who had grown rich and purchased the privileges of the nobility of the birth. They were known as the 'nobility of the robe'.

The nobles had lost all political power. They either entered the army or the church. Important public offices like ambassadors were reserved for them. A majority of the nobles had no lands and derived their income from their old feudal rights. They were exempted from the bulk of the taxes.

The nobility as a whole enjoyed one special privilege which was a serious and unnecessary injury to the peasants. That was the exclusive right of hunting, which was the chief pastime and sport of the nobles. Although the game destroyed their crops, the peasants were required not to disturb the game and thus, suffer the loss of their crops for the pleasure of the nobles.

1.2.2. b. Underprivileged Commoners: Below the two privileged classes (clergy and nobility) were the underprivileged commoners known as the third estate. The third estate was sub-divided into the bourgeoisie (middle class), the artisans and the peasants. The bourgeois comprised of lawyers, physicians, teachers, merchants, bankers, manufacturers and men of literature. Many of them were rich, intelligent, energetic, educated and well to do. This class especially resented the existing political and social conditions in France.

Belonging to the third estate, but beneath the bourgeois were the artisans living in towns and cities. They were comparatively a smaller class as the industrial life in France was not yet highly developed. These artisans were usually organized in guilds.

The peasants formed the majority of the third estate. France was an agricultural country. Thus, more than ninety per cent of the population was peasants. About a million of the peasants were serfs. The rest were free men, but they were all discontented against the existing system of the government and social organization. The burden of the society was on their shoulder. Nearly the entire revenue of the government was raised from the third estate. The peasants paid nearly 55% in taxes of what they produced or earned. The peasants paid taxes to the state, *tithes* to the Church, and feudal dues to the nobles. The peasants paid tolls to the nobles for the use of the roads and bridges in their estates. The peasants were forced to use the flour mill, oven and winepress of the nobles and paid for the service.

The peasants also paid indirect taxes like the *gabelle* (salt tax). The abuse connected with the administration of the salt-tax was the most glaring and scandalous. The salt-tax collectors called *gabellous* were the most hated by the French people. In France, each family was required by law to buy annually a specific amount of salt for household use. The price of the salt was very high in northern and central provinces and less in others. As a result many individuals turned into smugglers bringing in salt from the provinces where the rate of the salt was cheaper. Under these circumstances the *gabellous* used to make house to house searches and harass the people for hoarding of the salt. Besides the salt tax, the commoners had to pay the excise duty, *taille* (property tax), customs duties, etc. The feudal dues include *corvee* (forced labour) of two or three days and contribution in kind.

The French peasants, suppressed, oppressed and depressed were discontented about their existing condition. They were on the verge of starvation. A large number of the peasants who knew nothing of the statecraft and who were ignorant of the destructive and subversive theories of Voltaire and Rousseau were quite aware of the necessity of reforms by the hard circumstances of their miserable lives. They felt that the feudal dues should be abolished, and that the excessive taxes of the state should be reduced. Thus, the third estate desired a change in the government, society and economic conditions. The large and growing middle class and some of the nobility and the working class had absorbed the ideology of equality and freedom of the individual.

1.2.3. Economic Conditions: Among the direct causes of the French Revolution was a massive financial crisis caused by the enormous debt, government's lavish spending and the antiquated system of taxation, which brought little money to the national treasury. The existing tax system had placed the greatest tax burden on the shoulders of the third estate and virtually ignored the first two estates of their responsibilities. Successive attempts at

reforming the system proved fruitless in the face of opposition from the clergy and the nobility.

1.2.3. a. Bankruptcy of the French Government: The French government faced bankruptcy of the worst type. Since 1614, the French monarchy had operated without summoning the legislature of France known as the Estates General. The successive Kings used to manage their fiscal affairs by increasing the burden of the ancient and unequal system of taxes, by borrowing money, and sometimes by selling noble titles and other privileges. However, noble titleholders were exempted from further taxes. On the eve of the Revolution, France was deeply in debt and was on the brink of bankruptcy. Extravagant expenditures by Louis XIV on luxuries such as the construction and maintenance of the magnificent palace of Versailles, the social extravaganza of the royal court during the reign of Louis XIV, Louis XV and Louis XVI and the luxurious taste of Marie Antoinette, queen of Louis XVI were compounded by heavy expenditure on the Seven Years War (1756-63) and the American War of Independence (1776-83). The empty national treasury was the spark that set the French Revolution of 1789 in motion. While the French peasants were starving and dying, the royal court and the clergy and the nobles were having festivities and banquets. The French government mishandles the national economy. It had no regular budget. It wasted money without proper planning and the national debt went on increasing.

1.2.3. b. Heavy Taxes: Unlike the trading nations, France could not rely solely on tariffs to generate income. While average tax rates were higher in Britain, the burden on the common people was greater in France. Taxation in France relied on a system of internal tariffs separating the regions in France, which prevented a unified market from developing in the country. Taxes, such as the extremely unpopular *gabelle* were contracted out to private collectors who were permitted to collect far more than what the government demanded. This system led to an arbitrary and unequal collection of many of the consumption taxes in France. Further, the royal and feudal (signorial) taxes were collected in the form of compulsory labour (*corvee*).

The system of taxation in France excluded the nobles and the clergy from having to pay taxes. The tax burden was thus, borne by the peasants, wage earners and the professional and business classes. These groups were also cut off from most positions of power in the regime causing a great deal of unrest among them.

Many public officials had to buy their positions from the King. They tried to make profit out of their appointment not only to make up the money that they had to pay for their positions but also to enjoy hereditary rights over these positions. For instance, in a civil

lawsuit, judges had to be paid some fees by the parties to the litigation. Such a practice put justice out of the reach of the common people.

1.2.3. c. Failure of Economic Reforms: During the regimes of Louis XV (1715-74) and Louis XVI (1774-93) different finance ministers were appointed to improve the financial condition of France. The most notable among them was Turgot (1774-76). On the subject of finances his mind was made up. In the first place he intended to follow a policy of strict economy. In a letter to the King Turgot outlined his views summarizing them in the phrase: "No bankruptcy, no new taxes and no loans." By rigid economy, Turgot effected satisfactory savings for the treasury. However, the King was reluctant to cut down royal expenditure.

In order to improve the economic conditions of the people in general, Turgot issued the First Reform Edict in 1774, which was concerned with the grain trade. This edict abolished all government regulations related to the purchase and sale of grain and allowed full freedom in inter-provincial grain trade. However, Turgot's edict did not achieve much success. His enemies who were interested in the old system opposed his edict of reform. Besides, shortage of grains added to the failure of this experiment. Fear of famine brought disorder and there was an increase in grain prices. This resulted in widespread disturbances which came to be known as the 'Grain War', which had to be severely put down. Thus, Turgot's experiment in liberalization of the agricultural sector ended in a failure.

In spite of these failures, Turgot continued to suggest reforms. Early in 1776, he presented before the Parlement of Paris several other reforms. The two most important among them were the abolition of *corvee* and the disbandment of most of the guild corporations. He also proposed to introduce the principle of tax equality. Through this proposal he suggested that the privileged classes also should be taxed in order to raise additional revenue for the state. The reform proposal concerning the guilds intended to destroy their monopolies and restore the natural law of free competition. By doing away with the guilds, Turgot wanted to liberate the industry, advance commercial development, lower prices and allow the artisans the enjoyment of their natural right to labour.

The proposed Reform Edicts of Turgot met with severe opposition from the Parlement of Paris. In spite of this opposition, Louis XVI ordered the registration of these edicts. However, Turgot and the King had to face opposition and hostility from most powerful groups and privileged classes such as guilds, parlements, court favourites and especially the Queen, Marie Antoinette. Under heavy pressure

from these quarters, Louis XVI had no other alternative but to dismiss Turgot from his position in 1776. The guild corporations were re-established and the privileged classes still remained outside the tax net.

Following the dismissal of Turgot, after several months, Louis XVI appointed Necker (1776-81), the most famous of the bankers as the Director General of Finance. In order to improve financial resources of France, Necker, at first resorted to new loans and administrative reforms. However, the French support to the English colonies in America against England in the American War of Independence proved to be costly to the national treasury and national debt went on increasing by more than one and a half billion livres.

The administrative reforms of Necker were sound, though hardly sufficient as a remedy. He suggested the reduction of many of the unnecessary offices, simplified the accounting system and began to limit the functions of the revenue farmers by taking over the collection of several of the taxes. He floated loans of several million livres without increasing taxes during the years of the war. These measures added to the reputation of Necker as a financial wizard. However, later he was forced to raise loans to pay the interest charges on the earlier loans. This led to the financial crisis. As the financial situation went out of control, Necker had no other option but to suggest that the privileged classes must be taxed. Following this suggestion, Necker met with the same fate as that of Turgot and was dismissed.

Following the dismissal of Necker, Louis XVI appointed some other ministers between 1781 and 1783 who tried to do their best in solving the financial chaos in France. In a desperate attempt to bail out the monarchy from the economic crisis and financial disaster, Louis XVI appointed Calonne (1783-87) who had the support of the Queen, Marie Antoinette. He was highly intelligent and resourceful person. He undertook his duties with a full realization of the gravity of the situation.

Calonne believed that the best remedy for financial ailments of France was the restoration of the confidence of the people in the government and emphasized that the best way to restore the public confidence was to give the appearance of prosperity. Thus, Calonne threw economy to the winds and expanded the credit of the government by borrowing heavily from the capitalists. During his tenure of three years he borrowed a huge amount of money. A small part of the expenditure went to silence the opposition to his reforms such as publishers of newspapers and members of the Parlement of Paris. Certain amount was also spent to win the support of the royal family and the court. The greater part of the

funds went to meet the outstanding indebtedness and to promote public works.

Thus, an artificial prosperity set in a boom period in France. Increased production held out new goods and employment increased and the income of the workers also increased considerably. Besides, France witnessed a few good agricultural seasons and commerce and industry did not suffer as war with England had officially ended by the Treaty of Paris (1783). Meanwhile, the government expenditure began to increase whereas its income from taxation lagged behind.

The economic boom was like a bubble which burst very soon. In spite of a steady increase in taxes the annual deficit had risen to more than one hundred million livres. Under these circumstances the economic crisis was developing to serious proportions. France had reached a state of virtual bankruptcy. No one was ready to lend funds to the King which would be sufficient to meet the expenses of the government and the court. The loans amounted to one thousand six hundred and forty six millions and there was an annual deficit of a hundred and forty million livres.

Finding that the economic crisis in France was beyond redemption, Calonne presented a secret memorandum to Louis XVI in which he laid down a comprehensive plan of reform. Louis XVI reluctantly gave Calonne his support to summon an Assembly of Notables comprising of 144 representatives of the three estates on 22 February 1787 to address the financial situation as he was certain that the Parlement of Paris would never approve his reform proposals.

Calonne appeared before the Assembly of Notables, read an indictment of the *Ancient Regime* and then presented his reform proposals. In these proposals Calonne suggested: (1) the abolition of *corvee*; (2) abolition of internal customs; (3) permission for free grain trade within France; (4) extension of the system of provincial assemblies throughout France; (5) decreasing the burden of *taille* (property tax) and *gabelle* (salt tax); (6) transformation of the Bank of Discount into a State Bank; and (7) proposal to impose land tax payable by all propertied persons whether the clergy, nobility or the commoners.

The members of the Assembly of Notables felt that by approving Calonne's reform proposals they themselves would put an end to their social supremacy, destroy their fiscal privileges and agree to a sweeping reform of the entire political, social and economic structure of France. The huge deficit that Calonne had incurred gave an opportunity to the Assembly of Notables to mask their selfish opposition to the reforms suggested by Calonne on the

pretext of public interest. The resistance to Calonne's proposed reforms was so much that Louis XVI was forced to dismiss him. Fearing for his life, Calonne fled to England.

1.2.2. d. Famines: The economic and financial problems of France were compounded by a great scarcity of food in the 1780s. Crop failure in the 1780s caused these shortages, which led to a steep increase in the price of the bread. The bread crisis was one of the chief causes that led to the mob of Paris to initiate the Revolution of 1789. The poor conditions in the countryside had forced the rural population to move into Paris and the city was overcrowded and filled with hungry and disaffected masses of people.

1.2.2. e. Taxes By Edicts: As the economic situation and financial condition in France began to worsen, Louis XVI tried to impose additional taxes by issuing Royal Edicts. However, he had to face strong opposition from different sections. As the bankruptcy of the state was beyond anybody's control, the King was advised to summon the defunct Estates General in order to bring about a solution to the economic crisis of the country. Louis XVI, hoping to get support for his tax proposals, agreed to summon the estates General. The meeting of the Estates general on 5th May 1789, and subsequent events brought about the Revolution of 1789 in France.

Questions

1. Discuss the conditions in France on the eve of the Revolution of 1789.
2. Analyze the political and social conditions in France prior to the Revolution of 1789.
3. How far the social and economic conditions were responsible for the outbreak of the Revolution of 1789 in France?
4. Examine the political and economic conditions in France on the eve of the Revolution of 1789.
5. Describe the political, social and economic factors that led to the Revolution of 1789 in France.



FRENCH REVOLUTION-II

CONTRIBUTION OF THE PHILOSOPHERS

Objectives:

1. To understand the intellectual background of the French Revolution of 1789.
2. To study the philosophical views of various French philosophers, especially related to the state and society.
3. To review the contribution of the Encyclopedists and Physiocrats to the understanding of the conditions prior to the French Revolution of 1789.

2.1. Introduction: In addition to the economic and social difficulties, the *Ancient Regime* was undermined intellectually by the apostles of the Enlightenment. The philosophers were extremely critical of the Ancient Regime. In their writings, the French philosophers discredited the old order and generated optimism about the future. The philosophers introduced ideas such as constitutional monarchy, republicanism, popular sovereignty and social equality and influenced the course of the Revolution. Voltaire attacked the church and absolutism; Montesquieu made English constitutionalism fashionable and advocated the Theory of Separation of Powers, Rousseau promoted the Social Contract Theory through which he highlighted his concept of popular sovereignty. His influence on the French Revolution was more direct than any other philosopher. Denis Diderot and the Encyclopedists, through articles on various subjects attacked tradition and the Ancient Regime. Physiocrats advocated economic reform. The following were the prominent French philosophers who inspired the French Revolution of 1789.

The French philosophers were not conscious advocates of violent revolution. When the Revolution came, one of the philosophers who lived to witness its violence wrote: "The philosophers did not want to do all that has been done, nor to use the means that have been employed, nor to act as rapidly as has been done". They were the enemies of ancient abuses that long demanded suppression. Reason prompted them to attack the forces of superstition, ignorance and folly that continued and incompetent administration, a crushing financial system, a barbarous judicial procedure, religious cruelty, economic waste and confusion.

In several ways the philosophers demonstrated the rottenness of the French institutions through satire and wit, criticism and comparison, analogy, sociological theory and downright abuse. The French philosophers challenged the tradition and authority of the King. They believed that the *Ancient Regime* must go in order to bring about a better world. The philosophers questioned the basis of authority that existed upon revelation (religion), formulated new theories, aroused new enthusiasm and fixed new ideas for all mankind. The philosophers were the standard bearers of a faith that spread from France through all the civilized world. While destroying the old order, they established the basis of a new order.

2.2. Voltaire (1694-1778): Voltaire's intelligence, wit and style made him one of France's greatest writers and philosophers. famous writer and critic, much sought after by Louis XV of France, Frederick the Great of Prussia and Catherine the Great of Russia. Through his poems, biographies, histories, essays and dramas he attacked traditions and beliefs as well as existing institutions like the church and the state.

Francois Marie Arouet (pen name Voltaire) was born on 21 November 1694 in Paris. He was the son of a notary. He was educated at the Jesuit Collège Louis-le-Grand where he said he learned nothing but "Latin and Stupidities". He left school at 17 and soon made friends among the Parisian aristocrats. His humorous verses made him a favorite in society circles. Because of insults to the regent, Philippe II d'Orléans, wrongly ascribed to him, Voltaire was sent to the Bastille in 1717 for 11 months. During his time in prison Francois Marie wrote "Oedipe" which was to become his first theatrical success and adopted his pen name "Voltaire." He also undertook the writing of an epic poem on Henry IV, the "Henriade". It was at this time that he began to call himself Voltaire. Oedipe won him fame and a pension from the regent. Voltaire acquired an independent fortune through speculation; he was often noted for his generosity but also displayed shrewd business acumen throughout his life and became a millionaire.

In 1726, a young nobleman, the Chevalier de Rohan, resented a witticism made at his expense by Voltaire who was beaten. Far from obtaining justice, Voltaire was imprisoned in the Bastille through the influence of the powerful Rohan family. He was released only upon his promise to go into exile to England. The episode left an indelible impression on Voltaire: for the rest of his life he exerted himself to his utmost in struggling against judicial arbitrariness. During his more than two years (1726–29) in England, Voltaire met the English literary men of the period. Voltaire was attracted to the philosophy of John Locke and ideas of mathematician and scientist, Sir Isaac Newton. He studied

England's Constitutional Monarchy and its religious tolerance. While in England, Voltaire wrote the first of his historical works. "A History of Charles XII of Sweden", which remains a classic in biography.

Voltaire was particularly interested in the philosophical rationalism of the time, and in the study of the natural sciences. He was impressed by the greater freedom of thought in England. Voltaire's "Letters Concerning the English Nation", which appeared in 1733 in English, and in 1734 in French as "Lettres Philosophiques", may be said to have initiated the vogue of English philosophy and science that characterized the literature of the Enlightenment. In this book, Voltaire praised English customs and institutions. In this work, Voltaire described the country, England, where opinion was free and government constitutional; where religious persecution was unknown and every one was permitted to go to heaven in his own way; where the middle class was as respectable as the nobility; where civil liberties were guaranteed and men of letters and sciences were honoured. Voltaire pointed out the lack of these praiseworthy features in the French polity and society. It was interpreted as criticism of the French government and in 1734, the book was formally banned in France and in 1734, Voltaire was forced to leave Paris again.

After his return to France from England in 1729 and his banishment from Paris in 1734, Voltaire produced several tragedies. These included 'Brutus' (1730) and "Zaire" (1732). In 1733 he met Madam Emile du Châtelet, whose intellectual interests, especially in science, matched with his own. They took up residence together at Cirey, in Lorraine. In 1746, Voltaire was voted into the "Academie Francaise." In 1749, after the death of Emile du Chatelet and at the invitation of the King of Prussia, Frederick the Great, Voltaire moved to Potsdam, near Berlin in Germany. In 1753, Voltaire left Potsdam to return to France.

In 1759, Voltaire purchased an estate called Ferney near the French-Swiss border where he lived until just before of his death. Ferney soon became the intellectual capital of Europe. Voltaire worked continuously throughout the years, producing a constant flow of books, plays and other publications. He wrote hundreds of letters to his circle of friends and received hosts of visitors who came to do homage to the 'patriarch of Ferney'. He was always a voice of reason. Voltaire was often an outspoken critic of religious intolerance and persecution and employed himself in seeking justice for victims of religious or political persecution and in campaigning against the practice of torture. He regularly contributed to the Encyclopedia and managed his estate, taking an active interest in improving the condition of his tenants.

Voltaire also edited the works of Corneille, wrote commentaries on Racine, and turned out a stream of anonymous novels and pamphlets in which he attacked the established institutions of his time. Ironically, it is one of these great works, "Candide" (1759) that is most widely read today. It is the masterpiece among his 'philosophical romances'.

In 1778, at the age of 84, Voltaire returned triumphantly to France to attend the first performance of his tragedy "Irène" in Paris. But the emotion was too much for him and he died in Paris soon afterward. In order to obtain Christian burial he had signed a partial retraction of his writings. This was considered insufficient by the church, but he refused to sign a more general retraction. To a friend he gave the following written declaration: "I die adoring God, loving my friends, not hating my enemies, and detesting persecution." An abbot secretly conveyed Voltaire's corpse to an abbey in Champagne, where he was buried. His remains were brought back to Paris in 1791 and buried in the Panthéon.

Through his philosophical writings, Voltaire became the torchbearer of the French Revolution of 1789. He boldly attacked the *Ancient Regime* and criticized the existing political and religious beliefs and institutions. His plays, historical works and philosophical writings inspired the French people to question the political, social and economic conditions that existed in France.

2.3. Montesquieu (1689-1755): Montesquieu was one of the great political philosophers of the Enlightenment. He constructed a naturalistic account of the various forms of government, and of the causes that made them what they were and that advanced or constrained their development. He used this account to explain how governments might be preserved from corruption. He considered despotism as a danger for any government not already despotic. In order to prevent despotism, Montesquieu argued that it could best be prevented by a system in which different bodies exercised legislative, executive, and judicial power, and in which all those bodies were bound by the rule of law. This theory of the separation of powers had an enormous impact on liberal political theory. Montesquieu's Theory of the Separation of Powers greatly contributed to the framing of the constitution of the United States of America and also inspired the French people in their Revolution against the autocratic regime in France.

The original name of Montesquieu was Charles Louis de Secondat. He was born in Bordeaux, France, in 1689 to a wealthy family. Despite his family's wealth, De Secondat was placed in the care of a poor family during his childhood. He later went to college and

studied science and history, eventually becoming a lawyer in the local government. De Secondat's father died in 1713 and he was placed under the care of his uncle, Baron de Montesquieu. The Baron died in 1716 and left De Secondat his fortune, his office as president of the Bordeaux Parliament, and his title of Baron de Montesquieu. Later he became a member of the Bordeaux and French Academies of Science and studied the laws and customs and governments of the countries of Europe. He gained fame in 1721 with his "Persian Letters", which criticized the lifestyle and liberties of the wealthy French as well as the church. However, Montesquieu's book "On the Spirit of Laws", published in 1748, was his most famous work. It outlined his ideas on how government would best work.

Montesquieu became famous with his "Persian Letters" (1721), which criticized the lifestyle and liberties of the wealthy French as well as the church and national governments of France. The "Persian Letters" is an epistolary novel consisting of letters sent to and from two fictional Persians, Usbek and Rica, who set out for Europe in 1711 and remain there at least until 1720, when the novel ends. While Montesquieu was not the first writer to try to imagine how European culture might look to travellers from non European countries, he used that device with particular brilliance.

Many of the letters are brief descriptions of scenes or characters. At first their humor derives mostly from the fact that Usbek and Rica misinterpret what they see. In later letters, Usbek and Rica no longer misinterpret what they see; but they find the actions of Europeans quite incomprehensible. They describe people who are so consumed by vanity that they become ridiculous. Usbek shares many of Montesquieu's own views such as the contrast between European and non-European societies, the advantages and disadvantages of different systems of government, the nature of political authority, and the proper role of law. The best government, he says, is that "which attains its purpose with the least trouble", and "controls men in the manner best adapted to their inclinations and desires."

Montesquieu lived in England from 1729 to 1731 and greatly admired the English political system. Being a lawyer and student of constitutional government, Montesquieu summed up his ideas in his book 'L' Esprit Des Lois' (The Spirit of the Laws) published in 1748. Montesquieu's aim in "The Spirit of the Laws" is to explain human laws and social institutions. Montesquieu believed that all things were made up of rules or laws that never changed. He set out to study these laws scientifically with the hope that knowledge of the laws of government would reduce the problems of society and improve human life.

According to Montesquieu, there were three types of government: a monarchy (ruled by a king or queen), a republic (ruled by an elected leader), and a despotism (ruled by a dictator). Montesquieu believed that a government that was elected by the people was the best form of government. He did, however, believe that the success of a democracy - a government in which the people have the power - depended upon maintaining the right balance of power.

Montesquieu argued that the best government would be one in which power was balanced among three groups of officials. He thought England - which divided power between the king (who enforced laws), Parliament (which made laws), and the judges of the English courts (who interpreted laws) - was a good model of this. Montesquieu called the idea of dividing government power into three branches the "separation of powers." He thought it most important to create separate branches of government with equal but different powers. That way, the government would avoid placing too much power with one individual or group of individuals. He wrote, "When the law making and law enforcement powers are united in the same person... there can be no liberty." According to Montesquieu, each branch of government could limit the power of the other two branches. Therefore, no branch of the government could threaten the freedom of the people. His ideas about separation of powers became the basis for the United States Constitution.

"Montesquieu advocated constitutionalism, the preservation of civil liberties, the abolition of slavery, gradualism, moderation, peace, internationalism, social and economic justice with due respect to national and local tradition. He believed in justice and the rule of law; detested all forms of extremism and fanaticism; put his faith in the balance of power and the division of authority as a weapon against despotic rule by individuals or groups or majorities; and approved of social equality, but not to the point which it threatened individual liberty; and out of liberty, not to the point where it threatened to disrupt orderly government." Sir Isaiah Berlin.

2.2.4. Rousseau (1712-1778): Jean Jacques Rousseau has been considered as the Father of the French Revolution. His influence on the French society was much more than any other philosopher. In fact, it was Rousseau who provided the intellectual basis to the French Revolution. His greatest contribution to political philosophy was the famous book, "The Social Contract".

Rousseau was born at Geneva, Switzerland on 28 June 1712. His father was a watchmaker. His mother died shortly after his birth, and his upbringing was haphazard. At the age of 16 Rousseau

started a life of a wanderer. During this period he came into contact with Louise de Warens in 1728 who became his patron and later his lover. She arranged for his trip to Turin, where he became an unenthusiastic Roman Catholic convert. After serving as a footman in a powerful family, he left Turin and spent most of the next dozen years at Chambéry, Savoy, with his patron. In 1742 he went to Paris and came in contact with the circle of Denis Diderot, who was the editor of the Encyclopedia. Rousseau contributed articles on Music to the Encyclopedia. His autobiographical account *Les Confessions* (The Confessions) written in 1783 offer an insight into his turbulent life.

In 1749, Rousseau won first prize in a contest, held by the Academy of Dijon, on the question: "Has the progress of the sciences and arts contributed to the corruption or to the improvement of human conduct?" Rousseau took the negative stand, contending that humanity was good by nature and had been fully corrupted by civilization. Rousseau contended that man is essentially good, a "noble savage" when in the "state of nature" (the state of all the other animals, and the condition man was in before the creation of civilization and society), and that good people are made unhappy and corrupted by their experiences in society. He viewed society as "artificial" and "corrupt" and that the furthering of society results in the continuing unhappiness of man.

Rousseau's essay made him both famous and controversial. Although it is still widely believed that all of Rousseau's philosophy was based on his call for a return to nature, this view is an oversimplification, caused by the excessive importance attached to this first essay. In a second philosophical essay, "Discourse on the Arts and Sciences" (1750), Rousseau argued that the advancement of art and science had not been beneficial to mankind. He proposed that the progress of knowledge had made governments more powerful, and crushed individual liberty. He concluded that material progress had actually undermined the possibility of sincere friendship, replacing it with jealousy, fear and suspicion.

"The Discourse on the Origin of Inequality" (1755) is one of Rousseau's most mature and daring philosophical productions. In this revolutionary piece of writing, Rousseau maintains that every variety of injustice found in human society is an artificial result of the control exercised by defective political and intellectual influences over the healthy natural impulses of otherwise noble savages. After its publication, Rousseau returned to Geneva, reverted to Protestantism in order to regain his citizenship, and returned to Paris with the title "Citizen of Geneva."

The alternative to his philosophical thought expressed in “The Discourse on the Origin of Inequality” was his monumental work “On the Social Contract” written in 1762. Rousseau's Social Contract Theory laid down a new scheme of social organization. Rousseau believed that 'man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains.' He argued that all human beings have certain natural rights and liberties. These are, right to life, liberty and property.

Rousseau further emphasized that human beings no longer owed obedience to any government that failed to protect these rights and liberties. He was the first philosopher to promote the concept of popular sovereignty. He justified the right of people to revolt against a tyrannical government. Rousseau believed in the establishment of an ideal state with a just society in which individual citizens would put his person and his power under the direction of the general will, i.e., the law. The three great ideals of the French Revolution "liberty, equality and fraternity" are found in Rousseau's "Social Contract".

Besides the above philosophical works, Rousseau also wrote a number of books and pamphlets on various subjects during his stay in Switzerland, Luxemburg, England and France. The most important among them are: “Discourse on Political Economy” (1755) “The New Heloise” (1761), “Emile” (1762), “Constitutional Program for Corsica” (1765), and “Considerations on the Government of Poland” (1772). Although the authorities made every effort to suppress Rousseau's writings, the ideas they expressed, along with those of Locke, were of great influence during the French Revolution.

Rousseau was one of the first modern writers to seriously attack the institution of private property, and therefore is considered a forebear of modern socialism and Communism. Rousseau also questioned the assumption that the will of the majority is always correct. He argued that the goal of government should be to secure freedom, equality, and justice for all within the state, regardless of the will of the majority.

One of the primary principles of Rousseau's political philosophy is that politics and morality should not be separated. When a state fails to act in a moral fashion, it ceases to function in the proper manner and ceases to exert genuine authority over the individual. The second important principle is freedom, which the state is created to preserve.

2.2.5. Denis Diderot (1713-1784): Diderot was a French philosopher, and man of letters, the chief editor of the Encyclopedia, one of the principal literary monuments of the Age of

Enlightenment. The work took 26 years of Diderot's life. In seventeen volumes of text and eleven of illustrations, it presented the achievements of human learning in a single work. Besides offering a summary of information on all theoretical knowledge, it also challenged the authority of the Catholic Church.

Denis Diderot was born at Langres as the son of a successful cutler. He was first educated by the Jesuits. During this period he read and studies books of all kinds - his favorites were such classics as Horace and Homer. In 1732 Diderot received the Master of Arts degree from the University of Paris. His father expected him to study medicine or law, but Diderot spent his time with books. In order to earn his living Diderot worked for an Attorney, Clement de Ris, as a tutor and freelance writer. Diderot gained first notice in the 1740s as a translator of English books. Diderot wrote an article "Letter on the Blind" in which he questioned the existence of God, for which he was imprisoned for three months for his opinions.

In 1745 Diderot became the editor of the Encyclopedia with mathematician Jean Le Rond d' Alembert, who resigned later because he believed that mathematics was a more fundamental science than biology. Diderot enlarged its scope and made it an organ for radical and revolutionary opinions. The Encyclopedia was published between 1751 and 1772 in 17 volumes of text and 11 volumes of engravings. The Encyclopedia included a number of ideas of great French philosophers such as Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau. Besides providing latest knowledge, the Encyclopedia exposed the miserable conditions in which the country had fallen. It exposed a society based on inequality, injustice, exploitation and slavery and promoted revolutionary ideas.

2.2.6. The Physiocrats: The Physiocrats were the eighteenth century economists and social philosophers. The School of Physiocrats was founded by French economist Francois Quesnay. Factors responsible for the rise of the School of Physiocrats were numerous. They included the growing importance of agriculture in France, the disappointing results of the economic theory of mercantilism, the poor state of the French finance after the Seven Years War (1756-63), and the upsurge of liberalism in political and social thought. The Physiocrats held that the economy was subject to the rule of natural laws and that government should not interfere with the operation of the natural economic order. They advocated economic liberalism, freedom of trade, free competition, and the abolition of all special privileges. They were strong defenders of the rights to hold property, especially land.

Besides Francois Quesnay other leading figures among the Physiocrats were Gournay, Mirabeau and Turgot. Quesnay explained his views in his famous book "Tableau Economique" (1758). As the son of a prosperous agriculturist, Quesnay strongly emphasized the position of agriculture. In his opinion, the land is the sole source of wealth and only that mass of agricultural and mineral products which is not consumed in the process of production should be taxed. He took his stand on the maxim, "Poor peasant, poor kingdom, poor kingdom, poor monarch".

According to the Physiocrats the society is divided into three groups: farmers, landowners, and all others. The farmers were assumed to be fully productive. The landowners were considered partially productive because they cooperated with the farmers in the use and improvement of land. However, the Physiocrats held that the members of the third groups, which included people associated with trade and industry, were entirely unproductive.

Quesnay and his followers also stressed the importance of free competition in creating a healthy economy and establishing good prices in agriculture. They favored little government interference in the natural law in economics. That is, they were in favour of *Laissez Faire*. They maintained that the governmental activities should be limited to the protection of person and property. The Physiocrats advocated the abolition of all indirect taxes and the imposition of a single tax on the net income from land.

Questions

1. Examine the intellectual background of the French Revolution of 1789.
2. How far were the French philosophers responsible for the Revolution of 1789?
3. Discuss the contribution of Voltaire and Montesquieu to the outbreak of the Revolution of 1789 in France.
4. Review the role of Montesquieu and Rousseau in preparing the intellectual background of the French Revolution of 1789.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Voltaire
 - (b) Montesquieu
 - (c) Rousseau
 - (d) Encyclopedists
 - (e) Physiocrats



FRENCH REVOLUTION-III

**WORK OF NATIONAL ASSEMBLY
(1789-91) AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(1791-92)****3. A WORK OF NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (1789-91)*****Objectives:***

1. To understand the problems faced by the National Assembly (1789-91) and the Legislative Assembly (1791-92).
2. To study the various achievements of the National and Legislative Assemblies.

3. A.1. Introduction: When Louis XVI could not solve the problem of financial crisis he abolished all the parlements in a general restructuring of the judiciary. Public response to the actions of the king was strong and even violent. People began to ignore royal edicts and assault royal officials. Pamphlets denouncing despotism began to flood the country. At the same time, people began to demand for an immediate meeting of the Estates-General to deal with the crisis. The Estates-General was a consultative assembly composed of representatives from the three French estates, or legally defined social classes: clergy, nobility, and commoners. It had last been convened in 1614. Under increasing political pressure and faced with the total collapse of its finances Louis XVI reluctantly agreed to convene the Estates General. The king hoped that the Estates General might pull the state out of the deplorable situation and that it might help in replenishing the empty treasury. Within a short period the Estates General was converted into the National Assembly, which also came to be known as the Constituent Assembly.

3. A.2. Cahiers: During the early months of 1789, the three estates prepared for the coming meeting by selecting deputies and drawing up cahiers des doléances (lists of grievances). These lists reflected overwhelming agreement in favor of limiting the power of the king and his administrators through a constitution and establishing a permanent legislative assembly. The cahiers also suggested improvements in prison and hospital conditions and for reforms in economic, religious and political matters.

3. A.3. Composition of the Estates General: The Estates General met at Versailles on 5th May 1789. It constituted of 285 nobles, 308, clergy and 621 representatives of the third estate elected by all men of 25 years and above whose names appeared in the tax registry. Previously, each of the three estates had an equal number of delegates and each estate used to meet separately. It was a three chambered body with two of the chambers consisting of entirely of the privileged classes. Each estate had one vote for deciding any issue. In this way the privileged classes used to combine to outvote the third estate, which constituted more than 90 percent of the population.

3. A.4. Setting up of the National (Constituent) Assembly: Being aware of its strength, the third Estate demanded that each deputy should cast one vote in a single chamber composed of all three estates. This method would give each estate a number of votes that more accurately represented its population and would make it more difficult for the first two estates to routinely outvote the third estate. However, the clergy and nobility were opposed to this demand of the third Estate. The deadlock continued. Five weeks later, the third estate finally took the initiative by inviting the clergy and nobility to join them in a single-chambered legislature where the voting would be by head. Some individual members of the other estates joined the third Estate and on 17th June 1789, they together proclaimed themselves to be the National Assembly (also later called the Constituent Assembly).

3. A.5. The Tennis Court Oath: When the members of the newly formed National Assembly went to their usual meeting place on 20th June 1789, they found the entrance of the hall was blocked by soldiers. As the members of the National Assembly felt that their initiative was about to be crushed they regrouped at a nearby indoor tennis court on 20th June 1789 and swore not to disband until France had a constitution. This pledge became known as the 'Tennis Court Oath'.

3. A.6. Recognition of the National Assembly by the King: On 23rd June 1789, Louis XVI proposed major changes in the financial system. He also agreed to seek the consent of the deputies for all new loans and taxes, and proposed other important reforms. However, he still refused to recognize the transformation of the Estates-General into the National Assembly and insisted upon voting by estate. Moreover, he tried to intimidate the deputies by surrounding the meeting hall with a large number of soldiers. Faced with strong resistance by the third Estate and increasing willingness of deputies from the clergy and nobility to join the third estate in the National Assembly, the king had no other option but to agree to a vote by head on 27th June 1789.

3. A.7. Attempt to Suppress the National Assembly: A second attempt was made by the king to suppress the National Assembly. Additional troops were brought into Paris and Versailles. On 11th July 1789, Necker, who had been brought back as the finance minister and who was in favour of reforms was not only dismissed but also was ordered to leave the country. These actions of Louis XVI were considered by the people as the clear signs that the king sought to undo the events of the previous weeks.

3. A.8. Storming of the Bastille: Dismissal of Necker, the most popular minister roused the people of Paris. The people in general feared that the king was determined to use force to suppress the National Assembly. Under these circumstances crowds began to roam Paris looking for arms to fight off a royal attack. On 14th July 1789 these crowds attacked the Bastille, a large fortress on the eastern edge of the city. They believed that it contained munitions and many prisoners of despotism, but in fact, the fortress had only seven prisoners at that time. The storming of the Bastille, the symbol of royal autocracy marked the beginning of the French Revolution of 1789. Faced with this insurrection, the monarchy backed down. The troops were withdrawn, and Necker was recalled.

3. A.9. Municipal Government in Paris: Following the fall of Bastille, the people of Paris spontaneously formed a Municipal Government superseding the old royal form of government. They also organized a new military force called the National Guard. In the country side the peasants revolted, plundered the castles of the nobles and destroyed the documents of the titles of the nobles. A large number of nobles were killed by the rebellious peasants.

3. A.10. Achievements of the National Assembly: On 9th July 1789 the National Assembly proclaimed itself as the Constituent Assembly. The members sat in a semi-circle around the President of the assembly who was elected every 15 days. Those sat to the right of the President were the ultra-royalists. Those who sat to the right of the centre were those who recommended a constitutional monarchy and a parliamentary form of government like that of England. The members who sat to the left of the centre were led by Mirabeau. He advocated a constitutional monarchy. The members of the Constituent Assembly who sat to the extreme left of the President were those who wanted to carry out a programme of complete political, economic and social revolution in France along the lines visualized by Rousseau. They were in favour of democracy in a republican set up.

Between 1789 and 1791, the Constituent Assembly introduced a number of reforms in political, administrative, social and economic

spheres. The chief reforms of the National (Constituent) Assembly were the following:

3. A.10.1. Abolition of Feudalism: The most important work of the National Assembly was the abolition of feudalism, serfdom and class privileges. In many parts of France the peasants had revolted against the feudal lords and had burnt their castles. In order to give effect to the aspirations of the people it was necessary for the National Assembly to legalize what the peasants had accomplished and to destroy feudalism throughout France. On 4th August 1789, a resolution was passed by the National Assembly that introduced equality of taxes. The nobles and the clergymen agreed to give up their privileges. Serfs were liberated and manorial courts were abolished. The clergymen gave tithes and other privileges. Sale of offices was discontinued. These measures were signed by the King. In one week the National Assembly accomplished what many ministers had attempted but failed to carry out for many years. Feudalism and three medieval social orders were abolished. Following these fundamental changes, the National Assembly next turned its attention to the creation of an individualistic society on the basis of liberty, equality and fraternity.

3. A.10.2. Declaration of the Rights of Man: The other great work of the National Assembly was the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen adopted on 26th August 1789. The Declaration incorporated some of the principles of England's Bill of Rights and the American Declaration of Independence. It also reflected Rousseau's philosophy. According to the Declaration, "men are born and remain free and equal in rights". The rights of man are liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man further laid down that law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally or through his representative in its formation. The law must be same for all. No person shall be accused, arrested or imprisoned except according to the terms prescribed by law.

The Declaration closed with the assertion that since private property is an inviolable and sacred right, no one shall be deprived of it except when public necessity, legally determined, clearly demanded and properly compensated. One French historian called the Declaration of the Rights of Man, "the death certificate of the *Ancient Regime*".

3. A.10.3. Constitution of 1791: The National Assembly framed a new constitution for France. The constitution was completed in 1791 and was accepted by King Louis XVI. It was the first written constitution of France. It was based on the principle of separation of powers which was advocated by Montesquieu and was included in

the Constitution of the USA. The legislative, executive and judicial powers of the state were separated and vested in three separate organs of the state.

According to the Constitution of 1791, the form of government in France was to be monarchical. However, the king was to be a constitutional monarch. He was to be the head of the executive. He had the power to appoint the chief officers of the army and ministers of the government. The Constitution of 1791 did not adopt the British Parliamentary system. The ministers did not have a seat in the legislative assembly and were not dependant on its support. The king had only a 'suspensive veto' and not an 'absolute veto', i.e., he could only delay the passing of any legislative measure or bill for a period of four years.

The Constitution of 1791 assigned the legislative power to a single assembly comprising of 745 members elected for a period of two years, not by universal suffrage but by a tax paying electorate of little over four million. Only men who paid at least 50 livres in taxes and were landed proprietors could be candidates for election. The Legislative Assembly could initiate legislation and debate and vote upon bills before it.

The judicial power was completely revolutionized. The judges were to be elected. Their term of office was to range from two to four years. The jury system was introduced for criminal cases and torture was abolished.

3. A.10.4. Division of France into Departments: The National Assembly drew up a uniform administrative system for France. For this purpose France was divided into 83 provinces or Departments of nearly uniform size. Each Department was divided into districts and each of these districts were further divided into cantons. The smallest unit of the administration was the rural municipality or commune

The administrative system of France provided the basis for the creation of electoral units. In addition to participating in the elections, each active citizen was a member of the National Guard, which provided France with a system of local defence. Thus, France, from being a highly centralized state became one highly decentralized. Formerly, the central government was represented in each province by its own agent or office holder called 'Intendant' and his subordinates. In the newly formed Departments the central government was to have no representatives. The electors were to choose the local departmental officials. It was the business of these officials to carry out the decrees of the central government.

3. A.10.5. Confiscation of the Church Property: To meet the financial problems, the National Assembly confiscated the church property which was valued at many hundred million dollars. With the church property as security, the National Assembly issued paper currency known as *Assignates*. However, the natural temptation of printing more paper currency could not be checked by the National Assembly. This led to inflation and increase in prices of various commodities.

3. A.10.6. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy: Another important work of the National Assembly was the civil constitution of the clergy. In November 1789, the church property was confiscated. In February 1790 the monasteries and other religious orders were suppressed. In April 1790 absolute religious toleration was proclaimed. In July 1790, the National Assembly enacted the civil constitution of the clergy. By this act the episcopal structure and the status of the clergy was overhauled. The number of dioceses was reduced from 134 to 83, one for each Department. The number of bishops and priests was also reduced. They were to be elected by the electors of the Department. The clergy were to receive salaries from the state. In this way the clergy effectively became the officials of the state. Further, the clergy was required to take an oath of loyalty to the revolutionary government and they were not to take the oath of loyalty to the Pope. Thus, the religious policy of the National Assembly led to a conflict between revolutionary France and Rome which was not resolved until Napoleon's Concordat of 1801.

The clergy of France was divided in its reaction to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Majority of the bishops and clergymen refused to take an oath of loyalty to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Nearly one-third of the parish priests took the oath of loyalty to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. They came to be known as the "juring clergy" and those who refused were called the "non-juring clergy."

3. A.11. Flight of the King: When the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was presented to Louis XVI for his approval, the King remarked, "I would rather be King of Metz than remain King of France in such a position, but this will end soon." Humiliated by his loss of power, Louis XVI planned to escape from Paris. In the night of 20th June 1791, the King, Queen and other members of the royal family escaped from Tuileries in disguise. However, they were recognized and captured at the little village of Varennes not far from the frontier. They were brought back to Paris under humiliating circumstances.

In spite of these developments the National Assembly continued its work. The powers of the King were drastically reduced following his

attempt to escape from France. By September 1791, the National Assembly completed the Constitution. Louis XVI had no other option but to accept the Constitution of 1791. The National Assembly, which also doubled as the Constituent Assembly got itself dissolved on 30th September 1791, after passing a decree that none of its members was to be elected to the new proposed Legislative Assembly.

The work of the National Assembly had far reaching consequences on the political, social, financial, religious and legal systems of France. It destroyed the pillars of the ancient regime. It abolished feudalism, old form of government, old territorial divisions, the old financial system, the old judicial and legal system and the old ecclesiastical arrangements.

3. B. WORK THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (1791-92)

Elections were held under the Constitution of 1791 and the new Legislative Assembly met on 1st October 1791. The Legislative Assembly consisted of 745 members. However, all of them were inexperienced young and new to the job. This was chiefly due to the fact that the National Assembly before its dissolution had passed a law debarring its members from being elected to the Legislative Assembly.

3. B.1. Political Groups in the Legislative Assembly: The Legislative Assembly was troubled by the rivalry of various political groups. The Constitutionals were the supporters of the Constitution of 1791 and were in favour of a Constitutional Monarchy for France. They were prepared to accept the King with limited powers.

The second political group was comprised of the Republicans who were further divided into two main groups-the Girondins and the Jacobins. The Girondins were moderates and stood for establishing a republican form of government. The Jacobins were republicans of extreme type. They were prepared to adopt all kinds of means for the establishment and safety of the republican form of government. Initially, the Girondins had a majority in the Legislative Assembly, but the influence of the Jacobins gradually began to increase.

3. B.2. Laws against the Clergy and the Émigrés: The Legislative Assembly passed two laws, which had far reaching consequences. By the first law, all priests were required to act according to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The second law dealt with those French nobles who had fled from France (*émigrés*) and were persuading the foreign governments to intervene on their behalf to crush the revolution in France. The law required them to

return to France by a fixed date. If they failed to return their properties were to be confiscated.

Louis XVI did not approve both these laws and eventually vetoed both of them. This was exactly what the Girondins desired and had prepared for. By his refusal to sign these laws the King came to be looked upon as the enemy of the Revolution. The Girondins went further. They wished to make a traitor of the King himself and to do this a foreign war was necessary. Thus, the Girondins deliberately set themselves to provoke a foreign war.

3. B.3. Foreign Intervention: The intervention of the foreign powers in the internal affairs of France was becoming inevitable. The revolutionaries of France were determined to spread their ideas outside France as well. The cause of France became the “cause of all peoples against all kings”. Thus, the rulers of other European states were compelled wage a war against revolutionary France in order to crush the revolution. The *émigré* nobles were carrying on a propaganda war in other countries of Europe against Revolution in France. Under these circumstances there was a strong possibility of foreign intervention in France.

3. B.4. Declaration of Pillnitz: Earlier on 27th August 1791, the Austrian Emperor, Leopold II and the Prussian King, Frederick William had issued the Declaration of Pillnitz. In this declaration both the rulers had stressed that the cause of the French King was the cause of the kings of Europe and both Austria and Prussia were prepared to intervene in France if rulers of other countries joined hands with them.

3. B.5. Threat of a Foreign War: The threat of foreign intervention was resented by the people of France and this strengthened the resolve of the Girondins who were in favour of a war and thereby getting an opportunity to end the monarchy in France. Only the extreme Jacobins, who broke away from the Girondins, opposed a war. They were apprehensive that out of the war there would emerge either a regenerated monarchy or a dictatorship. With the exception of the ‘extreme Jacobins’ under the leadership of Robespierre and Danton, all other parties began to prepare for a foreign war.

3. B.6. Revolutionary War: The foreign war was provoked by the French revolutionaries who sent an ultimatum concerning the *émigrés* to the Emperor of Austria, Francis II, through Louis XVI (Emperor Leopold II had died on 1st march 1792). Emperor Francis II was the nephew of Marie Antoinette. In reply to the ultimatum, the Austrian Emperor demanded the restoration of the German princes their feudal rights which had been abolished by the revolutionaries. As the stand off between Austria and Revolutionary France

continued, war was declared on 20th April 1792. The declaration of war was approved by all parties in the Legislative Assembly, only seven members voted against it.

The revolutionary war that began in April 1792 lasted almost without a break until 1815 and gave a new direction to the entire course of European history. In France the war provided a new intensity to the revolutionary movement. The Girondin leaders were swept away from power and the Jacobins gained control. The Bourbon monarchy was overthrown and a new form of dictatorship was established in France.

France was not thoroughly prepared for the war. The Girondins could not prosecute the war and the war progressed disastrously for France. It was a five months story of defeat, humiliation and invasion. The French army was disorganized due to lack of proper leadership and discipline. There was no unity in the command and confidence between the officers and men. A number of officers and soldiers deserted which further weakened the morale of the French army.

3. B.7. Rising of 20th June 1792: As the French armies were being driven back from the frontiers, civil war growing out of religious dissensions was threatening France with internal disorder. The Legislative Assembly facing these twin problems passed two decrees. One decree ordered the deportation of all non-juring priests to penal colonies. The other decree provided for an army of 20,000 men for the protection of Paris.

Louis XVI vetoed both these measures. In order to pressurize the King to sign these decrees, the Jacobins organized a huge popular demonstration against the King. On 20th June 1792, a huge crowd marched to Tueries, forced open the gates of the fort and entered the apartment of the royal family. For three hours the King stood before the crowd, but refused to give any commitment. Having subjected the King of France to bitter humiliation, the crowd finally withdrew without resorting to any violence.

3. B.8. Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick: The revolutionary movement in France began to gather momentum. Under these circumstances, the Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, the Commander-in-chief of the Allied forces against France, published on 3rd August 1792, added fuel to the passions of the French revolutionaries. The manifesto was directed against not only the Jacobins but against all the patriotic Frenchmen. By this manifesto the Allies disclaimed intervention in the internal affairs of France, but they ordered the French people to restore Louis XVI to his full powers, to obey the orders of the invaders and not to resist or oppose Louis XVI or the Allies. The manifesto further declared that

National Guardsmen in arms would be treated as rebels, that the administrative officials and private citizens opposing the invading armies would be punished in accordance with the rules of war. If Paris and its inhabitants offered any insult or injury to the royal family or attacked the Tueries, the Allied monarchs would seek memorable vengeance by giving up the city to military execution and total ruin. Though Louis XVI repudiated the manifesto, his words carried no weight.

3. B.9. Revolt of 10th August 1792: Following the publication of the Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, the Parisians staged a revolt on 10th August 1792. Louis XVI was suspected more than ever of being secretly supporting the invaders. The Municipal government of the Girondins in Paris was overthrown by the Jacobins who organized a new Municipal government. The Jacobins provoked the revolt of 10th August 1792 with an aim of overthrowing Louis XVI. At the end of the insurrection, the revolutionary commune of Paris under the Jacobin leader Danton forced the Legislative Assembly to carry out its recommendations. The Legislative Assembly suspended the King and provisionally dethroned him. This made it necessary to draft a new constitution as the Constitution of 1791 was monarchical. Thus, the Legislative Assembly decided to call a convention to take up the task of drafting a new constitution.

3. B.10. The September Massacre, 1792: The King and the Queen were imprisoned in the Temple, an old fortress in Paris. The Paris Commune also arrested a large number of suspected persons. This was followed the so called September Massacre. As the news of the advance of the Prussian and Austrian troops under the Duke of Brunswick reached Paris, there was panic. This critical situation was exploited by the violent elements of the Commune. Incited by Marat, one of the most fanatic and radical personalities of the time, from 2nd to 6th September 1792, the radical revolutionaries carried on a massacre of the political prisoners in Paris, who were suspected to be sympathetic to the royalist cause. Nearly 1,200 people were savagely put to death.

3. B.11. The Battle of Valmy: On 20th September 1792, the Allied forces were checked at Valmy. The Battle of Valmy took place between a combined Prussian and Austrian force led by the Duke of Brunswick and a French army. The allied invasion of France was halted, and a retreat was begun that soon turned into a rout. The French victory was a turning point in the wars of the French Revolution, which had begun five months earlier. The Battle of Valmy marked the first of many victories for the troops of revolutionary France. Thus, France was saved from the immediate danger of further advance by the Allied powers. The French victory in the Battle of Valmy restored self-confidence to the French forces.

While the revolutionary ministry of France was negotiating with the retreating Allied powers, the National Convention was constituted to face the internal and external dangers confronting France and to draft a new constitution for the country.

Questions

1. Review the developments in revolutionary France between 1789 and 1791.
2. Discuss the chief achievements of the National Assembly (1789-91).
3. Describe the functioning of the Constituent Assembly (1789-91) in France during the Revolution.
4. Outline the problems faced by the Legislative Assembly (1791-92). How was it successful in solving them?
5. Examine the working of the Legislative Assembly (1791-92) in France.



FRENCH REVOLUTION-IV
**WORK OF NATIONAL CONVENTION
(1792-95) AND DIRECTORY (1795-99)**

4. A. THE NATIONAL CONVENTION (1792-1795)

Objectives:

1. To analyze the problems faced by the National Convention (1792-95) and the Directory (1795-99).
2. To understand the work done by the National Convention and the Directory.

4. A.1. Introduction: The third revolutionary assembly of France was the National Convention. On 21st September 1792, the newly elected members of the National Convention held their first meeting. According to Prof. C.J. Hayes, "Perhaps no legislative body in history has been called upon to solve such knotty problems as those which confronted the National Convention at the beginning of its session".

4. A.2. Problems faced by the National Convention: The National Convention had to decide the future of the deposed King. The country had to be saved from the foreign invasion; internal insurrection had to be brought under control; a government had to be established; social reforms were to be completed and consolidated; and a new constitution had to be framed for the country. In spite of these complex problems it goes to the credit of the National Convention that it accomplished these tasks successfully.

4. A.3. Struggle for Power: Foreign war and internal disturbances were the major challenges that the National Convention had to face. Under these circumstances there was a greater need for unity and determination. However, the National Convention was torn into frightening factionalism. The chief contenders for power in the National Convention were the Girondins and the Jacobins. Both these factions were devoted to republic. However, their differences were sharp on the issue of what part the city of Paris should play in the government. The Girondins represented the Departments (Provinces) and insisted that Paris, which constituted only one of the 83 Departments into which France was divided, should have only 1/83 of the influence. The Girondins argued that they would tolerate no dictatorship of the capital.

On the other hand, the Jacobins drew their strength from the capital, Paris. They considered Paris as the brain and heart of the country. The Girondins were anxious to observe the legal forms and processes. The Jacobins on the other hand were not so scrupulous. They were rude, active and indifferent to law. They believed in the application of force wherever and whenever necessary. The Girondins hated the three prominent leaders of the Jacobins-Robespierre, Danton and Marat.

4. A.4. Trial and Execution of Louis XVI: The contest between the Girondins and the Jacobins became sharper after the meeting of the National Convention. Louis XVI who was deposed earlier was put on trial. He was charged with plotting against the nation and attempting to overthrow the constitution. Following the trial, the King was unanimously found guilty of treason and was sentenced to immediate execution. While the Girondins pleaded for clemency, the Jacobins demanded his immediate death. Finally, Louis XVI was guillotined (executed) on Sunday, 21st January 1793. His last words were, "Gentlemen, I am innocent of that of which I am accused. May my blood assure the happiness of the French".

4. A.5. Coalition against France: The immediate consequence of the execution of Louis XVI was an increase in the number of enemies of France. France was already at war with Austria and Prussia. Following the execution of the French King other countries such as England, Spain, Russia, Holland and some states of Germany and Italy also joined the coalition against France. Civil war also added to the problems of the National Convention as the peasants of Vendee rose against the republic in support of the non-juring priests.

4. A.6. The Committee of Public Safety: The National Convention decided to meet the challenge from both within and outside. It voted to raise 300,000 troops to meet the challenge of the coalition of powers against France. It created a Committee of Public Safety, to provide executive oversight, a Committee of General Security, to oversee the police and a Revolutionary Tribunal, to try political cases. These committees were intended to concentrate the full force of the nation on the problem of national defence and to eliminate the enemies of the Republic, whether foreign or domestic.

4. A.7. Insurrection against the Girondins: Meanwhile, the struggle for power between the Girondins and Jacobins took a worse turn. The Girondins wanted to punish those Jacobin leaders, especially Marat, who had been responsible for the 'September Massacre' (1792). They also wished to punish the members of the Paris Commune for numerous illegal acts. In order to silence the Girondins, the Paris Commune, which supported the Jacobins organized an insurrection against the Girondins. The Tuileries,

where the Convention held its session was surrounded by the Parisian mob. The National Convention, thus became the prisoner of the Commune. The Commune demanded the expulsion of the Girondin leaders from the National Convention. Twenty-nine Girondin leaders were arrested and were later executed. The victory of the Commune was the victory of the Jacobins, who became the masters of the National Convention. The Girondins called upon the Departments to take up arms against the tyrannical Paris Commune. The Departments responded to the call of the Girondins. Around 60 out of 83 Departments participated in the movement against the Jacobins.

4. A.8. Efforts to Resist Foreign Invasion: Meanwhile, efforts were made to meet the danger of invasion by the foreign armies. To meet the needs of the war, a general call for troops was given and 750,000 men were enlisted in the army. Carnot, one of the members of the Committee of Public Safety rendered great service in organizing the armed forces by training and equipping the new recruits. These newly organized armies were sent in different direction against the foreign enemies of France. The French armies made superhuman efforts and were successful in many of the battles against the coalition forces.

4. A.9. Reign of Terror - Law of Suspects: While this great effort to resist the foreign invaders was going on, the Committee of Public Safety was engaged in a fierce campaign within France against all domestic enemies. By the Law of Suspects, any person of noble birth or who had held office before the Revolution or had any relation with an *émigré* or who could not produce a certificate of citizenship was liable to be executed. It was estimated that under this Law of Suspects about 5,000 persons were executed in Paris alone during the so called Reign of Terror.

The Reign of Terror was let loose by the Committee of Public Safety, the first real executive to govern France since the overthrow of the monarchy. The Reign of Terror officially began with the institution of the Revolutionary Tribunal in March 1793. Although, initially the Reign of Terror was started in Paris soon it spread to the countryside. Local tribunals were set up to arrest and condemn suspected anti-revolutionaries.

The deposed Queen Marie Antoinette also became a victim of the Reign of Terror and was executed through guillotine. The Reign of Terror came to an end when Danton and later Robespierre were sent to guillotine. As it happened, the coup against Robespierre and his associates was led by a group of dissident Jacobins, including members of the Committee of Public Safety. They had supported the Reign of Terror but feared Robespierre would turn on them next. On 27th July 1794 Robespierre and his close followers

were arrested on the convention floor. During the next two days, Robespierre and 82 of his associates were guillotined.

The Reign of Terror was the most radical phase of the Revolution, and it remains the most controversial. Some have seen the Reign of Terror as a major advance toward modern democracy, while others call it a step toward modern dictatorship. Certain defenders of the Revolution have argued that the Reign of Terror was, under the circumstances, a reasonable response to the military crisis of 1793. Others have rejected this idea, pointing out that the military victories of early 1794, far from diminishing the intensity of the Reign of Terror, were followed by the Great Terror of June and July 1794, in which more than 1300 people were executed in Paris.

4. A.10. Constitution of 1795: To prevent the re-establishment of the monarchy, the National Convention drew up a new Constitution for France. According to the new republican constitution the legislative power was to be vested in a bi-cameral National Legislature. One of the chambers was to be called the Council of Elders comprising of 250 members, who must be at least 40 years of age and be either married or widowers. The other chamber was to be known as the Council of Five Hundred. It was to be comprised of members of at least 30 years of age. The members were to be elected by property-holding electorate. The Council of Five Hundred alone had the right to propose laws. However, these laws could not be put in effect unless accepted by the Council of Elders.

The executive power of the state was to be exercised by a Directory consisting of five Directors. They were to be of at least 40 years of age and elected by both the chambers of the National Legislature. In rotation, each of the directors held the presidency for a 3-month interval, and one director was replaced each year.

The National Convention passed two decrees supplementary to the Constitution providing that two-thirds of each council should be chosen from the members of the National convention.

The new Constitution was accepted by the people of France by a referendum. The Law of Two-thirds was unpopular in Paris. The Parisian mob launched an attack upon the National Convention at Tuileries on 20th April 1795. The National Convention was saved by Napoleon Bonaparte, a military officer, who dispersed the crowd by using his presence of mind. Thus, by saving the National Convention from the unruly Parisian mob, Napoleon Bonaparte saved the Revolution.

The other important achievements of the National Convention include the introduction of a new system of weights and measures known as the Metric system. It also laid the foundation and did

preliminary work on the codification of the laws. It also took up the problem of national education, which was to be compulsory, free and completely secular.

4. B. THE DIRECTORY (1795-1799)

The Constitution of 1795 framed by the National Convention vested the executive authority of France in a Committee of Directors known as the Directory. The Directory, consisting of five members elected by both houses of the legislature, was in power for four years from October 1795 to November 1799. In rotation, each of the directors held the presidency for a 3-month interval, and one director was replaced each year. Among those who served on the Directory were Vicomte de Barras, Lazare Carnot, Joseph Fouché, and Comte Emmanuel Sieyès (Abbe Sieyes). The Directors were men of moderate talents and they did not hesitate to indulge in corruption. They were incapable of solving the problems facing France at that time.

Barras was elected to the third Estate and in the course of time, he became a staunch Jacobin. He took courage in attacking Robespierre. He saved the National Convention by employing Napoleon Bonaparte in 1795. Later, Barras was made one of the five Directors. He was a clever politician, entirely unscrupulous and immoral, who 'loved the throne for its velvet' and was always in debt. He was the leader of the Parisian society.

The period of four years that the Directory was in power was plagued by plots and intrigues. The royalists and the reactionaries found their way into the legislature through elections. They did not hesitate to use fair or foul means to sabotage the government. They were kept in check only by the use of force by the government.

4. B.1. Babeuf Plot: A reference may be made to the so-called Babeuf Plot of 1796. A political club known as the Society of the Pantheon was started in October 1795. It had a large number of former Jacobins as members. The society published a newspaper known as the Tribune, edited by a young agitator, Babeuf. Because of its disruptive nature, the Directory took action against the Society of the Pantheon. But the members of the Society set up a secret group of six members and began preparation for an uprising against the government. They aimed at restoring the revolutionary movement. They proposed to proclaim a 'Republic of Equals', in which the gap between the rich and poor would be reduced. The programme of the members of the Society was to infiltrate the units of army, police and administration through revolutionary agents. Thorough preparations were made for the proposed uprising. Arms and ammunitions were collected for this purpose. However, the

proposed insurrection ended in a failure. Right from the beginning the police had their agents in the movement. As a result on the eve of the insurrection Babeuf and his associates numbering around forty were arrested and their supporters were dispersed by force. The conspirators along with Babeuf were brought to trial and were executed. Thus, the Directory survived the worst threat to its existence.

4. B.2. Financial Crisis: The financial condition of France during the period of the Directory deteriorated. Wasteful public expenditure and corruption added to the financial crisis. Huge amount of money had to be spent to maintain an army of a million men. The population of Paris had to be fed at the cost of the nation. *Assignats*, which were issued by the National Assembly, could not solve the financial problem. As the inflation was mounting and the *Assignat* was losing its value. Under these circumstances, in 1797, the government was forced to declare partial bankruptcy. Payment of interest on the national debt was suspended. Finally, the *Assignats* had to be altogether withdrawn. The failure to solve the financial crisis brought discredit to the Directory. The Directory and the two legislative chambers lacked harmony. In spite of the firm measures taken during the revolution, the Roman Catholic Church was still strong and popular with the people of France.

4. B.2. Foreign Policy: When the Directory assumed office, France was still at war with Austria, Sardinia, England and smaller German states. Prussia, Spain and Holland had already withdrawn from the coalition and had made peace with France. Thus, the first task of the Directory was to continue the war against Austria, Sardinia and England.

The general plan of the military campaign of France against her enemies was to send one French army across the Rhine River through Germany and from there into Austria. Another army was to cross the Alps through northern Italy to Vienna, capital of Austria. Napoleon Bonaparte was appointed as the commander-in-chief of the French army for the Italian campaign. While the French army sent across the Rhine did not achieve desired success, the Italian campaign under Napoleon was quite successful. He defeated four Austrian generals in succession, each with superior numbers, and forced Austria and its allies to make peace. The Treaty of Campo Formio provided that France keep most of its conquests. By this treaty France acquired from Austria the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium), Lombardy and the Ionian Islands. In northern Italy Napoleon founded the Cisalpine (Italian) Republic (later known as the kingdom of Italy) and strengthened his position in France by sending millions of francs worth of treasure to the government. The French forces under Napoleon's command occupied every fort in

northern Italy. The Sardinian armies were defeated and were forced to give away Nice and Savoy to France.

One of the immediate effects of the victory of Napoleon in Italy was the dissolution of the first coalition against France and territorial gains from Sardinia and Austria. Following their defeat, both Sardinia and Austria left the coalition and England was the only power that was left in the field against France. Another important effect of the military victory of France was the sudden rise of Napoleon's popularity and fame among the French people. While the people applauded Napoleon's military success, the Directory feared and outwardly flattered him.

In 1797 Napoleon was appointed as the commander of the army that was intended to invade England. However, Napoleon was convinced that without a powerful navy it would not be possible to cross the English Channel. Under these circumstances, in 1798, to strike at British trade with the East, Napoleon led an expedition to Ottoman-ruled Egypt, which he conquered. His fleet, however, was destroyed by the British admiral Horatio Nelson, leaving him stranded. Undaunted, he reformed the Egyptian government and law, abolishing serfdom and feudalism and guaranteeing basic rights. The French scholars he had brought with him began the scientific study of ancient Egyptian history. In 1799 he failed to capture Syria, but he won a smashing victory over the Ottomans at Abū Qīr (Abukir). France, meanwhile, faced a new coalition; Austria, Russia, and lesser powers had allied with Britain.

4. B.3. Overthrow of the Directory: With the rising unpopularity of the Directory its days seemed to be numbered. Leaving his army behind Napoleon returned to France and entered into a conspiracy with Abbe Sieyes to overthrow the Directory. However, both of them were poles apart in their temperament and ideas. Napoleon was a man of action and believed in the autocracy of the sword. On the other hand, Abbe Sieyes was a philosopher who believed in a policy of checks and balances. However, both of them were unanimous on the question of the overthrow of the Directory. In the *coup. dt.* of November 9-10, 1799 Napoleon and his colleagues overthrew the Directory, seized power and established a new regime—the Consulate. The Consulate comprised of three members, Napoleon, Abbe Sieyes and Ducos. The Constitution which was framed a month later placed the supreme executive power in the hands of Napoleon as the first Consul.

Questions

1. Discuss the work done by the National Convention in France between 1792 to 1795 during the Revolution.
2. How far the National Convention was successful in solving the problems faced by France during the revolutionary period?
3. Review the working of the Directory in France between 1795 and 1799.
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Jacobins and Girondins
 - (b) Reign of Terror
 - (c) Babeuf Plot
 - (d) Directory (1795-99)



RISE AND FALL OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE- I

RISE TO POWER

Objectives:

1. To study the background of Napoleon Bonaparte before his rise to power.
2. To study the military campaigns of Napoleon before his rise to power.
3. To understand the circumstances that led to the rise of Napoleon to political power.

5.1. Introduction: No other personality has left an everlasting impression on the history of Europe in general and France in particular as Napoleon Bonaparte. He was one of the greatest military generals the world has produced. He dominated his age. He was a man of enormous energy, self-confidence and resourcefulness. His rise to power makes one of the most interesting chapters in the history of France. Rising to command of the French Revolutionary armies, he seized political power as First Consul in 1799 and proclaimed himself Emperor in 1804. By repeated victories over various European coalitions, he extended French rule over much of Europe.

5.2. Early Life of Napoleon: Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio on the island of Corsica on 15 August 1769, one year after the island was transferred to France by the Republic of Genoa. Thus, Napoleon was from his birth a French citizen. The family, formerly known as Bonaparte, was minor Italian nobility coming from Tuscan stock of Lombard origin. The family moved to Florence and later broke into two branches; the original one, Bonaparte-Sarzana, was compelled to leave Florence. In the sixteenth century this family moved to Corsica when the island was a possession of the Republic of Genoa.

Napoleon's father was Carlo (Charles) Bonaparte. He was an attorney and was nominated as Corsica's representative to the court of Louis XVI in 1778, where he remained for a number of years. Napoleon's mother, Maria Letizia Ramolino had dominant influence on Napoleon's childhood. Her firm discipline helped him later in his life. Napoleon was second in a family of eight children of

Carlo Bonaparte (Joseph, Napoleon, Lucien, Elisa, Louis, Pauline, Caroline and Jerome).

Napoleon's noble, moderately affluent background and family connections afforded him greater opportunities to study than were available to a typical Corsican of the time. Being one of a large family, he was destined from an early date for a military career. On 15 May 1779, at age nine, Napoleon was admitted to a French military school at Brienne. After graduating from Brienne in 1784, Napoleon was admitted to the elite *École Royale Militaire* in Paris, where he completed the two-year course of study in one year. He developed reading habits and became a diligent student particularly of history and geography.

5.3. Early Military Career: Napoleon graduated in September 1785 and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in an artillery regiment. He took up his new assignment in military in January 1786 at the age of sixteen. He served on garrison duty in Valence and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789. However, he took nearly two years of leave in Corsica and Paris during this period. He spent most of the next few years on Corsica, where a complex three-way struggle was taking place between royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. After coming into conflict with Pascal Paoli, the venerable patriotic leader of the Corsicans, who was becoming increasingly conservative, Napoleon and his family were forced to flee to France in June 1793. Thereafter, Napoleon identified himself completely with his adopted country and became an ardent patriot and a supporter of the Jacobins. He took sides in favour of the Jacobins at the height of the civil war between the Girondins and the Jacobins.

Through the help of fellow Corsican named Saliceti, Napoleon was appointed as artillery commander in the French forces besieging Toulon, which had risen in revolt against the republican government and was occupied by the British troops. He formulated a successful plan which forced the British to evacuate. In a successful military assault the city of Toulon was recaptured (December 1793). Napoleon was wounded in the thigh during the military operation. The military success of Napoleon earned him a promotion to brigadier-general. His actions brought him to the attention of the Committee of Public Safety, and he became a close associate of Augustine Robespierre, younger brother of the revolutionary leader Maximilien Robespierre.

For the next two years the fortunes of Napoleon varied. Following the downfall of the Jacobin leader Maximilien Robespierre, Napoleon was arrested and was briefly imprisoned in August 1794, but was released within two weeks.

In 1795, Napoleon was serving in Paris when royalists and counter-revolutionaries organized an armed protest against the National Convention on 3 October 1795. Napoleon was given command of the improvised forces defending the National Convention in the Tuileries Palace. He seized artillery pieces with the aid of a young cavalry officer, Joachim Murat, who later became his brother-in-law. Napoleon used the artillery the following day to repel the royalist attackers and thus, saved the National Convention. This action earned Napoleon sudden fame, wealth, and the patronage of the new Directory, particularly that of its leader, Barras. Within weeks he was romantically attached to Barras's former mistress, Josephine de Beauharnais, whom he married on 9 March 1796.

5.4. Italian Campaign of 1796–97: The newly established Republic of France though had driven from the field the greater number of its enemies, was still left at war with England and Austria. After a series of failures to defeat the French on the mainland, the British had abandoned its scheme. However, the British control of the sea was a permanent threat to the colonies and the possessions of France, and indirectly of great help to Austria. The Director, as the new French government was called, aimed at the very centre of the Austrian power which they hoped would give them victory and peace. With this objective the main armies of France were to advance to Vienna, the capital of Austria. At the same time another army was to support the chief attack and distract a part of the Austrian army by attacking the Austrian power and possessions in Italy. It was this subordinate attack which was entrusted to Napoleon. It was this Italian campaign that earned him an imperishable military glory and fame.

Within few days after his marriage to Josephine, Napoleon took command of the French 'Army of Italy' on 27 March 1796 and embarked on a successful invasion of Italy. The Italian campaign exhibited his daring, his rapidity of decision and of action, and at the same time the sureness with which he could distinguish between what was possible and what was not. On crossing the Italian Alps, Napoleon was confronted with a joint army of Sardinians and Austrians. However, Napoleon managed to separate them, and in the Battle of Mondovi defeated the Sardinians and forced them to accept the Armistice of Cherasco, (28 April 1796). By this armistice Sardinia withdrew from the war and ceded Savoy and Nice to France.

After his brilliant victory over Sardinia, Napoleon marched on to Milan, aiming not only to capture the city but to isolate the Austrians from the Sardinians. His first big battle was fought at Lodi on 10 May 1796. It was a great victory, and the Austrians retired far to the east of Milan. At Lodi, he gained the nickname of 'The Little

Corporal', a term that reflected his intimate relation with his soldiers, many of whom he knew by name.

Napoleon easily captured Milan. He entered Milan amidst immense popular enthusiasm. He seemed at first no conqueror but a liberator. Napoleon next laid siege to the great fortress of Mantua, the central Austrian fortress in Italy. It was strongly defended with artillery and surrounded for the greater part of it by impassable lakes and morasses. It was understood that the fall of Mantua would mean the fall of the Austrian power in Italy. Napoleon succeeded in defeating the Austrians in several encounters. The last and decisive blow was delivered to the Austrians on 14 January 1797, when an Austrian army of seventy thousand men was scattered at the Battle of Rivoli and Mantua was surrendered by the Austrians to Napoleon.

In spite of these military victories against the Austrians in Italy Napoleon was not yet successful in forcing the Austrians to enter into a peace agreement with the French. The Austrians were unwilling to accept defeat. They were watching events in Paris, hoping for a royalist revolution. However, they were disappointed in their hopes. In order to force the Austrians to sue for peace, Napoleon decided to press forward through the north-east of Italy and reached the town of Laibach.

As the French armies were advancing on Vienna on the Danube and from the east of the Adriatic under Napoleons leadership, Austria agreed to enter into a definite peace agreement with France, which led to the signing of the peace of Campo Formio on 17 October 1797. The Peace of Campo Formio contained both open and secret articles. By the open articles, the Belgian lands were ceded by Austria to France; a republic was set up in Northern Italy, to be called the Cisalpine Republic; France was to take the Ionian Islands; Austria was to be allowed to hold Venice and all her territory in Italy and Adriatic.

Besides these open articles there were secret ones. By these secret articles the Emperor of Austria promised to cede to France large districts on the left bank of the Rhine. France also promised that Austria should receive the important ecclesiastical state of Salzburg and a part of Bavaria; and she promised that, in the settlement of Germany, Prussia, the hated rival of Austria, should receive no compensation at all. The Peace of Campo Formio manifested the diplomatic skill of Napoleon along with his military victories.

Continuing his Italian campaign, Napoleon defeated the army of the Papal States. The Papal States had to pay the price of defeat, but Napoleon was anxious to leave the way open to the renewal of

friendly relations with the Pope. By the Peace of Tolentino (February 1797) the Pope cede Avignon to France, and Bologna, Ferrara, and the Romagna to the Cisalpine Republic. He handed over to Napoleon money, manuscripts, and paintings. However, the Directory would have liked still harsher terms imposed on the Pope, Pius VI including his dethronement as he had protested the execution of Louis XVI. The Pope was grateful to Napoleon for his escape from a deeper humiliation. However, in the next year, General Berthier captured Rome and took Pope Pius VI prisoner. The Pope died of illness while in captivity. Napoleon then marched on Venice and forced its surrender, ending over 1,000 years of independence.

The success of Napoleon in Italy resulted in territorial gains for France. The French boundaries extended up to the Rhine, the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium) were annexed and in the north of Italy a vassal republic (Cisalpine) was created which was French territory in all but name. Besides the territorial advantages France also got a lot of money from the Italian campaign. Napoleon demanded indemnity from the defeated Italian princes. The Pope had to pay twenty million francs, the Republic of Genoa fifteen million, and the Duke of Modena ten million. He also got a lot of money from Milan. In this way Napoleon could send a lot of money to France after meeting the expenses of the army.

Napoleon's remarkable series of military triumphs were a result of his ability to apply his encyclopedic knowledge of conventional military thought to real-world situations, as demonstrated by his creative use of artillery tactics, using it as a mobile force to support his infantry. He was also a master of both intelligence and deception and had a great sense of knowing when to strike. He often won battles by concentrating his forces on an unsuspecting enemy by using spies to gather information about opposing forces and by concealing his own troop deployments. In the Italian campaign, often considered his greatest, Napoleon's army captured 160,000 prisoners, 2,000 cannons, and 170 standards. A year of campaigning had witnessed major breaks with the traditional norms of eighteenth century warfare and marked a new era in military history.

5.5. Egyptian Expedition of 1798–99: On account of his military success in Italy, Napoleon's reputation had increased in France and his name had become a household word. In 1797, after Austria accepted a dictated peace, England was the only country that remained at war with France. The Directory decided to wage war against England and appointed Napoleon as the General of the Army which was meant for the invasion of England. In the early part of 1798 Napoleon surveyed the coastline and came to the conclusion that it was impossible to cross the English Channel on

account of the British naval supremacy. However, he visualized that as the British Empire was spread in various parts of the world, a blow could be given to her by attacking some other part of the British Empire. It was under these circumstances that Napoleon decided to undertake the Egyptian expedition to strike the British in Egypt. Napoleon also dreamt of advancing to India in order to drive out the British with the help of the Marathas and Tipu Sultan, the ruler of Mysore.

In March 1798, Napoleon proposed to the Directory a military expedition to seize Egypt, then a province of the Ottoman Empire, seeking to protect French trade interests and undermine Britain's access to India. The Directory, though apprehensive about the scope and cost of the expedition, readily agreed to the plan in order to remove the popular general from the center of power. The instructions given by the Directory to Napoleon when he was dispatched to Egypt included as its first point "to drive the English from all their possessions in the East which he can reach." The other instructions included: the Isthmus of Suez was to be cut; the condition of the natives was to be ameliorated; and peace was to be maintained with the Sultan of Turkey.

In May 1798 Napoleon sailed from Toulon with a fleet and an army. An unusual aspect of the Egyptian expedition was the inclusion of a large group of scientists and Egyptologists to throw light on the monuments and antiquities of the then little-known country. One of their significant discoveries was the finding of the Rosetta Stone that helped in the deciphering of the hieroglyphics. This deployment of intellectual resources is considered by some as an indication of Napoleon's devotion to the principles of the Enlightenment, and by others as a masterstroke of propaganda that covered the true imperialist motives of the invasion. In a largely unsuccessful effort to gain the support of the Egyptian populace, Bonaparte also issued proclamations casting himself as a liberator of the people from Ottoman oppression, and praising the principles of Islam.

On the way to Egypt, Napoleon's expeditionary force captured the Island of Malta on 11 June 1798. Proceeding further Napoleon reached the coast of Egypt on 1 July 1798 and six days later began his march to Cairo. He tried to conciliate the native population, but the Mamelukes fought for their power. On 21 July 1798, in a battle fought within the sight of the Pyramids, the Mamelukes were thoroughly defeated in the so called Battle of Pyramids and Napoleon became the master of Egypt. While the battle on land was a resounding French victory, the British Royal Navy managed to compensate at sea. The ships that had landed Napoleon and his army sailed back to France, but a fleet of ships that had come with them remained to support the army along the coast. On 1 August 1798, the British fleet under Horatio Nelson fought the French in the

Battle of the Nile capturing or destroying all but two French vessels. With Napoleon away from the coast, his goal of strengthening the French position in the Mediterranean Sea was frustrated, but his army nonetheless succeeded in consolidating power in Egypt, although it faced repeated uprisings.

In early 1799, Napoleon led the army into the Ottoman province of Syria, now modern Israel and Syria, and defeated numerically superior Ottoman forces in several battles. However, his army was weakened by disease, mostly bubonic plague, and poor supplies. Napoleon led 13,000 French soldiers to the conquest of the coastal towns of Al Arish and Jaffa. At Jaffa the slaughter of prisoners and brutality against the inhabitants did much damage to Napoleon's reputation. After his army was weakened by the plague, Napoleon was unable to reduce the fortress of Acre, and was forced to return to Egypt in May 1799. He was still strong enough to destroy a Turkish army which was sent into Egypt.

While in Egypt, Bonaparte tried to keep a close eye on the European affairs, relying largely on newspapers and dispatches from France. As the Egyptian campaign was stagnating, the knowledge of the political instability that was developing in France and the news of the formation of a second coalition against France prompted Napoleon to leave Egypt. He sailed from Alexandria on 23 August 1799, and after running great danger of capture by the British, reached France on 9 October 1799. Napoleon had left the army in Egypt under the command of Kleber, who was assassinated later in June 1800. As the French army could no longer resist a threefold attack by the Turks and the British, 20,000 French troops surrendered at Cairo and Alexandria in August 1801. Although Napoleon was later accused of abandoning his troops, his departure from Egypt had been ordered by the Directory, which had suffered a series of military defeats to the forces of the Second Coalition, and feared an invasion.

5.6. Coup d'état of 19th Brumaire (10 November 1799): By the time Napoleon returned to Paris in October 1799, the military situation had improved due to several French victories. However, the government was bankrupt and the Directory was corrupt and inefficient. It was thoroughly unpopular among the people. The country was restless and ready to acclaim anyone who would give them honour and security.

Napoleon was approached by one of the Directors, Sieyès, seeking his support for a *coup* to overthrow the constitution. The plot included Bonaparte's brother Lucien, then serving as speaker of the Council of Five Hundred, Roger Ducos, another Director, and Talleyrand. On 9 November 1799 (18 Brumaire), and the following day (19 Brumaire), troops led by Napoleon seized the control of the

council which was in session in the palace of St. Cloud away from Paris. Seeing the troops and fearing for their lives majority of the legislators fled. The rump of those who remained voted the constitutional revision and appointed three provisional Consuls to carry it out. These three Consuls were: Napoleon, Sieyes and Ducos. The three Consuls promised 'fidelity to the Republic, to liberty, equality and the representative system of government'. Early on 11 November 1799 Napoleon was back in Paris and the *coup d'état* was over. Paris and France accepted it with surprising calm. There was no sympathy with the Councils or with the Directors and France was ready for a new experiment.

5.7. Napoleon as the First Consul: Although Sieyès expected to dominate the new regime, he was outmanoeuvred by Napoleon, who drafted the Constitution of the Year VIII and secured his own election as the First Consul. This made him the most powerful person in France, a power that was increased by the Constitution of the Year X, which declared him First Consul for life.

During the period of the Consulate (1799-1804), Napoleon instituted several lasting reforms, including centralized administration, higher education, a tax system, a central bank, law codes, and road and sewer systems. He negotiated the Concordat of 1801 with the Catholic Church, seeking to reconcile the mostly Catholic population with his regime. His set of civil laws, the Code Napoleon or Civil Code, has importance to this day in many countries. The Code was prepared by committees of legal experts.

5.8. War Against the Second Coalition: The second coalition of the powers against France comprising of England, Austria, Russia, Turkey, Portugal and Naples had been formed in 1798. Its object was to crush the revolutionary government in France and to confine France to her old boundaries. Prussia remained aloof from the second coalition. The coalition was formed when Napoleon was away in Egypt. The war against the second coalition began when Austria refused to turn out Russian troops from her territory on the demand of France.

In the beginning the situation was favourable to the Allies. The French army was defeated and driven across the Rhine. A combined Austro-Russian army defeated the French forces in two great battles. However, the year 1799 ended very badly for the Allies. The French were able to regain their position. The English were defeated and compelled to evacuate Netherlands (Holland). France was saved from the humiliation of defeat and foreign occupation.

The arrival of Napoleon on the scene was a source of great anxiety to the Allies. Russia withdrew from the coalition as Tsar Paul was

greatly dissatisfied with both England and Austria. While he aimed at the revival of the *Ancient Regime* in Europe by crushing the revolutionary France, Austria was more interested in the acquisition of Piedmont. The conduct of Austria annoyed the Tsar. He was also annoyed with the English as the latter supported Austrian policy. Moreover, the Tsar developed a great admiration for Napoleon and consequently withdrew from the Second Coalition. This left Napoleon free to deal with Austria and England.

Napoleon planned a twofold attack against Austria. While Moreau was to lead an army across the Rhine into the Danube Valley in order to attack Vienna, Napoleon was to lead an army into Italy by the passes of Switzerland. In 1800, Napoleon returned to Italy, which the Austrians had reconquered during his absence in Egypt. The French troops under Napoleon's command crossed the Alps in spring. While the campaign began badly, the Austrians were eventually routed in June 1800 at Marengo, leading to an armistice. Napoleon's brother Joseph, who was leading the peace negotiations in Lunéville, reported that due to British backing for Austria, Austria would not recognize France's newly gained territory. As negotiations became more and more complicated, Napoleon gave orders to his general Moreau to strike Austria once more. Moreau led France to victory at Hohenlinden. As a result the Treaty of Lunéville was signed in February 1801, under which the French gains of the Treaty of Campo Formio were reaffirmed and increased.

After the break up of the Second Coalition, France remained at war with England only. England and France had been at war continuously for nine years. In the course of this war England had defeated the French navy and had conquered many of the colonies of France and of her allies or dependencies, Holland and Spain. However, England was in financial difficulties and her debt had grown enormously and there was widespread dislike of the war among the British people.

A change of government in England paved the way for peace between the two countries. With the collapse of William Pitt's ministry, a new government led by Addington became receptive to the overtures of peace from Napoleon. The English desired peace largely to regain the European markets that the French had closed to them. On the other hand, Napoleon was keen on peace to complete his reform programme in France and consolidate his position in Europe.

After prolonged negotiations, the British signed the Treaty of Amiens with France in March 1802, which set terms for peace. By the Treaty of Amiens England recognized the existence of the French Republic. England also agreed to withdraw her troops from

several French and some of the Dutch and Spanish colonies. However, England retained Ceylon (Dutch) and Trinidad (Spain) in West Indies. England also promised to evacuate Malta and Egypt which the French had seized in 1798 and which England had taken from them. In return, Napoleon agreed to evacuate the Kingdom of Naples, to guarantee the integrity of Portugal and to restore Egypt to the Ottoman Empire and to recognize the independence of the Ionian Islands. With peace restored, Napoleon extended French influence into Holland (the Batavian Republic), Switzerland (the Helvetic Republic), and Savoy-Piedmont was annexed to France.

The peace between France and Britain was uneasy and short-lived. The monarchies of Europe were reluctant to recognize a republic, fearing that the ideas of the revolution might be exported to them. In England, the brother of Louis XVI was welcomed as a state guest although officially England recognized France as a republic. England failed to evacuate Malta, as promised, and protested against France's annexation of Piedmont.

Within thirteen months after the conclusion of the Treaty of Amiens war broke out once again between England and France in May 1803. The responsibility for the rupture of peace of Amiens rests squarely on Napoleon. He had considered Amiens as merely a truce in his struggle to humble England and destroy her colonial empire and commercial position.

England was alarmed at the continuous growth of Napoleon's influence in various parts of the European continent. He had annexed Piedmont and controlled Genoa. He became the president of the Cisalpine Republic. Holland was occupied by Napoleon in 1800 and a new constitution was forced on that country. The work of reorganizing the German states was completed under Napoleon's direction which was named the Confederation of the Rhine. Napoleon refused to renew the commercial treaty which had existed between England and France before 1793 and imposed high tariffs on British goods which made a renewal of trade practically impossible.

In 1803, Napoleon sent troops to occupy Hanover, whose Elector was King George III of England. The ruler of Prussia, Frederick William III protested against the French invasion of Hanover, but took no further action to prevent it. In spite of the fact that the Kingdom of Naples was not at war with France, Napoleon sent troops into that country to occupy its ports. By threats Spain and Portugal were compelled to pay subsidies to France and the Dutch and the Swiss were ordered to contribute troops. These measures were intended by Napoleon as preliminaries to an invasion and conquest of England. However, by these actions, Napoleon aroused resentment and alarm in various parts of the continent.

5.9. Napoleon-Emperor of the French: In February 1804 a British-financed plot to assassinate Napoleon was uncovered by the former police minister Joseph Fouche. In the wake of these events, which revived royalist hostility, the Senate petitioned Napoleon to establish a hereditary dynasty. Thus, on 2 December, 1804, Napoleon crowned himself Emperor in a ceremony at Notre Dame de Paris presided over by Pope Pius VII. Napoleon created a titled court that included many of his statesmen and generals as well as ex-royalists. Believing that family ties were more durable than treaties, in the next few years he placed members of his family on the thrones of several satellite states--Naples, Holland, Westphalia, and Spain--and married his relatives to some of the most distinguished families in Europe.

Thus, Napoleon's rise to power was meteoric and spectacular. By his bravery, military ability and statesmanlike qualities Napoleon established an unchallenged position in France culminating in his coronation as the 'Emperor of the French'. About his rise to political power in France, Napoleon had said, "I found the crown of France lying on the ground and I picked it up with my sword."

Questions

1. Give an account of the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte to political power in France.
2. Trace the career of Napoleon Bonaparte till his coronation as the Emperor of France in 1804.
3. Discuss the role of Napoleon in Italian and Egyptian campaigns.
4. Describe the various stages through which Napoleon rose to political power in France.



RISE AND FALL OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE- II

DOMESTIC REFORMS OF NAPOLEON

Objectives:

1. To understand and appreciate reforms in various fields introduced by Napoleon Bonaparte in France.
2. To study the impact of Napoleon's reforms on the future history of France in particular and the European continent in general.

6.1. Introduction: After the overthrow of the Directory following the *coup d'état* on 10 November 1799, a new constitution was drafted for France. Under the new constitution the executive power was vested in the hands of three Consuls, who were to be elected by the Senate for a term of ten years. One of the three Consuls was to be the First Consul. The First Consul was given practically absolute powers. He alone could promulgate laws and appoint and dismiss any civil and military official in any part of the country.

Napoleon Bonaparte was appointed as the First Consul. He soon consolidated his position by dismissing his colleagues Abbe Sieyes and Ducos and appointed in their place two other Consuls who were not strong enough to defy him. In 1802 Napoleon was appointed as the Consul for life with the right to nominate his successor.

Though the fame of Napoleon rests primarily on his military achievements, his domestic reforms undertaken during the period of the Consulate (1799-1804) have earned him a permanent place in history. Napoleon himself was of the opinion that to be a good general one must be a good civilian as well. The significance of Napoleon's work is that while his empire passed away with him, his administrative reforms proved permanent. If Napoleon based his authority and power merely with the force of military might, his position would have been very unstable and risky. What kept the French pacified and supportive for about fifteen years, from 1799 to 1814, was Napoleon's ability and genius as an administrator.

6.2. Problems Before Napoleon: Napoleon had to overcome the cumulative disorders that had plagued France for over a decade. In the western part of France there were 40,000 Chouhans overrunning the countryside, cutting off communications between Paris and the Atlantic coast and defying the representatives of the

government. The entire south and the valley of Rhone were infested with robber bands that attacked the coaches, robbed the mail and sacked the houses of the well-to-do. People were reluctant to pay taxes, the currency had become worthless and the credit of the government was in ruins. The clergy had raised the standard of rebellion against the state and the servants of the government exacted tribute from the governed. The workers in the large cities suffered from unemployment. The merchants and manufacturers suffered from the suspension or abandonment of economic activities. The challenge of the Revolution to the Catholic sentiment of France and to the organization of the Catholic Church had been the source of many of the gravest difficulties that France faced.

6.3. Reforms undertaken by Napoleon: With determine foresight and great energy Napoleon began the work of pacification and reconciliation in France. He completed this task within few years by introducing far reaching reforms in various fields. The chief reforms measures undertaken by Napoleon were the following:

6.3.1. Centralized Government: One of the first and enduring reforms of Napoleon Bonaparte as the First Consul was the reorganization of the administrative system by the Law of 17 February 1800. It is a tribute to Napoleon's genius that this reform still serves as the basis of the French administrative system. Napoleon retained the geographical divisions (83 departments) established by the National Assembly (1789-91) at the beginning of the French Revolution. However, Napoleon ended the autonomy, which the elected Departmental Councils had enjoyed. Each department was put under the direct responsibility of a *Prefect*, each district under a *sub-Prefect* and each municipality under a *Mayor*. A Council of Prefectures and a General Council were established to assist the *Prefect*; a District Council to assist the *sub-Prefect* and a Municipal Council to assist the *Mayor*.

Napoleon developed the Secretariat of the State. He converted this into the Ministry of State under Murat which became a central registry. This new ministry enabled Napoleon to supervise and have a control over the different ministries without allowing them any collective responsibility. For the assessment and collection of taxes, Napoleon established a centralized administration. Tax collectors were required to deposit in advance a proportion of the estimated collection of the taxes. In this way, under Napoleon the centralization of the *ancient regime* was re-established and introduced a bureaucratic system of local government.

6. 3.2. Establishment of Law and Order: Napoleon took active steps to end disorder and pacify the country. Thousands of *émigrés*

were still living abroad where they were a source of disaffection towards France and of friction between France and the countries, which gave them shelter. Napoleon invited the *émigrés* to return to their native land and promised to restore their estates to them if they were not sold. A large number of political prisoners were released.

Towards the Chouhans in the western part of the country, Napoleon first adopted a policy of reconciliation, which resulted in an armistice and the beginning of a peaceful negotiation. As circumstances demanded, Napoleon used alternately conciliation and repression. Napoleon issued a proclamation offering an amnesty to the Chouhans who laid down their arms. However, those who refused to surrender were ruthlessly suppressed. However, these measures failed to produce any desired effect. As a result, Napoleon was forced to take stronger measures to put down the lawlessness. He made vigorous preparations for a war against the rebels. Ultimately, the military campaign of Napoleon succeeded in suppressing the Chouhan menace.

6. 3.3. Economic Reforms: The measures taken to suppress lawlessness were followed by introducing a number of reforms in the economic field. Napoleon's economic policy was aimed at increasing and stabilizing the prosperity of France. The business world and financial circles welcomed Napoleon's rise to power. By a careful collection of taxes, Napoleon was able to add to the revenue of the state. By rigid economy, by severe punishment of corrupt officials and by the practice of forcing other states to support the French armies, Napoleon was able to reduce the state expenditure. He checked speculation in currency and regulated Stock Exchange. In February 1800, Napoleon established the Bank of France, which became a premier financial institution regulating the national finances. It offered credit facilities to the business community and promoted commerce and industry.

During the Consulate period under Napoleon, the industrial regeneration of France began. While French commerce suffered due to the prolonged maritime struggle between France and England, industry began a slow recovery. Napoleon was particularly interested in industry and took special measures to protect French products against English competition. He established a Society for the Encouragement of National Industry. Napoleon's interest in industrial production was well received by the workers as well as the manufacturers.

6. 3.4. Public Works: Napoleon carried out a large number of public works in France. He employed prisoners of war to carry out many works of public utility. The splendid highways of France are

the achievements of Napoleon. In 1811, Napoleon could boast of 220 broad military roads, which he had constructed. Thirty of these roads radiated from Paris to the borders of France. Two Trans-Alpine roads brought Paris in touch with Turin, Milan, Rome and Naples in Italy. A large number of bridges were also constructed. The former network of canals and waterways were improved.

6.3.5. Improvement of Agriculture : Agriculture was improved by the introduction of new methods from Belgium and England. Marshes were drained making them suitable for agriculture and habitation. The Lyons silk industry was revived, partly through the adoption of the new Jacquard loom. Cotton was introduced from the East, and was manufactured by means of the spinning jenny which came from England. Gas was adopted as an illuminant. Important seaports and harbours were enlarged and fortified for commercial and naval purposes. The general condition of France, until the Empire touched its period of ruin, showed an air of prosperity in all classes.

6. 3.6. The Concordat (1801): Napoleon was confronted with the task of bringing peace between the church and the state in France. The Revolution of 1789 had led to a lot of bitterness between the church and the state. During the Revolution, church property was confiscated by the state. The attempt to set up a constitutional Catholic Church independent of Rome and the Pope had proved a great failure. The constitutional priests had no following. In many cases they had married and adopted a secular life. By the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, the revolutionary government had alienated the clergy in France and had antagonized the Pope. Honest and scrupulous Catholics refused to take the oath of loyalty to the constitution. The civil war between the supporters of the juring and non-juring priests led to the serious consequences. It became difficult to the government to pay the salaries of the clergymen. The Catholic Church was disestablished and state became neutral in matters of religion. Thus, the policy of the revolutionary government of France towards the church had dissatisfied and alienated the majority of the French Catholics. This was the state of affairs when Napoleon became the First Consul.

Napoleon approached the question of the state-church relation from the point of view of a statesman. Personally indifferent to religious dogma, Napoleon felt very strongly that France was fundamentally a Catholic country. He realized that the alienation of the church created national divisions, which were a source of political weakness. Napoleon had an instinct of the strength of the Catholic Church and of the danger of conflict with a body that commanded the loyalty of so many Frenchmen. He wanted an established church as a support for his throne. "A state without a religion is like

a vessel without a compass,” he said. Thus, Napoleon was convinced that religion was a necessity to the state, and that the French state must ally itself with Catholicism, the religion of the majority.

After the Battle of Marengo the rapprochement between Napoleon and the Papacy was hurried on. The Battle of Marengo was celebrated by a religious thanksgiving. Pope Pius VII was restored to the Papal States. Prolonged and intricate negotiations between the representatives of Pope, Pius VII and Napoleon took place both in Paris and Rome. Twenty one drafts were prepared and discarded before the final agreement could be reached between Napoleon and the Pope on 16 July 1801. This agreement on religious matters came to be known as the *Concordat*.

The preamble of the Concordat was a compromise between the extreme views of both the parties. It stated, “the Government of the French Republic recognized that the Roman Catholic and Apostolic religion is the religion of the great majority of French citizens...His Holiness (the Pope) likewise recognizes that this same religion has derived and in this moment again expects the greatest benefit and grandeur from the establishment of the Catholic worship in France and from the personal profession of it which the Consuls of this Republic make.” By this compromise the Papacy was protected against Napoleon’s threat to secularize the state, while Napoleon succeeded in defeating the Pope’s desire to have Catholicism declared as the state religion.

By the Concordat, the French government recognized Catholicism as the religion of the majority of the nation, and granted freedom of worship subject to the police powers of the state. In the Concordat the following clause appears, “worship should be public so long as it conformed to the police regulations which the government should judge necessary in the interest of public tranquility.” It was declared that no Papal Bulls were applicable to France; that no Synod of the clergy of France could be held without the permission of the First Consul; that no Bishop might leave his diocese even if summoned by the Pope. Worst of all, it was laid down that the declaration of the Gallican liberties, that is, the special rights and liberties of the Catholic Church in France, were to be taught to all those who were preparing for the priesthood. This declaration, formulated in 1682, had been a matter of long controversy between the old monarchy of France and the papacy. In short it curtailed the authority of the Pope within the Church of France, and declared that that authority was not final until it had been corroborated by the assent of the Church. Due to these limitations on his authority, the Pope was hesitant about accepting the Concordat as a whole, as this

declaration was attached to it. However, at the end the Pope had no other alternative but to accept it.

Napoleon agreed to place the churches and chapels at the disposal of the bishops. The Pope accepted the payment of salaries to the clergy by the state. The bishops were to be appointed by the First Consul and instituted by the Pope. The bishops were required to take an oath of loyalty to the head of the state. They would retain the church land that had been sold to the peasants during the revolution. However, such lands, which were under state control, would be restored to the church. Thus, Napoleon accomplished within a short period reconciliation between the state and the church.

The Concordat assured the government of the submission of the clergy, who became paid civil servants appointed by the state and bound to it by an oath of loyalty. However, later, Napoleon came into serious conflict with the Pope, especially on the question of the enforcement of the Continental System. The Pope excommunicated Napoleon and the latter retaliated by arresting and detaining the Pope.

6.3.7. Code Napoleon: Napoleon undertook legal reforms culminating in the Code Napoleon, which is considered as the greatest monument of Napoleon's fame and the most permanent work of the French Revolutionary era. It influenced not only the course of the French history, but practically the legal development of many of the European and other countries such as Germany and Italy.

One of the greatest evils of the *ancient regime* was the lack of a uniform code of law. The revolutionary assemblies had prepared a number of drafts, but none of them had been put into effect. Napoleon did not have any legal background. However, he approached the question of legal reforms with an open mind. In 1800, Napoleon appointed a Committee of eminent lawyers, who drew up a draft of a Civil Code. Napoleon presided over many of the meetings and made useful suggestions. His influence was naturally thrown on the side of the authority of the family as well as the state. He stood for the absolute authority of the father within the family over wife and children alike.

Concerning Napoleon's role at these general deliberations, Roederer, one of his intimates has the following praise, "In these sittings, the First Consul manifested those remarkable powers of attention and precise analysis which enabled him for ten hours at a stretch to devote himself to one object or several, without ever allowing himself to be distracted by errant thought." There is no doubt whatever of the passionate interest that he displayed in the

discussions of the intelligence and imagination that he manifested in the larger social and political aspects of the legal questions.

The Civil Code was discussed article by article by the Council of State. The Civil Code, which was also known as *Code Napoleon* came into effect on 21 March 1804 and is still the law of France. It was a brief and clear collection of legal principles. The Code Napoleon is based on common sense and experience rather than on theory.

The Code Napoleon was profoundly national. It maintained the social achievements of the Revolution of 1789. The Code provided with a body of statute law containing more than two thousand articles. The Code maintained the principle of civil equality established by the Revolution. It was at once 'a summary and correction of the Revolution'. It provided the unity of legislation that France had so long desired. It maintained the emancipation of civil law from religious influence as the state remained secular. It defended the revolutionary principle of equality by guaranteeing civil liberty and civil equality. Hereditary nobility was not re-established. It followed the general principle of revolutionary legislation concerning the land and the equality of inheritance. It granted religious toleration. Civil marriage was recognized and divorce was permitted.

The Civil Code of Napoleon also bore the impress Napoleon's authoritarian views, particularly in those provisions that were incorporated to restore the unity of the family life. The duties of parents and children were defined. The authority of the father in the family was restored and the despotism of the state repeated in the structure of the family. Under this code the status of women was systematically reduced. The code contained a number of reactionary provisions subjecting the wife to the power of the husband debarring her from the administration of their common property and requiring the husband's written permission for her acquisition of property. The right of divorce was recognized when the divorce was requested both by husband and wife, but it was strictly regulated in the interest of the family unity. The law of inheritance in general followed the revolutionary principle that there should be an equal division of property among the heirs. The sanctity of private property was maintained. The relation between one citizen and another, and his community and a citizen towards the state were defined clearly. The code also provided for individual rights and duties.

Compared to the legislation of the Revolution, the Code Napoleon was reactionary; in comparison with the legislation of the *Ancient Regime*, it was revolutionary. Its great virtue lay in its admirable brevity and clarity, in its remarkable application of deep-rooted

human impulses and juristic traditions to regulate and systematize the revolutionary enactments (reforms). Everybody could appeal to its general principles, and everybody could understand its specific provisions. In spite of all its defects, it was much more progressive than any other civil code that Europe then had. Wherever Napoleon's armies introduced it in the course of their conquest of Europe and in all other countries that it reached it brought the social and political ideals of the French Revolution. In that sense, the Code Napoleon became as universal as the Roman law and a permanent factor in promoting the democratic ideals of 1789. In France itself, it served to illustrate once again that the First Consul was systematically bent upon reconciling the old France with the new.

The Codes, which were promulgated during the Empire all bore the impress of the harsh paternalism and despotism which characterized Napoleon's imperial ideas. A Code of Civil Procedure upon which work was also begun during the Consulate was completed in 1806. The Code of Criminal Procedure and the Penal Code were also begun during the Consulate, but not completed till 1810. They continued many of the changes that were introduced during the revolution but weakened the application of these revolutionary principles. Equality before law was recognized by having the same penalties for all citizens. The penalties stipulated were harsher than those introduced during the Revolution. The penalties included life imprisonment and death penalty. However, the use of torture was abolished. The citizen was legally protected, at least in theory against arbitrary arrest and imprisonment. Though the procedure was a vast improvement over that of the *Ancient Regime*, a public trial with witnesses and a jury was not always given to all criminals. Nevertheless, after due allowance had been made for the reactionary elements that Napoleon introduced into the criminal procedure, the Criminal Code still remains a consolidation of the revolutionary achievements. The Commercial Code (1807) also served as a model for many countries in Europe.

In their totality, the Code Napoleon represents the most comprehensive effort ever made in France to achieve legal unity. If in France, the Codes reflected the imperial despotism of Napoleon, elsewhere, in Italy, Germany, Switzerland and Holland, the codes stood for the principles of equality. Everywhere they had a civilizing and refining influence and an instrument of the triumph of revolutionary principles over conservatism and reaction. In his last years at St. Helena, Napoleon observed: "My real glory is not my having won forty battles. What will never be effaced, what will endure for ever is my Civil Code."

6. 3.8. Reforms in Education: The Revolution of 1789 had aspirations towards the organization of an elaborate educational system in France, but had not found time to do more than make a beginning. In this field also, Napoleon in characteristic fashion, by his powers of energy and will, translated ideas into facts. However, Napoleon carried out many reforms in the field of education according to his own bias towards rigid centralization and authority. According to the new scheme of education visualized by Napoleon, there were to be schools of four grades: primary, secondary, semi-military boarding schools, and special schools for technical training. At the head of all and controlling all came the Imperial University, which was definitely constituted in 1808. There was to be a single University for entire France, with seventeen subordinate provincial institutions controlled from the centre. It was intended to bring the entire educational system of France under the control of the University. No one was to be allowed to teach who was not a graduate in one of the faculties of the University. All schools were required to teach ethical principles of Christianity and loyalty to Napoleon. However, the vast military and political tasks which claimed Napoleon's attention prevented him from realizing his aim. The famous *Institute de France* had been established in 1795 for higher study and research. Napoleon greatly appreciated the work it did in physical science and the fine arts, in mathematics and literature. However, Napoleon reorganized the institution. He disliked the study of moral and political sciences, and, by a decree of 23 January 1803, Napoleon abolished the department that was devoted to these studies.

Napoleon was equally opposed to liberty of expression in the press and in literature. Newspapers were strictly censored, and at last almost suppressed. All books had to be submitted to examination before they were published. The theatre was also had to submit to a peculiarly rigid control.

6.3.9. The Legion of Honour: Napoleon instituted the Legion of Honour to reward persons who rendered meritorious service to the state in different fields of activity. He felt that such recognition would encourage the principle of 'career open to talent'. Napoleon extended this patronage to artists and writers. He promoted the beautification of Paris so that it might become the most artistic city as well as the political center of Europe.

The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Empire had far reaching effects upon Europe. The achievements of the Revolution were introduced in those regions overrun by Napoleon's armies of conquest. In the newly conquered territories in Germany, Italy, Poland and the Netherlands, Napoleon introduced a modern administrative system. With the spread of revolutionary ideals,

feudalism was abolished and social equality and economic advancement was promoted. Initially, Napoleon presented himself as the champion of the oppressed people against their tyrannical rulers.

Napoleon greatly contributed to the promotion of nationalism leading to their final unification later in Italy and Germany. First of all Napoleon reduced the number petty principalities and brought about political unification by constituting the Confederation of the Rhine in Germany and the Northern Italian Kingdom. He also eliminated Austrian influence from these regions. Besides, by introducing common administrative structure and uniform legal system, Napoleon sowed the seeds of national sentiments among the German and Italian people. Thus, Napoleon may be described as a *child of the revolution*, and a link between the French Revolution and the New Europe.

Questions

1. Give an account of the reforms introduced by Napoleon Bonaparte in France.
2. Critically examine the domestic policy of Napoleon Bonaparte.
3. Write a detailed note on the Concordat (1801).
4. Evaluate the role of Napoleon in the legal reforms in France.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) The Concordat (1801)
 - (b) The Code Napoleon



RISE AND FALL OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE- III

EXPANSION, CONSOLIDATION AND DOWNFALL

Objectives:

1. To study various military campaigns undertaken by Napoleon to expand the French Empire.
2. To understand the measures taken by Napoleon to consolidate his power in France and Europe.
3. To analyze the causes for the downfall of Napoleon Bonaparte.

7.1. Introduction: With his coronation in 1804, Napoleon became the Emperor of France. Being an ambitious person, he dreamt of establishing his power over the whole continent of Europe. The extension of the French boundaries and expansion of Napoleon's power in different regions of Europe had already started since Napoleon captured political power in France following the *coup d'état* in November 1799. Even during the wars against the Second Coalition Napoleon had succeeded in defeating Austria and expanding the French dominion in Italy, Netherlands and the Rhine region. During the Consulate period (1799-1804) Napoleon could not follow a forward policy in Europe as he was keen to introduce drastic reforms in France, win over the support of the French people in general and consolidate his position in the country. Once he completed the pacification of the country through his far-reaching reforms, Napoleon crowned himself as the Emperor and followed a vigorous foreign policy that led to the expansion and consolidation of his power throughout Europe. However, the European powers joined against Napoleon and in a sustained effort managed to push back the French forces. A number of circumstances worked against Napoleon which finally led to his downfall.

7.2. War Against the Third Coalition: In 1804, Napoleon assembled a large army of 1,50,000 men known as the 'Grand Army' or 'Army of England' at Boulogne apparently for the invasion of England. There was a general fear in England about the impending French invasion and preparations were made to meet

the French threat. For nearly eighteen months, the two armed opponents stood face to face across the English Channel. The superiority of the British navy was the chief obstacle for the French invasion of England.

England prepared for defence as well as for offence against France by forming the Third Coalition against France. In 1805 England convinced Austria and Russia to join a Third Coalition against Napoleon. Sweden and Naples also joined this coalition. The object of the third coalition was the expulsion of the French from North Germany, the independence of Switzerland and Netherlands (Holland) and the restoration of Savoy-Piedmont to the King of Sardinia. However, the Third Coalition did not aim at the changing the form of government in France.

7.3. Battle Of Trafalgar (1805): Napoleon's grand design of invading England did not materialize. The English Channel was protected by Admiral Nelson and Cornwallis. Napoleon knew the French fleet could not defeat the British navy and therefore tried to lure the British fleet away from the English Channel so that, in theory at least, a Spanish and French fleet could take control of the Channel long enough for French armies to cross to England. Napoleon was wholly ignorant of nautical matters, his orders to his admirals were often contradictory. The fleet of rafts he had prepared would have sunk in the Channel, or taken at least three days to transport his army, even if the crossing was unopposed. However, with Austria and Russia preparing an invasion of France and its allies, Napoleon had to change his plans and turn his attention to the continent.

The French fleet was blockaded in the Spanish fort of Cadiz by a large British fleet commanded by Admiral Nelson. Napoleon issued fresh instructions to the French navy to reach the Mediterranean. These orders of Napoleon fitted in perfectly with Nelson's own plans which were to give battle to the French and Spanish squadron whenever they moved out of Cadiz. The French Admiral left Cadiz determined to show his eagerness to meet the British fleet. The decisive naval battle took place on 21 October 1805 off the Cape Trafalgar and the result was the crushing defeat of the French fleet. After six hours of ship to ship battle more than half of the combined French and Spanish fleet of thirty-three ships were destroyed or captured. The British navy remained intact without the loss of a single ship. However, Admiral Nelson died in the course of the Battle of Trafalgar, a sacrifice to his own victory.

The British victory at Trafalgar was decisive in determining the continuity of England's mastery over the seas. In so far as the actual invasion of England was concerned, Trafalgar hardly affected the situation. Napoleon had already abandoned the plan of

invading England two months earlier and had already reached the Austrian capital Vienna before he received the news of the French disaster at Trafalgar.

7.4. War Against Austria And Russia: Following his unsuccessful attempt to invade England, Napoleon had given orders to the 'Grand Army' to advance to the line of the Upper Rhine in August 1805 on the pretext of Austrian mobilization. The campaign against Austria was swift and decisive. Two Austrian armies were put into the field, the larger one under Archduke Charles in Italy, the smaller one under General Mack in Germany. Leaving the Italian campaign to Massena and his own step-son Eugene, Napoleon adopted the plan he had formulated in 1800 of striking across the south of Germany to Vienna. General Mack who awaited the arrival of the Russians in Bavaria was encircled by Napoleon at Ulm and forced him to surrender (20 October 1805) More than 20,000 Austrian were taken as prisoners.

From Ulm Napoleon hastened to Vienna. With the defeat of Mack's forces the last obstacle on the way to Vienna was removed. Archduke Charles who had also been defeated in northern Italy was hurriedly recalled to protect Vienna. But he arrived too late. By the middle of November 1805 Napoleon entered Vienna unopposed. The Austrian Emperor Francis II fled to join Tsar Alexander I. The Austrian forces in the neighbourhood of Vienna retreated in order to join the approaching Russians. The resistance of the Allies against Napoleon received a fresh impetus when they received the news of England's victory at Trafalgar against the French fleet which took place the day after the defeat of the Austrians at Ulm.

7.5. Battle Of Austerlitz: Bernadotte, the commander of the French army in Hanover moved south to join Napoleon. In the course of his march, he crossed Ansbach, a Prussian province without permission from the Prussian King. This prompted Frederick William III to prepare for a war against the French. With an agreement with the Tsar, it was arranged that the King of Prussia should offer his services to Napoleon as mediator and that he should join the Allies if his proposals were not accepted by Napoleon. If Frederick William III had acted swiftly Napoleon's position would have been critical. But before he could move, Napoleon encountered and defeated the combined Austrian and Russia armies in the decisive Battle of Austerlitz on the plains of Moravia on 2 December 1805, the first anniversary of Napoleon's coronation. This 'model battle' filled Napoleon with pride. "The Battle of Austerlitz is the most splendid of all I have fought", Napoleon wrote home.

7.6. Treaty Of Pressburg: Following the defeat of the Allies at Austerlitz, the Tsar retreated eastwards with his army and the Austrian Emperor Francis II submitted for the third time to Napoleon. The Prussian King gave up the recent arrangement with the Tsar and formed an alliance with Napoleon as a result of which he was permitted to occupy Hanover. On 26 December 1805, Austria was forced to sign the disastrous Treaty of Pressburg. By this treaty:

(1) Austria was compelled to give up the last of her Italian possessions-Venetia, Istria and Dalmatia to the Kingdom of Italy. She was permitted to retain Trieste. Tyrol was ceded to Bavaria and other lands to Baden and Wurtemberg.

(2) Bavaria and Wurtemberg were recognized as kingdoms over which the Austrian Emperor renounced all rights.

It was part of Napoleon's deliberate policy to consolidate the south German states and to create a dependent relationship between them and him which would form a complete check on Austria. Baden became the 'Grand Duchy'. Dynastic marriages further consolidated the arrangements. The first was between Napoleon's step-son Eugene and a daughter of the Bavarian house. The second between Napoleon's brother Jerome and the Princes of Wurtemberg and the third between a niece of Josephine and the Prince of Baden.

The most important consequence of the Treaty of Pressburg was the reconstruction of Germany. Francis II had already given up the elective imperial title which had been held by the Habsburg rulers of Austria for nearly four hundred years as the 'Holy Roman Emperors'. Napoleon abolished the institution of the 'Holy Roman Empire'. The independence of some of the smaller states was terminated and merged with other states. Sixteen of the German states in the south and south-western Germany were constituted into a league known as the 'Confederation of the Rhine' and became tributary vassals of the French Empire. "Roll up the map of Europe", William Pitt is said to have remarked after the Battle of Austerlitz, "it will not be wanted these ten years."

Besides the wars of conquest and expansion, Napoleon proceeded to expand and consolidate his power in other ways as well. He adopted the policy of establishing vassal states under the rule of members of his family. The Bourbon king of Naples in Italy, Ferdinand was deposed and Napoleon's brother, Joseph Bonaparte was elevated to the throne. Napoleon's sister Elise was made the Princess of Lucca, a Duchy in Italy. Another brother of Napoleon, Louis Bonaparte was appointed as the King of Netherlands (Holland) Napoleon's brother-in-law, Joachim Murat

became the Grand-duke of Berg and his step-son Eugene acted as the Emperor's Viceroy in the Kingdom of Italy.

7.7. Wars Of The Fourth Coalition-War Against Prussia: Soon friction developed between Napoleon and Frederick William III. Napoleon was planning to form a north German Confederation similar to the Confederation of the Rhine. Napoleon at this time was negotiating for peace with England on the basis of the restoration of Hanover to England which had been promised to England. However, Prussia had occupied Hanover. Under these circumstances, Frederick William allied with the Tsar, who was still at war with France and demanded that Napoleon should withdraw his troops to the west of the Rhine. Napoleon marched against Prussia. One Prussian army was defeated by Napoleon in the Battle of Jena. A second army of Prussia was defeated by the French forces at Aurstadt. Several Prussian fortresses fell to the French troops. Napoleon entered Berlin on 25 October 1806 and seized the sword of Frederick the Great as his prize. From Berlin, Napoleon issued the famous Berlin Decrees which declared the British Isles in a state of blockade and prohibited commerce with them on the part of his dominions and those of his allies. Then he set forth upon a new campaign, this time against Russia.

7.8. Campaign Against Russia And The Treaty Of Tilsit: After defeating Prussia, Napoleon turned his attention against the Russians. Proceeding to Warsaw, he planned a new campaign which resulted in two chief battles at Eylau and Friedland. In the Battle of Eylau Napoleon narrowly escaped defeat and lost more than half of his men. It was a drawn battle, the Russian soldiers fighting with reckless bravery. However, Napoleon was successful in defeating the Russian army at Friedland (June 1807). But a single battle could not bring about the fall of the Russian Empire as Austerlitz and Jena had destroyed Austria and Prussia respectively. Nevertheless, the Battle of Friedland was a decisive battle. It justified Alexander I in negotiating with Napoleon, who was conducting a diplomatic campaign along with the military campaign. Napoleon had concluded an armistice with Sweden which was threatening from behind, pacified Austria upon his flank, stimulated the national aspirations in Poland by creating the Duchy of Warsaw, and entered into a treaty with the Shah of Persia (Iran).

On a raft on the River Memel as it flows past Tilsit, a conference between Napoleon and Alexander I was arranged to discuss the preliminaries of peace. Subsequent meetings were held in the Tilsit town itself. Frederick William III of Prussia also joined them. After prolonged negotiations the Treaty of Tilsit was signed.

Tsar Alexander I was delighted to find that Napoleon did not demand of him any sacrifice of territories and that he even

suggested the extension of the Russian boundaries at the expense of the Ottoman Empire and Sweden. On the other hand the Tsar recognized the changes Napoleon had brought about or was about to make in Western Europe, in Italy and in Germany. Alexander I agreed to mediate between England and France. In case England declined to make peace then Russia would join France in enforcing the Continental blockade which was designed to bring England to terms.

Prussia, however, was to lose heavily. The Prussian share in the partition of Poland (except part of West Prussia and Austrian Galatia) was formed into the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. The King of Saxony, an ally of Napoleon was appointed as the Grand Duke of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Out of the western provinces ceded by Prussia together with Hanover and some small German states, the Kingdom of Westphalia was created and granted to Jerome Bonaparte. Both Saxony and Westphalia joined the Confederation of the Rhine.

By this time Napoleon was at the zenith of his power. The Tsar became his ally; Prussia was crushed so completely that for sometime she ceased to be a factor in the European affairs and Austria was afraid to move. Napoleon was not only supreme in a greatly expanded France but he had established a number of vassal kingdoms and tributary states so that his will was supreme everywhere in western and central Europe.

7.9. The Continental System: By defeating Austria, Russia and Prussia Napoleon had become supreme in the European continent. However, in spite of all his efforts, he could not inflict any defeat on England. England's naval power, industrial development and commercial prosperity enabled her to withstand Napoleon's attempts to humiliate her. Finally, in a desperate attempt to bring England to her knees, Napoleon devised a plan known as the Continental System, to destroy British commerce and ruin her economy as a prelude to her political and military humiliation.

Napoleon introduced the Continental System by the Berlin and Milan Decrees (1806). By these decrees Napoleon imposed continental blockade of the British Isles. He prevented the import of British goods by any country in Europe. No British ships were to be allowed to enter European ports and all European countries were forced to stop their trade with England. In this way Napoleon wanted to teach a lesson to the nation of shopkeepers.

England also retaliated against Napoleon's Continental System. The British government issued Orders in Council, which led to the blockade of all European ports by the British navy. Thus, the British navy from trading on sea with other countries prevented those

countries, which had stopped their trade with England under French threat.

The implementation of the Continental System was a physical impossibility for Napoleon. His empire was very wide and lack of a strong navy made his task still difficult. To ensure the working of the Continental System, Napoleon had to exercise his political control over European countries. Italy was the first to disobey the Continental System, but the French army subdued her. When the Pope also refused to obey, Napoleon did not hesitate to imprison him. As the Europeans were deprived of necessities of life due to the blockade, they began to defy the orders of Napoleon. The Continental System, rather than harming British economy, damaged the European economy in general and the French in particular. Under these circumstances Napoleon was finally forced to give up the continental System.

7.10. The Peninsular War: It was with the object of enforcing the Continental System that Napoleon was forced to interfere in Portugal and Spain, which led to the Peninsular War. At first, Napoleon arranged with Spain for the conquest and partition of Portugal. In 1808, French forces under Marshal Joachim Murat captured Madrid. Members of the Portuguese royal family, under the British protection escaped to the colony of Brazil. They remained there until the overthrow of Napoleon.

With a large number of troops stationed in Spain, Napoleon set about to dismantle the last of the surviving Bourbon dynasties in Spain. Earlier, Revolution had overthrown the Bourbons in France and Napoleon himself had dispossessed the Bourbons in Naples. The Bourbon King of Spain, Ferdinand VII was forced to vacate his Spanish throne to be occupied by Napoleon's brother Joseph. Murat, Napoleon's brother-in-law took Joseph's place as the King of Naples.

The highhanded action of Napoleon in Spain incited the freedom loving Spaniards to rebel against the French occupation of their country. The efforts of Napoleon to suppress the Spanish revolt led to the Peninsular War. In Spain, Napoleon encountered an opposition quite different in nature and quality from any he had met so far in Italy or Germany. Previously, he waged wars against the governments and their armies. However, in Spain he had to face the popular struggle. Napoleon under-estimated the strength of Spanish national feeling. England sent Arthur Wellesley to organize the Spanish and Portuguese resistance to the French army. The so-called Peninsular War, which continued from 1808 to 1813, resulted in heavy casualties for the French. The French were defeated and expelled from Spain and Joseph was deposed. The

Peninsular War marked the beginning of Napoleon's downfall. Napoleon later remarked that the 'Spanish ulcer that killed him'.

Other European countries followed the example of the Spanish revolt and began to repudiate the Continental System. When Austria revolted, Napoleon sent a French army, which defeated them at Wagram, near Vienna in July 1809. Meanwhile, Napoleon divorced his wife Josephine, as she could not bear him children, and married the 18-year-old Archduchess Marie Louise, daughter of Emperor Francis I of Austria, so that she could produce an heir to his vast empire. The couple had a son, also named Napoleon (II), who was given the title King of Rome.

7.11. Invasion Of Russia: The alliance between Napoleon and Tsar Alexander I came under severe strain due to a number of reasons. Russian economy had suffered heavily due to the Continental System. Mutual distrust brought them to the brink. The withdrawal of Russia from the Continental System prompted Napoleon to invade Russia with a huge army of 600,000 men. In June 1812, Napoleon's army crossed the Neman River into Russia. The Russians retreated without giving an opportunity to Napoleon to defeat them. As they withdrew, the Russians followed the 'scorched earth' policy, depriving the advancing French troops provisions and communication. The French army suffered due to starvation and severe Russian winter. In September 1812, Napoleon fought the Russians at Borodino, near Moscow. The battle resulted in many casualties on both sides, but produced no clear result. Napoleon, with heavy losses in men and material pushed forward to Moscow, but found the city empty and burning. As the Czar made no offer of peace, Napoleon began his return march from Moscow in October 1812. The snowstorms and freezing temperature and lack of supplies brought disaster to Napoleon's already dilapidated army. Russian soldiers called Cossacks killed many of the stragglers. Out of 600,000 men, about 500,000 died, deserted or captured during the campaign.

7.12. The Battle Of Nations: The collapse of the Grand Army was a great military and political setback for Napoleon. This encouraged the formation of the Fourth Coalition comprising of England, Austria, Russia, Prussia and Sweden. The Germans began their war of liberation. Though Napoleon won initial victories against the allies, he was defeated in the so-called Battle of Nations at Leipzig in October 1813. Napoleon retreated into France. The allies pursued him and captured Paris in March 1814.

7.13. The Battle Of Waterloo: Napoleon abdicated the throne of France on 11 April, 1814. He was exiled to the island of Elba in the Mediterranean Sea. The Bourbon monarchy was restored to France and Louis XVIII, brother of executed Louis XVI was placed

on the throne of France. However, Napoleon escaped from Elba and returned to France in February 1815. He regained the French throne and forced Louis XVIII to seek refuge in Belgium. Napoleon, once again ruled France for hundred days. The coalition powers, with a determination to prevent Napoleon from establishing his rule over France for a second time, joined forces. The Anglo-Prussian forces under the command of Duke of Wellington (Arthur Wellesley) and Blucher respectively, defeated Napoleon Bonaparte for the last time in the Battle of Waterloo in Belgium on 18 June 1815. Napoleon once again fled to Paris and abdicated for the second time on 22 June 1815. He tried to escape to the United States, but failed in his attempt. In August he was sent to the barren island of St. Helena, in the South Atlantic Ocean. Napoleon died of cancer on 5 May 1821. In 1840, the British and French governments cooperated in bringing his remains to Paris.

7.14. Causes Of The Downfall Of Napoleon: The downfall of Napoleon Bonaparte was as sudden as his rise. The decline of Napoleon began since 1808 and his downfall was complete with his final defeat in the Battle of Waterloo in 1815. The chief reasons for the decline and downfall Napoleon can be summarized as the following:

7.14.1. Over Ambition of Napoleon: Napoleon was an inordinately ambitious person. After capturing political power through the coup d'état, Napoleon, at first, became Consul for a period of ten years along with Sieyes and Ducos. However, on himself becoming the First Consul, Napoleon exercised political power as a dictator. Soon after he dropped the other two Consuls and became Consul for life in 1802. His ambition prompted him to crown himself as the Emperor of France in 1804. Besides, he was not content with ruling over France. His ambition led to wars of conquests against the neighbouring countries to build a Europe-wide empire. This attempt led to long drawn wars, which exhausted France of manpower and resources. Besides, excessive pride, over confidence, intolerance and boundless ego contributed to the downfall of Napoleon.

7.14.2. Heterogeneous Character of Napoleon's Empire: Napoleon's vast empire was multi-racial, multi-lingual and multi-cultural. Thus, he could not cement the different regions through any bond of union. The empires created by sword had to be maintained by sword alone. The French occupied regions outside France did not remain loyal to Napoleon. The hatred of the French occupation led to national sentiments in Italy, Germany and Spain. The spirit of nationalism was awakened in every part of Europe by the tyranny of Napoleon. In the earlier part of his career, Napoleon appeared as a liberator, freeing subject peoples from oppression. However, in course of time, they found that their new freedom was

more burdensome than their former serfdom. Thus, the people in French occupied regions began their struggle for liberation from France. The people's resistance to the French domination led to popular uprising, especially in Spain, which led to the Peninsular War and defeat of the French forces.

7.14.3. Weakness of the French Naval Power: Under Napoleon the French navy was much more inferior to that of England. This was manifested in the defeat of the French navy in the Battle of the Nile (1798) and the Battle of Trafalgar (1805) by the British navy. In both battles, Admiral Horatio Nelson commanded the British fleet against the French. The supremacy of the British prevented Napoleon from carrying on a plan of invasion of England. Moreover, weakness of the French naval power led to the failure of the Continental System of Napoleon.

7.14.4. Failure of the Continental System: As observed earlier, Napoleon's attempt to destroy the British economy through the Continental system proved to be the greatest blunder. He underestimated the naval and commercial power of England. Rather than harming the British trade and commerce and ruining her economy, the Continental System boomeranged on France. England, with her powerful navy blockaded the European ports and prevented the entry of neutral ships. The European powers, which suffered due to the British blockade, repudiated the Continental System and carried on trade with England. Napoleon's attempt to enforce the Continental System led to the Peninsular War and wars against Prussia and Russia leading to reverses to the French forces.

7.14.5. Setback in the Peninsular War: Napoleon himself admitted that it was the 'Spanish ulcer' that ruined him. In order to enforce the Continental System, Napoleon sought to impose greater control over Portugal and Spain, which resulted in the Peninsular War. Moreover, the deposition of the Bourbon King of Spain and enthronement of Napoleon's brother, Joseph aroused the Spanish people to fight against the French army of occupation. The British lent their support to the Spanish revolt by sending Arthur Wellesley to organize and lead the Spanish army of resistance. During the long-drawn Peninsular War (1808-1813) the French army faced defeat. The Peninsular War destroyed the myth of Napoleon's invincibility.

7.14.6. Failure of the Russian Campaign: Napoleon's invasion of Russia with an enormous army of 600,000 men was suicidal. Besides, its cost in terms of men and money, the war against Russia ultimately ruined Napoleon and his reputation. The 'scorched earth' policy followed by Russia and severe winter proved disastrous to the French army. A large part of the French

army perished due to hunger, cold and Russian attack. The collapse of Napoleon's 'Grand Army' was followed by his defeat in the Battle of Nations (1813) at Leipzig by the Fourth Coalition of powers.

7.14.7. Alienation of the Catholics: Another cause of Napoleon's downfall was the treatment meted out by Napoleon to the Pope. Napoleon's annexation of the Papal States, followed by the imprisonment of the Pope for refusing to obey the decrees that introduced the Continental System, alienated the Roman Catholics in Europe in general and in France in particular. The alienation of the Catholics was a psychological and political setback to Napoleon.

7.14.8. Coalition of Powers: The monarchical European powers, which had united against revolutionary France, continued their alliance against Napoleon. With ambitious designs on Europe, Napoleon unwittingly drew the continental powers in coalition against him. England, Austria, Prussia, Russia and later, Sweden formed as many as four coalitions against Napoleon. Though he had succeeded in breaking the earlier three coalitions either through diplomacy or war, he could not prevent them scheming against him. Napoleon could never defeat England, which was the core of the coalition against him. The British navy and economic resources greatly helped England in withstanding Napoleon's assault, such as the Continental System. The British general, Arthur Wellesley (Duke of Wellington) played an important role in the Peninsular War and the Battle of Waterloo, which led to the final downfall of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Questions

1. Give an account of the expansion and consolidation of the Napoleonic Empire in Europe.
2. Discuss the wars of expansion and consolidation undertaken by Napoleon against Austria, Prussia and Russia.
3. Trace the course of events that led to the downfall of Napoleon.
4. Analyze the chief causes of the downfall of Napoleon.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Treaty of Tilsit
 - (b) Continental System
 - (c) Peninsular War
 - d) Causes of the downfall of Napoleon



ERA OF METTERNICH-I

THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

Objectives:

1. To understand the problems that were faced by the European statesmen after the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte.
2. To study the measures undertaken by the Congress of Vienna to solve the problems created by the French revolution and Napoleonic Empire.
3. To critically analyze the European settlement brought about by the Congress of Vienna.

8.1. Introduction: Napoleon was decisively defeated in the Battle of Nations at Leipzig (October 1813) by a coalition of four powers—England, Austria, Russia and Prussia. By the Treaty of Chaumont (9 March 1814) these four powers converted themselves from a coalition to an alliance for a period of twenty years. They proposed first to overthrow Napoleon, next to prevent him or his dynasty from returning to France, and to guarantee the territorial settlement to be made by a concerted alliance for twenty years. Differences between Austria (Metternich) and Russia (Alexander) made an agreement difficult. It was chiefly due to the influence of Castlereagh, the foreign secretary of England the alliance and agreement between different powers were brought about. By the end of March 1814 the Allies had decided to restore the Bourbons to France and had occupied Paris. By the beginning of April, Napoleon abdicated for himself and his family. Following his exile to the island of Elba in the Mediterranean the Allies sat down to mould the map of Europe.

8.2. Restoration Of The Bourbon Dynasty In France: The abdication of Napoleon led to the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty to France. Louis XVIII brother of Louis XVI returned to France from his exile. He was not popular in France as he seemed to be degrading the glory which France had won under Napoleon, by shaking hands with the allies. Though Louis XVIII proclaimed a constitution for France, he tried to revive the old theory of Divine Right of Kings to some extent, which the Frenchmen despised. The royalists let loose a 'white terror' against the supporters of Napoleon, whom they plundered and murdered. The army, the pride of France was greatly reduced; many of its great leaders and

more of its fine soldiers were dismissed. The Church, which so many Frenchmen had assailed, was reestablished in something like its old bigotry and power. Worse than all this, Louis XVIII was asked by the Allies to consent to a reduction of the boundaries of France. The ideal of the Revolution and Napoleon was that France should realize the age-long dream of French diplomacy, that she should extend to her natural boundaries, and include Belgium and the left bank of the Rhine in her territory. That ideal had been achieved and France had held these territories for over twenty years. She was now to be called upon to surrender them.

8.3. The First Treaty Of Paris: The Allies lost no time in enforcing their decisions on France and by 30 May 1814, the First Treaty of Paris was signed. It was mainly due to the efforts of the able statesman of France, Talleyrand that the Allies offered lenient terms to France. The First Treaty of Paris fixed the boundaries of France fixed at what they were in 1792 and not to those of 1789. France was neither disarmed nor called upon to pay a war indemnity, neither was she asked to restore the masterpieces of art, which Napoleon had plundered from Italy or Germany. The island of Malta in the Mediterranean, which Napoleon had conquered, but which England had taken from him, remained with England. France retained all her trading stations and commercial privileges in India, but was compelled to dismantle all fortresses. France ceded to England Mauritius, a naval station on way to India. However, the allies returned to France the rich island of Guadeloupe and most of her other possessions in the West Indies. Tobago and St. Lucia were ceded to England and part of San Domingo to Spain. France retained her Fishery Rights in the St. Lawrence and off Newfoundland. Her military advantages in her colonies were, therefore, reduced, but her commercial wealth remained practically unimpaired. Yet the Allies could have deprived her of every colony she possessed.

In the published articles of the First Treaty of Paris, the Powers announced that they intended to restore Holland with increased territory; to form an independent German Federation; to recognize the independence of Switzerland; and to form a new Italy, composed of sovereign states. This first sketch of the territorial arrangements of Vienna was defined in more detail in secret articles of the Treaty.

8.4. Problems Before The European Statesmen: After the settlement with France, the Allies agreed to meet in a Congress at Vienna to settle the rest of Europe outside France, on an agreed basis. Redeemed, restored, forgiven, a monarchy again and akin to the old type of European states, France claimed a share in the discussions of Vienna. The European statesmen were faced with the problem of remaking the map of Europe, which had been

shattered by the Napoleonic wars of conquest. Several states had ceased to exist, and boundaries of many others had been modified. The *'ancient regime'* had been crushed everywhere and new forces of liberalism and nationalism had been let loose. The European balance of power had been upset. Thus, the victorious Allied powers were faced with the formidable problem of: (a) Reconstructing the map of Europe; (b) restoring the *'ancient regime'* to its former position; and (c) resettling the dispossessed monarchs and nobles.

Austria had played a leading role during the revolutionary era and its *Chancellor*, Metternich was greatly responsible for the downfall of Napoleon. Thus, Vienna, the capital of Austria was chosen as the venue of the Congress of the European sovereigns and statesmen to settle the post-Napoleon problems of Europe.

8.5. The 'Big Four': Six sovereigns-Tsar Alexander I of Russia, Frederick William III of Prussia, Francis I of Austria and Kings of Denmark, Bavaria and Wurttemberg, attended The Congress of Vienna. England was represented by Lord Castlereagh, the Foreign Minister and Duke of Wellington. Talleyrand represented France. Besides other European states such as Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia and the minor princes of Germany were also represented. Prince Metternich, the Chancellor of Austria presided over the Congress of Vienna.

The Congress of Vienna was dominated by the *'Big Four'*-England, Austria, Russia and Prussia. There was no real unity of purpose among the representatives at the Congress of Vienna. Each representative was motivated by national greed and ambition, desiring to gain maximum out of the spoils of the war. There was mutual suspicion and rivalry among the *'Big Four'*. Russia and Prussia, on the one hand, quarreled fiercely with Austria and England, on the other. Talleyrand held the balance and used it to the advantage of France. Finally, at the beginning of 1815, the differences at Vienna became so serious that France, Austria and England formed a defensive alliance (3 January 1815) to resist the claims of Russia and Prussia. The point on which the Russo-Prussian group was opposed to the Anglo-Franco-Austrian group was simple: Prussia desired to annex the whole of Saxony in exchange for the large amount of Polish territory she was surrendering to Russia. Tsar Alexander I supported Prussia. Metternich refused to allow Prussia so large an extension of territory contiguous to Austria and Castlereagh and ultimately Talleyrand stood with him. The differences went right up to the brink of war. Finally, Alexander gave way and Prussia secured only about half of Saxony.

Much of the work of the Congress was done through committees, and some parts of the settlement were the results of negotiations and intrigues carried on within smaller groups. Most of them had already entered into agreements for which they tried to secure the approval of the Congress. Many of the Vienna decisions, therefore, had been reached before the Congress opened.

8.6. *The Second Treaty Of Paris:* As the negotiations between the European statesmen were going on in Vienna, the world was suddenly startled by the news that Napoleon had escaped from Elba, that Louis XVIII was in flight, and that France had once again welcomed the Emperor, whose downfall had been decreed by the rest of Europe. Napoleon landed with a small force, traversed half of France without any difficulty or bloodshed, and finally late at night on 20 March 1815 entered the Palace of Tuileries. Once again Napoleon achieved a bloodless conquest, and declared his intention of being a constitutional ruler at home, and assured to maintain peaceful relations with every Power abroad. After his return from Elba, Napoleon ruled for a hundred days. He was finally defeated by the European Allies in the Battle of Waterloo on 18 June 1815 and was exiled to the Island of St. Helena.

After the final defeat of Napoleon, the Allies imposed the Second Treaty of Paris (20 November 1815) on France. The terms of this treaty were sterner than the First Treaty of Paris. She was now compelled to pay a war indemnity, to restore the works of art, to submit to being garrisoned by an Allied army until 1818. Her boundaries in Europe were further reduced from the line of 1792 to that of 1790, and certain strategic places on the frontier were now taken from her. Had it not been for the moderating counsels of Castlereagh and Wellington, France might have been compelled to cede Alsace and Lorraine.

8.7. *The General Aims Of The Congress Of Vienna:* The negotiations at the Congress of Vienna went on from 15 September 1814 to 9 June 1815 and the Treaty of Vienna was signed on 9 June 1815, a few days before the Battle of Waterloo (18 June 1815).

Though the representatives at the Congress of Vienna, specially the 'Big Four' were divided among themselves on questions affecting their respective countries, they were able to identify their common problems and agree on general aims. The chief aims of the Congress of Vienna were:

(1) The re-establishment of the 'Principle of Legitimacy' by restoring dynasties and frontiers as existed prior to 1789.

(2) Securing durable peace in Europe by compensating the victors either for the losses they had suffered during the revolutionary or Napoleonic wars or for the help they had given in defeating Napoleon. This was known as the 'Principle of Compensation'.

(3) Resettlement of Germany.

(4) To limit France and to surround her with powerful neighbours.

(5) To establish the 'balance of power' so that future aggression of any power would be difficult.

8.8. The 'Principle Of Legitimacy': The 'Doctrine of Legitimacy' was promoted by the clever French diplomat, Talleyrand, who wished to prevent the partitioning of the French territory. According to the 'Principle of Legitimacy' the dynastic changes introduced by the French Revolution and Napoleon were to be undone and those legitimate rulers who were deprived of their thrones were to be restored.

By applying the 'Principle Legitimacy', Louis XVIII, the Bourbon ruler was restored to France. Bourbon rulers of Spain and Naples (Two Sicilies) were restored to their respective kingdoms. The House of Orange was restored to Holland (Netherlands). The House of Savoy to the Kingdom of Sardinia-Piedmont. The Habsburg Princes were restored to the Central Italian Kingdoms of Parma, Modena and Tuscany. The various German princes were restored to their principalities. The Papal States including Rome in Central Italy were restored to the Pope. The Swiss Confederation was also restored and her neutrality was guaranteed by the European powers.

The application of the 'Principle of Compensation' proved to be difficult. Big Powers were greedy for territories and were demanding greater part of the spoils. However, according to a compromise plan, the 'Principle of Compensation' was put into effect fairly to the satisfaction of all.

In the course of the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, England had acquired certain important Dutch colonies such as Ceylon and South Africa and a part of Guyana. By applying the 'Principle of Compensation' these colonies were confirmed to England for her leading role in the defeat of Napoleon. England also obtained the offshore islands such as Malta and the Ionian Islands in the Mediterranean and Heligoland in the North Sea. In the West Indies, England had seized the islands of St. Lucia and Tobago from France and Trinidad from Spain, which were retained by her. The French islands in the Indian Ocean, Mauritius and Seychelles were also secured by England.

To compensate the Dutch and to create a stronger state on the northern frontier of France, the Southern (Austrian) Netherlands (Belgium) was merged with the Northern (Dutch) Netherlands (Holland) under the rule of the restored Dutch Prince of Orange.

To compensate Austria for the surrender of her claims on Austrian Netherlands, she was given a commanding position in Italy. The territories of the historic republics of Venetia and Lombardy were granted to Austria. The members of the ruling House of Austria, Habsburgs were restored to the Italian Kingdoms of Parma, Modena and Tuscany. She also acquired a predominant position in the German Confederation and also obtained a part of Poland (Galicia). The Vienna Congress also recognized the right of Austria to Illyrian Provinces, which had been lost in 1809 and recently recovered.

Russia had played a very important role in defeating Napoleon. Thus, Russia obtained Finland from Sweden and a major part of Poland.

Prussia's gains were quite significant. She recovered all the German territories conquered by Napoleon and in addition she acquired Swedish Pomerania, two-fifths of Saxony, part of Poland (Posen), Westphalia and most of the Rhineland. These additions were intended to make Prussia a strong country to the east of France.

Sweden, as compensation for the cession of Finland to Russia and Pomerania to Prussia secured Norway from Denmark. Thus, Denmark was punished for her alliance with Napoleon.

To the Kingdom of Sardinia, Savoy, Piedmont and Nice were restored and Genoa was added. Thus, the Kingdom of Sardinia was strengthened on the southern frontier of France.

The Swiss Confederation was restored under the guarantee of neutrality. Spain and Portugal recovered their old boundaries in Europe.

8.10. Resettlement Of Germany: As regards the settlement of Germany, it was decided not to restore all the German states, which existed before the French Revolution. After conquering the German states, Napoleon had created the Confederation of the Rhine. After the fall of Napoleon, the German patriots desired to remain united. But the princes of South Germany as well as other small states wanted to regain their sovereignty. Neither Prussia nor Austria was keen to erect a unified German state. Finally, the Congress of Vienna settled the German question by creating a loose Confederation of thirty-nine German states. There was to be a *Diet* at Frankfurt, which was to consist of delegates from the thirty-nine states, presided over by the Chancellor of Austria. Each member state was free to manage its own internal affairs. The

members of the Confederation were forbidden to enter into an alliance with a foreign power either against the Confederation as a whole or against a fellow member. For all practical purposes, Austria dominated the German Confederation.

8.11. Balance Of Power: One of the chief aims of the Congress of Vienna was to maintain the balance of power in Europe. To secure the balance of power, the statesmen at Vienna thought it necessary to have a 'ring-fence' around France. By applying the 'Principle of Compensation', the Congress of Vienna strengthened the states on the French frontier to prevent any future French aggression. Accordingly, by merging Belgium, Holland was strengthened. The Kingdom of Sardinia was strengthened by restoring Piedmont, Savoy and Nice and by adding Genoa. Prussia was made strong by granting her the Rhine Provinces, two-fifths of Saxony, Westphalia, part of Poland (Posen) and Swedish Pomerania.

8.12. An Assessment Of The Congress Of Vienna: According to Grant and Temperley, "It has been customary to denounce the peacemakers of Vienna as reactionary and illiberal in the extreme. It is true that they represented the old regime and were, to a large extent, untouched by the new ideas. But they represented the best and not the worst of the old regime, and their settlement averted any major war in Europe for forty years. According to their lights the settlement was a fair one. France was treated with leniency, and the adjustments of the balance of power and territory were carried out with the scrupulous nicety of a grocer weighing out his wares, or of a banker balancing his accounts..."

However, the Vienna settlement was not without flaw. The Congress of Vienna succeeded in re-drawing the map of Europe and restoring the *Ancient Regime*. But while revising the frontiers of the European countries, the statesmen ignored the realities. The Congress of Vienna brought unwilling people together while it separated those people who wished to remain united. Unifications and disintegrations were brought about most recklessly and arbitrarily without giving any consideration to the liberal ideas of nationalism and democracy. Italy was kept divided by breaking it up into eight states. The people of Northern Italy were brought under Austrian domination. Norway was handed over to Sweden, Finland to Russia and Belgium to Holland. Great injustice was done to Germany by creating the German Confederation of thirty-nine states. Poland was the most unfortunate country. It was divided among Austria, Russia and Prussia.

According to C.D. Hazen, "The Congress of Vienna was a Congress of aristocrats, to whom the ideas of nationality and democracy were incomprehensible or loathsome. The rulers rearranged Europe according to their own desires, disposing of it as

if it were their own personal property, ignoring the sentiment of nationality, which had lately been so wonderfully aroused, indifferent to the wishes of the people. There could be no 'sentiment' because they ignored the factors that alone would make the sentiment permanent. The History of Europe after 1815 was destined to witness repeated, and often successful, attempts to rectify this cardinal error of the Congress of Vienna."

Prof C. J. Hayes is of the opinion that "in all these territorial readjustments there was little that was permanent and much that was temporary." Union of Belgium and Holland lasted only for fifteen years till the Revolution of 1830. Italian and German settlements survived for fifty years. Union of Norway and Sweden was dissolved in 1905. Finland was separated from Russia in 1917 and Poland was recreated as an independent state after the First World War.

The Congress of Vienna suppressed nationalism and democracy. The 'System of Metternich' that grew out of it openly supported conservatism and reaction. It upheld the cause of dynastic monarchies, aristocratic societies, the established Church and traditionally accepted conventions.

In spite of all these shortcomings, the Congress of Vienna did achieve considerable success. The problems faced by the European statesmen following the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars were manifold. Yet, the statesmen at Vienna, in a surprisingly short time succeeded in settling their differences and reaching a peace settlement which lasted longer than any other peace settlement before or after.

Certain special provisions of the peace settlement at Vienna reflected the humanitarianism of the eighteenth century. It included a declaration favouring the abolition of the slave trade, arrangement for free navigation and addition to international law.

Questions

1. Examine the various problems faced by the European statesmen following the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte. How far were they successful in solving them?
2. What were the aims and objectives of the Congress of Vienna? How far were they achieved by the Treaty of Vienna (1815)?
3. Give an account of the settlement imposed on France in particular and Europe in general by the European statesmen in the Congress of Vienna.

4. Critically make an assessment of the achievements of the Congress of Vienna.
5. Write a detailed note on the Congress of Vienna (1815).



9

ERA OF METTERNICH-II

THE CONCERT OF EUROPE

Objectives:

1. To study the different approaches such as the Holy and Quadruple Alliances to European peace after the European settlement at the Congress of Vienna.
2. To understand the various problems faced by the European Powers and their attempt to solve them through various Congresses.
3. To analyze the factors that led to the end of the Concert of Europe.

9.1. Introduction: There was a general desire for peace in Europe after almost a quarter of century's destructive warfare. The statesmen who had brought about the European settlement at Vienna were anxious that the settlement should be permanent or at least durable. For this purpose the Allies desired to set up machinery for implementing and guaranteeing the peace settlement. This led to the formation of the Concert of Europe. It was the first attempt of its kind at international government. It aimed at preventing war by deliberations in Congresses. This system of diplomacy by Congresses was one of the most outstanding characteristics of the nineteenth century international relations. The Concert of Europe held four congresses before it finally broke up in 1823.

The work of Vienna, interrupted by Napoleon, who was finally defeated by the Allies in the Battle of Waterloo (18 June 1815), was completed by two treaties signed at Paris on 20 November 1815. Of these, one was the Second Treaty of Paris and the second was

the Quadruple Alliance between the Four Great Powers. They bound themselves to maintain the arrangements of Chaumont, Vienna, and Paris by armed force for twenty years, both as regards the territorial boundaries that were fixed and regards the perpetual exclusion of Bonaparte and his dynasty from the throne of France. At the end, by Article VI, they agreed to 'renew their meetings at fixed periods' to discuss matters 'of common interest'. In this lay the germ of future international government.

9.2. The Holy Alliance : Tsar Alexander I of Russia was a man of deep religious feelings. He proposed that the chief powers should enter into a Christian Union with a view to conducting the affairs of Europe upon Christian principles of charity, peace and love. This so called Holy Alliance was signed on 26 September 1815. It was to be signed by kings alone. With the exception of England, the Holy Alliance was signed by the rulers of Russia, Austria and Prussia and by the President of the Swiss Republic. The Pope and the Ottoman Sultan had not been invited to sign.

The Holy Alliance was nominally an attempt to apply the principles of morality to international diplomacy. In other words, to create in Europe a political conscience. To all intents and purposes this nebulous scheme, which loomed so prominently before the eyes of contemporaries, never materialized, and was still-born.

The importance of the Holy Alliance lay not in the ineffectual agreement itself but in it's becoming a symbol of absolutist policies. Autocratic and repressive rulers used the alliance as an instrument to maintain the *status quo* in Europe. During the mid-1800s, many democratic and nationalist uprisings were put down in the name of the alliance. The Holy Alliance came to be regarded by European liberals as a union of despots against the liberties of mankind. Castlereagh called it a "piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense". Metternich looked upon it as merely a "loud sounding nothing," or "moral demonstration." "The Holy Alliance," he explained, "was merely a philanthropic aspiration clothed in a religious garb." But though the practical importance of the Holy Alliance was negligible, it merits attention because it disclosed a fundamental disparity of opinion between the Eastern Powers on the one hand and the British government on the other.

9.3. The Quadruple Alliance: Lord Castlereagh was by no means in entire sympathy with the policy of repression, which had been developed at the Vienna Congress. Yet Metternich and the Tsar were anxious to secure the support of England to the Holy Alliance. Being a Christian country, England could not entirely deny the professed ideals of the Holy Alliance. A way out of this difficulty was found in the fact that George III was insane and that his duties were being carried on by a Prince Regent, who sent a private letter to

Tsar Alexander, expressing his sympathy with the sentiments and regretting that he had no authority to commit the country to it. However, England agreed to send representatives from time to time to Congresses of the powers whenever important matters should arise, which should call for joint European action.

The bond, which Castlereagh and Metternich did recognize, was that of the Quadruple Alliance which was signed on 20 November 1815 by England, Russia, Austria and Prussia. Article VI of the Quadruple Alliance stated, "To facilitate and to secure the execution of the present Treaty, and to consolidate the connections which at the present moment so closely unite the four sovereigns for the happiness of the world, the High Contracting Parties have agreed to renew their Meetings at fixed periods, either under the immediate auspices of the Sovereigns themselves, or by their respective Ministers, for the purpose of consulting upon their common interests, and for the consideration of the measures which at each of these periods shall be considered the most salutary for the repose and prosperity of Nations, and for the maintenance of the peace of Europe."

However, it is important to note that the signatories to the Quadruple Alliance differed greatly about the interpretation of the Article VI of the Quadruple Alliance. According to Castlereagh, England was bound to defend the territorial limits laid down at Vienna for twenty years. She was bound also to meet periodically in Congresses with her Allies, but she was not bound to interfere in case of internal revolution in any country other than an attempt to restore Napoleon. On the other hand, Metternich argued that the Quadruple Alliance did commit its members to armed interference to suppress internal revolution in any country, if the Congress thought it advisable. In the end these two views were bound to come in conflict.

9.4. Congress Of Aix-La-Chapelle (1818): The primary aim of the Quadruple Alliance was the maintenance of the Second Treaty of Paris. It was felt that the coalition which had succeeded in overthrowing Napoleon should be kept in existence in order to check any possible revival of French aggression, and it was agreed that that the representatives of the powers should meet from time to time to consider the best measures for the continuance of European peace.

The first of these Congresses was held at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. One of the main questions, which came up for consideration at this Congress, was that of France. It was agreed at this Congress that as France had paid off the war indemnity, the Allied army of occupation should be withdrawn from France, and this was done before the end of the year. France was also admitted as a member

of the Concert of Europe and the Quadruple Alliance became the Quintuple Alliance. However, the four Allied powers re-affirmed their own Quadruple Alliance to meet any danger that might arise from France.

The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle called upon the King of Sweden to explain as to why he had not discharged the treaty obligations with regard to Norway and Denmark. The ruler of Monaco was asked to improve the administrative system of his country. The Congress also dealt with the disputed succession to the Duchy of Baden.

It is important to note that, before the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle dissolved, signs had already appeared regarding the divergent interests and mutual jealousies among the members of the Concert of Europe, which finally led to its break up. Tsar Alexander came forward, flourishing the Treaty of Holy Alliance and demanding a general union of sovereigns against revolution. He wanted, among other things, to send an armed allied force to help the Spanish King to subdue the revolted colonies in America. Many of these Spanish colonies had become independent during the Napoleonic wars. Castlereagh strongly opposed the proposal of Tsar Alexander I to send an Allied force to Latin America and prevailed on the Congress to disclaim the use of force in any such attempt. Between the previous Spanish colonies of Latin American and England trade was steadily developing and England was not prepared to support any move which would harm her interest.

Tsar Alexander proposed a joint action in the Mediterranean against the pirates of the Barbary Coast of North Africa. But Castlereagh and Metternich had no enthusiasm for any of these schemes. On the other hand, England's claim to search the ships for slave traders was not accepted by other representatives.

9.5. Congress Of Troppau (1820): The military revolt in Spain in 1820 led to the demand of the Constitution of 1812, which was a liberal constitution. The king's life was in danger and he finally agreed to the demand of the liberals and professed to be a complete constitutional monarch. Tsar Alexander was shocked at the news of the developments in Spain. He feared the army and feared democracy as well, and both had been triumphant in Spain. If these movements spread elsewhere no monarch would be safe and the Christian Union would be dissolved. He issued a circular saying that it was clearly the duty of other monarchs to assemble at once in Congress, to denounce the Spanish Constitution of 1812, and if necessary, to send an Allied army to suppress it by force.

Castlereagh was not favourable to the demand of the Tsar. He was opposed to any kind of interference in the internal affairs of other states. In May 1820, he issued a lengthy State Paper, which was

the foundation of British foreign policy in the nineteenth century. Castlereagh claimed that England was committed only to preventing the return of Napoleon or his dynasty to France, and to maintaining the territorial arrangements of Vienna by armed force for twenty years. He regarded the Spanish revolution as an internal affair not dangerous to other countries, and he did not think England would be justified in sanctioning any attempt to suppress it by force. He explained to the diplomats of the continent that England owed her present dynasty and constitution to an internal revolution. She could not deny to other countries the same right of changing their form of government. Besides, English Government could not act without the support of its Parliament and people. Thus, Castlereagh insisted that the Spanish revolution was entirely an internal affair of Spain and a collective intervention by other states in the internal affairs of any state undergoing revolutionary change was impracticable and objectionable.

Outbreak of revolutions in Portugal, Naples and Piedmont demanding the liberal Constitution of 1812, made it necessary to summon the Congress of Troppau towards the end of 1820. England and France sent only observers. Metternich drafted the 'Protocol of Troppau' to express the views of the three founder members of the Holy Alliance-Russia, Austria and Prussia. According to the Protocol of Troppau, "States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the result of which threatens other states, *ipso facto*, cease to be the members of the European alliance and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guarantee for legal order and stability. If owing to such alterations immediate danger threatens other states, the powers bind themselves by peaceful means or if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty states into the bosom of the great alliance."

The Protocol of Troppau justified the intervention by powers in the internal affairs of other states. England, however, refused to be a party to the above declaration.

9.6. Congress Of Laibach (1821): The third Congress of the Concert of Europe met at Laibach, which was a continuation of the Congress of Troppau. In this Congress it was decided that Austria should be entrusted with the task of suppressing the revolts in Naples and Piedmont. Thus, in spite of further protests from England, Metternich undertook to suppress the revolutions and Constitutions in Naples and Piedmont. The Austrian armies moved into Italy in March in 1821, suppressed the revolutions and constitutions in Piedmont and Naples and restored the kings to their respective thrones.

9.7. Congress Of Verona (1822): The fourth Congress was held at Verona in 1822. Earlier in March 1821 a revolt broke out in

Greece against the Turkish authority. It was not really a democratic revolt or a demand for a constitution. It was a national movement of the Greek Christians against the tyrannical Ottoman Empire. Metternich, however, recognized no difference between Sultan Mahmud of Turkey and King Ferdinand of Naples or of Spain. Metternich and Castlereagh were apprehensive that Tsar Alexander might go to war against the Ottoman Empire in support of his co-religionists in Greece. The Tsar, who considered the Balkan question a dependent issue of the Russian politics, was anxious to take isolated action in Turkey as Metternich had taken in Italy. However, Metternich was determined to prevent the Tsar's ambition in the Ottoman Empire. Metternich and Castlereagh met at Hanover towards the end of 1821, patched up their differences and agreed to summon one more Congress, where they hoped to prevent the Tsar from taking any active measures against the Ottoman Empire.

However, before the Congress met at Verona in the autumn of 1822, disturbances in Spain became so serious that the Bourbon ruler of Spain, Ferdinand VII made an appeal to the Bourbon ruler of France, Louis XVIII for help and France was inclined to play in Spain, the role of intervener which Austria had played in Italy and Russia intended to play in Turkey. England was opposed to any intervention either in Spain or in Turkey.

Meanwhile, Castlereagh, who in his later years had shown some objection to the Congress system, committed suicide on August 3, 1822. Canning succeeded Castlereagh to foreign office. He was also hostile to the Congress system and the projects of armed intervention in other states. Canning sent the Duke of Wellington as the British representative to the Congress of Verona.

The Congress of Verona was soon occupied with the question of Spain rather than with Greece. Canning's firm resistance to intervention prevented any joint action in Spain. France eventually invaded Spain in 1823 on her own responsibility, restored Ferdinand VII and abolished the Spanish Constitution of 1812.

The danger of Russian intervention in the Ottoman empire in favour of the Greeks was avoided by extracting a promise from the Ottoman Sultan that he would introduce reforms in the Ottoman Empire and for a time, the Greek revolt continued without any outside interference.

9.8. End Of The Concert Of Europe: The Congress of Verona marked the completion of the breach between England and her partners in the Quadruple Alliance. Canning's attitude in 1822 had damaged the 'moral solidarity' of Europe, and injured the Congress system. Canning had stronger sympathies with liberal movements

abroad. When the Duke of Wellington communicated to the Congress Canning's firm refusal to intervene in Spain, the Congress did not accept England's principle of non-intervention. As a consequence, England withdrew from the Congress itself. Thus, the era of Congress collapsed with the withdrawal of England from the Concert of Europe.

In spite of the withdrawal of England from the Congress system, the system was not yet extinguished. In December 1823, the King of Spain, Ferdinand VII, now restored to his throne, summoned the Allies to a Congress on Spanish America. Canning refused to send any British representative. The result was that the attempted Congress was a failure. To check any plan of bringing the Latin American colonies back under the Spanish rule and to promote the growing trade between England and those colonies. Canning encouraged President Munro of the US to issue the famous Munro Doctrine (1823), proclaiming, "Any European interference in the Americas other than by the colonial powers in their existing colonies would be taken as showing an unfriendly disposition to the US". Independence of the former Spanish colonies was recognized by the USA and England.

Later in 1824, Tsar Alexander I attempted to convene a Congress on the question of the Ottoman Empire and Greece. England once again refused to participate in the Congress. Though the other four powers met at St. Petersburg in January 1825, they broke up on very bad terms and without having decided anything. To all intents and purposes. This was the end of the Congress system.

Though the Concert of Europe was formed to maintain general peace in Europe, with the passage of time both the forces of conservatism and liberalism became stronger. The 'old order' was successfully challenged in Spain, Portugal, Piedmont and Naples. England being liberal in outlook sympathized with the liberal movements. Thus, she found it difficult to continue her association with the conservative powers.

England also opposed the principle of intervention. The mutual jealousies among the powers right from the beginning weakened the Concert of Europe. It was also said that the Concert of Europe was a product of Napoleonic wars and one of its chief aim was to contain the common enemy, France. However, when the French danger was over, the unity of the Allies ended and every power decided to deal individually with her diplomacy.

According to Grant and Temperley, "It is not fair, however, to dismiss the first serious experiment in international government without pointing out some of its merits. The idea of personal conference and mutual confidence between the rulers was

excellent. Castlereagh was sincere in promoting the re-unions and so was Metternich up to a point. But Alexander I went too far and too fast for both. After 1820, the Congress system became in fact a trade union of kings for suppressing the liberties of people. To the continuance of that system, Parliamentary England could not give consent and Parliamentary France only shared in it with reluctance. The smaller powers, which did not share in it at all were naturally opposed to it.”

Questions

1. Review the working of the Concert of Europe.
2. Critically examine the achievements and failures of the Concert of Europe.
3. Trace the differences between England and other members of the Concert of Europe.
4. Write a detailed note on the Concert of Europe.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) The Holy Alliance
 - (b) The Quadruple Alliance
 - (c) The Congress of Troppau (1820)



ERA OF METTERNICH-III

**THE REVOLUTION OF 1830
(JULY REVOLUTION)****Objectives:**

1. To understand the character of the restored Bourbon dynasty and its reactionary policies followed by the restored King Louis XVIII and his successor Charles X.
2. To review the circumstances that led to the Revolution of 1830 in France
3. To study the consequences of the Revolution of 1830.

10.1. Introduction: The Revolution of 1830, also known as the July Revolution, an uprising in Paris in July 1830 led to the abdication of King Charles X. It resulted in a victory for liberal advocates of constitutional reform over the absolute monarchy. The July Revolution of France acted as a signal for democratic uprisings on the European continent, particularly in Belgium, Germany, Italy, and Poland.

10.2. Restoration Of The Bourbon Dynasty: Following the defeat of Napoleon in the Battle of Leipzig (1813), the Bourbon dynasty was restored in France in the person of Louis XVIII. Born in Versailles, he was the brother of Louis XVI and in early life was known as the *Comte de Provence*. He remained in Paris after the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789, but escaped to Belgium two years later. After Louis XVI's execution in 1793 he proclaimed himself regent, and after the death of his brother's heir, Louis XVII, in 1795, he took the title Louis XVIII. He lived as an exile in various European countries until he became king after Napoleon's first abdication in 1814. On Napoleon's return to power in 1815, however, Louis XVIII again fled to Belgium; later the same year he was restored to the throne after Napoleon's final defeat at the Waterloo.

10.3. The Charter (Constitution) Of 1814: Louis XVIII accepted the position of a constitutional monarch. He issued the Charter of 1814, which remained the constitution of France until 1848. Under this Charter, the power of governing was vested in the king. The royal powers included the command of the army and navy, the right

to declare war and conclude treaties, the making of appointments to the public service and to the Chamber of Peers, and the proposing of legislation. A bicameral legislature was established. The Chamber of Peers consisted of hereditary nobles together with some members appointed by the king for life. The Chamber of Deputies consisted of members elected for a period of five years. Those who were above forty years of age and paying at least 1,000 francs annual tax were made eligible to be the deputies. Those who were thirty years and above and paying 300 francs tax annually were given the right to vote. Laws could be proposed only by the Crown, and they were to be accepted or rejected by the Chamber of Deputies. No tax could be imposed without the approval of the Legislature.

On paper the Charter preserved many of the principles of the Revolution, though it failed to maintain them in fact. Frenchmen declared to be equal before the law and to be equally eligible for all public positions. Every Frenchman, when accused, was to be entitled to a fair trial before a jury. Freedom of press was promised. Religious toleration was promised, though Roman Catholicism remained the official religion of the state. The nobility created by Napoleon was recognized equally with that of the ancient regime, but neither was endowed with pre-revolutionary privileges.

The importance of the Charter of 1814 lay in the fact that it accepted, at least in form, much of the work of the Revolution and the Napoleonic regime. This included religious toleration, personal equality, eligibility for office, the Code Napoleon, the Concordat with the Pope and a well organized government system. In the second place, it was not entirely inconsistent with the Divine Right of Kings, on which the Bourbon monarchy had been based. The Charter was not imposed by a dominant people on kings. It was granted by the monarchy as a concession to the nation. It was a gift from the Crown to the people.

10.4. The Ultra-Royalists: Louis XVIII was a man of common sense. He realized that it was necessary for him to accept the position of a constitutional monarch. He did not want to go on the long journey of exile and lose his throne again. However, along with him hundreds of noblemen of the ancient regime, known as *émigrés* also returned to France. They utterly resented the Revolution and all its results. They were the men who had learned nothing and forgotten nothing. They formed the ultra-royalist party under the restored monarchy. They are more royalists than the king. They aimed at the recovery of all the ancient noble privileges, and at the same time they desired to secure a degree of political power which the nobles of the eighteenth century had not possessed. Essential features of the policy of the Ultra-royalists included the revival of the power of the church and the suppression

of the freedom of the press. Their recognized leader was the Count of Artois, the King's brother, whom they looked forward to be the next king.

10.5. The Moderates: The most important party opposed to the Ultras was that of the Moderates, who were loyal to the Crown and the upholders of the Constitutional Charter of 1814. The Moderates consisted of several distinct groups, with varying aims. Their unwillingness to act together in times of crisis was one of the reasons that gave an upper hand to their opponents.

10.6. The Radicals: Other minor groups that manifested radical tendency included the Republicans, the Bonapartists, and other discontented groups. These groups were eager to revive the Republic. However, they were unable to secure substantial representation in the Chamber of Deputies.

10.7. The White Terror : The Ultra-royalists were against the granting of the Charter of 1814 by Louis XVIII. They tried to pressurize him to repeal the Charter and restore the Old Order. However, Louis XVIII wanted to avoid any conflict and rule in peace. He adopted a policy of moderation and ignored the demands of the Ultra-royalists. In desperation, the Ultra-royalists decided to take the matter in their own hands and let loose a reign of terror on the Republicans, Bonapartists, liberals and revolutionaries, who were massacred in large numbers. The Catholics attacked the Protestants and the cycle of violence and murder continued for a time and the government was helpless. A number of leaders of the Revolution were killed. As Louis XVIII lacked an efficient military force he accepted the help of the Austrian troops to restore order.

10.8. General Election Of 1815: A general election was held in 1815, and it resulted in the victory of the Ultra-royalists who commanded a majority in the Chamber of Deputies, although the Moderates prevailed in the Chamber of Peers. The Chamber of Deputies met in October 1815. The King and his leading minister the Duke of Richelieu were in favour of a policy of moderation and conciliation. However, the Ultra-dominated Chamber of Deputies under the leadership of Count of Artois demanded vengeance upon their enemies. They demanded the punishment of those who had supported Napoleon in the Hundred Days. Thousands of Bonapartists were either imprisoned or exiled and some of them were executed including Marshall Ney, one of the most popular heroes of Napoleonic France on charges of being a traitor. Under these circumstances the king dissolved the Chamber of Deputies.

Fresh elections were held in 1816 and the new Chamber of Deputies contained a Moderate majority, and for the next few years

the country was ruled on Moderate lines. Richelieu continued in office until 1818, and during this period France was able to pay off the indemnity imposed by the Second Treaty of Paris, and the Allied army of occupation was withdrawn. An electoral law passed in 1817 was regarded as advantageous to the Moderates. In 1819 a new press law was passed which abolished the censorship. The Left gained strength at the elections of 1819, and in alarm many Moderates crossed over to the Ultras.

10.9. Fall Of The Moderates: In February 1820, the Duke of Berry, son of the Count of Artois was murdered by an anti-Bourbon fanatic. The Ultras contended that such events were the logical outcome of a Moderate and Liberal policy of the government. Under these circumstances the government introduced a series of reactionary measures. Personal liberty was restricted, the press was once again censored and a new electoral law was introduced to the advantage of the Ultra-royalists. In 1821, Richelieu was replaced by Villele, an able and cautious statesman but a pronounced reactionary, who held office till the end of 1827.

10.10. Accession Of Charles X: Following the death of Louis XVIII in 1824, his younger brother, the Count of Artois ascended the throne, who took the title of Charles X. He began well by announcing his intention of maintaining the Charter of 1814 and respect for parliamentary institutions. But soon he became unpopular. He was ultra-reactionary and pro-clergy. He was a strong critic of his brother's liberalism. He was determined to restore the Old Regime in all its glory. He was keen to revive the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and promote the interests of the nobility and the clergy as against the interests of the masses and popular liberty.

10.11. Reactionary Policies: The government under the supervision of Charles X adopted such reactionary policies, which ultimately led to the Revolution of 1830. In 1825, the government led by Villele adopted a measure of to indemnify the *émigré* nobles to the tune of a billion francs to compensate the loss that they had suffered due to the confiscation and sale of their lands during the Revolution of 1789. As this huge amount could not be raised through direct taxes a new method was adopted. It was proposed to reduce the rate of interest on the public debt from five to four percent. The lowering of the rate of interest adversely affected the capitalists and middle class holders of the national bonds. This measure led to a loss of one-fifth of their income annually in order to compensate the *émigré* nobles.

Under the rule of Charles X, the power of the Church was strengthened, and the Jesuits were permitted to return to France. The Church was given control over education, marriage and the

registration of births and deaths. Moreover, a law of sacrilege was proposed, which made the theft of the sacred vessels from a Church punishable by death, while those who desecrated the Host were to suffer the amputation of a hand. Though the law was passed with amendments, it was never imposed due to strong opposition.

The press, which was lately emancipated, became a tool of the executive. No newspaper could be published without the sanction of the Crown. Press censorship was introduced and severe punishment was prescribed for defaulting writer of any article or designer of any illustration. A law was passed by which the National Guard was disbanded.

Villele became unpopular with both the extreme members of the Ultra party and the Leftists, and at the end of 1827 the Ultra Royalists and the Leftists combined to bring about his fall.

Martignac, the successor of Villele was faced by a hostile majority in the new Chamber of Deputies. He attempted certain measures of conciliation, modifying the press laws and limiting the educational activities of the Jesuits. He thus offended the extremists of the Ultra Royalists without conciliating those of the Left, and the two groups renewed their alliance and forced Martignac to resign in 1828.

10.12. The Polignac Ministry (1828-1830): Polignac, a former *émigré* and an intriguing diplomat became the Premier in 1828. He followed a vigorous reactionary policy. According to Grant and Temperley, Polignac was chauvinist, which was bad; ultra-clerical which was worse; and an enemy of parliament, which was fatal. He plotted to overthrow the parliament and constitution of France. Polignac's reactionary policies aroused hostile public opinion against the government. A no-confidence motion in the Polignac ministry was passed with a majority in the Chamber of Deputies in March 1830. Instead of dismissing the Polignac ministry, Charles X dissolved the Chamber of Deputies itself and ordered fresh elections.

10.13. The July Ordinances: In the general elections held in July 1830, led to the crushing defeat for the King and Polignac ministry. The new Chamber of Deputies was more hostile to the King and his reactionary ministry. Under these circumstances, Charles could have saved his throne by dismissing Polignac. However, the King was too much under the influence of Polignac who plotted to overthrow the Parliament and Constitution of France. He induced the King to issue four ordinances on 25 July which came to be known as the July Ordinances. Under these Ordinances: (a) publication of newspapers without the permission of the government was prohibited; (b) the newly elected Chamber of

Deputies was dissolved by setting aside the recent elections; (c) the electoral law was changed which reduced the number of voters from 100,000 to 25, 000; and (d) the date for new elections was fixed.

10.14. Outbreak Of The July Revolution Of 1830: The July Ordinances clearly indicated the curbing of liberties of the people and assumption of absolute powers by the monarchy. Charles X and Polignac were wholly unaware of the forces of public opinion in France. The journalists of Paris and many of the newly-elected deputies organized protests. Workmen, especially printers, joined the agitation, and within a day or two Paris was in the midst of a revolution. Barricades were erected in the streets, and fierce fighting broke out in which about hundred lives were lost. Sensing that the situation was going out of hand, Charles X abdicated in favour of his nine-year old grand-son, Count of Chambord (son of murdered Duke of Berry) and fled to England with his family on 31 July 1830. Later he died in Austria in 1836.

Following the abdication of Charles X and the end of the Revolution of 1830, some of the revolutionaries were in favour of establishing a republican government in France. However, others felt that abolition of monarchy might invite the hostility of the powers of Europe. They were in favour of establishing a Constitutional Monarchy of the English type, with Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, of the Orleanist branch of the Bourbon dynasty (he was a descendant of Louis XIII). He had always seemed to be well-disposed towards liberal opinions. He had middle class temperament. Louis Philippe accepted the offer of the Chamber of Deputies to be the Constitutional Monarch of France and became King 'by the will of the people'.

10.15 Results of Revolution of 1830

10.15.1. Impact on France: As compared with the Revolution of 1789, the Revolution of 1830 was a mere incident involving less bloodshed, limited to street fighting in Paris and limited to three days only. The Revolution of 1830 resulted mainly in the transfer of power from the Bourbons to the Orleanists. Though the Revolution of 1830 did not lead to the overthrow of monarchy in France, it definitely put an end to the principle of Divine Right of Kings in France. Charles X had been 'King of the French by the grace of God', whereas Louis Philippe became 'King of the French by the will of the people'.

The Revolution of 1830 extinguished the hopes of the Ultra Royalists and the influence of the clerical party, which had been so decisive during the reign of Charles X. The clergy lost their position

in the Chamber of Peers and various government departments and the state assumed a distinct secular character.

It may be said that the Revolution of 1830 was a victory for the middle class (bourgeoisie). The liberal middle class comprising of the journalists, merchants and other professionals engineered the revolution. Louis Philippe represented this middle class. His regime is also known as the 'July Monarchy' and also referred as the 'Bourgeoisie Monarchy'.

10.15.2. Impact on Europe: It has been often said that 'when France caught cold all Europe sneezed'. The Revolution of 1830 had profound influence on the rest of Europe. The success of the revolution and accession of Louis Philippe, a liberal monarch alarmed conservatives and reactionaries. There was great shock in the courts of Austrian, Prussian and Russian empires. The success of the Revolution of 1830 in France greatly encouraged liberals in various European countries.

10.15.3. Independence of Belgium: The echo of the Revolution of 1830 was felt in Belgium, which was merged with Holland at the Congress of Vienna (1815). The forces of nationalism and liberalism led to rioting in Brussels against the oppressive Dutch rule. The riots soon developed into an uprising. As the King William I, king of the United Netherlands refused to agree to grant a separate legislature, the Belgians declared their independence on 4 October 1830. The Belgians were in favour of a monarchy. They adopted a liberal constitution and chose a German Prince, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, as their Constitutional King, who was crowned in July 1831. At an international conference at London, Russia, Prussia, Austria, England and France recognized the independence of Belgium. The independence of Belgium marked the first major breach in the Vienna Settlement and a significant success of the principle of nationality.

10.15.4. Suppression of Polish Revolt: Russia had acquired a major part of Poland at the Congress of Vienna (1815). Tsar Alexander I had granted a liberal constitution to Poland with a parliament and freedom of the press. Polish was recognized as the official language and all position in the government were reserved for the Poles. Thus, in relation to Poland, Tsar Alexander I ruled as a constitutional king entirely separates from the Empire of Russia.

Following the death of Tsar Alexander I in 1825, his brother Nicholas I became the Tsar of Russia. He ruled as an absolute emperor and extended his absolutist policies to Poland. This led to unrest among the patriotic Poles who wished to establish an independent nation.

The success of the Revolution of 1830 in France encouraged the patriotic Poles who staged a revolt at Warsaw against the Tsar Nicholas I. Soon the revolt spread to other regions of Poland. The Poles failed to secure support from England and France and were left to face the Russian army, which succeeded in suppressing the Polish revolt. Following the failure of the Polish revolt, Poland lost its identity and was converted into a frontier province of the Russian empire. Its liberal constitution was abolished and many of the revolutionaries were severely punished.

10.15.5. Revolt and Reaction in Germany and Italy: The impact of the Revolution of 1830 was felt in Germany and Italy. In Germany there were isolated outbreaks of popular movements in few German states such as Saxony, Hanover, Hesse and Brunswick, where the princes were forced to grant liberal constitutions similar to the French Charter of 1814. However, Prince Metternich, the Chancellor of Austria, the high priest of reaction and conservatism forced the princes of the above German states to withdraw their liberal constitutions and suppress the popular movements.

The revolutionary spirit of 1830 also influenced the Italian states. There were popular uprisings in Modena, Parma and Papal states demanding liberal constitutions. Austria was quick to act by sending an army, which suppressed the popular revolts and restored the respective rulers to their original position.

Questions

1. Trace the circumstances that led to the Revolution of 1830 in France.
2. Discuss the causes and consequences of the Revolution of 1830.
3. How far were the policies of Louis XVIII and Charles X responsible for the Revolution of 1830? What were its results?
4. Write a detailed note on the Revolution of 1830.



ERA OF METTERNICH-IV

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

Objectives:

1. To analyze the circumstances that led to the Revolution of 1848.
2. To review the policies of Louis Philippe which were responsible for the Revolution of 1848.
3. To understand the consequences of the Revolution of 1848.

11.1. Introduction: The Revolution of 1830 in France brought an end to the restored Bourbon dynasty, when the last Bourbon ruler, Charles X fled from the country. As the Revolution of 1830 was led by the middle class (bourgeoisie), the political power shifted from the aristocracy to the middle class; from conservatism to liberalism. The liberals invited the Duke of Orleans, Louis Philippe to be the head of the state as the constitutional monarch. This led to the establishment of the liberal Orleanist Monarchy in France in 1830, also known as the July Monarchy. However, the liberal Orleanist Monarchy founded by Louis Philippe did not succeed in consolidating its power. Failure of Louis Philippe's domestic and foreign policy ultimately led to his downfall and end of the Orleanist Monarchy due to the Revolution of 1848.

11.2. Louis Philippe: Louis Philippe (1773-1850) called the Citizen King was the King of France from 1830 to 1848. He was the son of Louis Philippe Joseph, Duke of Orleans. Louis Philippe was also known as Philippe Égalité, and was born in Paris. Before taking up the kingship of France, Louis Philippe had an adventurous career. Like his father, he was in sympathy with the French Revolution (1789) that resulted in the establishment of the First Republic. In 1790 he joined the Jacobins, members of a French radical political club. Two years later, at the age of 18, he was given a command in the revolutionary army and as a colonel, fought at the battles of Valmy and Jemappes. After the defeat of the French army by the Austrians in Holland (1793), Louis Philippe was implicated with his superior officer in a plot against the republic, and he fled to Switzerland.

After the execution of his father by the French Revolutionary Tribunal, Louis Philippe became the central figure around whom his

supporters, the Orleanist party, rallied. However, he did not actively enter into the intrigues for restoring the monarchy. During the regime of the Directory and that of Napoleon, Louis Philippe remained outside France, traveling in Scandinavia, the United States (where he lived for four years in Philadelphia), and England. He also visited Sicily at the invitation of Ferdinand I, king of the Two Sicilies, and in 1809 he married the king's daughter Maria Amelia.

In 1814, after the abdication of Napoleon, Louis Philippe returned to France and was welcomed by King Louis XVIII, who restored to him the Orleans estates. He was quite liberal in his attitude and behaviour and identified himself with the middle class. Thus, after the Revolution of 1830, following the abdication of the last Bourbon ruler, Charles X, the liberals invited Louis Philippe to be the new constitutional ruler of France.

Louis Philippe had many qualifications for his new task as the ruler of France. He was shrewd though not scrupulous, and fully conscious that he must never forget his role of constitutional king. He was tolerant in religious matters, whereas his predecessors had been bigoted. He took pain to divest himself of any character of Divine Right. He sent his sons to the ordinary schools, he walked about the streets with an umbrella under his arm, he lived in the Tuileries and appeared readily to bow from the balcony when there was any applause in the streets. He was anxious to represent himself as the heir of all the historic tendencies of France. As a Bourbon he claimed to embody the historic past, as the son of Egalite and the soldier of Jemmappes he claimed to have shared in the glories of the Revolution. He restored the tricolour and the National Guard. He did not even refuse to recognize Napoleon. During his reign, the body of the great conqueror was brought from St. Helena by a son of a royal house and laid in the most magnificent of resting places at the Invalides. He filled the Palace of Versailles with pictures of all the battles of French history and solemnly dedicated it 'to all the glories of France.'

11.3. Causes Of The Revolution Of 1848: Louis Philippe ruled France for 18 years. During these years, he followed a policy of 'golden mean' that is neither conservative nor liberal. He encouraged industrial progress in France and promoted foreign trade. He also attempted to cultivate friendly relations with other states. However, gradually the rule of Louis Philippe became unpopular due to the failure of his foreign policy. Besides various sections of the French people became unhappy over his domestic policies. These factors led to the Revolution of 1848 in France, which resulted in the overthrow of the Orleanist Monarchy of Louis Philippe and the establishment of the Second Republic.

11.3. 1. Failure of Louis Philippe's Foreign Policy: One of the main causes of Louis Philippe's unpopularity among the French people was his weak foreign policy. On the whole Louis Philippe followed a policy of peace. On the other hand, the French people looked forward for national glory and prestige. They expected their king to follow vigorous and active foreign policy. They still cherished the memories of the glorious Napoleonic Empire. The failure of Louis Philippe to shape his foreign policy according to the desires of the French people brought about a breach between him and the people.

a. Failure to Provide Leadership to Revolutions: Following the Revolution of 1830 in France, liberal movements broke out in Belgium, Poland, Germany and Italy. Liberals in these countries hoped that the French king would provide them leadership and support their movement for reforms. The French liberals also desired that their king should support these movements. But Louis Philippe remained passive for the fear of Metternich, the Chancellor (P.M) of Austria and other conservative powers. Though he co-operated with England in helping the Belgians to achieve independence from Holland, he refused the Belgian throne to his son. This timid policy of Louis Philippe wounded the sentiments of the French people.

b. Withdrawal of Support to Mehmat Ali: Mehmat Ali, the Pasha (Viceroy) of Egypt revolted against the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire in an attempt to assert his independence (1840). The French people desired that the Pasha should be supported against the Sultan when Pasha appealed for help. By this, the French could have revived their influence in Egypt which they had lost. But the Ottoman Sultan was supported by the British. Hence, French support to Mehmat Ali would have involved France in a war with England. Thus, Louis Philippe hesitated to give any support to Mehmat Ali, who could not fight the Sultan single-handedly and was forced to surrender. Once again, the French foreign policy received a severe setback which alienated the people from Louis Philippe.

11.3.2. Discontent of the People Against the Domestic Policy of Louis Philippe:

a. Unpopularity of Louis Philippe's Government: While Louis Philippe fought his subjects single-handed on matters of foreign policy, imposing an unpopular peace upon a nation in love with glory, his conduct of internal affairs was equally not calculated to conciliate public opinion. Louis Philippe was very unpopular among the large sections of the people. A very narrow middle class, especially the rich bourgeoisie, supported his government. Louis

Philippe's bourgeoisie government neglected the interests of other sections of the French people. The rich bourgeoisie monopolized power in the government to enrich themselves at the expenses of the other sections of the French people. Thus, the majority of the French people gradually turned against the bourgeoisie government of Louis Philippe.

b. Conflict between Thiers and Guizot: Conflict between Thiers and Guizot two of the important statesmen of Louis Philippe considerably weakened the Orléanist monarchy. Both of them were opposed to the Legitimists and Republicans. However, they held opposite views regarding foreign policy and parliamentary reforms. Guizot believed in peaceful foreign policy and was opposed to any parliamentary reforms or the extension of suffrage (right to vote). On the other hand, Adolphe Thiers was in favor of active foreign policy and the extension of suffrage. Thiers who was the prime minister of Louis Philippe in 1840 was in favor of assisting Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt in his revolt against the Sultan of Turkey. But he was dismissed as the Prime Minister when he insisted in supporting Mehemet Ali. Guizot became the Prime Minister of France in 1840 and continued till the revolution in 1848. In Guizot, Louis Philippe found a strong supporter of his views.

c. Grievances of the Working Class: The French Revolution of 1789 had abolished the privileges of the nobles and the clergy, but it had failed to eliminate poverty. The rich still exploited the poor. The industrial progress in France had led to the emergence of the working class, who were poorly paid, worked in difficult conditions and lived a miserable life. No labour law was passed by the bourgeoisie government of Louis Philippe in favor of the working class except the factory Act of 1841, which prohibited employment of children below the age of 8 years. The working class organized itself in trade unions to safeguard their rights and to demand an equal or reasonable distribution of wealth. The working class became quite receptive to the socialist ideas preached by Saint-Simon, Fourier, Proudhon and Louis Blanc. Louis Philippe's government instead of solving the problems of the working class suppressed their strikes and movements. Thus, the working class became the sworn enemy of the bourgeoisie government of Louis Philippe.

d. Opposition of Various Groups: By 1846, the bourgeoisie monarchy of Louis Philippe became very unpopular with different sections of the French people. The legitimists consisting of many persons of the old nobility and clergy opposed Louis Philippe's government and were in favor of restoring the Legitimate Bourbon rulers to the French throne. The Bonapartists, who cherished the memory of Napoleon and praised his achievements at home and

abroad, disliked Louis Philippe's policy of "peace at any cost". The Catholics were critical of bourgeoisie government of Louis Philippe. Some of them were in favor of restoring the legitimate Bourbon monarchy. They disliked Guizot, the Prime Minister of Louis Philippe who was a Protestant. The Republicans became the chief enemies of the Orleanist monarchy. They were opposed to Louis Philippe's government when it made clear that there would be no further extension of suffrage. This implied that majority of the French people would have no right to vote. The Republicans organized themselves and attempted rebellions against the government which were quickly put down by the government and the Republicans were suppressed by breaking down their association and crushing their newspapers. Thus Republicans were opposed to monarchy either Conservative or liberal and they were in favor of a republican form of government. The Socialists who emerged as the leftwing of the Republican Party favoured socialist pattern of society. They desired to establish cooperative factories and wanted a guarantee of living wage for all workers. These radical revolutionaries were in favour of even destroying the private property.

11.3.3. Immediate Cause- Reform Banquets: As the unpopularity of Louis Philippe's government increased, there was a great demand for parliamentary reforms. However, Louis Philippe, on the advice of his conservative Prime Minister, Guizot, refused to grant any further extension of suffrage to the French people. A majority of the French people including the workers had no right to vote due to high property qualification. As Louis Philippe's government was reluctant to introduce any reform, Thiers and his liberal supporters organized a number of 'Reform Banquets' to mobilize public opinion in favor of the extension of suffrage. One of these reform banquets being prohibited by the government, the Parisian mob became restless and demanded the dismissal of Guizot. This was followed by the Revolution of 1848.

On 22 February 1848, the Parisian mob, angry workers and students assembled and shouted for reforms. The National Guard also joined the mob against the government. The streets of Paris were barricaded by the workers. As the situation of law and order in Paris was going out of control, Louis Philippe dismissed Guizot from the post of Prime Minister to satisfy the rebels. However, this action was too late and the rebels were not satisfied with the mere dismissal of Guizot. They demanded far drastic reforms in the functioning of the government and the extension of franchise to all adult Frenchmen. Under these circumstances, Louis Philippe being apprehensive of disastrous consequences abdicated the throne of France in favour of his grand son, Count of Paris. After his abdication Louis Philippe lived with his family in England, where he died at his home in Claremont, Surrey. Thus, the Revolution of

1848 led to the downfall of the Orleanist Monarchy of Louis Philippe.

11.4. Results Of The Revolution Of 1848:

a. End of the Monarchy and Establishment of the Second Republic: After the overthrow of Louis Philippe the Second Republic was proclaimed on 26 February 1848. According to Lamartine, "Royalty is abolished. The Republic is proclaimed. The people shall exercise their political rights." Thus, the Revolution of 1848 put an end to the monarchy in France. Though Louis Philippe abdicated in favour of his grand son, Count of Paris and took refuge in England, the revolutionaries set up a provisional government. The provisional government consisted of Lamartine, a liberal Catholic leader, Ledru Rollin, a Jacobin republican, Louis Blanc, the socialist leader and Albert, a working man. Thus, for a second time a Republic was established in France.

b. End of the Bourgeoisie Predominance: The Revolution of 1848 naturally invited comparison with the earlier two revolutions – against Louis XVI (1789) and Charles X (1830). It may be noted that by the first revolution the power was taken away from the autocratic monarchy. The second revolution was against the power of the aristocracy, and the third revolution, that of 1848 was against the predominance of the bourgeoisie in the government. In other words, legal equality was established in 1789, social equality in 1830 and political equality in 1848. The Revolution of 1848 was brought about by the republicans with the support of the working class which led to the end of the predominant position of the middle class in the government. Universal manhood suffrage under the Second Republic extended the political power to the people.

c. Features of the Second Republic: After the Revolution of 1848, elections were held to the National Assembly on the basis of universal manhood suffrage. The National Assembly, also known as the Constituent Assembly laid the foundation of the Second Republic in France. Emphasis was laid on 'family, rights of property and public order'. Concessions were made to the Catholics by promising reforms in education. The humanitarian liberals were pacified by abolishing slavery in the colonies, by declaring the freedom of the press and by doing away with capital punishment for political offences. The republicans were pacified by the restoration of the tricolor (red, white and blue), the revolutionary flag of France and Marseillaise, the national anthem and by adopting a republican constitution. The Constitution of 1848 provided for a president to be elected for four years by universal manhood suffrage and a legislature elected likewise. The president would choose his own cabinet. He was not to veto any act of the legislature and he was ineligible for re-election.

d. Economic Democracy: The Revolution of 1848 was also a landmark in the history of economic democracy in France. Lamartine regarded the Republic as an end in itself, but Louis Blanc considered it as a mean to an end. A decree drafted by Louis Blanc provided that. "The provisional government engaged themselves to guarantee the existence of the workmen by means of labour. They engaged themselves to guarantee labour to every citizen."

Thus, a remarkable experiment in socialism was put into effect in France. To assure work to everyone national workshops were opened. The National Guards was opened to all citizens. A special commission was constituted to lay down a programme of social and economic reform. However, the experiment in national workshops was a great failure as it was hastily put into effect and it was badly managed. The provisional government devised a plan of employing unemployed Parisians in certain public improvement work in Paris and paying them two francs per day from the national treasury. As a result, national workshops became a breeding ground of idleness and unproductiveness. Thus, the provisional government closed down the national workshop and the government subsidy to the workers was withdrawn. This resulted in economic distress which in turn led to rebellions in various parts of France. To crush these rebellions, the National Assembly entrusted dictatorial powers to General Cavaignac, who called out regular army to suppress the working class rebellions. Thus, socialism as an organized movement ended in a failure in France.

e. Impact on Europe: The Revolution of 1848 in France greatly inspired and encouraged the liberals in other parts of Europe to revolt against the autocratic monarchies and demand constitutional governments. In Vienna, students and workers demonstrated against Metternich, the Chancellor of Austria and attacked and burnt his house. Following these rebellions, Metternich resigned his post and took refuge in England. Simultaneously, liberal movements spread to other countries of Europe such as Italy, Germany, Denmark and Holland. The rulers of these countries were forced to grant liberal constitutions. These liberal movements also forced their rulers to abolish press censorship and put an end to serfdom and feudal privileges. In Italy and Germany the movement for national unification began to gather momentum. Thus, the Revolution of 1848 can be considered as a landmark in the history of Europe as it led to the establishment of the Second Republic in France and ultimately resulted in the downfall of Metternich who dominated the European political stage since 1815.

Questions

1. Discuss the causes and results of the Revolution of 1848.
2. Trace the course of events that led to the Revolution of 1848.
3. How far were the policies of Louis Philippe responsible for the Revolution of 1848? What were its results?
4. Examine the circumstances that led to the establishment of the Orleanist Monarchy in France. What led to its downfall?
5. Write a detailed note on the Revolution of 1848.



12

ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION-I

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

Objectives:

1. To review the various factors that contributed to the Agrarian Revolution in England.
2. To understand the measures undertaken to improve agricultural productivity in England.
3. To know about the various inventions that took place in England to improve agricultural productivity.

12.1. Introduction: Agrarian Revolution is a term applied to a period of agricultural change held to be of particular significance, and usually referring to increases in the output and productivity of English agriculture. During the early 1700's, a great change in farming began in England. The revolution resulted from a series of discoveries and inventions that made agriculture much more productive than ever before. By the mid-1800's, the Agrarian Revolution had spread throughout much of Europe and North

America. One of the revolution's chief effect was the rapid growth of towns and cities in Europe and the United States during the 1800's. As fewer people were needed to produce food, farm families by the thousands moved to the towns and cities.

12.2. The System Of Enclosures: The system of enclosures was one of the important causes of the Agrarian Revolution. Enclosure was the division or consolidation of communal fields, meadows, pastures, and other arable lands in Western Europe into the carefully delineated and individually owned and managed farm plots of modern times. Before enclosure, much farmland existed in the form of numerous, a dispersed strip under the control of individual cultivators only during the growing season and until harvesting was completed for a given year. Thereafter, and until the next growing season, the land was at the disposal of the community for grazing by the village livestock and for other purposes. To enclose land was to put a hedge or fence around a portion of this open land and thus prevent the exercise of common grazing and other rights over it.

In England the movement for enclosure began in the twelfth century and proceeded rapidly in the period 1450-1640, when the purpose was mainly to increase the amount of full-time pasturage available to manorial lords. Much enclosure also occurred in the period from 1750 to 1860, when it was done for the sake of agricultural efficiency. By the end of the nineteenth century the process of the enclosure of common lands in England was virtually complete.

12.2.1 Kind of Land Enclosed : There were three kinds of land that could be enclosed – the common fields, the commons, and the wastes. During the eighteenth century, the Lord of the manor held a large portion of the village. By careful adjustments of his leases he could also secure a large fraction of the common-fields. Along with these the Lord could secure enclosure by mutual agreement with other holders.

12.2.2. Enclosure in the Rest of Europe : In the rest of Europe enclosure made little progress until the nineteenth century. Agreements to enclose were not unknown in Germany in the sixteenth century, but it was not until the second half of the eighteenth century that the government began to issue decrees encouraging enclosure. Even then, little advance was made in western Germany until after 1850. The same policy of encouragement by decree was followed in France and Denmark from the second half of the eighteenth century, in Russia after the emancipation of the serfs (1861), and in Czechoslovakia and Poland after World War I. Common rights over arable land--which constitute the most formidable obstacle to modern farming--have now for the most part been extinguished, but some European land

is still cultivated in the scattered strips characteristic of common fields, and common rights continue over large areas of pasture and woodland.

12.2.3 Reasons for the Enclosure Movement : The chief reason for the enclosure movement was the inefficiency of open-field farming and the increased production that could be obtained from enclosed farm by the new and more scientific methods. It was found that the open-field villages had been very poor. A number of writers such as Arthur Young, Ellis and others have written convincingly about the desperate condition of many of the open-fields. However, all open-field farming was not as bad as this. An enlightened village might adopt many of the new methods of agriculture. The enclosures facilitated modern methods of farming. According to the opinion of Arthur Young, the engrossing of the farms and the squeezing out of the small occupier would be justified by the enormously increased production. The new farming was the capital farming. The days of the self-sufficient villages were over. Arthur Young claimed that more produce meant higher rents for the landlords, more profits for farmers and higher wages and more food for the labourers.

12.2.4. Effects of Enclosure : The effects of enclosure may be understood from three points of view: production, rent and people. The first result was to increase the total area which could be brought under cultivation. Much of the commons was good land, which could be worth converting into arable, while the best land of the common-fields was often used as pastures for the production of better cattle. A considerable part of the wastes that were enclosed was to raise crops. While the gross product of any given village after the enclosure was often less than it had been before, especially where arable land was converted into grass-land, there is no question that as a whole the produce of the country was greatly increased. Though the enclosures did not produced more, it was a necessary preliminary to any practice of the new farming, which aimed at and obtained much greater results per acre of land. The supporters of enclosure maintained that tenant farming, which certainly increased as enclosures became general, also tended towards high farming. The landlords could and did force their tenants to adopt the new methods of farming by increasing the rents to a level which could only be paid by giving up old methods and adopting new methods of farming.

The system of enclosure did result in the increase in the rents. In the first place the costs of enclosure were so high that only by higher rents the costs could be recovered. Often the rents were doubled and even quadrupled. Where rich arable land was converted into pastures, the rise in rent was considerable. The saving in labour gave increased profits. Rents depended not on

gross produce, but on net profits, that is, the amount that went to feed the industrial population in the towns. Enclosures tended to reduce the number of the rural workers and increase those of the towns. The same amount of food produced by fewer hands would cost less to produce. This resulted in an increase in profit. As such the landlords could exact more rent. Bringing the poorer lands under farming led to a rise in the relative value of good land and thus, rents rose due to this factor as well.

The increase in production and rents had considerable effect on the inhabitants of the land. The squires, the parsons, the lawyers, and the large tenant farmers benefited considerably from the system of enclosure. The small farmers, copyholders and tenants were pushed to the brink of ruin who gradually disappeared from the land that was brought under the enclosure. The cottagers and labourers were either driven from the rural districts altogether or remained as wage-earners, who gradually became a landless proletariat.

As food output was increasing due to enclosures, the proportion of the population working on the land was falling. Although in absolute terms the rural agricultural population rose from about 2.78 million in 1700 to 3.84 million in 1850, this represented a fall in the proportion of the population in this category, from 55 per cent to 22 per cent. At this point, England had the lowest proportion of its workforce in agriculture than any country in the world. It is not surprising therefore, that England also had the highest rate of urbanization. In 1850 over 40 per cent of the population lived in towns, more than twice the proportion of the next most urbanized country. The importance of this lies in what those people not working on the land were doing. Since they were not working in agriculture they were employed in industry and commerce; in other words, they were part of the workforce of the Industrial Revolution. The Agrarian Revolution enabled a much smaller proportion of the population to feed the country, so providing the opportunity for the Industrial Revolution.

Increases in agricultural output and improvements in the efficiency of agricultural labour went hand in hand with changes in the social relationships between those involved in farming. By 1850 the majority of farmers produced much more than they needed for themselves, and were businessmen farming for the market. Private property rights were universal and farming was dominated by the tripartite class structure of landlord, tenant farmer, and labourer. The period during which these changes occurred was a more protracted one, and, unlike the first transformation, there are strong grounds for claiming it was underway by the mid-seventeenth century. The significance of these changes, which amount to the establishment of agrarian capitalism, lies both in their effects on

production, and in their impact on the lives of those working in the countryside.

Although it can be argued for a transformation in output in the century-and-a-half after 1700 on the basis of population data, there are no agricultural statistics with which agricultural output can be measured directly until 1866. This lack of direct information is one of the reasons why there is so much disagreement among historians about the timing of the Agrarian Revolution. On a local level information can be constructed about some aspects of particular farms, including the areas under individual crops and the type and number of animals. There is also some evidence of the yields of crops per sown acre, but these are only partial measures of output and productivity. On a national scale there are estimates of production by contemporary commentators, but have no way of checking how accurate they are. The only reliable statistics for the period before 1850 are population numbers, the prices of some agricultural commodities, a series of the rental value of land, and some statistics of imports and exports of grain. Some argue that there was no decisive turning point in the 300 years after 1550, others maintain that output growth accelerated dramatically after 1700, while some of the most recent work considers that the revolution in output did not take place until the turn of the nineteenth century.

12.3. Increase In Agricultural Production: Although direct evidence of output and productivity is lacking, there is plenty of indirect evidence about changes in the way that farming was conducted that led both to increased output and increased productivity. Increasing the intensity of production meant that more food could be produced, even though yields of particular crops, such as wheat, did not necessarily increase. We can identify four major ways in which this came about.

12.3.1. Land Reclamation: The first was through land reclamation or the improvement of land quality through capital investment. Under the pressure of a rising population from the mid-sixteenth century, marshes were drained, woods cleared, upland wastes ploughed, and lowland heaths were brought under cultivation. It is difficult to measure the loss of woodland from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, although recent research has shown the extent to which woodlands were preserved rather than destroyed during these centuries. In 1350 roughly 10 per cent of England was wooded; by the middle of the nineteenth century that figure was around 5 per cent, although both estimates are very approximate. Locally, woodland losses could be severe, as in Norfolk, which lost three quarters of its medieval woods between 1600 and 1790, while most of the great woodland areas, such as the Weald of Kent and Sussex, remained intact.

Rough pastures were usually in upland areas and required stone clearing and wall building. From the sixteenth century onward, upland wastes were gradually encroached upon. However, when pressure on land eased, as in the early eighteenth century, land was reverted back to waste. The real attack on upland wastes came in the century after 1750, and particularly in the first two decades of the nineteenth century using the device of parliamentary enclosure.

The transformation of heathland could be spectacular. Root crops, particularly turnips, coupled with the extensive use of marl (a mixture of clay and calcium carbonate) and lime, were responsible for turning heathlands and some downlands into productive land growing wheat and barley, with fodder crops supporting large numbers of animals. Turnips took up to five times the amounts of nutrients from the soil than did cereal crops and these nutrients were then recycled, either as manure, or through crop residues left in the soil. Heathland reclamation was therefore different from the reclamation of woodland. Soils under woodland could be inherently fertile, but those under heath were not, and cereal crops could only be sustained by new intensive arable rotations.

12.3.2. Reducing Fallow: A second way of increasing the agricultural production was the reduction of the amount of fallow land. In some crop rotations land was left fallow without growing crop on the land for up to a year. Contemporary farmers knew that fallows were necessary to enable them to control perennial weeds, and to allow the land to regain its fertility after growing crops. In fact, the process of recuperation involved the conversion of nitrogen gas in the air into nitrogen salts in the soil by bacterial action, which produced nutrient for the plants. In the 1690s about 20 per cent of arable land in England was fallow; by the 1830s it was 12 per cent, and by the 1870s it was 4 per cent.

12.3.3. Improved Crop-Growing Methods: The eighteenth century saw the replacement of the three-field system of wheat–barley–fallow by the four-field rotation system (wheat–turnips–barley–clover), which was designed to ensure that no land would need to lie fallow between periods of cultivation because if crops are rotated correctly they absorb different kinds and quantities of nutrients from the soil. The four-course rotation system was subsequently popularized by a retired English politician and enlightened landowner named Charles Townshend. He found that turnips could be used as the fourth crop in a four-field-rotation system. The other crops consisted of two grains, especially varieties of wheat; and a legume, such as alfalfa or clover. Each crop either added nutrients to the soil or absorbed different kinds and amounts of nutrients. Thus, farmers were not required to leave any land fallow, as in the two or three-field rotation systems.

Townshend's experiments did not become well-known during his lifetime, except to earn him the nick-name 'Turnip' Townshend. But in the late 1700's, and English nobleman Thomas Coke produced greatly increased yields using Townshend's system. Coke encouraged other farmers to adopt the method, and it soon became widely used in England. The system enabled farmers to grow crops on all their land each year, which made farmland much more productive. Both Townshend and Coke lived in the county of Norfolk, and thus, the four-field rotation system came to be known as the 'Norfolk System'.

12.3.4. Introduction of New Crops: Another method of increasing agricultural production was through the introduction of new crops. This was done by replacing lower-yielding crops by higher-yielding crops such as potatoes, red clover, and turnips – into Britain in the seventeenth century. This improved farming practices, since farmers could use them to feed their livestock throughout the winter. This meant that it was no longer necessary for animals to be slaughtered in the autumn so that meat could be salted for storage through the winter. Also, clover returned certain nutrients to the soil, and the growing of turnips meant that the land was thoroughly weeded by hoeing.

The major change was the introduction of the potato into England in the late sixteenth century. For most of the following century it remained a curiosity, but by the close of the seventeenth century it seems that potatoes were fairly widely grown in the north-west for everyday consumption. A major growth in potato cultivation took place during the last quarter of the eighteenth century against the background of population growing at an unprecedented rate, and a series of bad harvests during the 1790s. In the nineteenth century, potatoes became a food of those working on the land as well as those working in industry. Much of the new cultivation took place in small plots of land cultivated by agricultural labourers, in cottage gardens, in allotments, and in potato patches in the corners of farmers' fields.

12.4. Livestock Productivity: Livestock productivity rose through two processes: first, through an increase in the number of animals supported by a given area of land, because of increased fodder supplies; and secondly, because livestock became more efficient at converting fodder into saleable livestock products, such as meat, milk, and wool. As seen already two new fodder crops, turnips and clover, were introduced from the seventeenth century in England. However, some meadows were also improved by a process known as "floating", whereby a thin film of river water was kept flowing over the grass during the winter. This moving water kept the meadow frost-free and encouraged the growth of early grass,

providing fodder, usually for sheep, in March and April when fodder shortages were usually most acute.

In the late 1700's, an English farmer named Robert Bakewell showed how livestock could be improved by intensively breeding animals with desirable traits. Bakewell produced improved breeds of cattle, horses, and sheep. He became best known for developing a breed of sheep that could be raised for meat as well as for wool. Earlier breeds of sheep were expensive to raise for meat because they fattened too slowly. As a result, most sheep were raised for wool only. But Bakewell's breed, called the 'Leicester' fattened quickly. It could therefore be raised for slaughter as a reasonable cost. The cost was so low that mutton soon became the most popular meat in England. From the mid-1740s, Bakewell began experiments with sheep and by the 1790s there were 15 or 20 breeders of Bakewell's calibre in the Midlands. Bakewell developed the long-wool New Leicester sheep, which was important in its own right, but especially valuable when crossed with other breeds. The most important short-wool sheep was the Southdown, established by John Ellman of Glynde in Sussex. These two breeds were the foundations of sheep breed improvements of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Other successful breeders included the Colling brothers of County Durham and George Culley of Northumberland.

12.5. Invention Of New Farm Equipment: Little mechanization of farming took place before the mid-nineteenth century. However, before that period there can be little doubt that small improvements to basic farm implements had improved their efficiency. The Rotherham plough, for example, patented by Disney Stanyforth and Joseph Foljambe in 1730, was light, strong, easy to make, and cheap to produce. Fewer horses were needed to pull it, and there was consequently less need for a man or boy to tend the horses. It meant that ploughing could now be carried out by just one man.

The first important inventor of the Agrarian Revolution was Jethro Tull, an English farmer. Jethro Tull lived during the late 1600's and early 1700's. But his inventions were not widely used until the late 1700's. When Jethro Tull began his career, farmers still planted seeds by sowing, that is, by hand scattering. To conserve seed and increase yields, inventors had tried to build a machine that would dig small trenches in the soil and deposit seeds in them. In about 1700, Tull built the first such 'seed drill' that worked. Actually, it was the first successful farm machine with inner moving parts and thus became the ancestor of all modern farm machinery.

The first major change in harvesting technology was the shift from shearing with the serrated-edge sickle to reaping with a smooth-edged hook, then to 'bagging' with a heavy smooth hook, and

finally to using a scythe. This saved labour because three times as much corn could be cut in a day by a man using a scythe than could be cut with a sickle. The move to using a bagging hook and then a scythe to harvest wheat began in southern England during the Napoleonic Wars, but it was not until the years after 1835 that the change was widespread. Around 1790 some 90 per cent of the wheat harvest was carried out with the sickle; by 1870 it was 20 per cent.

The first successful threshing machines were developed in Scotland towards the end of the eighteenth century, coinciding with a shortage of labour during the Napoleonic Wars. Their use became much less common after the wars, as there was no shortage of labour. The threshing machines began to reappear in the 1840s and 1850s, and by this time they were much more substantial, usually mobile, and powered by steam. Other, smaller, labour-saving machinery was also introduced, including winnowing machines, turnip cutters, chaff cutters, bean mills, and, rather later than these, oil-cake crushers. Reaping machines did not appear until the 1850s.

Questions

1. Examine the various factors that led to the Agrarian Revolution in England.
2. Review the stages through which the Agrarian Revolution progressed in England.
3. Discuss the various steps that were undertaken in England to achieve agricultural productivity.
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Enclosures
 - (b) Increase in agricultural production
 - (c) Inventions in farm equipments



ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION-II

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Objectives:

1. To analyze the various factors that led to the Industrial Revolution in England.
2. To review inventions that had taken place in different fields such as textiles, coal and iron, power, transport and communication.
3. To understand the impact of the Industrial Revolution.

13.1. Introduction: The Industrial Revolution is one of the most significant landmarks in the history of mankind. The Industrial Revolution that first broke out in England in around 1750 and lasted nearly for a century till 1850, was a more intensive and fundamental process of transformation than had been ever known before. During the Industrial Revolution changes were introduced in the field of manufacturing, mining, transportation, communication and agriculture. It also brought about a transformation for the 'domestic system' to the 'factory system'; a change from small output to mass production; use of basic materials such as iron and steel; use of new energy sources; invention of complex machines and application of science to industry. No revolution, asserts C. M. Cipolla, has been as dramatically revolutionary as the Industrial Revolution. It opened up a completely different world of new and untapped sources of energy such as coal, oil and electricity. The term 'Industrial Revolution', was first used by a French socialist, Louis Blanc in 1837 to suggest a revolutionary departure from the past.

13.2. Factors That Led To The Industrial Revolution: The Industrial Revolution first started in England and gradually spread to other countries of the continent. A number of factors explain as to why the Industrial Revolution first began in England. England was ahead of the continent in respect of industrialization. The British entrepreneurs showed greater enterprise in promoting industrialization. The growth of foreign trade brought in the much needed capital and raw materials. The agricultural and demographic revolutions, the growth of banking system, transport and technology and other developments put England at an advantageous position to be the home of Industrial Revolution.

Different historians have emphasized different factors for the outbreak of the Industrial Revolution in England. According to historians like Charles Wilson and Nef, the end of the medieval economy prepared the background for the Industrial Revolution in England. According to them the growth of overseas colonies and the development of the banking and insurance system and the exodus of peasants from village to towns contributed towards the early industrialization. Other historians such as Lands observe that on the eve of the Industrial Revolution, England was technologically superior to other European countries. There was an increase in domestic demand because of better transport, urbanization, better purchasing power, distribution of wealth and growth of population. On the other hand, historians such as Ralph Davis attribute the Industrial Revolution to the British foreign trade and the foreign markets spread across America, Africa and Asia. Other historians describe the origin of the Industrial Revolution as a combination of demand and supply, a new industrial mentality and growth of scientific outlook since the seventeenth century. The chief causes of the Industrial Revolution in England were the following:

13.2.1. Geographical Location of England: England's geographical location at the confluence of the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean had given an advantage to the English sailors and traders. Besides, the humid climate in the coastal England was more favourable to industries such as textile. Being an island country, England developed as a strong maritime power not only for defence but also to undertake voyages of exploration and discoveries which led to the establishment of colonies in the western hemisphere, Asia and Africa. These colonies, besides promoting trade and commerce, provided ready markets for the manufactured goods and became the sources of raw materials needed for the industries in England.

13.2.2. Progress in Science: There had been a steady accumulation of scientific knowledge in England. England produced a number of scientists whose inventions enabled to large scale production in factories. Inventors, such as James Hargreaves, Richard Arkwright, Samuel Crompton, Edmund Cartwright and others brought about revolutionary changes in the textile industry through their inventions. Humphrey Davy, Henry Bessemer, Darby and others made contributions to the coal and iron industry. Thomas Newcoman, James Watt, George Stephenson, Robert Fulton and others revolutionized power and transport industry.

13.2.3. Political Stability: Another important cause of Industrial Revolution was the political and administrative stability that prevailed in England in the eighteenth century. Politically, England was a free country. Her Parliamentary system of government

promoted democracy and domestic peace unlike the revolutionary upheavals in other European countries such as France. The peaceful condition in England and prevailing law and order created a favourable condition for the capitalists to invest their wealth in factories and machines.

13.2.4. Flexibility of the British Society: The English society was more flexible than other European countries such as France. Thus, it was able to adjust itself to the changing socio-economic pattern. The English landlords, found a better way of increasing their wealth by shifting their attention from land to trade and business. They also invested their wealth in industry.

13.2.5. British Policy of Promoting Trade and Colonization: England's policy towards promoting trade, commerce and colonization became an important factor in the Industrial Revolution. The British Parliament passed Navigation Acts to protect British shipping from the competition of European rival powers. The British Government itself did not undertake commercial activities. These activities were carried on by private companies such as the East India Company and other private entrepreneurs. They not only earned huge profits for themselves, but in the long run generated capital and resources for the country by promoting industry and trade.

13.2.6. Immigration of Artisans into England: On account of religious intolerance and persecution of the Protestant minorities in countries like France and Spain, a large number of Huguenots (Protestants) migrated to England with their wealth and skills. Their craftsmanship, especially in the textile industry gave an impetus to the Industrial Revolution in England.

13.2.7. Natural Resources: England had abundant natural resources such as iron and coal. These resources were necessary for producing stronger materials such as iron and steel to replace wooden components of machines. Coal was used for smelting iron ore to extract pig iron and produce steel. Coal was also used as a source of energy to produce steam with which the heavy machines could be run.

13.2.8. Availability of Cheap Labour: The Agrarian Revolution during the eighteenth century brought about significant changes in the agricultural process. A vast tract of land was brought under 'enclosure', that is taken over and consolidated into large estates and many of them were converted into sheep farms which required a small number of persons to manage them. Besides, new technology was introduced in the farming which increased agricultural efficiency and deprived a large number of people, their livelihood. As the Agricultural Revolution went hand in hand with

the Industrial Revolution, a large number of small peasants, who lost their land holdings to 'enclosures' and landless labourers, who were no longer required for farm work began to migrate to towns and cities in search of employment and livelihood. Thus, the exodus of peasants from village to towns led to the availability of ready and cheap labour to work in industries.

13.3. Inventions During The Industrial Revolution

13.3.1. Textile Industry:

One of the most important features of the Industrial Revolution was the introduction power driven machinery in the textile industries of England and Scotland. Machines were invented to speed up the spinning and weaving processes in the textile industry.

For hundreds of years before the Industrial Revolution, spinning had been done in the home on a simple device called a spinning wheel. It was operated by a single person, powering it with a foot pedal. The spinning wheel produced only one thread at a time. The first spinning machines were crude devices that often broke the fragile threads.

In the 1760's, two new machines revolutionized the textile industry. One was the Spinning Jenny, invented by James Hargreaves and the other was the water frame, or throttle, invented by Richard Arkwright. The Spinning Jenny made it possible to turn out eight threads at a time. However, the thread produced by the Spinning Jenny was too soft for weaving and the thread produced by the water-frame was though strong was coarse. This problem was solved by the invention of spinning mule in 1779, by Samuel Crompton. The spinning mule combined the features of both the spinning jenny and the water-frame. The spinning mule was efficient in spinning fine yarn for high quality cloth. During the 1780' and 1790's, larger spinning mules were built. They had metal rollers and several hundred spindles. These machines ended the home spinning industry.

Until the early 1800's, almost all weaving was done on handlooms as no one could solve the problem of mechanical weaving. In 1733, John Kay, Lancashire clockmaker, invented the flying shuttle. This machine doubled the speed of weaving. In the mid-1780', an Anglican clergyman named Edmund Cartwright developed a steam-powered loom. By this invention, textile production was revolutionized as the speed of weaving was greatly increased. In 1803, John Horrocks, a Lancashire machine manufacturer, built an all-metal loom. With the passage of time further improvements were made in the loom.

In the United States, Ely Whitney invented a mechanical device known as the cotton gin in 1792, which could separate cotton seeds from the fibers of the cotton ball. In 1846, Elias Howe invented the sewing machine, which revolutionized the clothing industry.

The first textile mills were established in England in the 1740's. By the 1780's, England had 120 mills and by 1835, England had more than 120,000 power-looms.

13.3.2. Coal and Iron Industry:

The Industrial Revolution could not have developed without the progress in iron and coal industry. Coal provided the power to drive the steam engines and was needed to extract iron by smelting. Iron was used to replace wood and improve machines and tools and to build bridges and ships. The large deposits of coal and iron ore helped England to become the world's first industrial nation.

To make iron, the metal had to be separated from the non metallic elements in the ore. This separation process is called smelting. For thousands of years before the Industrial Revolution, smelting had been done by placing iron ore in a furnace with burning fuel that lacked enough oxygen to burn completely. Oxygen in the ore combined with the fuel, and the pure melted metal flowed into small moulds called pigs. The pigs were then hammered by hand into sheets. Beginning in the early 1600's, the pigs were rolled into sheets by rolling mills.

The most important fuel for smelting was charcoal, made by burning hardwoods. By the early 1700's, England had almost used up its hardwood forests. Charcoal became so expensive that many iron makers in England quit the industry because of the high cost of production.

Between 1709 and 1713, Abraham Darby, succeeded in using coke to smelt iron ore. Coke is made by heating coal in an airtight oven. Smelting with coke was much more economical and efficient than smelting with charcoal. However, most iron makers continued to use charcoal as they complained that coke-smelted iron was brittle and could not be worked easily. In about 1750, Darby's son, Abraham Darby II invented the blast furnace, which was worked by leather bellows. This process made coke iron as easy to work as charcoal iron. In 1760, John Smeaton of Scotland invented the pump blower, which replaced the leather bellows. In about 1784, Henry Cort developed the puddling process for the purification of pig iron made with coke. Iron making techniques continued to improve, and iron production increased tremendously in England. In 1856, Henry Bessemer invented a process by which steel could be produced out of iron.

Progress in iron and coal industry went on simultaneously. Initially, coal mining was a dangerous task. Many miners lost their lives due to lack of safety in the coal mines. However, mining was made comparatively safe by the invention of the safety lamp by Sir Humphrey Davy in 1816. The safety lamp could give an advance warning to the miners about the presence of poisonous gases in coal mines.

13.3.3. Revolution in Power:

Most of the important inventions during the Industrial Revolution required much more power than horses or water wheels could provide. To drive the heavy machines a new, cheap, and efficient source of power was needed and it was found in the steam engine.

The first commercial steam engine was invented by Thomas Savery in 1698. It was a steam pump used for pumping out water from coal mines. In 1712, Thomas Newcomen, improved on Savery's steam engine. However, Newcomen's steam engine had serious defects. It wasted much heat and used a great deal of fuel. In 1760's, James Watt of Scotland began working to improve the steam engine. By 1785, he had eliminated many of the defects of earlier engines. Watt's steam engine used heat much more efficiently than Newcomen's engine and used less fuel.

The great potential of the steam engine and power-driven machinery could not have been achieved without the development of machine tools to shape metal. In 1775, John Wilkinson invented a boring machine that drilled a more precise hole in metal.

Invention of electric power further increased the capacity of the industries to manufacture more goods. The Italian scientist Alessandro Volta invented the voltaic cell by immersing strips of copper and zinc in weak solution. Andre Marie Ampere, a French physicist demonstrated the relation between electricity and magnetism. This enabled an English scientist, Michael Faraday to invent dynamo to produce electricity. The use of electricity has not only revolutionized industrial production but has also made the lives of people much more comfortable by its domestic use for various purposes

13.3.4. Transport and Communication:

The progress of the Industrial Revolution depended on industry's ability to transport raw materials and finished goods over long distances. Until the early 1800's, England had poor roads. Horse-drawn wagons travelled with difficulty, and pack-animals carried goods over long distances. A series of turnpikes was built between

1751 and 1771, which made travel by horse-drawn wagons and stagecoaches easier.

During the early 1800's two Scottish engineers, John Macadam and Thomas Telford, made important advances in road construction. John Macadam discovered a method of building sturdy roads with layers of broken stones. Such roads came to be known as Macadamized roads. Telford developed a technique of using large stones for road foundations. These new methods of road building made travel by land faster and smoother.

England had many rivers and harbours that could be adapted to carrying goods. Until the early 1800's, waterways provided the only cheap and effective means of transporting coal, iron and other heavy goods. British engineers widened and deepened many streams to make them navigable. They also built canals to link cities and to connect coal fields with rivers. They also built many bridges and lighthouses and deepened harbours. In 1807, the American inventor Robert Fulton built the first commercially successful steamboat called "Clermont". Within a few years, steamboats became common on British rivers. By mid-1800's, steam-powered ships were beginning to carry raw materials and finished goods across the Atlantic Ocean.

The first rail systems in England carried coal. Horses pulled the freight cars, which moved on iron rails. In 1804, Richard Trevithick built the first steam locomotive. In 1814, George Stephenson built the iron-horse worked by steam to carry coal from mine to the port. He improved the steam engine and by 1830, Stephenson's famous steam locomotive engine named "Rocket" began to carry goods and passengers on the Liverpool-Manchester Railway in 1830 at a speed of 29 miles per hour.

The introduction of telegraph and telephone brought about revolution in the field of communication. The electric telegraph was invented by Wheatstone in England and Samuel Morse (1791-1872) in the United States of America in around (1832-35). In 1838 he developed the Morse Code. After 1845, telegraphic system was introduced widely. In 1866 an undersea cable was set up in the Atlantic Ocean. By the end of the nineteenth century all the important commercial centres were connected by telegraphic system. Alexander Graham Bell (1847-1922) invented telephone in 1876. It was a device which could send voice messages over a distance.

13.4. Results Of The Industrial Revolution:

13.4.1. Economic Results:

The Industrial Revolution had far reaching economic results. The Industrial Revolution led to the expansion of industry and increase of wealth. Individual investors played an important part in the growth of the Industrial revolution from the beginning. The creators of the newly created surplus wealth were the industrial capitalists who owned the factories. With the progress of the Industrial Revolution, the power and influence of the industrial capitalists also grew. It was the industrial capitalists who were responsible for the expansion of industries. They reinvested their gains in new enterprises rather than distributing the surplus to the general population.

The old method of small production in the home with one's own tools could not meet the competition of machine production. Moreover, the cost of machinery was prohibitive to the individual workers. This led to the rise of the factory system. This stimulated the growth of division of labour and of mass production through standardization of processes and parts.

The development of multiplied productivity required an ever larger market for the selling of the product. As domestic markets began to reach a saturation point, the pressure for imperialistic expansion and spheres of influence in the underdeveloped parts of the world increased. Thus, the need for ready markets for their manufactured goods and cheap raw materials led the industrially advanced nations of Western Europe to conquer the economically backward countries of Asia and Africa.

The Industrial Revolution led to international economic dependence. The cotton textile industries of England depended upon a steady supply of raw cotton from the slave-worked plantations of the United States and India. As the population of Europe, especially of England, became more and more engaged in urban industry, they raised less food on their farms and became heavy importers of wheat, meat and other tropical food products. In exchange for food, Europe exported manufactured goods. Thus, the entire world became a market place.

13.4.2. Social Consequences: The social consequences of the Industrial Revolution were noteworthy. With the rise of the factory system came a shifting of population from small agricultural villages to the industrial cities. This led to the emergence of a large urban proletariat class (working class). This class neither owned any property nor had any education. It entirely depended on wage earning for a living.

Housing in the growing industrial cities could not keep up with the migration of workers from rural areas. Severe overcrowding resulted in the growth of slums in many of the urban centres. As a result many people lived in extremely unsanitary conditions that led to the outbreak of diseases.

Due to the Industrial Revolution, the factory wages were low. Some employers deliberately kept them low. Many people agreed with the English writer Arthur Young, who wrote: "Every one but an idiot knows that the lower classes must be kept poor, or they will never be industrious." However, the working and living conditions of the working class began to improve during the 1800's. The British Parliament began to act in the interest of the middle and working classes. It passed laws regulating factory conditions.

Women and children were employed in large numbers and were mercilessly exploited. Children of poor parents were farmed out to factory owners on terms that amounted to slavery. These miserable conditions continued for more than half a century in England. Due to the agitation by reformers, public conscience and government intervention led to a better deal to the workers in general and women and children in particular.

The abundant supply of labour in excess of demand and the lack of any independent means of subsistence led to the fear of loss of job among the workers. Mass unemployment became one of the serious social problems arising from the Industrial Revolution.

Although the working class did not first share in the prosperity of the Industrial Revolution, members of the middle and upper classes prospered from the beginning. Many people made fortunes during this period. The revolution made available products that provided new comforts and conveniences to those who could afford them. The middle class won political and educational benefits.

The Industrial Revolution indirectly helped in increasing England's population. The people of the middle and upper classes enjoyed better diet and lived in more sanitary houses. Thus, they suffered less from disease and lived longer. Later, the material condition of the working class also improved. Due to these improved conditions, the population grew rapidly.

13.4.3. Political Impact: The Industrial Revolution had far reaching impact on the political life in England. The middle class acquired a large measure of political power through the Reform Bill of 1832. This bill redistributed seats in Parliament to grant representation to the new industrial centres and to diminish the representation of the so called "rotten borough". It also gave the right to vote to a large new group of the moderately well to do. The middle class was also

successful in putting down the agitation of the Chartists, which was essentially an effort to secure for the lower classes the same political rights as has been acquired by the middle class through the Reform Bill of 1832. In France, the position of the middle class was strengthened by the Revolution of 1830, which put Louis Philippe on the throne as a constitutional monarch. The accession of Louis Philippe enabled the French middle class to have an effective control over the government as in England.

The new working class created by the Industrial Revolution began to assert itself. Though hampered by poverty, ignorance, and lack of leadership, the working class gradually developed a feeling of common consciousness and tried to find means to improve their condition by political agitation, trade union movement and cooperative action. With the progress of democracy, chiefly due to the efforts of the middle class, the working classes also gradually grew stronger politically. The working classes were able to make their influence felt directly in elections and plebiscites.

The Industrial Revolution led to a new balance of world powers. It became more and more clear that military strength depended on industrialization. The progress of the Industrial Revolution in England, France and Germany was the most powerful factor that contributed to the dominance of Europe by these three nations at the beginning of the twentieth century. The adoption of the Industrial Revolution in the later nineteenth century led to the emergence of Japan as a major industrial and military power in the Far East. The industrial progress of the Northern United States led to its victory over the predominantly agrarian Southern States in the American Civil War (1860-65).

13.4.4. Intellectual and Cultural Results: The social and economic transformation that was brought about by the Industrial Revolution encouraged the growth of the science of economics or political economy. The economic thinking of the nineteenth century was chiefly due to the writings of Adam Smith. In his famous treatise, *Wealth of Nations* (1776), Adam Smith put forward his views regarding non-interference by government with business. He strongly supported the economic doctrine known as *laissez faire*, which appealed strongly to the new capitalists of the Industrial Revolution.

A group of classical economists developed and elaborated the ideas of Adam Smith. The important among the classical economists were Thomas Malthus, David Ricardo, Nassau Senior, and James Mill. Thomas Malthus formulated the *Principles of Population* (1798), in which he argued that any improvement in the economic condition of the poor would be counter-balanced by an increase in population. According to him, the only alternative to this

problem was the limitation of the population by moral restraint. David Ricardo enunciated the famous Iron Law of Wages. According to this law the wages must inevitably tend to an amount just capable of maintaining life, much as the coal fed into a steam engine was just capable of maintaining the fire under the boiler.

The Industrial Revolution also stimulated socialist ideas. Robert Owen's experiment at New Lanark, Scotland, was a cooperative community scheme for improving the condition of the workers. In France Saint Simon, Fourier, and Louis Blanc tried to improve the conditions of workers. However, their idealistic schemes were not practical. In spite of this, they created public opinion against the system of *laissez faire*, which demanded and obtained better working conditions, a higher standard of living, an increased leisure, and a greater freedom for women and children.

The Industrial Revolution greatly encouraged scientific investigation. With the manufacturing techniques becoming more complex, experts were required to manage and improve them. The profession of engineering became an integral part of the industrial civilization. With the passage of time laboratory research became an important part of promoting inventions. Applied sciences got additional impetus due to the requirement of new technology.

The progress of the Industrial Revolution made available to a large part of the population a variety of material goods. The mass-circulation of newspaper, the automobile, the radio and the motion picture, have supplied man with a whole new set of interests. The benefits of the Industrial Revolution have gradually led to the secularization of the society.

Questions

1. Discuss the factors that led to the Industrial Revolution in England.
2. Examine the inventions that took place in the fields of textile, iron and coal, power and transport and communication during the Industrial Revolution.
3. Describe the consequences of the Industrial Revolution.
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Causes of the Industrial Revolution.
 - (b) Revolution in Textile industry
 - (c) conomic and social impact of the Industrial Revolution



ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION-III**DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM
(UTOPIAN AND MARXIST)****Objectives:**

1. To understand the circumstances that led to the development of socialism.
2. To review the contribution of Utopian Socialists to the progress of socialist ideas.
3. To study the development of scientific socialism or Marxism and its principles.

14.1. Introduction:

The term 'Socialism' is a political and economic theory or system of social organization based on collective or state ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. Like capitalism, it takes many and diverse forms.

The word 'socialism' was first used in the early 1830s by the followers of Robert Owen in Britain and those of Saint Simon in France. By the mid-nineteenth century it denoted a vast range of reformist and revolutionary ideas in England, Europe, and the United States. All of them emphasized the need to transform capitalist industrial society into a much more egalitarian system in which collective well-being for all became a reality, and in which the pursuit of individual self-interest became subordinate to such values as association, community, and cooperation. There was thus an explicit emphasis on solidarity, mutual interdependence, and the possibility of achieving genuine harmony in society to replace conflict, instability, and upheaval. A critique of the social-class basis of capitalism was accompanied by the elevation of the interests of working class or proletariat to a position of supreme importance, and in some cases the principle of direct workers' control under socialism was invoked as an alternative to the rule of existing dominant classes and elites.

Images of a future 'classless' society were used to symbolize the need for the complete abolition of socio-economic distinctions in the future: an especially important idea in the Marxist tradition. However, socialists rarely agreed on a strategy for achieving these goals, and diversity and conflict between socialist thinkers, movements, and parties proliferated, especially in the context of the First and Second International Working Men's Associations (founded respectively in 1864 and 1889). Increasingly, as the nineteenth century developed, socialist aspirations focused on the politics of the nation-state and the harnessing of modern science, technology, and industry. Yet other, alternative visions of a socialist future emphasizing, for example, the potential of small-scale communities and agrarianism rather than full-scale industrialization—always coexisted with the mainstream tendency. In addition doctrines such as anarchism, communism, and social democracy drew on the key values of socialism, and it was often difficult to separate the various schools and movements from each other. Thus Marx and Engels regarded themselves as 'scientific socialists' (as opposed to earlier 'utopian socialists'), but saw socialism in the strict sense of the term to be a transitional phase between capitalism and full economic and social communism.

14.2. Utopian Socialism The beginning of socialism was a direct outcome of the Industrial Revolution. The changed system of production brought into sharp contrast the distinction between two types of property - productive or capital and commodities for individual use. Many thinkers contrasted the great increase in productivity made possible by the use of machines, with the terrible poverty of the large number of workers. They were convinced that the chief reason for this evil was the private ownership of capital under the old concept of property rights. Thus, socialism demanded the complete control of capital and means of production by society as a whole for the benefit of all. Many different ways were proposed to achieve this goal.

Utopian socialism is a term used to define the first currents of modern socialist thought. Although it is technically possible for any person living at any time in history to be a utopian socialist, the term is most often applied to those utopian socialists who lived in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, the other branches of socialism overtook the utopian version in terms of intellectual development and number of supporters. Utopian socialists were important in the formation of modern movements for intentional community and cooperatives.

Utopian socialists never actually used this name to describe themselves; the term "utopian socialism" was introduced by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in '*The Communist Manifesto*' and used by later socialist thinkers to describe early socialist or quasi-

socialist intellectuals who created hypothetical visions of perfect egalitarian and communalist societies without actually concerning themselves with the manner in which these societies could be created or sustained.

Although the utopian socialists did not share any common political, social, or economic perspectives, Marx and Engels argued that certain intellectual characteristics of the utopian socialists unified the disparate thinkers. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels wrote, "The undeveloped state of the class struggle, as well as their own surroundings, causes Socialists of this kind to consider themselves far superior to all class antagonisms. They want to improve the condition of every member of society even that of the most favored. Hence, they habitually appeal to society at large, without distinction of class; nay, by preference, to the ruling class. For how can people, when once they understand their system, fail to see it in the best possible plan of the best possible state of society?. Hence, they reject all political, and especially all revolutionary, action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavor, by small experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to pave the way for the new social Gospel." The contribution of some of the prominent Utopian Socialists is given below:

14.2.1. William Godwin (1756-1836): William Godwin was an English author and philosopher. His major literary work is 'An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness' (1793). This book discusses the relationship of an individual with the government and the society. Godwin believed that all monarchies were 'unavoidably corrupt'. He felt that no individual should hold power over another. Godwin surveyed the evils of contemporary society, including the extreme inequality of wealth, the wretchedness of the poor and the oppression on the part of the rich. He objected to the accumulation of private property and opposed most of the existing social institutions, including marriage. Godwin's belief that reason could and should rule over our lives reflected the influence of French philosophers of the 1700's.

14.2.2. Saint Simon (1760-1825): Saint Simon was a French socialist who fought in the American Revolution and was imprisoned during the French Revolution. He advocated an atheist society ruled by technicians and industrialists. Saint Simon is regarded as the founder of socialism in France. His views were formed by a keen observation of the Industrial Revolution and the role of science in human life. He advocated the replacement of traditional ruling classes by elite representing the new economic power. According to him economic problems are more important than political problems. He was of the opinion that the French

Revolution had failed because it had neglected the most important questions of wealth. He was in favour of establishing a government controlled by industrialists, bankers and technicians. However, they were to be appointed by the state and be responsible to it. But he did not believe in a classless society.

14.2.3. Robert Owen (1771-1858): Robert Owen was a British socialist, born in Wales. He left school when he was nine years old to work as a cotton spinner. Gradually he became a wealthy textile manufacturer. He became a social reformer and pioneered a cooperative movement. He tried to prove as a businessman that it was good business to think about the welfare of the employees.

Owen was part owner and the head of the New Lanark Cotton Mills in Scotland in 1799. By improving working and housing conditions and providing schools he created a model community. His ideas stimulated the cooperative movement by pooling of resources for joint economic benefit. He attracted international attention by showing that workers could be treated well, even generously, without the employer incurring any loss. Owen wrote on the subject of proper social conditions, and tried to interest the British government in building 'Villages of Cooperation'. He suggested that these villages should be partly agricultural and partly industrial. In 1825, Owen implemented his ideas through an experiment by establishing the famous "New Harmony Community" in Indiana (USA). It was designed as a voluntary and freely self-governing cooperative community. Unfortunately, the experiment was a failure. Owen lost popularity by his anti-religious views. Many of his associates at New Harmony refused to work. After the failure of the New Harmony experiment in 1827, Owen returned to England.

Owen retired from business to devote all his time to his social theories. He lived in London. He organized the 'Grand National Consolidated Trades Union' in 1833, in order that the unions might take over industry and run it cooperatively. However, this scheme collapsed in 1834. In 'A New View of Society' (1813), he claimed that personal character is wholly determined by environment. He had earlier abolished child employment, established sickness and old-age insurance and opened educational and recreational facilities at his cotton mills in the north of England.

14.2.4. Charles Fourier (1772-1837): Fourier was a French socialist. He was a contemporary of Saint Simon and Robert Owen. He wrote a number of books among which the best known was '*The New Industrial World*' (1829-30). In this book Fourier criticized the social conditions of his times and held that society could be improved if private property was eliminated. He was of the opinion that society could be improved through an economic and social regrouping of people. Fourier advocated that society should be

organized in self-sufficient cooperative units of about 1,500 people each. Such cooperative communities were known as 'Phalanxes'. In such cooperatives, each person would own a share of the property. Fourier believed that all evils and most human miseries arose from the unnatural limitations imposed by the existing economic and social system. He argued that if every one was allowed to do as he liked he would select an appropriate occupation. This would contribute to a harmonious and happy society. He went to the extent of stating that marriage should be abandoned. Fourier's ideas regarding the cooperative communities could not be put into effect as he could not raise enough money for this experiment.

14.2.5. Louis Blanc (1811-1882): Louis Blanc was a French socialist and journalist. He was the first to make use of the contemporary political machinery to achieve the ends of socialism. Thus, he represents the transition from 'Utopian Socialism' to 'Proletarian Socialism'. In 1839 he founded the 'Revue du Progrès', in which he published his 'Organisation du Travail', advocating the establishment of cooperative workshops and other socialist schemes. In 1840, Louis Blanc published his famous book titled '*The Organization of Labour*'. He also wrote five volumes of the *History of Ten Years*, criticizing the decade of Louis Philippe's reign and highlighted the political and social evils of his days.

The Revolution of 1848 in France gave an opportunity to Louis Blanc to implement his views. He became a member of the provisional government after the revolution of 1848. He instituted the national workshops. Through these workshops, Louis Blanc hoped to eliminate unemployment and relieve the pressure of competition which kept wages at the poverty level. Louis Blanc was the first socialist to believe that state must be used to set up a new social order. He also saw a close relation between political and social reform. Louis Blanc was a member of the provisional government of 1848 and was responsible for the establishment of national workshops in France. However, these experiments ended in a failure and Louis Blanc was forced to flee from France to England where he lived in exile till 1871.

14.2.6. Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865): Proudhon was a French socialist of extreme views. He is also generally referred as 'the Father of Anarchism'. He was a member of the Constituent Assembly of 1848. He was imprisoned for three years for his views, and had to go into exile in Brussels. Proudhon published '*What is Property?*' (1840) and '*Philosophy of Poverty*' (1846). According to Proudhon, 'all property is theft'. It became one of the most famous revolutionary phrases of the nineteenth century. Proudhon asserted that property was a cancer at the heart of the society, not a natural right. In its place there should be complete equality of reward.

However, property was the basis of his system which led him to reject the state and all forms of collectivism. Like Karl Marx, he demanded an economic reorganization of society. He drew a sharp distinction between economic and political action.

Proudhon was the founder of French anarchism. He was opposed to traditional forms of government. In his opinion, centralized government was a tyranny which must be broken by the workers and the middle class by organizing syndicates which they would control and manage. The syndicates would be the basis of a new society in which people would rule themselves in a system of non-government or anarchism.. Thus, Proudhon preached a doctrine of federation in which society would consist of small communities running their own affairs with little or no central administration. According to Proudhon, with the abolition of property and government, men would be free to develop the best part of their nature.

The Utopian Socialists differed widely in their background and in their interests. However, they had certain common basis of agreement. Most of the Utopian Socialists drew inspiration from various sources such as the early Christians and the later humanists and rationalists. Their views were shaped by the socio-economic environment of their respective societies. They tried to persuade those in political and economic power to support their plans. Their moderate and reformist outlook distinguished them from the Marxists and led to their classification as Utopians.

The Utopian Socialism failed to achieve the desired results due to a number of reasons. The Utopian Socialists failed to understand the moving forces in society through ages. The people who enjoyed power and wealth were not ready to surrender their privileges. They also lacked historical perspective. Though the views of the Utopians Socialists were ideal, they were not practical. As a result most of the experiments of the Utopian Socialists ended in a failure.

14.3. Marxism

14.3.1. Karl Marx (1818-1883): Karl Marx is regarded as the founder of the most powerful movement in the history of the world - Scientific Socialism also known as Communism. Karl Marx made a close study of the industrial society and formulated certain conclusions, which constitute the chief principles of Marxism. The basic ideas of Karl Marx were first expressed in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848), which he wrote with Friedrich Engels, a German economist. Marx believed that the only way to ensure a happy and harmonious society was to put the workers in control. This idea was shaped into the principle of the "*Dictatorship of the Proletariat*". His ideas were partly a reaction to hardships suffered during the 1800's

by workers in France, Germany and England. Most factory and mine workers were poorly paid, and they had to work long hours under unhealthy conditions. Marxism had great influence on the history of the world. It inspired the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia (1917) under the leadership of Lenin. Russia became the first country in the world to implement Marxism as interpreted and modified by Lenin, which came to be known as Marxism-Leninism.

Karl Marx was born on 5 May 1818, at Trier in the German Rhineland, to middle class Jewish parents. His father was a practicing lawyer. When Karl Marx was six years old, his family was converted to Protestant Christianity. However, during the later part of his life Marx gave up religion altogether. Right from the beginning, Karl Marx manifested his intellectual ability. After initial school education he joined the University of Bonn in 1835 to study law. The next year, he was transferred to the University of Berlin. There he became more interested in philosophy. Marx came under the influence of Hegel, the most popular philosopher in Berlin at that time. He also came in contact with Ludwig, who was of the opinion that religion and all products of the human mind were derived from man's material conditions. Marx was greatly inspired by this idea, which he used in his ideology.

Karl Marx acquired his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Jena in 1841. He did not succeed in getting a teaching job due to his opposition to the Prussian Government. He became a freelance journalist and helped in creating and managing a number of radical journals. After his marriage in 1843, he and his wife moved to Paris. Here, Marx met working class socialists such as Proudhon and Michael Bakunin for the first time. He also came in contact with a young German radical, Friedrich Engels, who in 1844 came from Manchester with the material for his book *The Economic Condition of the Working Classes*. He became the best friend of Marx and collaborated with him on several articles and books.

The time spent in Paris was a formative period in Marx's life. When he left the city in 1845, he was a dedicated socialist interested in economics and the nature of history. It was in Paris that he reached his interpretation of history which saw economic factors as the cause of all historical change. From 1845 to 1848, Marx lived in Brussels, Belgium. Thereafter he returned to Germany. He edited the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which was published from Cologne during the German Revolution of 1848. Through this journal Marx became a well-known figure throughout Germany as the supporter of radical democratic reforms. After the collapse of the 1848 revolution, Marx fled from Prussia and spent the rest of his life as a political exile in London.

In London, Karl Marx did not have a regular job for livelihood. He was too proud or too much a professional revolutionary to work for a living. However, he wrote occasional articles for newspapers. He worked as a protocol reporter for the *New York Tribune*. Marx, his wife and their six children were financially supported by Engels, who sent them money regularly. In 1864, Marx founded The “International Workingmen’s Association”. This association aimed at improving the life of the working classes and preparing for a socialist revolution.

14.3.2. Works of Karl Marx: Karl Marx wrote a number of Philosophic Essays between 1842 and 1847. Some of them were published during his lifetime, but others were not discovered until the 1900's. While he wrote some of them alone, some were written in collaboration with Engels. The essays of Marx were of varied length, ranging from about fifteen sentences to a 700 page book. He wrote *The German Ideology* (1845-1846) along with Engels. The essays of Karl Marx show the philosophic foundations of his radical views. The main themes in his essays include his strong view that economic forces were increasingly oppressing human beings and his belief that political action is a necessary part of philosophy. The essays also show the influence of Hegelian philosophy of history.

Hegel argued that in order to understand any aspect of human culture, we must retrace and understand its history. Thus, Hegel developed a theory of history that came to be known as his dialectic. Hegel believed that all historical developments have three basic characteristics. First, they follow a course that is necessary. Second, each historical development represents not only change but progress. Third, one phase of any historical development tends to be confronted and replaced by its opposite. This, opposite, in turn, tends to be replaced by a phase that is somewhat a resolution of the two opposed phases. These three phases of a typical dialectical development have often been called thesis, anti thesis, and synthesis.

The Communist Manifesto (1848) is one of the important works of Karl Marx written along with Friedrich Engels. The German title of the Communist Manifesto is *Manifest Der Kommunistischen Partei* (Manifesto of the Communist Party), a pamphlet written jointly by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to serve as the platform of the Communist League on the eve of the German Revolution of 1848. *The Communist Manifesto* became one of the principal guidelines for the European socialist and communist parties in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The Communist Manifesto opens with the dramatic words “A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of communism” and ends

by stating, “The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite.”

The Communist Manifesto is a brief but forceful presentation of the authors' political and historical theories. The Manifesto embodied the authors' materialistic conception of history, i.e., the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. It surveyed the history from the age of feudalism down to nineteenth century capitalism. Marx and Engels believed that the capitalist class would be overthrown and replaced by a workers' society. The communists, the vanguard of the working class, constituted the section of society that would accomplish the “abolition of private property” and “raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class.” The result of this revolution, according to Marx and Engels, will be a classless society in which the chief means of production are owned by the society.

The Das Kapital (Capital) is the major work of Karl Marx. *The Das Kapital*, in three volumes, was published in 1867, 1885 and 1894. Marx spent about thirty years writing it. Engels edited the second and third volumes from the original manuscripts of Marx. Both of these volumes were published after the death of Marx. The fourth volume exists only as a mass of scattered notes.

In the *Das Kapital* Karl Marx put forward his theory of the capitalist system, its dynamism, and its tendencies toward self-destruction. He described his purpose as to lay bare “the economic law of motion of modern society.”

Much of the *Das Kapital* deals with Marx's concept of the surplus value of labour and its consequences for capitalism. In Marx's mind, it was not the pressure of population that drove wages to the subsistence level but rather the existence of a large number of unemployed. Marx held the capitalists responsible for this evil. He was of the opinion that under the capitalistic system, labour was merely a commodity and could get only its subsistence. The capitalist could force the worker to spend more time on his job than was necessary to earn his subsistence. The excess product, or surplus value, thus created, was taken by the capitalist. As a result, Marx saw the accumulation of riches being accompanied by the rapid spread of human misery.

Karl Marx also wrote about the practical problems of leading an international revolutionary movement. These writings are in the form of correspondence with Engels and his other friends.

14.3.3. Theories of Karl Marx (Marxism)

(a) Dialectical or Historical Materialism: The doctrine of Karl Marx is sometimes called dialectical materialism, and part of it is referred as historical materialism. Marx adopted these terms from Hegel's philosophy of history. Though Marx did not use these terms, Engels and most of later Marxists used them.

Materialism is a philosophical position that states that everything is material, or a state of matter. The word comes from the Latin *materia*, meaning matter. Dialectics can be understood as the theory of the union of the opposites. It consists of a thesis, an anti-thesis and a synthesis. The synthesis combines what is true of both thesis and anti-thesis. It brings one closer to reality. The synthesis then becomes a thesis and thus, the process goes on until one reaches the absolute, after which there will be no anti-thesis.

Hegel had based his dialectic on Plato's concept that ideas alone possess reality. Ideas are the totality of thoughts and experiences. Hegel was of the opinion that the task of philosophy was to arrive at an understanding of what had happened in the past. However, Marx differed from Hegel and emphasized that the function of philosophy was not to interpret the world but to change it. Marx rejected the idealist philosophy of Hegel and retained his dialectical method. According to Hegel mind was real and matter was the reflection of mind. Whereas Marx held that matter was real and mind was the reflection of matter.

After formulating his idea about materialism, Marx put forward the concept of historical materialism and applied it to the particular field of human relations in the society. According to Marx, production and exchange govern all human relations. Two factors enter into production - (i) Productive forces, i.e., men, their labour, practical skill and their instruments. (ii) Productive relations between men and relations between men and things.

In the materialistic interpretation of history, Karl Marx maintained that in a primitive society productive relations were based on cooperation. But at an early stage in history, few members of the society acquired control over the productive forces, which enabled them to live by the labours of majority. Subsequently productive relations were between these two opposing classes. Thus, the historical process had been the history of the class struggle. Marx believed that the productive conditions taken as a whole form the economic structure of the society, the material basis on which the super-structure of laws and political institutions are based. The economic structure is the sub-structure, provides the real basis for the superstructure. The constituents of the super-structure reflect the interests of the dominant class. In the course of history a point is reached when, because of some new invention or discovery, the productive forces come into conflict with the existing productive

relations. This conflict leads to the social revolution. The revolt in the sub-structure will gradually or violently result in the subversion of the super-structure.

Throughout history, Marx distinguished five economic forms of production, i.e., primitive, slavery, feudal, capitalist and socialist. Under the primitive stage the means of production were socially owned. As there was no private ownership there was no exploitation of one class by another. In the second stage, slavery, private ownership came to be recognized in land and cattle. The slaves lost personal freedom and a slave-owning society came into being. At the third stage, feudalism, new productive forces emerged and demanded some skill and initiative from the workers. The slaves became serfs exploited by the feudal lords. In the fourth stage, capitalism, the means of production has been owned by the capitalists. The workers enjoyed personal freedom but had no control over the means of production. They were forced to sell their labour to the capitalists at a price dictated by them. In the last socialist stage there would be social ownership of the means of production and this would finally put an end to exploitation. Thus, according to Marx, change in the productive forces always had been the real cause of revolutions. Every great movement in history, in the final analysis is the outcome of an economic cause.

(b) Class Struggle: Karl Marx propounded his theory of class struggle in *The Communist Manifesto* when he stated: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle". He was of the opinion that in society the most constant factor is the presence of opposing economic groups or classes with conflicting economic interests. He believed that there has been a strain in all societies because the social organization never kept pace with the development of the means of production. As the productive forces develop, man's economic relations are changed. The differing methods of acquiring the means of existence divide mankind into separate groups and create within each group a separate group consciousness. The group consciousness leads to class struggle between the two mutually hostile classes - the exploiters and the exploited. Since the break up of the primitive tribal community organizations, the historical process has been largely the history of class struggle.

According to Marx, the entire history is a struggle between the ruling and working classes. Past societies tried to keep the exploited class under control by using elaborate political organizations, laws, customs, traditions, ideologies, religions and rituals. Marx argued that personality, beliefs, and activities are influenced by these institutions.

Marx was of the opinion that private ownership of the chief means of production was the core of the class system. For the people to be truly free, Marx believed that, the means of production must be publicly owned by the community as a whole.

(c) Theory of Surplus Value: The Marxian theory of surplus value is one of the fundamental principles of Marxism. Marx believed that labour was the only factor responsible for producing value. Thus, labour is the only legitimate source of all value. Since the Industrial Revolution, the capitalists are in control of practically all the means of production. They create and control competitive conditions for labour and do not pay the labourer all that the labourer is entitled to, in return for the value created by his labour. The labourer produces more value than he is paid for by the capitalists. The capitalist appropriates the surplus as his profit. Industrial competition makes the capitalist reduce the wages of the labourer to the minimum just enough for his subsistence. His subsistence-minimum is only a fraction of the value created by him. Gradually, this fraction becomes smaller and smaller with the extension of machinery.

Under the industrial set up, the labourer only owns his skill to work which he sells to the capitalist and receives wages in return. However, the wages received by the labourer are very much lower than the value of the labour. The amount of surplus value appropriated by the capitalist may be calculated as follows. Suppose a labourer works ten hours a day and only six hours work is needed for his subsistence wage. The surplus value, in this case, appropriated by the capitalist is equal to four hours work of the labourer. In order to solve this problem, Marx advocated the abolition of the capitalist society and nationalization or socialization of all means of production, distribution and exchange.

(d) Destruction of Capitalism: Marx visualized the final destruction of capitalism because of the inherent weaknesses of such a system. According to him, the capitalist can control the wages of the labourer more successfully in large-scale industrial units than in small ones. This leads to large scale profit to the capitalist. Thus, there is a greater tendency on the part of the capitalist to establish monopoly control and bring about industrial combines and industrial consolidation. This leads to gradual concentration of capital and industry in the hands of fewer and fewer people. As a result the number of capitalist would decrease and the number of ill-paid workers would increase. The rich would become richer and the poor, poorer. With the widening of the gap between the few rich and majority of the poor due to the exploitative tendency of the capitalists, would increase the misery and sufferings of the working class. The relations between the capitalists and working class would deteriorate and the workers

would organize themselves against the capitalists and fight for their rights. Thus, the revolution of the working class against the capitalists would destroy the capitalism.

(e) Dictatorship of the Proletariat: According to Marx, there is a deep-rooted economic antagonism between the capitalists and the proletariat (workers). He foresaw the intensification of the conflict between the two classes carried out on a worldwide scale. Marx strongly believed in the inevitability of this class-struggle and the ultimate victory of the proletariat. However, he did not want to leave this development to the forces of economic evolution. Marx wanted that this revolution should be carried on through organization and energetic action on the part of the working class. He wanted the workers to organize a socialist political party to bring about the change. He believed that the International Working men's Association started in 1864 would create unity among workers and promote proletarian revolution. This would result in the economic and political domination by the workers.

Marx believed that the workers would reorganize their resources. By a political and social revolution they would take over the political and economic control of the world leading to the nationalization of the means of production and distribution. The capture of political power was necessary for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a classless society. This transformation from a capitalist to a communist and classless society must involve a period of transition of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat which was necessary result of class struggle. Thus, dictatorship of the proletariat is but a transition to the abolition of all classes.

(f) Withering Away of the State: Marx had his own views regarding the origin and nature of the state. It has been generally accepted that the state exists or should exist to promote the welfare of its citizens. However, Marx denied this. According to him the state is an instrument in the hands of the economically dominant class to establish its rule. The state is a machine for the oppression of one class by another. Marx argued that with the disappearance of the classes and the emergence of classless society the need for the state will also disappear and the state will 'wither away'. Marx further asserted that the withering away of the state will be followed by the emergence of a communist society, free from exploitation and class war.

The dictatorship of the proletariat would not be the end or final state of social evolution. It would be only a means to an end, i.e., the withering away of the state. After establishing their political control over the state machinery, the proletariat would destroy the capitalists and the bourgeoisie and convert the means of production, distribution and exchange into state property. When the

division of society into classes would be abolished and the conflict between the exploiters and the exploited would come to an end, there would be no longer any need for the state to survive as an instrument of coercion. Thus, the state withers away and the age of equality and cooperation would replace the age of inequality and struggle.

(g) Theory of Revolution: Marx was of the opinion that the communist revolution would develop in two phases. In the first phase the bourgeoisie would bring about a revolution against the feudal lords and capture political power. Under these circumstances the proletariat should extend their support to the bourgeoisie in bringing about the revolution. With the success of this phase of the revolution, the bourgeoisie would turn against the proletariat and use the state machinery to exploit them. This would prepare the ground for the second phase of revolution. The proletariat would align itself with the left-wing bourgeoisie elements to bring about the second phase of revolution. After achieving success, the proletariat would discard the left-wing bourgeoisie elements and establish full control over the government machinery.

(h) "Religion, Opium of the People": Marx believed that the private property came along with private family. However, with the establishment of a classless society both would disappear. Marriages would be based on the basis of mutual affection, rather than on the basis of moral, religious or economic consideration. With the disappearance of the family, religion will also disappear. Marx considered religion as 'opium of the people and an ally of capitalism'. Marxism emphasizes only material aspects and does not accept religious and spiritual values.

Though Marxism had great influence on the history of human thought, it had certain inherent defects. History cannot be interpreted purely on economic terms. Though economic forces do play an important role, there are other factors such as religion, science, ethics etc. through which history can be interpreted. The theory of class struggle is based essentially on the supposition that modern society is sharply divided into two classes only, i.e., the capitalists and the proletariat. However, there are increasing differences among the capitalists and the working classes. Besides, the theory of class conflict promotes fanaticism and hatred between different classes. The class war would prove to be a disaster to humanity. Marxism's antagonism to religion cannot be justified. In fact among the radical communists, Marxism itself became an article of faith. In certain respect Marxism is abstract.

Lenin, after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia (1917) found that the implementation of Marxism in its original form was impractical. He modified the doctrine to suit the Russian conditions in the form

of the “New Economic Policy”, which led to the new Communist Doctrine of Marxism-Leninism. Similarly, Mao tse Tung had to modify Marxism to suit Chinese environment. The failure of the communist experiment in Soviet Russia and other East European countries during the 1990's proved either the unsuitability or the failure of Marxism in the modern age. Complete abolition of private property is not possible or desirable. Human beings by nature are individualistic. Lack of incentive would not induce them to put in their best efforts in any task that is assigned to them. Marxism does not hold out any 'positive freedom' for workers.

Questions

1. Who were the Utopian Socialists? Examine their contribution to socialism.
2. Account for the emergence of the Utopian socialists and point out their views on socialism.
3. Examine the contribution of Karl Marx to the rise of scientific socialism (Communism).
4. Analyze the chief principles of Marxism.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Robert Owen
 - (b) Proudhon
 - (c) Karl Marx



15

FORMATION OF NATION STATES – I

THEMES OF NATIONALISM - UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Objectives:

1. To understand the themes of nationalism.

2. To analyze the various stages in the unification of Italy.
3. To study the role of Mazzini, Count Cavour and Garibaldi in the process of the unification of Italy.

15. 1. Introduction- Themes Of Nationalism: The nineteenth century was marked by two movements of the utmost importance, both arising from the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars - nationalism and liberalism. Nationalism is a term that refers to a doctrine or political movement that holds that a nation—usually defined in terms of ethnicity or culture—has the right to constitute an independent or autonomous political community based on a shared history and common destiny. Most nationalists believe the borders of the state should be congruent with the borders of the nation. Nationalism has had an enormous influence on world history. In modern times, the nation-state has become the dominant form of societal organization. Historians use the term nationalism to refer to this historical transition and to the emergence and predominance of nationalist ideology.

The starting point of nationalism is the existence of nations, Nations are typically seen as entities with a long history: Most nationalists do not believe a nation can be created artificially. Nationalist movements see themselves as the representative of an existing, centuries-old nation. However, some theories of nationalism imply the reverse order - that the nationalist movements created the sense of national identity, and then a political unit corresponding to it, or that an existing state promoted a 'national' identity for itself.

Nationalists see nations as an inclusive categorization of human beings - assigning every individual to one specific nation. In fact, nationalism sees most human activity as national in character. Nations have national symbols, a national culture, a national music and national literature; national folklore, a national mythology and in some cases a national religion. Individuals share national values and a national identity, admire heroes, eat the national dish and play the national sport.

Nationalists define individual nations on the basis of certain criteria, which distinguish one nation from another; and determine who is a member of each nation. These criteria typically include a shared language, culture, and/or shared values which are predominantly represented within a specific ethnic group. National identity refers both to these defining criteria, and to the shared heritage of each group. Membership in a nation is usually involuntary and determined by birth. Individual nationalisms vary in their degree of internal uniformity: some are monolithic, and tolerate little variance from the national norms.

Nationalism has the strong territorial component, with an inclusive categorization of territory corresponding to the categorization of individuals. For each nation, there is a territory which is uniquely associated with it, the national homeland, and together they account for most habitable land. This is reflected in the geopolitical claims of nationalism, which seeks to order the world as a series of nation-states, each based on the national homeland of its respective nation. Territorial claims characterize the politics of nationalist movements. Established nation-states also make an implicit territorial claim, to secure their own continued existence: sometimes it is specified in the national constitution. In the nationalist view, each nation has a moral entitlement to a sovereign state.

The nation-state is intended to guarantee the existence of a nation, to preserve its distinct identity, and to provide a territory where the national culture and ethos are dominant - nationalism is also a philosophy of the state. It sees a nation-state as a necessity for each nation: secessionist national movements often complain about their second-class status as a minority within another nation. This specific view of the duties of the state influenced the introduction of national education systems, often teaching a standard curriculum, national cultural policy, and national language policy. In turn, nation-states appeal to a national cultural-historical ethos to justify their existence, and to confer political legitimacy - acquiescence of the population in the authority of the government.

Nationalists recognize that 'non-national' states exist and existed, but do not see them as a legitimate form of state. The struggles of early nationalist movements were often directed against such non-national states, specifically multi-ethnic empires such as Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. Most multi-ethnic empires have disappeared. The first studies of nationalism were generally historical accounts of nationalist movements such as the Unifications of Italy and Germany.

15.2. UNIFICATION OF ITALY :

During the eighteenth century, intellectual changes began to dismantle traditional values and institutions. Liberal ideas from France and Britain spread rapidly, and from 1789 the French Revolution became the genesis of 'liberal Italians'. A series of political and military events resulted in a unified kingdom of Italy in 1861.

Nationalism and liberalism stimulated the revolutionary changes of 1848 throughout the Central Europe, especially in Italy, Germany

and the whole of the Austrian Empire. The liberal revolutionaries in these countries, chiefly among the middle classes had attempted to bring about two important changes, that is, creation of a unified national state for each nationality and the establishment of a constitutional and parliamentary government in each state, with guarantees of personal liberty. With the revival of conservatism in the 1850's, the liberal movement in the Central Europe received a set-back. However, in spite of this initial setback, liberalism began to gain ground among a considerable minority. During the two decades from 1850 to 1870, this minority increased in number and influence. Gradually, liberalism became such a powerful current that it succeeded in achieving the unification of Italy.

15.2.1. Background: For many centuries, Italy, in the words of Metternich, was nothing more than a geographical expression. It was a patchwork of small states jealous of one another. Never, since the days of the Roman Empire had the Italian Peninsula been effectively united under one rule. Various attempts to bring the Italian Peninsula under one government had ended in failure. The division of Italy among the foreign dynasties was one of the chief hurdles in the path of the Italian unification. Austria had occupied the northern part of Italy. The Princes of the Hapsburg family of Austria ruled over the duchies of Parma, Modena and Tuscany. In the south, the Kingdom of Two Sicilies (Naples) was under the Bourbon dynasty. Central Italy was under the temporal authority of the Pope. Apart from the political division of the peninsula, the Italians themselves had not yet developed a full sense of national consciousness. Different regions and towns of Italy had developed their own distinct traditions which led to local jealousies which in turn checked national growth. "In Italy", wrote Metternich, "provinces are against provinces, towns against towns, families against families and men against men".

15.2.2 Napoleon and Italy: It remained for Napoleon Bonaparte to level the barriers of local rivalries and bring to Italy at least a good administration and an approach towards political unity. In the course of his wars of conquest, Napoleon brought the entire Italian Peninsula under his authority. The Hapsburg princes and the Bourbon ruler were driven out of the country and the Papal States were annexed. Under Napoleon's wise administration, a uniform legal and administrative system was introduced in Italy. From the temporary union under the Napoleonic Empire, Italy acquired the great heritage of the French Revolution such as, equality before the law, religious liberty, freedom of the press and self government.

15.2.3. Congress of Vienna and Italy: After the Napoleonic Wars and Napoleon Bonaparte's second defeat, the major European powers that met at a conference called the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The topic of discussion was to limit France's power, set limits

on nations so that no one nation becomes too strong, and divide the territory conquered by Napoleon. In its negotiations, the Congress returned domination of the Italian Peninsula to Austria. Austria now occupied Lombardy and Venice and had considerable influence on other Italian states. One of the few places of independence was the Kingdom of Sardinia, which now controlled Piedmont, Nice, Savoy and Genoa.

Some of the things that conflicted and interfered with the unification process were: Austrian control of Lombardy and Venice, several independent Italian states, the autonomy of the Papal States, and the limited power and influence of Italian leaders. Thus, the bliss of Italian unity was short lived.

15.2.4. II *Risorgimento*: Though the diplomats at Vienna succeeded in dividing Italy, they could not crush the national spirit that Napoleon had roused during his conquests and administration of the Italian Peninsula. During the years following the Congress of Vienna, the desire for some kind of unity grew stronger, particularly in the south. This desire manifested itself in liberal movements in the Kingdoms of Naples and Piedmont demanding liberal constitutions in 1812. The sporadic insurrections were promptly suppressed by Austrian troops. After every such uprising the Austrian government ruthlessly crushed all outward symptoms of opposition or independence. These autocratic measures of Austria rather than curbing liberalism strengthened the spirit of nationalism and a desire for unity. The Italian patriots and nationalists made systematic underground preparations for the *Risorgimento* (resurrection).

During the first half of the nineteenth century, only aristocrats, intellectual, and upper middle class took up the cause for Italian unification. The masses showed no concern. However, the people with a passion for unification started to form secret societies, namely the Carbonari (Charcoal Burners). Although at first, they only demanded more rights from their respective government, the cause began to grow. Under the slogan of "freedom and independence" the Carbonaris were active in exciting opposition and revolution against foreign rule. By 1820, the Carbonari were involved in numerous failed revolutions against the Kingdom of Two Sicilies, the Kingdom of Sardinia, Bologna, and other Italian states. However, the Austrian Empire crushed all these revolutions; thus leading to more resentment from the Italians. However, the Carbonaries kept the hope for an independent and united Italy alive even when their fortunes were at the lowest ebb.

15.2.5. *Determination to oust Austria from Italy*: Suppression of the liberal movement in Italy by Austria indicated the predominant Austrian hold over Italy. The Italians began to focus their attention

upon the need for the expulsion of the Austrian influence in Italy. The liberals realised that Italy could never achieve unity until she is free from the Austrian dominance. The petty Italian rulers were more powerful against their subjects as they were backed by the resources of the Austrian Empire. Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor, as the promoter of the new European system based on conservatism and reaction became a great obstacle in the way of Italian unification.

The promoters of Italian unification were divided into three groups on the question of the form of national union. There was unanimity regarding the aim, though there was diversity of opinion as to how the aim should be achieved. Austria was the common foe and the overthrow of Austrian dominance from Italy was the chief aim of all political programmes. However, the efforts of the Italian patriots were weakened by their failure to formulate a single line of action. Their mutual distrust and lack of cooperation weakened the cause of Italian unification for some time. The three main groups which aimed at bringing about the unification of Italy were: (1) The Republicans (2) The Federalists and (3) The Royal Sardinian Party.

15.2.6. Giuseppe Mazzini and the Republicans: The soul and spirit of the Carbonari and the revolutions was a man named Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872). Mazzini wanted not only a united Italy, but an Italy with a republican form of government. He brought the campaign for unification into the mainstream when in 1831 he created the *Young Italy*, a group created for the sole purpose to spread the ideas of unification, revolutions, and republicanism.

Mazzini was one of the three men because of whom the unification of Italy became possible. In fact, he was the forerunner in the quest for Italian unity. Mazzini was born in Genoa in 1805. He studied law and read widely the writings of democratic thinkers. As a young man, he joined the revolutionary secret society, the Carbonari. His radical views soon aroused the suspicion of the authorities and in 1830 he was arrested. Although the authorities failed to substantiate a definite case against Mazzini, he was banished from the country soon after his release. But he did not give himself to despair. Firmly putting all his personal interests aside, Mazzini devoted himself to the cause of Italian independence and unity.

While he was in prison, Mazzini had already resolved on the course of his future action. Having lost faith in Carbonarism, whose leaders were largely men of advanced years, Mazzini decided to entrust the cause of Italy to youthful minds and hands. Accordingly he organized a society called the *Young Italy* among the Italian exiles in Marseilles in 1832. His friends established the first branch of the *Young Italy* at Genoa. Soon after similar branches were established throughout northern and central Italy. The *Young Italy*

attracted mostly students, young professional men and youths of mercantile classes. Within two years the membership grew to more than fifty thousand. The banner of the organization bore on one side the words Unity and Independence and on the reverse Liberty, Equality, and Humanity. Members undertook to spread the national idea regardless of sacrifices and hardship, even at the risk of their own lives.

Mazzini, more than any other leader had grasped the vision of a united Italy and preached the same vision to his countrymen. His chief aim was to educate the Italians that Italy was a nation and not a geographical expression, and to convince the people that “the whole peninsula, though divided by artificial political barriers, was a living unity with a common heritage of traditions and historic memories”. Though, Mazzini failed to establish a republic in Italy, his propaganda broadened the political horizon of Italians and created a vigorous public opinion in favour of national independence and unity.

15.2.7. Gioberti and the Federalists: The Federalists advocated an Italian federation under the presidency of the Pope. This faction sought to reconcile traditional religion with modern liberalism. The leader of this faction was Vincent Gioberti, a priest from Piedmont. Like Mazzini he also lived many years in exile. Through his book *The Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians* (1843), Gioberti advocated a confederation of the existing Italian states, each provided with a liberal constitution under the leadership of the Pope. For a long time the temporal power of the Papacy had been regarded as the chief obstacle in the way of Italian unification. Gioberti’s plan was to make Papacy the basis upon which a united and regenerated Italy should be built up.

15.2.8. Pope Pius IX and Liberal Reforms: In 1846, a liberal, Pius IX was elected as the Pope. His accession was acclaimed all over Italy. He was believed to be anti-Austrian and a liberal. He was very much influenced by Gioberti’s writings. The Pope enacted numerous liberal reforms. He proclaimed an amnesty for all political offenders. The amnesty was followed by other measures such as the institution of a Council of State, the membership of which was thrown open to laymen; the establishment of a municipality in Rome and the formation of a civic guard. The liberal attitude of the Pope alarmed Metternich, who confessed “we were prepared for everything except for a Liberal Pope”.

These Papal reforms led to liberal movements in different parts of Italy and soon, other states also introduced liberal reforms. The Sicilians were first to take action. To prevent a revolutionary movement in Naples, King Ferdinand II granted a constitution. The Pope too granted a liberal constitution followed by the rulers of

Tuscany and Piedmont. But these reform movements were not enough. A series of uprising known as the Revolution of 1848 occurred throughout Europe including France, Germany, the Austrian Empire, and northern Italy. The revolutionary tide in Austria swept Metternich from power in 1848. This facilitated the unification of Italy.

15.2.10. The Royal Sardinian Party: After 1848, the task of achieving Italian unity became essentially the responsibility of the government of the Kingdom of Sardinia-Piedmont. The liberal royalists looked upon the Kingdom of Piedmont for leadership. Due to the industrialization and commercial development, Piedmont possessed a considerably influential liberal middle class. Besides, among Italian states she alone possessed an army which could face Austria. Piedmont also had best economic position to promote nationalism. In 1848, the King of Piedmont, Charles Albert established a constitutional government.

The first serious attempt to oust Austrian dominance from the Italian peninsula was made by Charles Albert in 1848. When Piedmont made preparations for a war against Austria, the whole of Italy flocked under its banner. The Pope, the Duke of Tuscany and even Naples agreed to join in the struggle. The Piedmontese army scored initial victory over the Austrians. But soon Austria regained its hold. Gradually the Italian states including the Pope withdrew from the struggle due to conflicting obligations. Defection of its allies left Piedmont to carry on the struggle with Austria single handedly and was crushed under the weight of Austrian arms. Being disgraced, Charles Albert abdicated in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel II in 1849.

While Piedmont had failed against Austria, Mazzini had also failed in his attempt in establishing a Republic at Rome in 1849. The Pope was protected by the French troops sent by Louis Napoleon. Following the failure of the Republic, Mazzini went in to exile. In the face of these developments, the Pope became more conservative. Not only there was the decline of republicanism but also Gioberti's plan for a federal union of the Italian states under the Pope. The Pope, on whom the scheme depended, repudiated it after the overthrow of Mazzini's republic and the restoration of the Papal State. The Pope also appealed to the Italians to resist the 'encroachment' of Piedmont. However, the Italian Catholics while accepting the religious supremacy of the Pope disregarded his political counsels and co-operated in the unification of Italy.

15.2.11. Role of Count Cavour (1810-1861): The dream of the Italian unification was finally realized by Count Camillo di Cavour, the Prime Minister of Victor Emmanuel II. Cavour was a Piedmontese nobleman by birth. As a young man he served for

sometime in the Engineers Corps of the Sardinian army. However, he had to resign his commission in 1831 because of his liberal principles. He spent the next fifteen years in managing the family estate and preparing himself for a higher service. Due to extensive reading of English authors and his experience in England, Cavour was infused with liberal ideas and became an ardent supporter of constitutional government.

In 1847, Cavour took a definite political step. He founded with several others, a journal called *Il Risorgimento*, devoted to securing a constitution for Piedmont. He wrote a number of articles in the journal expressing his views on various political subjects. These articles had great influence on the king as well on public opinion. In February, 1848, Charles Albert granted the constitution to his people and in June, Cavour became a member of the parliament under its provisions. Two years later he was appointed as minister of agriculture and commerce and in 1852, he became the Prime Minister. From then until his death in 1861, except for two short intervals, he remained Prime Minister and virtual ruler of the Kingdom of Piedmont.

Before taking up the leadership of Italian unification, Cavour desired to strengthen the Kingdom of Piedmont by introducing a number of political and economic reforms. "Piedmont", he said, "must begin by raising herself, by establishing in Europe, as well as in Italy, a position and credit equal to her ambition." Despite much opposition he made great progress in a comparatively short time. His first reforms were in the field of military affairs. Cavour was of the opinion that if Piedmont had to take up the leadership of Italian unification, she must prepare for a new war. Thus, he reorganized the army, built new fortresses and strengthened old ones and increased the military resources. He also concentrated on the development of industry and commerce. Reforms in finances were introduced, tariffs were lowered, roads were improved, railway system was developed and an enlightened social and agrarian policy was adopted. Being influenced by the English liberalism, it was Cavour's ambition to adopt British policy, first in Piedmont and ultimately in the larger sphere of a united Italy. His aim was to adopt a constitutional monarchy broad based on the practices of liberty and religious toleration, keeping the church within its limits; to pursue a policy of free trade and promote industry and agriculture. On the basis of the regenerated and strong state, Cavour wanted to follow a vigorous foreign policy.

15.2.12. Alliance With Napoleon III: Cavour saw that, although Piedmont was growing stronger, it could not expel Austria from Italy without foreign assistance. Thus, he was keen on gaining the support of one of the great powers in Europe. His choice was either England or France. During the Crimean War (1854-1856) Cavour

joined England and France and established a strong claim to equality with other states. Piedmont was represented in the Congress of Paris. Cavour himself attended the Congress and used the forum to denounce the influence and misgovernment of Austria in Italy.

In order to achieve his goals, Cavour needed the help of a strong ally, the King of France, Napoleon III. France proved to be a good partner because it was a traditional enemy of Austria and any loss of Austrian influence would be beneficial. Also, Napoleon III showed favour to a liberated and united Italian peninsula. To seal the deal of this partnership, both leaders met secretly at Plombières, a French spa. Piedmont would stir up trouble in one of the territories controlled by Austria, thus forcing Austria to go to war against Piedmont. France would help Piedmont in exchange for Nice and Savoy.

15.2.13. War Against Austria: After securing the alliance of Napoleon III of France, Cavour decided to hasten the crisis. His aim was to pick up a quarrel with Austria in such a way that a war against her would be justified. By supremely clever and unscrupulous diplomacy, Cavour provoked Austria into insisting that Piedmont should disarm. When Piedmont refused to accept this ultimatum Austria declared war on the former on 19 April 1859. The war was short but decisive. The combined forces of France and Piedmont inflicted a severe defeat on the Austrians at Magenta on 4 June 1859 and again at Solferino on 24 June 1859. At the peak of success when it seemed as if Austria was about to be expelled completely from Italy, Napoleon III withdrew from the war without consulting his ally and concluded the armistice of Villafranca with the Austrian Emperor on 8 July 1859. By the terms of the treaty which was signed at Zurich on 10 November 1859, Lombardy was annexed to Piedmont, but Venetia still remained under Austrian rule.

15.2.14. Formation of the North Italian Kingdom: With the acquisition of Lombardy the area and population of Piedmont doubled. During the war against Austria, a number of nationalist groups in Central Italy had sprung into action expelling petty rulers and preparing for liberation. In August 1859, nationalist representatives of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Romagna unanimously declared for union with Piedmont. While England was favourable towards the merger of these duchies with Piedmont, Napoleon III insisted that he could not permit the expansion of Piedmont without compensation for France. Accordingly, Cavour won Napoleon's approval for the creation of North Italian Kingdom by reluctantly surrendering Savoy and Nice to France. Victor Emmanuel II then accepted the annexation of the four Italian states.

On 2 April 1860 an enlarged parliament, representing nearly half of the population of the peninsula met at Turin.

15.2.15. Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882): If Mazzini was the soul of the Italian unification process, then Garibaldi was the hero. The unification movement in Northern and Central Italy inspired similar movements in Southern Italy as well. The credit for leading such a movement belongs to Garibaldi. As a young man he had joined the society of the Young Italy and participated in an attempted insurrection at Genoa in 1833. Being condemned to death for his rebellious activities, Garibaldi managed to escape from the country. In 1834 he went to South America, where he plunged at once into several revolutionary wars. There he gained the expert knowledge of guerilla warfare which helped him later in the conquest of Sicily and Naples. He returned to Italy, and in 1848 took active part in the short lived Roman Republic. Troops sent by Napoleon III to protect the interests of the Pope drove the republicans out of the city and compelled Garibaldi to flee for his life, a second time. This time he sailed to New York where, working at first as a candle-maker and later as a trader, he accumulated the small fortune which enabled him to purchase the island of Capera off the coast of Italy.

Garibaldi carefully watched the growing opposition to the Bourbon rule in the Kingdom of Naples. When he felt that the time was ripe for expelling the Bourbons from the southern kingdom, he collected a thousand Red Shirts at Genoa. In May, 1860, Garibaldi landed in Sicily with his Red Shirts. Within a few weeks Garibaldi became the master of the entire island. In August 1860, Garibaldi led his forces across the straits of Messina to attack Naples. The Bourbon army collapsed before him and Francis II, the Bourbon ruler of Naples fled. Garibaldi entered the capital amidst joyful acclaim of the people. After a plebiscite, the annexation of Naples to Piedmont was proclaimed. With Garibaldi at his side, Victor Emmanuel rode into Naples early in November, to make the annexation official. After the culmination of his patriotic mission, refusing all honour and rewards, Garibaldi withdrew to the island of Capera.

15.2.16. Annexation of the Papal State: Meanwhile, the rest of the Papal state, except Rome and a small district around it, had also been occupied by Piedmontese troops. On 18 February 1861, the first national Parliament representing the north and the south met at Turin. The United Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed on 17 March 1861, and Victor Emmanuel II was officially proclaimed "by the grace of God and the will of the nation, King of Italy". The more difficult part of the unification was over. Only Venetia and Rome remained outside the Italian union. However, Cavour, the chief architect of the Italian unification was not destined to witness the fulfillment of his dream of the final unification of Italy. He died on 6 June 1861.

15.2.17. Final Unification of Italy: The final stages in the unification of Italy i.e. acquisition of Venetia and Rome, depended less upon the efforts of the Italians themselves than upon changes in the balance of European powers. In the course of the German unification wars, Bismarck, the Chancellor of Prussia entered into a secret alliance with Italy against their common enemy, Austria. With the defeat of the Austrian forces in the Austro-Prussian War (1866), Venetia was acquired by Italy. Four years later the acquisition of Rome was made possible by the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870. When the Prussians invaded France in 1870, Napoleon III found it necessary to withdraw the French troops from Rome which had been protecting the Pope since 1849. In July 1871, Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, the Eternal City. In 1872, Rome was made the capital of the Italian Kingdom.

Thus, nationalism triumphed in Italy. The aspirations of the poets, philosophers, revolutionaries, patriots and nationalists of Italy were realized after a long struggle which lasted for decades. The unification was a long and arduous process. But all the problems that remained before the unification were not solved after the unification. As the last quarter of the century unfolded, this was evident. But, Italy stayed united and focused on solving its new problems. In the end, Cavour, Garibaldi, and Mazzini became the founding fathers of a nation and were immortalized.

Questions

1. Write a note on the themes of nationalism.
2. Describe the different stages in the unification of Italy.
3. Give an account of the unification of Italy.
4. Examine the role of Mazzini, Cavour and Garibaldi in the unification of Italy.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Themes of nationalism
 - (b) Mazzini
 - (c) Count Cavour
 - (d) Garibaldi



FORMATION OF NATION STATES –II

UNIFICATION OF GERMANY**Objectives:**

1. To analyze the problems faced by the Germans towards their national unification.
2. To understand the various efforts made by the Germans towards the unification of Germany before the emergence of Bismarck.
3. To review the role of Bismarck in the unification of Germany.

16.1. Introduction: The unification of Germany was one of the important events in the European history. It manifested the emergence of a new nation that dominated the European continent for a long time. With the unification of Germany under the leadership of Bismarck the centre of political gravity of Europe shifted from France to Germany. Bismarck as the Chancellor of the newly created German Empire became the architect of European diplomacy.

The success of a long drawn struggle for national unification in Italy in the face of many odds revived the hopes and aspirations of the German unity. Just as the small Kingdom of Piedmont took up the lead in the unification of Italy, so also the much larger and more powerful Prussian Kingdom became an instrument of German unification. What Cavour, the ablest of the Piedmontese ministers had done for Italy, Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor of Prussia did for Germany. Both Italy and Germany had a common enemy, namely, the Austrian Empire.

16.2. Germany Before The French Revolution: On the eve of the French Revolution, Germany was the most divided country in Europe. There were over two hundred states and petty principalities owing a nominal obedience to the Emperor, but practically independent in the management of their internal affairs and in their external relations with one another. Austria enjoyed the precedence, and the imperial dignity was vested in the House of the Habsburgs. However, Prussia was the stronger military power, and therefore a formidable rival of Austria. The rest of the German

principalities grouped themselves round Austria or Prussia, while strenuously clinging to their independence and jealously resisting any encroachment upon their sovereign rights. The only bond between the various states, apart from their nominal allegiance to the Emperor, was the *Diet*, comprising of representatives of the various states and the German language were the only bond between the various German states.

16.3. Napoleon And Germany: The process of unification of Germany started in the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is one of the ironies of history that Napoleon was the creator of modern Germany. Thus, directly by his constructive statesmanship, and indirectly by the results which opposed to his rule aroused, he contributed to the formation of a united Germany and laid the foundation of the German Empire. In the first place he reorganized the German state-system by an extensive redistribution of territorial power. He reduced the number of independent States from over 200 to 39. He abolished a number of petty principalities and simplified the political map of Germany and brought the prospect of federal unity within the range of possibility. In 1806, Napoleon abolished the Holy Roman Empire, which was replaced by the Confederation of States dependent upon France. Thus, by bringing the various German the Rhine under one political, administrative and legal system Napoleon was greatly responsible for the growth of national consciousness in Germany.

16.4. Congress Of Vienna And Germany: Following the defeat of Napoleon in the Battle of Nations at Leipzig (1813), the Congress of Vienna (1815) dissolved the Confederation of the Rhine created by Napoleon and set up a loose confederation of 39 German states. Provision was made for a Federal *Diet* which was to be presided over by Austria. The ruler of every state was sovereign within his territory. The German liberals and nationalists desired to have a united Germany. But Metternich, the conservative Chancellor of Austria and princes of the southern German states opposed the proposal. The new German Confederation was to have a *Diet* comprising of delegates of the 39 German states presided over by Austria. Thus, the Congress of Vienna disappointed German nationalists and patriots. Germany was once again kept divided and the Austrian predominance in Germany created the greatest obstacle in the way of German unity.

16.5. Spirit Of Liberalism And Unity: Inspired by revolutionary and nationalist ideals the intellectuals and students especially from the various German universities took initiative to promote sentiments of nationalism and national unity among the Germans. The University of Jena became the centre of intellectual movement. Metternich, the architect of the European settlement and the champion of conservatism and reactionary forces, crushed

liberalism, constitutionalism and parliamentarism in Germany. As against the reactionary policies of Metternich, the intellectuals, professors, students, writers and poets kept the flame of liberalism and nationalism burning.

16.6. The Carlsbad Decrees: The emergence of nationalism and liberalism and the sentiments for national unification in Germany made Metternich uneasy. He feared that if such ideas not nipped in the bud, they might prove dangerous to conservatism and dynastic traditions in Europe. Under these circumstances, Metternich became instrumental in issuing the so called Carlsbad Decrees. These decrees were repressive measures drafted at a conference of German states in Carlsbad and enacted by the *Diet* of the German Confederation in 1819. The Carlsbad Decrees were meant to counteract the threat of revolution. These decrees provided for uniform press censorship, abolition of liberal student organizations, state supervision of universities, and a federal commission to investigate subversive activities. Thus, the Carlsbad Decrees strengthened the Austrian rule and suppressed German nationalism. In spite of all these measures the aspirations of the liberal Germans for constitutionalism and unity continued to grow.

16.7. The Zollverein: Meanwhile efforts were also made to bring about some sort of unity amongst the states in the economic sphere. An important step in this direction was taken by introducing Zollverein or customs union. The economic unity finally paved the way for political unity, and community of material interests stimulated the growth of national feeling and fostered national consciousness. Prussia, the largest of the German states took an important lead in the formation of this organization in 1818.

The starting point of the Zollverein lay in the financial reforms initiated by Maasen in accordance with the principles of Adam Smith. In order to unite the scattered provinces of Prussia, he created a new tariff system which abolished all internal customs and established free trade throughout Prussian territory. In the case of foreign imports a moderate tariff was levied on manufactured goods, but no tariff whatever was imposed on raw materials. On the other hand, transport duties on commodities conveyed through Prussia were made very high in order to compel other States to enter the Customs Union. In 1834 the important States of Bavaria, Wurttemberg, and Saxony entered the Zollverein. Within few years the system was extended over the whole of Germany.

The exclusion of Austria from zouverein owing to her protectionist policy, deprived her of any voice in the commercial policy of Germany, and left Prussia without a rival to challenge her predominance. Thus, the quiet, but incessant, pressure of economic forces broke down the political barriers which divided

Germany, and helped to eliminate the various territorial and dynastic influences which worked towards separation.

16.8. Fall Of Metternich: The Revolutions of 1830, weakened conservatism in Europe. There was a demand for constitutional government in various states of Germany. However, the King of Prussia was hesitant to introduce any liberal constitution due to the fear of Metternich. With the passage of time, as the liberal forces began to assert in Europe, the conservatives were on the defensive. The Revolution of 1848 shook the very foundation of conservatism. Metternich was swept away from power in Austria. With the fall of Metternich the dream of Unification of Germany came within the reach of the German people.

16.9. The Frankfurt Parliament (1848): After the Revolution of 1848, the process to bring about the unification of Germany was initiated by a central representative body, which came to be known as the Frankfurt Parliament. It comprised of five hundred members from the Parliamentary Assemblies of different German states. The proposed constitution excluded all non-German lands from the proposed German Empire and provided for a hereditary emperor, a democratic legislative body, a governmental ministry, and a supreme court. In April 1849, the Frankfurt Parliament sent a delegation to Berlin to offer the title of hereditary German Emperor to the King of Prussia, Frederick William IV. The Prussian king, fearing war with Austria and Russia, declined the German Crown. He was resolved not to take a 'crown of shame' from the hands of a popular assembly. He would have accepted the Crown if it was offered to him by the German princes. Not only Frederick William IV refused the Crown, but also withheld his consent to the Frankfurt Constitution. As a result the efforts of the Frankfurt Parliament to bring about German unification ended in failure. Radical political groups in Germany tried to impose the constitution through civil war, but were suppressed.

16.10. Prussian Leadership: Frederick William IV entertained an ambition of creating a German union under Prussian leadership. Thus, after the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament, he invited other German states except Austria to form a new close union under his leadership. Seventeen of the lesser states accepted his invitation and the parliament of the proposed German Union met at Erfurt in March 1850. However, Austria demanded the abandonment of Frederick William's project and the re-establishment of the German Confederation. As Frederick William IV hesitated to go to war with Austria, he had no other alternative but to give up the plan for the German Union.

Frederick William IV was succeeded by his brother William I in 1861. With his accession the achievement of German unity became

a possibility. William I began to reform the Prussian army and chose the gifted general von Moltke as its chief of staff and appointed von Roon as minister for war. He also introduced compulsory military training throughout Prussia. The large scale military reform involved additional expenditure which the king asked the Prussian Assembly to sanction.

However, the Prussian liberals who commanded a majority in the Assembly were not in favour of achieving German unity at the point of the sword. They believed that the unification of Germany could be achieved by the spread of the ideas of nationalism and liberalism and the force of public opinion. This led to a constitutional crisis in Prussia. William I was resolved to abdicate rather than disband the new regiments. On the other hand the Assembly was also resolved to assert the right of the Parliament to control the executive.

16.11. Bismarck's Leadership: The unification of Germany was finally achieved under the leadership of Otto von Bismarck, who was appointed President of the Prussian ministry in 1862. He used diplomacy and wars to bring about the German unity. He entered the stage of European politics as one of the most original and remarkable characters of the Nineteenth century. Bismarck is one of the few great nation builders of Europe. Not only he succeeded in creating a unified German Empire but later, he raised her to a commanding position in Europe. In realizing this object, Bismarck demonstrated a rare diplomatic skill and infinite resourcefulness.

Bismarck was born in Brandenburg in the family of big landlords. After his education, Bismarck joined Prussian civil service. He then entered the Prussian *Diet* where he made a great mark through his speeches in which he condemned the liberals. Subsequently when the Prussian King granted a liberal constitution to the people he condemned his action. However, when Frederick William IV rejected the Crown of united Germany offered to him by the Frankfurt Parliament, he expressed happiness. The King was quite pleased with Bismarck's reactionary views and appointed him a minister of the Crown.

During the next eleven years Bismarck served as a diplomat. His diplomatic career took him to Frankfurt, St. Petersburg, Paris, Vienna and London. When William I became the ruler of Prussia, he appointed Bismarck as Chancellor in 1851 and later as the President of Prussian Ministry in 1862. After becoming the Chancellor of Prussia, Bismarck's chief concern was with the national interest of Prussia. By strengthening Prussia politically, economically and militarily, he decided to achieve the German unity under the Prussian leadership.

As a first step towards this direction, Bismarck was determined to put down the liberal majority in the Prussian Parliament. This involved him in a four years battle with the Parliament. In 1863 Bismarck said, "Not by speeches and majority decisions are the great questions of the time decided...but by blood and iron." Bismarck impressed on the King the need to increase Prussia's military strength for the future greatness of Prussia. On the advice of Bismarck the King decided to increase the strength of the Prussian army and made arrangements for its training on modern lines. This required a lot of money which had to be approved by the Parliament. As the Prussian Parliament, which was dominated the liberals refused to sanction the expenditure on an enlarged and modernized army, the King carried his plans through ordinances and forcibly collected taxes to meet the expenses. He also imprisoned a number of 'inconvenient' leaders of the Parliament and made the Parliament ineffective.

The history of Bismarck during the quarter of a century in which he controlled the destinies of Germany, and made her the strongest military Power in Europe, is the record of statesmanship directed with sagacity, insight, and ruthless energy towards the attainment of a single object. His purpose was to end the dualism which had been the bane of the German political system by driving Austria out of the Confederation, and he steadily worked to accomplish this by war instead of peaceful means.

Bismarck made use of diplomacy and wars to bring about the unification of Germany. He fought three wars in the course of the unification of Germany. These were: (1) War against Denmark (1864). (2) Austro-Prussian War (1866) and (3) Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871)

16.12. War With Denmark (1864): The actual occasion for war between the two leading Powers of the Germanic Confederation sprang from the thorny problem of the Schleswig and Holstein duchies. These duchies, although subject to the Crown of Denmark, had maintained an independent existence for four centuries, and strenuously resisted the efforts of the Danish national party, known as the Eider-Danes, to make them an integral part of the kingdom. The situation was complicated by the fact that, while the male line of the Danish royal house appeared likely to die out, the Salic law, prohibiting succession in the female line, still prevailed in the duchies. This meant that the personal union between Denmark and the duchies would soon terminate unless the autonomy of the latter were first extinguished.

A crisis was reached in 1848 when Holstein organized an insurrection against Denmark and appealed, as a member of the Germanic Confederation, for the assistance of the German people.

Holstein and Schleswig were thus caught up in the great wave of national enthusiasm which was sweeping over Germany. However, the London Protocol of 1852 recognized the integrity of the Danish monarchy, but granted a measure of autonomy to the duchies. This compromise proved unworkable, and the relations between Denmark and the German Confederation grew more and more strained. Eventually, in 1863, matters came to a head. The Eider-Danes pressurized the King of Denmark to annex these two duchies. The King yielded to the pressure and merged these two Duchies into his kingdom.

The annexation of Holstein and Schleswig gave Bismarck an opportunity which he wanted to turn to the benefit of Prussia. Bismarck decided to take military action against Denmark and restore the position of the two 'German states to their original position.' However, he realized that Prussia needed an ally in the event of European interference. Bismarck proposed to Austria that both Prussia and Austria should take joint action against Denmark and restore the *status quo*.

Austria, whose fears of French Italian policy under Napoleon III made her anxious to cultivate the friendship of Prussia, and thus accepted Bismarck's proposal for a joint intervention in the duchies. Bismarck had his own sinister motive in inducing Austria in a war against Denmark. He anticipated a quarrel with Austria about the future of the duchies which could be used by him to wage a war against Austria and exclude Austria from the German Confederation. In the meantime, Bismarck managed to ensure the neutrality of the French King, Napoleon III by making vague promises. By assisting Russia in putting down the Polish revolt in 1863, Bismarck had already won over the good will of the Tsar.

With these diplomatic maneuvers, Bismarck sought a legitimate pretext for war against Denmark which he found in Denmark's violation of the London Protocol of 1852, which left England, France, and Russia without legal ground to protest. The Austro-Prussian troops attacked and defeated Denmark in 1864 and forced the King to surrender Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia and Austria jointly.

16.13. Austro-Prussian War (1866): Bismarck had rightly anticipated a quarrel between Austria and Prussia regarding the future of the two duchies acquired jointly from Denmark. A temporary agreement was reached in the Convention of Gastein (1865). According to this agreement Prussia assumed control of Schleswig and Austria of Holstein. Bismarck was certain that this arrangement would strain the relationship between the two powers.

Bismarck had planned to go to war with Austria in order to exclude her from German Confederation. However, before planning a war against Austria he took precautions to prevent the danger of foreign intervention on behalf of Austria. His cooperation with Russia in the suppression of the Polish revolt (1863) earned him the friendly neutrality of the Tsar. With shrewd diplomatic move Bismarck also managed to ensure the neutrality of Napoleon III. He was also given an understanding that if Prussia was given a free hand in Germany, France might get some 'compensation'. On the other hand Napoleon III, who was involved in the affairs of Mexico, decided to remain neutral in a contest between Prussia and Austria. Bismarck also secured Italian cooperation against Austria. Through a secret agreement in April 1866, Bismarck promised Venetia to the Italian Kingdom, which was still under the Austrian occupation. From England Bismarck expected no trouble.

Following the preliminary preparations for the decisive conflict with Austria, Bismarck wanted a pretext to go to war against Austria. He got this opportunity following a dispute between Prussia and Austria regarding the administrative arrangements of the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. Besides, in June 1866, Bismarck brought forward a proposal for the dissolution of the existing Frankfurt Parliament and election of a new National Assembly. Bismarck further indicated that in the proposed new scheme of reform of German Confederation, Austria would not have any place.

These developments irritated Austria and she mobilized her army against Prussia. Austria managed to get support of a number of German states, especially Saxony,, Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Hanover. The Prussian army also moved towards the Austrian borders. In the Austro-Prussian War, also known as the Seven Week's War, the Austrian army was defeated by the Prussian forces at Sadowa on 3 July 1866.

The Austro-Prussian War came to an end by the Treaty of Prague (1866). Bismarck shrewdly prevailed upon the King of Prussia to offer very generous terms to Austria as he did not want to alienate her. He wanted to secure Austria's neutrality in a possible future war against France to bring about the final unification of Germany. By the terms of the Treaty of Prague, the Confederation of Germany was dissolved. This eliminated Austrian influence in Germany. Venetia was handed over to Italy. The Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein were annexed to Prussia. Austria was compelled to pay a war indemnity of only 3,000,000 pounds to Prussia.

In the place of the old German Confederation, Bismarck established the North German Confederation comprising of all German states lying north of the river Main. The King of Prussia

became the Emperor of the North German Confederation. The Confederation was to have a bi-cameral legislature. The two houses were the parliamentary assembly, the *Reichstag*, elected by manhood suffrage and a federal council, *Bundesrath*, comprising of deputies from different states.

16.14. Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871): Bismarck's work of unifying Germany under the leadership of Prussia was not yet over. He had to bring the southern German states within the German Confederation. The southern German states showed no inclination to exchange their independent sovereignty for Prussian rule. However, forces outside Germany unexpectedly came to Bismarck's aid.

Relations between France and Prussia gradually began to deteriorate. The French resented the rise of Prussia in Central Europe with enlarged territories and increased military might. As the price of his neutrality during the Seven Week's War, Napoleon III failed to achieve any compensation from Bismarck, which lowered his prestige in the eyes of his people. Public opinion in France and Germany was cultivated in such a way that people of both countries began to view each other with suspicion, jealousy and hatred. With this background Bismarck sought an opportunity to wage the final war of German unification against France.

Once again with superior diplomatic skill, Bismarck managed to secure the neutrality of European powers in a possible war against France. Thereafter he sought an excuse for the war which would represent France as the aggressor and Prussia as the defender of German rights. Such an excuse was found in the question of Spanish Succession.

Following the revolution in Spain, the Spanish throne was offered to Prince Leopold, an Hohenzollern, a distant relative of the King of Prussia. The offer was welcomed by Prussia but was opposed by France. Napoleon III feared the encirclement of France if Hohenzollerns ruled both Germany and Spain. Benedetti, the French ambassador to Prussia informed King William that France would not consent to Leopold becoming the King of Spain. War seemed inevitable. But much to Bismarck's disappointment Leopold refused to accept the throne of Spain. In France this news was greeted with jubilation as a great diplomatic victory over Prussia. The French Foreign Minister was not quite satisfied and sent a telegram to Benedetti, the French ambassador to meet the Prussian King at Ems and get an assurance from him that no other relative of his would accept the Spanish Crown.

Benedetti met the Prussian king on 13 July 1870 at Ems and presented the French demand. William I firmly refused to give any

such guarantee. Following his meeting with the French ambassador, William I sent a telegram from Ems to Bismarck in Berlin regarding the negotiations between himself and the French ambassador. Bismarck received the so called Ems Telegram when he was dining with von Roon and von Moltke. All the three, who were eager for a war against France became greatly disappointed. However, Bismarck edited the telegram and twisted it to suit his objective, namely to provoke a war between Prussia and France. The modified telegram was published in an extra evening edition of the German official newspaper. It evoked different reactions in Prussia and France. While the people of Prussia felt that the French ambassador had mis-behaved with their Emperor, the French felt that the Prussian Emperor had insulted France by refusing to listen to the French ambassador. The French were so much provoked by the Ems Telegram that with the overwhelming support of the French people, Napoleon III declared war on Prussia on 19 July 1870.

Bismarck had been preparing for this final war of German unification. He had already reached an understanding with the southern German states as well as other European powers. He was assured of Austrian neutrality due to the lenient terms offered to her following the Seven Week's War. The Russian Tsar also remained neutral.

Soon after the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, the southern German states joined the North German Confederation, which completed the unification of Germany. In the Franco-Prussian War, France was decisively defeated in the Battle of Sedan on 1 September 1870, and Napoleon III surrendered. The German troops proceeded towards the French capital, Paris. Following the surrender of Napoleon III to the Germans, the Second French Empire collapsed. In Paris a republic was proclaimed and a provisional government was hastily formed to take charge of affairs. The republican leaders were ready to make peace with Germany, but not at Bismarck's terms. Thus, the struggle continued and the German army pressed on and besieged Paris. In spite of a strong resistance from the French people, Paris fell to the German troops.

The Franco-Prussian war came to an end by the Treaty of Frankfurt (May, 1871). By this treaty, France agreed to cede Alsace and a part of Lorraine including Metz and Strasburg to the German Empire. France was required to pay an indemnity of five billion francs to Germany. Besides humiliating France and acquiring territorial advantages Bismarck accomplished the unification of Germany. The merger of the southern German states with the North German Confederation brought about the final unification of Germany. A federal government was established with Berlin as its capital. King William, the ruler of Prussia was proclaimed as the

German Emperor on 18 January 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. This symbolized the newly achieved unity of the German people. However, but for Bismarck the unification of Germany would have remained just a dream for a long time.

Questions

1. Trace the initial attempts made towards the unification of Germany before the emergence of Bismarck.
2. Discuss the various stages in the unification of Germany.
3. Examine the role of Bismarck in the unification of Germany.
4. Give an account of the unification of Germany.



17

EASTERN QUESTION-I

GENERAL BACKGROUND AND THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE (1821-31)

Objectives:

1. To understand the general background of the Eastern Question.
2. To review the background of the Greek War of Independence.
3. To study the course of the Greek war of Independence, the role of the European powers, and the final achievement of the independence of Greece.

GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE EASTERN QUESTION

17.1. Introduction: In the nineteenth century the European statesmen were faced with major and complex problems arising out of the decay and decline of the Ottoman (Turkish) Empire which came to be known as the Eastern Question. It was the problem of filling the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the Ottoman Empire from the Balkan Peninsula and the emergence of independent Balkan states. Thus, the rise of the Balkan states is the history of the decline of the Ottoman Empire. The phrase 'Eastern Question' came into common diplomatic usage during the period of the Greek rebellion against the oppressive Ottoman rule. However, the Eastern Question existed from the middle of the Fifteenth Century since the Ottoman Turks had set their foot on the Balkan Peninsula.

Following the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, the Ottoman Turks established a vast empire in southeastern Europe and along the north coast of Africa in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries. The Turks conquered the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula – Serbs, Bulgars, Greeks and Rumanians. Alien from the European community in religion, race, language and political institutions, the Turks occupied the European land in the Balkan Peninsula for nearly 500 years. The Turkish occupation was not political, economic or religious. It was purely military. Turks never absorbed the Balkans nor were they absorbed by them. As a result of the Turkish conquest, the Balkan kingdoms lost their independence and the Balkan nationalities were politically buried within the Ottoman Empire.

In spite of oppression and suppression, the Balkan peoples survived. With the gradual decline of the Ottoman power in the nineteenth century, the Balkans re-emerged. Fed up with Turkish autocracy and inspired by the French Revolution, the Serbs, Greeks, Bulgars and Rumanians were eager to re-assert their independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The Eastern Question became a complicated issue for the following reasons: (1) The steady and gradual disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. (2) The rise of nationalism among the people of the Balkan Peninsula and their attempt to emerge as independent nations. (3) The conflicting interests of great powers and the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disintegration of the Ottoman Empire from Europe. The Eastern Question assumed different character at different times.

17.2. Conflicting Interests Of Big Powers In The Balkans:

17.2.1. Russia: Russia was a land-locked state in winter when the sea froze and blocked her ports. Though Russia possessed a long coastline in the north, she lacked 'all weather ports'. This

geographical handicap hampered (obstructed) Russian trade and commerce and her political ambitions. This prompted her to seek an approach to the 'warm waters of the southern seas'. Thus, right from the time of Peter the Great (1682-1725) and Catherine the Great (1762-1796), Russian imperial policy had been to extend her power southwards. Visualizing the gradual disappearance of the Ottoman Empire, Russia saw an opportunity to achieve her aim of acquiring control over the Black Sea and penetrate to the Mediterranean Sea through the straits of Bosphorus and Dardanelles.

Russia had racial affinity with the Balkan peoples. Thus, Russia always claimed to champion the cause of the Balkan people against the Turkish atrocities. The Tsar considered himself as the natural protector of fellow Slavs in the Ottoman Empire.

Since 1774 (Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji between Catherine Great of Russia and the Ottoman Sultan), the Tsar had rights as protector of the Greek Orthodox Christians. On the pretext of protecting the Orthodox Christians, Russia desired to extend her influence in the Balkan Peninsula at the cost of the Ottoman Empire. Hence, Russia was eager to fill in the vacuum created by the gradual disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. Thus, Russia was keen on the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire to further her own political and imperial interests in the Near East. Russian ambition was a constant factor in the Eastern Question.

17.2.2. Austria: There was intense Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkan Peninsula. The Austro-Russia rivalry in the Balkan Peninsula was at three levels:

(i) Russian support to rising nationalism in the Balkan Peninsula was viewed by Austria with apprehension. Russia championed Slav nationality and helped the Serbians during their revolt against the Ottoman Empire. Austria also had imperial ambition in the Balkan Peninsula. She considered Russian support to the establishment of a Slav Empire with Serbia as nucleus as a danger to the integrity of the Habsburg Empire, as a number of Slavs inhabited the border regions of the Empire. Serbian nationalism aimed not only at the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire but also the Habsburg Empire of Austria. Thus, Austrian hostility was directed against both Serbia and Russia.

(ii) Metternich, the Chancellor of Austria was opposed to any liberal movement in any part of Europe. He was strongly opposed to revolutionary movements in the Balkans. He was in favour preserving Ottoman authority in the region. He felt that the safety and integrity of the Austrian Empire, which also included a number

of subject nationalities such as Germans, Italians, Croats, Magyars, Slavs, Rumanians, Poles etc. was linked to the safety and integrity of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Peninsula.

(iii) Austria was opposed to any Russian influence in the Balkan Peninsula. For a long time Austria had been coveting the Ottoman Provinces Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia.

17.2.3. England: England was apprehensive of Russian designs in the Balkan Peninsula and desired the continuation of the Ottoman Empire in Europe as a barrier against Russia. This was necessary to safeguard her empire in India and to protect her commercial and strategic importance in the Mediterranean.

17.2.4. France: France had two important interests. Since Napoleon Bonaparte's time France had entertained hopes of extending her power in North Africa and Asia Minor. Thus, France supported the dependencies of the Ottoman Empire in these parts in their resistance to the Sultan. France also had treaty rights as protector of Roman Catholic interests in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, France was interested in the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire.

17.3. Reasons For The Gradual Decline Of The Ottoman Empire: The decline of the Ottoman Empire was a very gradual process. She managed to survive for a long time due to the conflicting interests of European powers and of various rebellious groups within her empire. However, the Ottoman Empire was slowly undermined because of internal weaknesses. The internal weaknesses were:

The ambition of the pashas or provincial governors, who were practically free from the control of the Central government, was one of the important factors that led to the decline of the Ottoman Empire. The Sultans had only nominal control over them. Two powerful pashas in the early nineteenth century were Ali of Janina in Albania and Mehemet Ali in Egypt.

The weakness of the Sultans to assert their authority and introduce reforms was another important cause of the decline of the Ottoman Empire. At one time the Turkish civil service was unmatched by any in the West. However, gradually, it became corrupt, lazy, disloyal and inefficient. Turkey failed to reform her inefficient government. Besides, the decline of the fighting qualities of the Turkish military also contributed to the weakness of the Ottoman Empire.

The social system also undermined the fighting spirit of the Turkish forces. The Turks came to rely more and more on slaves and foreigners to do the work for them. Religious and racial factors were the fundamental causes for the gradual shrinking of the Ottoman Empire. Built up by the sword, Turkish dominion was maintained only by the sword. No ties of common sentiment nor common religion knit together conquerors and conquered. Racially and religiously, the Turks were quite different from the Balkan people.

The external factors that led to the weakness of the Ottoman Empire were the growth of the power of Russia and her expansion towards the Balkan Peninsula from the eighteenth century onwards and the spread of the ideas of nationalism and liberty among the subject people of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Peninsula.

17.4. Serbian Revolt: The Serbians were the first among the Balkan nationalities to rise in revolt against the Ottoman Empire in 1804. The revolt was led by Kara (Black) George, the ancestor of the Karageorgevic dynasty of Serbia. It was a story of heroic fights and bloody massacres on both sides. But after eight years Kara George maintained his position, and in the Russo-Turkish Treaty of 1812 obtained a promise of autonomy. He was defeated in 1813, and fled the country. Later in 1815 his rival, enemy and ultimate murderer, Milos Obrenovic, raised another revolt against the Turks. He was successful in asserting the *de facto* independence of Serbia at once and, after many and tedious delays, secured a constitution and the recognition of himself as Prince of Serbia. It was only in 1829 by the Treaty of Adrianople that the Serbians enjoyed complete autonomy.

17.5. The Greek War Of Independence (1821-1831):

17.5.1. Background: The Greeks were the first to achieve independence from the Ottoman Empire after a decade long revolution. A number of factors contributed to the Greek war of independence against the Turks. The Greeks had been under Ottoman rule since the mid-1400s. Islamic law applied only to Muslims, with the Greek Orthodox Church allowed to function and Greeks free to worship as they pleased and to maintain their own culture and language. Thus, the Turks usually displayed great moderation in their treatment of the Greek population. The Greeks saw the Ottoman Turks as inferior, and they looked back at what they considered the glories of ancient Greece. Thus, there was a revival of national consciousness among the Greeks due to a renewed interest in Greek classics, both in literature and language. Increase in the secret societies, the most famous being the *Philike Hetairia* (Association of Friends), founded at Odessa by four Greek

merchants in 1814. It had a membership of 200,000 by 1820; and the ideas of liberty and nationalism inspired by the French Revolution.

The Greeks had a long tradition of independence. In spite of suppression, the Greeks had enjoyed greater political autonomy and privileges than other Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. In their village communities, the Greeks had the elements of the vigorous local life which suited their genius. In the Orthodox Church they possessed the organization necessary to bind them together in the sense of common nationality. In the past the Greeks had occupied a special position in both the Turkish government and the navy. A number of Greeks were employed by the Turks in the civil administration.

Long before the outbreak of the war of independence, the wealthy island community of Greek merchants of the Aegean and the Adriatic, though nominally forming part of the Ottoman Empire, had enjoyed a practical independence, though they had to send to the Ottoman Sultan an annual tribute in money and in sailors to man the imperial navy. The Greeks had been granted a limited amount of autonomy in the field of education. They had established schools and universities and had developed close ties with intellectual movements in France and other countries. The Greek Patriarch, the head of the Orthodox Church had good relations with the Sultan of Turkey. Having tasted greater autonomy, the Greeks wanted to be free from the control of the Ottoman Empire.

A revolt against Ottoman rule gave Serbia quasi-autonomy by beginning in 1813, and this encouraged the Greeks. There was a tendency among Greeks to believe that it would be their fellow Orthodox Christians with power, the Russians, who would free them from the Ottoman control. Then, in 1814, at the center of a thriving Greek community in Odessa in Russia, Greek exiles laid what they hoped would be the ground work for an armed uprising inside Greece, and they misleadingly portrayed their group as having the approval of the Russian authorities.

17.5.2. Greek Revolt: In 1821 Greeks in the Peloponnese (the Peloponnesian Peninsula) rebelled, inspired by news of an uprising in Moldavia, which was also under Ottoman rule, just across the border from Russian territory - the Ukraine. A small group led by a Greek, that included some Russians, had crossed the border into Moldavia where they raised the flag of Greek independence and hoped that the Romanians and Bulgarians of Moldavia would rise with them for their own independence. The revolt in Moldavia was crushed, but the revolt in the Peloponnese spread.

The rebels in the Peloponnese lacked good organization and discipline. For the most part they were Christians killing their enemies without mercy. Leaders emerged who tried to invoke restraint and to stop looting, but they had little effect. However, glorified by the accomplishments of ancient Greece, the Greek peasants of 1821, armed with scythes, clubs and slings, grabbed what valuables they could and killed wherever possible, including small clusters of Muslims fleeing their homes. Of the estimated 50,000 Muslims living in the Peloponnese in March 1821, an estimated 20,000 were killed within a few weeks - men, women and children.

In Constantinople, the Ottoman sultan, Mahmud II, ordered the arrest of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregorios V. The Patriarch was accused of having intrigued with the uprising and having committed perjury and treason. Patriarch Gregorios along with two other Bishops was hanged. Sultan Mahmud II believed that it was his right to order the execution. Christians across Europe were aware of the uprising in the Peloponnese but not of the atrocities of the revolutionaries, and they were shocked by the hanging of Gregorios.

In April 1821, the revolt north of the Peloponnese spread across the Isthmus of Corinth, north toward central Greece and toward Athens. The Greek rebels captured a number of cities and towns from the control of the Turks. The Greeks and the Turks manifested their cruelty in the course of the Greek War of Independence. While the Greek rebels massacred a large number of Muslims, the Turks slaughtered Christians at Constantinople.

The Greeks had the advantage of superiority at sea. They were the experienced mariners, and Greek sailors who had been working on Ottoman ships abandoned those ships, leaving the Turks to recruit inexperienced dock-labourers and peasants and the Turks weakened on the sea. In 1822, the Greeks captured the coastal region in the west just north of and across the isthmus from the Peloponnese, and farther east they took Athens and Thebes. The Greeks were not in control of west and east-central Greece as well as on the Aegean islands.

17.5.3. Declaration of Independence by the Greeks: In 1822, the Greeks declared independence, stating: "We, descendants of the wise and noble peoples of Hellas, we who are the contemporaries of the enlightened and civilized nations of Europe, we who behold the advantages which they enjoy under the protection of the impenetrable aegis of the law, find it no longer possible to suffer without cowardice and self-contempt the cruel yoke of the Ottoman power which has weighed upon us for more

than four centuries - a power which does not listen to reason and knows no other law than its own will, which orders and disposes everything despotically and according to caprice.”

17.5.4. Policy of Major Powers Towards Greece: At the time of the Greek revolt, representatives of the Great European powers were at the Congress of Laibach (1821). In the eyes of the Austrian Chancellor, Metternich the Greeks were rebels against the lawful sovereignty of the Ottoman government, and the principle of ‘Legitimacy’ was invoked to serve as a plea for non-intervention.

On her side England adhered strictly to the theory of non-intervention. Castlereagh, and still more Canning, believed that it was the bounden duty of England to hold aloof from the internal concerns of other States, except where she was entitled to intervene in virtue of treaty-obligations. At the same time England and Austria regarded the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in the light of a political axiom. They could foresee that the success of the Greek war of independence would be the beginning of the end of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, both England and Austria bent all their energies to isolate the Greek revolt and prevent it from developing into a European conflagration. For a time this policy was successfully pursued.

Tsar Alexander I was in a dilemma. Common Russians wanted to avenge the death of the Patriarch, but the Tsar had other matters to consider and merely withdrew his ambassador from Constantinople. As the founder of the Holy Alliance and as a signatory of the Protocol of Troppau, he was opposed to revolutionary movement, wherever it might occur. Thus, in spite the expectations from the Greeks, the Tsar failed to support them in their revolt and the movement for Greek independence received a set back.

During the first six years (1821-1827), the Great Powers did not intervene in the Greek War of Independence. It was generally agreed to ‘hold the ring’, to prevent outside interference, and to regard the dispute as a private affair between Turkey and Greece. During this period Russia, Austria and England followed similar policy towards the Ottoman Empire and Greek War of Independence.

This was the situation during the early years of the Greek War of Independence. Yet, even at this stage it became increasingly difficult for the European Powers to refrain from interference. Russia, in particular, showed signs of restlessness. The Tsar could not forget that he was the champion of the Orthodox Church, and therefore had a particular interest in a war which bore the

character of an Orthodox crusade against the infidel. Moreover, it was the traditional policy of Russia to advance southwards. At the same time the actions of the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire such as the execution of the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople gave a pretext for Russia to intervene. Both England and Austria, however, were anxious to avert hostilities, and urged the Sultan to make certain concessions. The result was to preserve peace for the time being.

17.5.5. Intervention of Mehemet Ali: However, the situation changed when the Ottoman Sultan called upon Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt to help him in suppressing the Greek revolt. He was promised the pashaliks of Morea, Syria and Damascus as the price of his assistance against the Greek insurgents. With the arrival of Ibrahim, the son of Mehemet Ali and the capture of Athens (1827) the Greek resistance collapsed. Sympathy for the Greek cause spread throughout Europe and America. The Russians were also moved with national and religious feelings as Russia claimed herself as the protector of the Orthodox Christians.

17.5.6. Intervention by Russia, England and France: The Greek Revolt in 1826-27 was on the point of collapse due to Ibrahim's vigorous activities. The new Tsar of Russia, Nicholas I, who succeeded Alexander I in December 1825, was determined to intervene to help the Greeks. At this point the Foreign Minister of England, George Canning decided that the only way of averting war was for England to act with Russia in putting pressure on the Ottoman Empire. In March 1826, the Tsar demanded the withdrawal of Turkish forces from Moldavia and Walachia. In April 1826, the Duke of Wellington was sent to Russia. England and Russia signed a protocol (Protocol of St. Petersburg) on 4 April 1826. By this Protocol, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire was urged to make an armistice with the Greeks and grant them a measure of 'Home Rule'. In July 1827, Canning, by then Prime Minister of England, called a meeting in London of the representatives of Russia and France. By the Treaty of London, these three Powers agreed that an autonomous Greek state should be established under Turkish suzerainty. The three Powers also agreed to conclude an alliance, and if the Turks refused an armistice they would work together to secure Greek independence. Austria and Prussia did not agree to the coercion of Turkey in favour of rebellious subjects and refused to associate with this arrangement.

17.5.7. The Battle of Navarino: As the Sultan refused mediation and the proposed armistice, the allied fleets of England and France destroyed the Turko-Egyptian fleet at Navarino in October 1827. The results of Navarino were momentous. The Sultan proclaimed a

Holy War against the Christian Powers, and repudiated the treaty into which he had recently entered with Russia (Treaty of Akkerman, 1826) respecting the Danubian Principalities and the navigation of the Straits. This provided a pretext to Russia to intervene in Turkey.

Meanwhile, Wellington had become the Prime Minister of England (1828). He was opposed to any move that would weaken the Ottoman Empire and hoped for its preservation as a barrier against Russian ambitions in the Mediterranean.

17.5.8. War between Russia and Turkey: England withdrew from the conflict and the Greek question was handled by Russia and Tsar Nicholas I declared war on Turkey early in 1828. The outbreak of the war between Russia and Turkey put Wellington in a tight spot. If England stood aloof from the struggle, she would have no voice in the final settlement. Besides, Greece, liberated by the Russian arms, would become a dependency of Russia. Thus, Wellington accepted the suggestion of France to send an expeditionary force to Morea to drive out the army of Mehemet Ali. However, before the arrival of the French, Codrington, the English admiral had already secured the evacuation of Morea by making a naval demonstration before Alexandria.

17.5.9. The Treaty of Adrianople: After preliminary reverses the Russian army reached Adrianople in the summer of 1829. Diebitsch, the commanding general, despite the smallness and demoralization of his army, assumed the airs of a conqueror and summoned the Turks to make peace. With the advance of the Russian army towards Constantinople, the Sultan was forced to come to terms and by the Treaty of Adrianople (1829) the Sultan recognized the autonomy of the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Walachia. Though these principalities nominally remained under Ottoman suzerainty. But for all practical purposes they came under the protection of Russia.

17.5.10. Recognition of the Independence of Greece: The Greek Question was finally settled by the European Powers. Russia would have been content with Greece becoming a vassal state, autonomous but tributary. This solution was not acceptable to England. She shared the conviction of Austria that the creation of a tributary state would lead to Russian intrigues in the Balkans and provide the pretext for continued interference in the affairs of Turkey. Thus, Wellington and Metternich, who had both strongly upheld the preservation of the Ottoman Empire, were compelled by force of circumstances to recognize Greece as a sovereign and independent state. Thus, by the Convention of London (1832), the independence of Greece was recognized and the new state was

placed under the protection of Russia, England and France. The success of the Greek War of Independence marked the first serious breach in the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. This created the precedent for the rise of a group of Balkan states.

Questions

1. Discuss the general background of the Eastern Question.
2. Trace the course of events that led to the Greek War of Independence.
3. Critically examine the role of the European Powers in the course of the Greek War of Independence.



18

EASTERN QUESTION-II

THE CRIMEAN WAR (1854-56)

Objectives:

1. To review the circumstances that led to the Crimean War.
2. To understand the role played by the European Powers in the Crimean War.
3. To analyze the consequences of the Crimean War.

18.1. Introduction: The Crimean War (1854–1856) was fought between Imperial Russia on one side and an alliance of France, England, Kingdom of Sardinia and the Ottoman Empire on the other. Most of the conflict took place on the Crimean Peninsula, with additional actions occurring in western Turkey, the Baltic Sea region, and in the Russian Far East. The allies objected to expanding Russian power in the Black Sea area and to the seizing of land from the Ottoman Empire. Russia was defeated in 1856. The Crimean War is sometimes considered to be the first ‘modern’ conflict and introduced technical changes which affected the future course of European history.

18.2. Background Of The Conflict: The roots of the conflict among the European Powers lay in the Eastern Question posed by the decline of the Ottoman Empire, a development which had explosive implications for the European balance of power. From the late eighteenth century, Russia had become increasingly eager to

take advantage of this situation to increase her influence in the Balkans and to capture from the Turks control of the straits of Bosphorus and Dardanelles between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. Following their victory in the Russo-Turkish War (1828-1829) and especially after the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi (1833), the Russians moved towards the establishment of a unilateral protectorate over the Ottoman Empire.

England and France viewed the possibility of Russian control of the straits of Bosphorus and Dardanelles as a threat to their own interests in the Middle East, and many in those countries despised Russia as the despotic enemy of liberalism. Austria too, despite a long tradition of diplomatic cooperation with Russia, was uneasy about growing Russian influence in the Balkans. In 1841, the European powers and the Ottoman Empire managed to replace the Unkiar-Skelessi agreement with a general European protectorate.

18.3. Causes Of The Crimean War:

18.3.1. Condition of the Balkan Peninsula: Like any other wars, there were many divergent causes for the Crimean War. But of all these causes the condition of the Balkan Peninsula was the most important. The Turkish power had extended over the whole of the Balkan Peninsula with the exception of the free Kingdom of Greece. Few even among European diplomats of that period had any clear idea of the network of races and religions and languages that filled up the peninsula. The Turkish rule was not intentionally cruel, nor actually so except when its authority was dangerously challenged. The Turks were everywhere on the peninsula little more than a garrison of occupation, maintaining, not very effectively, a sort of order, raising taxes and for the rest letting the subject population go their own way and follow their own ideas in social life and religion. However, without question the Turkish power was growing weaker, less effective militarily, and more corrupt. The Ottoman Empire was little influenced by the progress of science and industry which had so changed the character of Western Europe. As for political liberty and the participation of the people in the administration of the government, it had a deep-seated aversion.

As the Ottoman Empire grew weaker, the subject nationalities and religions grew more self asserting. The Greeks had already broken away and established an independent power. Their example inspired other subject nationalities in the Balkan Peninsula. Beyond the Danube, in the Principalities of Moldavia and Walachia, there was a large measure of self-government due to various agreements and treaties. Other subject people as the Rumanians were eager to get more concessions from the Sultan. The Serbians who were conscious of their glorious past were dissatisfied with the

considerable amount of self-government which they had already won.

The Montenegrins still maintained their practical independence behind their mountain fortresses. The Bulgarians, Albanians, and Macedonians were hardly conscious of their separate existence. However, their lands were full of disturbances resulting from a sense of the differences which separated them from their rulers. Religion was one of the important factors that kept the Balkan Peninsula in ferment. There were many Muslims among the conquered peoples; but the orthodox or Greek form of Christianity persisted among most of the people of the peninsula. The Tsar of Russia was recognized as the head of the Orthodox Church. Religion in the Balkan Peninsula tended to assume a strong political character.

18.3.2. Fear of Austria About Russian Advance in the Balkans:

The condition in the Balkan Peninsula was obviously unstable. There was apprehension among the European Powers that a revolution might take place in any part of the Balkan Peninsula at any time, which would upset the Balance of Power. Thus, the European Powers to the north of the Danube watched events in the Ottoman Empire with anxiety in which ambition and fear both played an important part. The Austrian Empire owed its origin to the necessity of barring the way against the invasions of the Ottoman Empire and its very existence was closely bound up with the resistance to the Turkish Power. However, with the growing weakness of the Ottoman Empire, Austria was no longer apprehensive of the Turkish Power. But the fear of the power which might take Turkey's place in the Balkan Peninsula began to worry the Austrian Empire. Austria desired influence, if not territory in the Balkan Peninsula, and she feared the designs and ambitions of Russia.

18.3.3. Russia's Claim to Protect the Orthodox Christians: The apprehension of the Austrian Empire regarding the ambitions of Russia in the Balkans was justified due to the fact that Russia was a great Slav state, and the majority of the population of the Balkans spoke Slavonic languages. Besides, Russia had religious grounds for interference on behalf of the members of the Orthodox Church. Russia also claimed that she possessed treaty rights of interference as well. It was a constant matter of dispute as to how far these rights were extended. In the Treaty of Kutchuk Kainarji, which was drawn up in 1774 between Russia and Turkey, there were two clauses which contained the seeds of controversy. By one article (14) Russia was allowed to build a Christian Church in Galata, a part of Constantinople and to keep it always under her protection. By another article (7) Turkey promised to protect the Christian Church and religion within her dominions and to allow the Russian

Ambassadors to make representations on behalf of the Church in Galata. On the ground of these articles the Russians claimed a right to represent and protect the Christian communities of the Balkans. This would have meant a perpetual danger of interference. The Ottoman Empire had never admitted this right claimed by Russia.

18.3.4. Tsar's Proposals to England: Tsar Nicholas I was certain that any Russian move in the Balkan Peninsula would attract the opposition from England. Thus, he was keen to draw England into a plan of territorial adjustment in the region in consultation with England. Thus, in January 1853, Tsar Nicholas I tried to get an understanding with England about the position of Turkey and to prevent a rapprochement between England and France. The Tsar had a conversation with the English Ambassador to Russia, Sir Hamilton Seymour. The Tsar was an old friend of Lord Aberdeen, the English Prime Minister. The Tsar spoke of Turkey as a country that 'seemed to be falling to pieces.' The Turk was, he said, 'a very sick man' who might suddenly die on their hands. It was very important to make up their minds as to what should be done with his territories before that even occurred. He suggested that England and Russia could settle the issue without war. Then the Tsar hinted plainly at the settlement that he desired. The Balkan states were to be independent under Russian protection. Russia was to occupy Constantinople but not to annex it. England could have Egypt and Crete. Thus, the Tsar suggested the partition of the Turkish territories between England and Russia with France left out of the deal. However, England showed no inclination to accept the proposals of the Tsar. The maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was the traditional British policy and there was no desire to abandon it.

18.3.5. Napoleon III's Grudge Against the Tsar: Napoleon III of France had his own personal grudge against the Tsar, Nicholas I. He felt insulted when the Tsar addressed him as 'friend' rather than the courteous form 'brother'. The Tsar's tariffs had irked the French businessmen, his religious intolerance had irritated the Catholics and his suppression of Polish uprising had angered the French liberals. Thus, in order to win support of various sections of the French population, Napoleon III wanted to have a showdown with the Tsar.

18.3.6. Immediate Cause – the Question of the Holy Places: The Franco-Russian dispute over the holy places in Palestine was the immediate cause of the Crimean War. The question of the Holy Places concerned the management of the places of pilgrimages at Jerusalem and especially the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. The Turkish government kept order between the rival claims of the Latins or Roman Catholics and the Orthodox or Greek and Russian Christians. The French government had a traditional right, running

back to the times of the Crusades, to be considered the protector of the Christians in the East. However, since the development of the power of Russia, the Tsars had begun to put forward their own claims. Genuine religious feelings came to strengthen national rivalries and political ambitions.

France's interest in Palestine had been stimulated by a domestic crisis in 1840-1841. Napoleon III pushed it because he relied on the support of militant clerical groups in France. In 1850 Napoleon III requested the restoration to the French Catholics of the rights that France had acquired from Turkey by a treaty in 1740. This meant that the French wanted the key to the Church of the Nativity in the old city of Jerusalem and the right to place a silver star on Christ's birthplace in Bethlehem.

The manifestation of the rivalry and conflict between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox monks over the control of the Holy Places was possession of the keys of the main door of the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. Up to the middle of the 18 century, the Roman (Latin) Catholic monks were recognized by the Sultan of Turkey as the guardians of the holy shrines. However, in the later half of the eighteenth century, the Roman (Latin) Catholics had neglected their duties and the Greek Orthodox monks had replaced them. After 1789 France had lost interest in the quarrels between the Roman and Orthodox monks and the Orthodox monks gradually encroached upon the rights of their Roman Catholic rivals. The Orthodox monks held the keys of the main door, whereas the Catholic monks held the keys of the side doors. For the sake of maintaining equality of right, the Catholic monks claimed the keys of the main door as well. The Emperor of France, Napoleon III, to gain popularity in France, particularly among the clergy, demanded from Turkey the restoration of the old Catholic rights. In December 1852 the Ottoman sultan, responding to French pressure decided in favour of the Roman Catholics.

The dispute between Russia and France over the question of the Holy Places in Palestine became serious when the Tsar sent to Constantinople Prince Menschikov, one of the most prominent figures at the Russian Court, to demand not merely concessions in the Holy Land, but also the recognition of the Russian claim to be accepted as the protector of the Christians of the Balkan Peninsula.

At this point the British decided to checkmate the Tsar. The British diplomat at Constantinople, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe feared and disliked Russia. Though he saw the weak points of Turkey very clearly, he was nevertheless determined to uphold her territorial integrity and independence even at the risk of war. He took much responsibility upon himself. Communications with London took a long time, as the telegraph had not yet been brought to

Constantinople. Redcliffe persuaded the Sultan to make concessions on the comparatively trivial question of Holy Places, but to stand firm against the recognition of the Russian protectorate of the Balkan Christians, which would inevitably lead to loss of independence. In May 1853, Menschikov left Constantinople in protest against this decision, and it was clear that war was dangerously threatening.

18.4. The War: When the Menschikov Mission became public knowledge it strengthened the anti-Russian faction in the British cabinet. So the British decided it was worth a war to keep and expand their interest in the Eastern Mediterranean. In June 1853 an Anglo-French naval force entered the Dardanelles.

Shortly after he learned of the failure of Menschikov's diplomacy, the Tsar marched his armies into Moldavia and Walachia, the Ottoman Principalities. The action of Russia could be considered as falling short of actual war, as she had certain treaty rights in the Principalities. Tsar Nicholas I believed that the European powers, especially Austria, would not object strongly to the annexation of a few neighbouring Ottoman provinces, especially given Russian involvement in suppressing the Revolutions of 1848.

Austria regarded the course of Russian advance into Moldavia and Walachia with great interest, as the contest was close to her frontiers, and on lands in which she had ambitions if not claims. A conference was called at Vienna and a 'Vienna Note' was drawn up to Turkey and Russia by France, Austria, Prussia and England. The 'Vienna Note' aimed at protecting the Christian population of the Balkans without admitting the right of Russia to interfere. There was hope for a moment that peace might be preserved. Turkey refused to accept the 'Vienna Note' in its simple form. Russia accepted the declaration, but with a dangerous interpretation. As the passion was growing in both the countries, Turkey declared war on Russia on 4 October 1853.

When Turkey declared war on Russia, the European Powers would not allow the war to be bilateral between the two countries, as the interests involved were too great. Austria watched the contest with close attention, however, she did not venture to interfere. Prussia too decided not to interfere in the war. Some of her statesmen, including the rising Bismarck, saw in this conflict an opportunity for Prussia to play an important and decisive part as the forces of Russia and attention of Austria were occupied in the conflict. However, Prussian influence was hardly perceptible during the course of the Crimean War.

Among the other European Powers, England was drawn in the war on the side of the Ottoman Empire chiefly due to the traditional

British foreign policy. England believed that the spread of Russian power into the Mediterranean would threaten Egypt and the road to India. The war fever in England developed under the influence of Palmerston and the press. In France, under the regime of the new Empire public opinion played a much less important part. All rested with Napoleon III. Though he had proclaimed that 'The Empire means peace', strong forces pushed him into the Crimean War. The desire to maintain the prestige of France in the East, his dependence on the Catholic and Clerical party in France, above all the need which he instinctively felt to give the country what it expected from a Napoleon-glory and victory. Thus, England and France joined the Crimean War against Russia supporting Turkey.

At the end of October 1853, the joint French and English fleets passed the Dardanelles to give their moral support to Turkey. While they were in the neighbourhood of Constantinople, a Russian fleet attacked and destroyed the Ottoman fleet at the Black Sea port of Sinope on 30 November 1853, resulting in a public outcry in England and France. This quite natural act of war seemed an insult to the two great Western Powers, and an open war became inevitable. England and France officially declared war on Russia in March 1854. This marked a great change in European politics when English and French soldiers appeared as allies on the battlefield, and it may be said that it marked the beginning of the *entente* which became fully established in the early twentieth century. England and France were later joined by the Italian Kingdom of Sardinia in 1855 with the intention of being present at the peace conference and thus able to argue for her interest in Italian unification. She also needed assistance in her attempt to expel Austria from the smaller Italian kingdoms.

The first object of the Allies was to drive the Russian forces from the Principalities of Moldavia and Walachia. The Russians had laid siege to Silistria, through which they planned to pass to a crossing of the Balkans and to march on Constantinople. However, the defence of the place was unexpectedly stubborn. The attitude of Austria, while Russia remained on the Danube, was menacing. The Russians were forced to abandon the siege of Silistria and withdrew altogether from the principalities of Moldavia and Walachia. Immediately Austria sent troops into the two Principalities. Austria was to hold these principalities until the peace and handover them to Turkey once peace was established. Meanwhile, the Vienna Conference, in session throughout the war, formulated a peace proposal. These proposals included: (1) the abolition of the Russian Protectorate of the Danubian provinces; (2) the freedom of the navigation of the Danube; (3) the complete introduction of Turkey into 'the European equilibrium'; (4) the renunciation by Russia of her exclusive patronage of the Balkan Christians.

18.5. The Siege Of Sebastopol: As the war proceeded the Allies were keen to give a decisive battle to the Russian forces in order to force the Tsar to accept the peace terms. However, it proved to be difficult to discover a really vulnerable point in the wide territories of his loosely organized state. Cholera had broken out in the ranks and files of the allies, and the French and English armies were in many ways unprepared for a great enterprise. But, on the insistence of the home authorities, it was determined to attack the Russian naval station of Sebastopol at the southern end of the Crimean Peninsula in the Black Sea. It was believed that the task would be an easy one.

In September 1854, the Allies, Turks, French and English landed at Eupatoria to the north of Sebastopol. Marshal Saint-Arnaud and Lord Raglan then began their march on to the city itself. On 20 September 1854 they met the Russian commander, Menschikov, posted on the northern side of the river Alma. After hard fighting the Russians were completely defeated, and the road to Sebastopol was open. The Allies probably made here the greatest of the many mistakes during the campaign. They did not attack the city at once, though the Russian commander, Todleben, held that such an attack could not have been resisted. The Allies also made no attempt to establish any blockade on the north side of the river on which Sebastopol stands. Instead, they undertook a long and difficult march round to the south of the city and established their camp there. The interval thus allowed was brilliantly used by Todleben to throw up the fortifications which held the besiegers at bay from September 1854 to September 1855.

The siege of Sebastopol had some peculiar features. It was never a blockade. No serious attempt was made to cut off the city from communication with Russia. The Allies could not completely prevent the supply of provisions and other military stores from Russia to Sebastopol. Prince Menschikov commanded a considerable army in the hilly region to the east of the city, and from there he constantly threatened the besieging armies and sometimes attacked them and inflicted serious loss. The plan of the Allies was to capture Sebastopol not by starvation but by bombardment and direct assault. The supremacy of the Allied navies was the very basis on which the whole siege depended. However, the direct action of the navy was small. As the Russian fleet was sunk in the mouth of the Sebastopol harbour, the Allied fleet could not enter and their guns could not reach the city from the outside.

Despite bloody victories over the Russians at the Alma River, Balaklava, and Inkerman, the war dragged on, as the Russians refused to accept the Allies' peace terms. During the winter, diplomacy was active and there were attempts to bring more Allies

into the field against Russia. A conference was held at Vienna which lasted from March till May 1855. Meanwhile, the Russian Tsar Nicholas I died during the course of the war in March 1855 and was succeeded by Alexander II, who sent representatives to Vienna. The 'Four Points' were accepted by Russia as a basis of negotiation. Finally, with the fall of Sebastopol on 9 September 1855, and after Austria threatened to enter the war, Russia agreed to make peace. The new Tsar, Alexander II, anxious to give his country peace agreed for a conference to be called at Paris.

18.6. The Treaty Of Paris: The Treaty of Paris, signed on 30 March 1856, was a major setback for Russia's Middle Eastern policy. Russia was forced to return southern Bessarabia and the mouth of the Danube to the Ottoman Empire; Moldavia and Walachia were guaranteed self-government under the suzerainty of Turkey. Both these principalities and Serbia were placed under an international rather than a Russian guarantee. The Black Sea was declared neutral and the Russians were forbidden to maintain a navy on the Black Sea. It was thrown open to the mercantile marine of every nation. The Sultan limited himself to vague promises to respect the rights of all his Christian subjects. About the Treaty of Paris, A.J.P. Taylor says that it 'solved' the problem of the relations between Russia and Turkey in three ways. The Turks gave a voluntary promise of reforms. The Black Sea was neutralized, and the Danubian principalities were made independent of Russia. As far as the reforms in Turkey were concerned, the Sultan never fulfilled his promises. The neutralization of the Black Sea was a great achievement of the Treaty of Paris and it seemed to provide a barrier against Russia without any effort on the part of the Western Powers.

Thus, the Crimean War had far reaching effects on the politics of Europe. A check was put on the Russian influence in the Balkans and the Black Sea. She was kept back from the Danube. Her military strength in the Black Sea was completely finished for years to come. The creation of two autonomous States of Moldavia and Walachia put a barrier between Russia and Turkey. Turkey was the greatest gainer by the Crimean War. She got a new lease of life under the protection of the European Powers. Her territorial integrity was guaranteed and she was admitted, for the first time, to the European community of nations from which she had been previously excluded.

In military terms, the war was a blundering, needlessly costly affair. The commanders on both sides proved remarkably inefficient, squandering lives in senseless engagements like the famed "Charge of the Light Brigade," in which a British unit suffered severe losses during the Battle of Balaklava. Inefficiency and corruption hampered supply services for both armies, and medical

services were appalling. The British nurse Florence Nightingale won fame by her efforts to improve the care of the sick and wounded, but more men died of disease than in battle. According to Grant and Temperley, "The Crimean War occupies a peculiar place in the history of Europe in the nineteenth century. The military methods resemble rather those of the Napoleonic age than of the period soon to be opened by Moltke and the military system of Prussia. Steam vessels were used, but their full importance was not appreciated. The telegraph had been brought to Vienna, but Constantinople and the Crimea were still beyond its reach. All that concerned the feeding and the sanitation of the armies was almost medieval in character. It was the last war to be fought without the help of the modern resources of science."

An indirect effect of the Crimean War was that Tsar Alexander II was forced to carry out a large number of reforms in Russia with a view to winning over the people. The most important reform was the emancipation of the serfs. Moreover, as the Russian expansion was checked on the European side, its activity was transferred towards Central Asia and the result was that the British government in India had to worry about the growing influence of Russia in that region.

Nevertheless, the war was an event of major significance in European history. It marked the collapse of the arrangement whereby the victors of the Napoleonic Wars—England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia—had cooperated to maintain peace in Europe for four decades. The myth of Russian might was laid to rest, and the breakup of the old coalition permitted Germany and Italy to free themselves from Austrian influence and emerge as nations in the decade that followed. Finally, the shock of the Crimean defeat was the catalyst for a program of sweeping internal reform in Russia under Nicholas's successor, Alexander II.

Questions

1. Trace the circumstances that led to the Crimean War (1854-56).
2. Discuss the causes of the Crimean War (1854-56). What were its consequences?
3. Examine the course of events that resulted in the Crimean War (1854-56). What were its results?
4. Write a detailed note on the Crimean War (1854-56).



19

EASTERN QUESTION-III

THE RUSSO-TURKISH WAR (1877-78)

Objectives:

1. To analyze the background of the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78).
2. To understand the nature of rising of the Balkan Christian nationalities against the Turkish rule.
3. To study the attitude of the European Powers towards the problems in the Balkan Peninsula.
4. To review the consequences of the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78) and the importance of the Congress and the Treaty of Berlin (1878).

19.1. Introduction: The Crimean War resulted in a definite setback to the Russian policy in the Near East. It also provided the Sultan of Turkey an opportunity to put his house in order if he desired to do so. For twenty years following the Treaty of Paris (1856), the Sultan was relieved of all anxiety regarding the Russian danger. During this period, the Sultan did nothing to solve the problems of his subjects. In 1875, the unrest among the Christian subjects spread far and wide in the Balkan Peninsula. The Eastern Question once again reopened with the insurrection of the peoples in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Gradually the unrest spread to Serbia and Montenegro. The Russian interference in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire, especially in the Balkan Peninsula ultimately led to another conflict between the two powers resulting in the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78).

19.2. Nature Of The Russian Empire: The Russian Empire had long been aggressive and expansionist. In the nineteenth century it was the largest state in Europe and, next to the British Empire, the largest in the world. At the end of the century it embraced a sixth of the land surface and a twelfth of the population of the earth. Unlike

the British Empire, it was a solid block of contiguous territory, almost as much Asiatic as European.

The Russian Empire under its Tsars was also a despotic state. It lagged behind the countries of western and central Europe in the nineteenth century movements of industrialization, liberalism, and constitutional government. For a brief time in the early 1860's Tsar, Alexander II (1855-1881) had followed a 'westernizing' policy and introduced some liberal reforms, such as emancipating the serfs, authorizing elective *zemstovs* to exercise certain powers of local self-government, and modernizing the Empire's judicial system. But the Tsar soon lost his reforming zeal and returned to the traditional practices of repressing dissent at home and promoting expansion abroad. In 1871, he took advantage of the defeat of France by Germany, and of Bismarck's benevolent attitude, to get rid of the limitations which had been imposed on Russia by the Treaty of Paris (1856) following the end of the Crimean War. Violating the provisions of the Treaty of Paris, the Tsar reestablished Russian naval power in the Black Sea.

19.3. Rising Of The Balkan Nationalities: There was a lot of restlessness and discontentment among the Christian nationalities of the Balkan Peninsula. There was a strong Pan-Slav movement among the Balkan people encouraged by Russia. Being defeated in the Crimean War, Tsar Alexander II could only make Russia's influence felt by propagandist policies and by a general support of the Slav peoples outside Russia. In this way Tsar Alexander II desired to turn the Slav peoples of the Balkans into satellites of the Russian Empire. The Austro-Hungarian Empire also began to aspire to expand to the Aegean Sea through the Balkan Peninsula. Thus, a conflict between Russia and Austria became inevitable. The Sultan of Turkey did not carry out his promises of reforms in the interests of his Christian subjects and the oppression by the Turks on their Christian subjects increased. These factors led to the rising of the Balkan Christian nationalities against the oppressive rule of the Ottoman Empire.

The rising of Balkan nationalities against Turkey were encouraged by rival powers, Austria and Russia. Austrian interest in the Balkan Peninsula was chiefly due to her desire to recover territories and prestige which she had lost to Italy and Germany in the course of their unification. Russia had a longstanding interest in the Balkan Peninsula, which was intensified due to Austrian interests. The revolts in different regions of the Balkan Peninsula and the Bulgarian areas south of the Danube attracted the attention of Austria and Russia.

In 1858, Montenegro, which had already shown strong sympathy for Russia, had beaten the Turks at Grahovo. However, during the

next few years, her very existence was threatened by Turkey, and Russia came to the rescue of Montenegro. Rumania, though not a Slav state, was assisted by Russia to complete her unity in 1861. In 1867 Russia intervened to remove the Turkish garrison from Belgrade and other Serbian fortresses, and thus renewed her intimate connection with Serbia. In 1870 Russia abrogated the Black Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris (1856), and announced the restoration of the fortress of Sebastopol and rebuilding of her navy on the shores of the Black Sea. These factors demonstrated the revival of the Russian power and encouraged the Slav population of the Balkans to rise against the Turks.

The first signs of revolt against the Turks began among the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. A bad harvest in 1874 led to the risings in both Bosnia and Herzegovina, which became formidable in 1875. They were helped by the people of Serbia and Montenegro. The movement began to spread and there was the danger of a general conflagration. The Great Powers were anxious to localize the rising and to remove the causes of the rising. A note proposed by Count Andrassy, the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary was circulated on 30 December 1875, in which the Turkish rule in the Balkans was condemned and its shortcomings were pointed out. The Sultan once again expressed his willingness to introduce reforms. However, the Christian rebel nationalities had no faith in the promises of the Sultan.

19.4. Turkish Atrocities In Bulgaria: Meanwhile, the Bulgars also joined the struggle against Turkey. As the situation became dangerous, the European Powers presented to the Sultan what came to be known as the 'Berlin Memorandum'. Through this Memorandum, the European Powers asked the Sultan to make certain definite concessions and threatened with armed intervention if he failed to do so. However, the Sultan of Turkey ignored the 'Berlin Memorandum' on account of the indifferent attitude of England. Disraeli, the Prime Minister of England was keen to purchase the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal and did not consider the Turks as bad as they were portrayed. Besides, he was keen to preserve the integrity of the Turkish Empire against the territorial ambitions of the Russian Tsar.

The Turks tried to crush the Bulgarian revolt with a heavy hand resorting to outright massacre in which nearly twelve thousand Bulgars including women and children were killed. The Turkish atrocities against the Bulgarians stirred the deepest sympathy of Christian Europe. When the report of the atrocities committed by the Turks on the people of Bulgaria reached England, the British public opinion was aroused against the Turks. These events brought Gladstone, the leader of the Liberal Party in England from temporary retirement and induced him to publish a pamphlet called

'Bulgarian Horrors'. Gladstone called upon the government to drive out the Turks out of the Christian provinces of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Bulgaria 'bag and baggage'. However, Disraeli, the British Prime Minister, who was fearful of Russian interference in the Balkans, did not take any action.

19.5. Attitude Of The European Powers: As the situation in the Balkans was assuming an alarming proportion, the reactions of the European Powers further complicated the Eastern Question. Russia planned to bring about the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, which would clear the way for her to the Balkans and the Mediterranean. The German Chancellor, Bismarck was anxious to prevent an open breach between his two partners of the League of Three Emperors, Austria and Russia. In the eventuality of the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, Bismarck wanted it dissolved by joint agreement of the European Powers. Austria wavered between backing Turkey against Russian advance and willingness to accept a limited and negotiated partition of the Ottoman Empire from which she could gain territories. France was still hopeful of revenge against Germany for her humiliating defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71). She was not in favour of any direct involvement in the Eastern Question. As far as England was concerned, preventing Russian expansion into the Balkans was a primary aim and Disraeli who had recently bought for England a large portion of the stock in the Suez Canal from the Khedive of Egypt favoured support for Turkey.

The excitement in Russia was naturally great, and the Pan-Slav appeal was irresistible. Montenegro and Serbia plunged into war with Turkey on 30 June and 1 July 1876 respectively. The Montenegrins won many successes against the Turks. However, the Serbs were badly beaten at the end of October 1876, and only an ultimatum from Russia prevented the Turks from advancing on Belgrade, the capital of Serbia. At the end of October 1876, the Tsar was informed by England that, whatever might be the feeling as to Turkish atrocities, England must protect her interests in the Suez Canal and Constantinople. Tsar Alexander II on his part gave a solemn assurance to England that he had no design on annexing Constantinople or Bulgaria. However, Disraeli remained unconvinced of the Tsar's assurance and his anti-Russian posture continued. The Tsar publicly announced that he would act independently of the other European Powers, if he failed to secure adequate guarantees from the Turkish Sultan for the future protection of her Christian subjects.

19.6. Conference At Constantinople: In December 1876, a Conference of Great Powers was called at Constantinople to

consider the situation in the Balkans. Abdul Hamid II, who had become the Sultan of Turkey at the end of August 1876 through a palace revolution was a cruel and cunning despot. A day before the Conference of Great Powers met at Constantinople to demand reforms, the new Sultan promulgated a liberal constitution for the entire Ottoman Empire. The Sultan, as a liberal and constitutionalist informed the delegates at the conference that Turkey was now a reformed state, and that he should not be asked to surrender his sovereign rights over his own subjects, when he has invited them to share in his government. Thus, the conference, nonplussed and baffled, broke up without accomplishing anything. Once being free from the European pressure, Abdul Hamid II ended the constitution in May 1877, disgraced Midhat Pasha, who had promoted the liberal constitution and murdered him a few years later.

19.7. Outbreak Of The Russo-Turkish War (1877-78): It seems quite clear that the action of Abdul Hamid II was motivated by the fact that England would support him against Russia, as she had done in the Crimean War. A British naval squadron was already present in Besika Bay. However, the Sultan was wrong in his calculations. When Russia and England presented joint demands in April 1877, he rejected them. As the war against Turkey became inevitable, Russia struck a bargain with Austria. In return for recognizing independence of Serbia and Montenegro, Russia agreed to offer Austria a free hand in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In return Russia sought free hand in Rumania and Bulgaria. With this understanding, following the rejection of joint demands from England and Russia by the Sultan, Russia declared war on Turkey on 14 April 1877.

Following the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War, Rumania joined Russia and Serbia renewed her war against Turkey. Montenegro was already at war with Turkey since 1876. Bulgarians also supported Russia. A Russian army invaded the Ottoman Empire from the north, traversing Rumania and crossing the Danube in June 1877. To its surprise, it encountered fierce resistance from Turkish troops led by the military genius of Osman Pasha entrenched at Plevna, in Bulgaria, just south of the Danube. Twice in July, and again in September, the Russian infantry was pushed back by Plevna's Turkish garrison. After nearly five months of resistance, the Turkish garrison was forced to surrender in December 1877. Before the end of January 1878 Skobelev, the most brilliant of the Russian generals, had opened the way to Adrianople, which fell on 28 January 1878. The Turks were everywhere in retreat and the Russians were victorious. Abdul Hamid sued for peace, and an armistice was agreed on 31 January 1878.

With the success of Russia, England became jittery. The British fleet was ordered to leave Besika Bay and proceed to Constantinople. The Russian army moved within sight of Constantinople. The danger of a war between England and Russia seemed to be imminent. However, Russia became timid. Her army was worn out and exhausted, her supplies were wretched and her finances were in disorder. It was quite impossible for the Tsar to risk a conflict with a new enemy or enemies. In all probability, he would have had to fight Austria-Hungary on land as well as England on the sea. Under these circumstances Russia took the wisest course and signed a separate peace with the Turks on 3 March 1878 at San Stefano. By this she hoped to preserve most of her gains without offending England, as she did not enter Constantinople, and proposed to evacuate Adrianople.

19.8. The Treaty Of San Stefano (1878): By this treaty: (1) The Sultan of Turkey recognized the complete independence of Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania. (2) The Sultan agreed to introduce reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the joint control of Russia and Austria. (3) Greater Bulgaria was to be created as an autonomous tributary state extending from the Danube River to the Aegean Sea and from the Black Sea to Albania comprising of north and south Bulgaria (Eastern Roumelia) as well as considerable part of Macedonia.

The Treaty of San Stefano was extremely favourable to the Bulgarians. It realized the vision of Greater Bulgaria. Greece and Serbia vigorously protested against the settlement which ignored their own claims upon Macedonia. The Great Powers were also hostile to the Treaty of San Stefano on different grounds. England especially disapproved the proposal for an enlarged Bulgaria. She felt that the newly erected state of Bulgaria would become a Russian province and this would prepare a ground for her ultimate advance towards Constantinople. Disraeli was determined to check the spread of Russian influence in the Balkans. He was convinced that the security of the sea route to India through the Mediterranean needed a strong and friendly Turkey. Austria had her own reasons for dissatisfaction. She claimed as her share of spoils the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus, both England and Austria demanded a European Congress for revising the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano. Russia was reluctant to accept the joint demand of England and Austria. She did not want to give up her hard won benefits out of the Russo-Turkish War. However, the warlike moves of England such as ordering Indian troops to proceed to Malta and ordering the British fleet to be ready for action convinced Russia the imminent danger of a war for which she was not prepared. Under these pressures Russia had no other alternative but agree to the Anglo-Austrian demand for an European Congress for the revision of the Treaty of San Stefano.

19.9. The Congress And Treaty Of Berlin (1878): The European Congress met at Berlin in June 1878. It was attended by Russia, Turkey, Austria, England, France, Italy and Germany. Bismarck, the German Chancellor presided over the Congress as 'honest broker'. His chief aim was to preserve the League of Three Emperors (Germany, Austria and Russia) of 1872. The outcome of the discussions in the Congress of Berlin was the Treaty of Berlin, which rudely shattered the dream of Greater Bulgaria. The new state of Bulgaria, now established as an 'autonomous and tributary principality under the suzerainty of the Sultan' was only a fragment of the state proposed by the Treaty of San Stefano. It was restricted to Bulgaria proper extending from the Danube to the Balkans and from the Black Sea to the frontiers of Serbia and Macedonia. The region to the south of the Balkan range, known as Eastern Roumelia was to remain within the Ottoman Empire, under the direct military and political authority of the Sultan, but administered by a Christian governor-general nominated by the Sultan, with the assent of the Powers, for a term of five years. Macedonia was to be returned to Turkey.

The provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano with regard to the independence of Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania were left untouched at Berlin. The provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the province of Novi-Bazar, while remained under the nominal suzerainty of the Sultan, were placed under the administrative charge of Austria. Turkey surrendered Cyprus to England. Russia was allowed to retain Southern Bessarabia, Kars and Batum. Rumania had to be content with the barren Dobruja. Turkey promised reforms and full religious liberty to all her subjects.

19.10. Significance Of The Treaty Of Berlin: The Congress and Treaty of Berlin were significant more for their effects on the alignment of the Great Powers than for their efforts to settle the fate of Turkey. The Prime Minister of England, Disraeli, who was one of the British representatives at the Congress of Berlin along with the Foreign Minister, Lord Salisbury, counted it as one of his greatest achievements. After the Congress, he made a triumphant return to England and boasted that he had obtained 'peace with honour'. Many at that time considered the results of the Congress of Berlin as a fine diplomatic victory for England. He had prevented war, checked Russian expansion, safeguarded the navigation of the Straits and secured Cyprus.

By the Treaty of Berlin Russia lost important advantages which she had secured by the Treaty of San Stefano and her influence in the Balkan Peninsula was weakened. The Russian plan to work through the Balkans directly over the ruins of Turkey or indirectly through vassal states carved out of Turkey to the Mediterranean was checked. However, Russia efforts to expand merely changed

direction. After 1878 Russia made an attempt to extend her influence in Asia, towards the Far East in Manchuria and towards the South in Persia and Afghanistan.

The settlement, which openly violated the legitimate claims of Bulgarian nationality, had no element of permanence. The separation of North and South Bulgaria lasted only till 1885 in which year the two regions were unified.

Germany secured the gratitude and friendship of the Sultan of Turkey and gained a new and useful ally for the future. However, Russia, the member of the League of Three Emperors nursed a profound sense of grievance, against her Allies, Austria and Germany. Russia felt cheated at the Congress of Berlin. An alienated Russia withdrew from the League of Three Emperors. This forced Bismarck to enter into a closer alliance with Austria in 1879, which created a vicious circle of alliances which was ultimately responsible for the division of Europe into two rival armed camps.

The Pan-Slav Movement received a setback. The occupation of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Novi Bazar by Austria stood in the way of the creation of Greater Serbia including Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro. This increased tension between Austria and Serbia.

The enduring significance of the Treaty of Berlin is to be found in the new nations which were arising from the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. Pan-Slavism had failed to solve the problems of the Balkans, but nationalism which involved important modifications of the Treaty of Berlin proved more successful. Rumania became a kingdom in 1881 and Serbia in 1882. In 1908, Ferdinand was proclaimed as the Tsar of Bulgaria and in 1910 Nicholas became the first king of Montenegro.

It is important to note that the Treaty of Berlin forms a great landmark not only in the history of the Eastern Question, but also in the European history. According to Taylor, "The Congress of Berlin made a watershed in the history of Europe. It had been preceded by thirty years of conflict and upheaval; it was followed by thirty-four years of peace. No European frontier was changed until 1913, not a shot was fired in Europe until 1912."

Questions

1. Examine the causes and consequences of the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78).
2. Trace the course of events that led to the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78).

3. Review the background of the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78) and analyze its impact on European politics.
4. Discuss the factors that led to the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78). Point out the significance of the Treaty of San Stefano (1878) and the Treaty of Berlin (1878)



20

ROAD TO WAR AND PEACE – I

DIPLOMACY AND SYSTEM OF ALLIANCES (1871-1907)

Objectives:

1. To understand the chief aims of Bismarck's foreign policy after 1871.
2. To analyze the circumstances that led to the emergence of the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy.
3. To trace the course of events that led to the formation of the Triple Entente between England, France and Russia.

20.1. Introduction: The European Diplomacy which ultimately led to the emergence of two rival systems of Alliances among the European Powers between 1870 and 1907 centered on the German Empire. For two decades from 1870 to 1890, Bismarck, the architect of German Unification and Chancellor of the German Empire was the driving force of European Diplomacy. Thereafter, Kaiser William II, the Emperor of Germany, took the wheels of German diplomacy in his own hands and precipitated a situation which finally brought the European continent to the brink of war.

20.2. Important European Powers: In order to understand the European Diplomacy between 1870 and 1907 it is important to take into consideration the important powers that existed in the European continent. Bismarck reasoned that there were five great powers – England, France, Austria, Russia and Germany. Italy and Turkey made very weak sixth and seventh powers respectively. From the day of its foundation, the German Empire became the

greatest power on the continent of Europe. Following her defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71), France for some time ceased to count in international affairs. Italy had only recently completed her unification and was much inferior in strength to the great military monarchies. Austria had been weakened by the defeats she had suffered in the course of German unification and by the turmoil of races within her borders. Russia appeared to be strong, but her losses in the Crimean War (1854-56) had shown the weakness of her military power. England alone was incapable of classification with the other great powers. Her military strength was quite small, while her naval power was overwhelming. She remained aloof from the European questions, and refusing to be entangled in alliances, remained for many years in 'splendid isolation'.

20.3. Aims Of Bismarck's Foreign Policy:

20.3.1. Preservation of European Peace: Bismarck believed that after her unification and transformation into an empire, Germany was a satiated power and that her best interests lay in supporting the *status quo*. He was particularly concerned that the rivalry between Austria and Russia in the Near East should not result in a war in which Germany would have to make a choice as to which power to support. Much of his efforts were devoted to solving the Eastern Question.

20.3.2. Concentration on European Issues: Bismarck believed that Germany's main interests lay in Europe, not in the Balkans, the Near East or Africa. He did not want a colonial empire and remarked: "My map of Africa lies in Europe." However, he was forced under popular pressure to seek colonial expansion.

20.3.3. Isolation of France: The Franco-Prussian War left bitter memories in France. It seemed probable that at an appropriate future date France would embark upon a war of revenge. Bismarck regarded this as the chief danger, which the German Empire had to face. However, Bismarck was convinced that by herself France would not be able to attack the German Empire with success. Hence, she might seek allies to wage a 'war of revenge' on Germany and attempt to recover Alsace and Lorraine. Therefore, Bismarck was determined to prevent France from obtaining allies and isolate her and ensure the safety of the German Empire.

20.3.4. Prevention of anti-German Coalition: Since France was unlikely to start a war, except with the support of an ally, Bismarck made it his policy to keep on good terms with Austria, Russia and England. This consideration led to the policy of forming alliances, important being the League of Three Emperors (*Dreikaiserbund*) and the Dual Alliance.

20.3.5. Diversion of other powers to non-European Activities:

Bismarck felt that the best way to prevent other powers from taking an active interest in interfering in European affairs at Germany's expense was to divert them to clashes with each other in areas where German interests were not involved. For example, he encouraged France in her ambitions in Africa, particularly in Tunis, so that she might forget the Rhine. Bismarck also encouraged England in Egypt and Italy in North Africa.

20.4. The Three Emperors' League (*Dreikaiserbund*): Between 1871 and 1890, the German Empire dominated the European affairs, and Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany became the chief arbiter of European politics. As mentioned above, the defeat of France and the loss of Alsace and Lorraine had left a deep sense of hurt among the French and their hope for the future were expressed in the single word *revanche* (revenge). Bismarck was apprehensive that in her attempt to avenge her defeat of 1871, France might secure allies. His attitude towards France was set forth in a letter to the German ambassador at Paris: "We want France to leave us in peace." He even indirectly encouraged the French in colonial enterprise so as to keep them occupied and divert their attention from any attempt of retaliation for their humiliating defeat in the hands of Germany.

However, Bismarck was well aware at heart that the breach between the two countries was irreparable. The rapid recovery of France since 1871, coupled with the swift reorganization of her military forces, gave additional weight to the warning publicly uttered by Moltke. "We have earned in the late war respect, but hardly love. What we have gained by arms in six months we shall have to defend by arms for fifty years." Under these circumstances Bismarck used all his energies to the task of isolating France in Europe. "We have to prevent France finding an ally," he wrote. Further he stated, "As long as France has no allies she is not dangerous to Germany."

With the above objective in mind, Bismarck struck an understanding among the three Great Powers of Eastern Europe (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia). This resulted in the so called The Three Emperors' League (*Dreikaiserbund*), which was an informal alliance among Austria, Germany, and Russia, announced officially in 1872 on the occasion of the meeting of Emperors William I,(Germany), Francis Joseph (Austria-Hungary), and Alexander II (Russia). The chief architects of the alliance were Bismarck, Julius Andrassy, and Prince Gorchakov. Though no actual treaty was concluded, the three Eastern Powers agreed to work together for "the maintenance of the boundaries recently laid

down, the settlement of problems arising from the Eastern Question, and the repression of revolutionary movements in Europe.” They also agreed to preserve the social order of the conservative powers of Europe and to cooperate with one another for the preservation of peace and to consult one another ‘in order to determine a common course of action’ in case of threat of war.

However, the Three Emperors’ League was doomed right from the beginning. The ideas of Austria-Hungary differed essentially from those of Russia. Austria-Hungary wished to absorb Serbia, to annex Salonica, but to preserve the Turkish Empire if she could. On the other hand, Russia wished to dominate Bulgaria, to annex Constantinople, and to break up the Turkish Empire if she could. Between these two extreme views there could be no real reconciliation.

The reopening of the Eastern Question in 1875 introduced a new factor into the situation. Bismarck was apprehensive that any rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia over the Balkan Peninsula might break up the Three Emperors’ League. Bismarck’s fears proved to be correct when the old conflict between Russia and Austria-Hungary was revived by the uprising in Herzegovina, a province of the Turkish Empire. The events in the Balkans and the Turkish Empire eventually led to the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78). At the Congress of Berlin (1878), Bismarck cooperated with Austria-Hungary which was allowed to take up the administrative charge of Bosnia and Herzegovina though the two provinces continued to be part of the Turkish Empire. This ‘ingratitude’ of Germany towards Russia angered the latter. The Tsar demanded that Bismarck should withdraw his support from Austria-Hungary or forfeit the friendship of Russia. This approach of Russia rudely shattered the Three Emperors’ League. As Bismarck continued his support to Austria-Hungary, Russia withdrew from the Three Emperors’ League in 1878.

20.5. The Austro-German Dual Alliance (1879): Withdrawal of Russia from the Three Emperors’ League prompted Bismarck to think seriously about a durable alliance with other power. Italy and England were hardly suitable for an alliance as Bismarck hated parliamentary states and did not think that any alliance with them could be permanent or stable. Thus, his choice was Austria-Hungary. The possibility of an understanding between Russia and France hastened Bismarck’s resolve to enter into an alliance with Austria-Hungary and the Treaty, which finally sealed the Austro-German Dual Alliance, was signed on 7 October 1879. It was in form, simply a defensive alliance.

The Austro-German Treaty, whose terms were not disclosed till 1887, provided that if either Austria or Germany was attacked by

Russia, they would assist each other with all their forces. However, in the event of an attack by any other Power (France), the allied country would observe 'benevolent neutrality'. If Russia joined France, either by active cooperation or military measures, Austria and Germany agreed to act together. The alliance was to continue for five years, with a possible extension of three years. It was renewed in 1883 and at subsequent intervals and, after 1902, was automatically renewed at the end of every three years till 1914.

20.6. Renewal Of The Three Emperors' League: Bismarck still wanted to keep Russian friendship after the signing of Dual Alliance (1879) with Austria. The year 1881 was particularly favourable for the restoration of the League of the three conservative Emperors. In that year, Tsar Alexander III ascended the Russian throne after the assassination of Alexander II. The fate of his father made Alexander III ready for a renewal of the Three Emperors' League of 1872 which promised to suppress the revolutionary movements.

On 18 June 1881, the Three Emperors' League was defined by a treaty signed at Berlin. By Article I, Austria-Hungary, Germany and Russia agreed to 'observe benevolent neutrality and to localize the war' if hostilities occurred between one of them and a fourth Great Power. This applied not only to France or perhaps England, but also to Turkey. In the latter case it was, however, stipulated that the three powers must reach a previous agreement as to the results of the war before Turkey was attacked. By Article II Russia recognized the Austro-Hungarian position in the Balkans as created by the Treaty of Berlin. By secret protocols attached to this Article, Austria-Hungary was to be allowed to annex Bosnia-Herzegovina whenever she chose, and to continue to occupy the Sanjak of Novibazar. Russia's compensation for this was that the other Powers undertook not to oppose but amicably arrange for the addition of Eastern Rumelia to Bulgaria, if and when produced by the force of circumstances. By Article III the three Powers agreed to compel Turkey to maintain the principle of closing the Straits of Constantinople to warlike operations.

The Treaty binding the Three Emperors' League was renewed in 1884, but expired in 1887, three years before Bismarck's fall. This treaty served a useful purpose. It enabled Bismarck to intervene with effect whenever friction arose between Russia and Austria-Hungary. However, this arrangement could not be permanent, and it broke down in the Bulgarian crisis of 1885-87.

20.7. The Triple Alliance (1882): By 1881 Germany was secure in Europe. He encouraged England and France in annexationist designs overseas. England occupied Egypt and France annexed

Tunis. Italy had long had her eye on Tunis, but Bismarck had thoughtfully omitted to inform her of France's intentions. Italy felt that she was being isolated and turned to Austria-Hungary for help. Thus, Bismarck managed to take advantage of the irritation of Italy against the annexation of Tunis by France by drawing her into an alliance.

On 20 May 1882, Italy, Germany and Austria-Hungary signed a Triple Alliance Treaty at Vienna. This treaty may be described as one of neutrality and guarantee. By this treaty Germany and Austria-Hungary undertook to assist Italy if she was attacked by France. Italy bound herself to render reciprocal aid to Germany under similar circumstances. In case one or two of the signatory Powers were attacked by two other Powers, that is Russia and France, all the signatory Powers would unitedly enter the war. In the case of an unprovoked attack by Russia alone upon Germany or Austria-Hungary, Italy was bound only to benevolent neutrality. The treaty was meant to last for five years and to be kept secret.

The Triple Alliance benefited Germany as it further isolated France. Bismarck obtained from Italy the promise of support against France which Austria-Hungary had refused. Italy's gains were even more. She was not bound to help either Germany or Austria-Hungary against an attack by Russia alone. On the other hand she was protected against Austria-Hungary by the very fact of the Alliance. The Triple Alliance was renewed in 1887 and certain changes were made in favour of Italy. Italy made agreements on two points with Germany and Austria-Hungary separately: (1) Germany promised Italy to support by arms her claims to Tripoli and to check those of France in Morocco, in return for a renewed Italian offer to aid Germany against France in Europe. (2) Austria recognized Italy's interests in the Balkans, thereby making a great concession. According to Prof. Fay, "The Triple Alliance in its wording and in its origin was essentially defensive in character and designed primarily to preserve the peace of Europe."

20.8. The Reinsurance Treaty (1887): The Three Emperors' League broke down in 1887. Russia and Austria-Hungary were in opposite camps on the question of Bulgaria. Bismarck had already bound Germany with Austria-Hungary through the Austro-German Dual Alliance of 1879. However, he could not afford to lose the goodwill of Russia. Bismarck feared that if left alone, Russia might join France in an alliance. Moreover, there was every possibility of a war between Russia and Austria-Hungary if Russia joined another camp. These factors prompted Bismarck to bring about the Russo-German Reinsurance Treaty which was signed on 18 June 1887.

The chief provisions of the Reinsurance Treaty were: (1) If one Power was at war with a third Great Power, the other would maintain benevolent neutrality and try to localize the conflict. (2) Germany recognized the predominant influence of Russia in Bulgaria, and agreed to prevent the restoration of Prince Alexander. (3) Maintenance of the principle of closing the straits of Constantinople, on the lines of the Treaty of the Three Emperors' League of 1881. The Reinsurance Treaty was to last for three years. It is important to note that the reinsurance Treaty renewed the friendship between Germany and Russia and prevented an Austro-Russian war. Moreover, it also prevented a Franco-Russian coalition.

A general survey of Bismarck's foreign policy between 1870 and 1890 shows that it was primarily inspired by the idea of keeping France isolated and enabling Germany to develop her new possessions and her enormous resources undisturbed. He encouraged Italy and England to rival France in colonial development so as to divert her attention from Alsace and Lorraine. He secured Germany against France by alliance with Italy, and against Russia by alliance with Austria. The problem Bismarck could not solve was how to remain on good terms, or in alliance, both with Austria and with Russia at once. Bismarck was bound more closely to Austria-Hungary than to Russia. However, with his downfall in 1890, the European diplomacy took a different direction.

20.9. Franco-Russian Dual Alliance (1893): The fall of Bismarck in 1890 brought about drastic changes in the European diplomacy. The immediate result was the liberation of France from the isolation which was imposed upon her by Bismarck for nearly two decades. The Reinsurance Treaty signed between Germany and Russia came to an end in 1890. William II, who had ascended the throne of Germany in 1888, refused to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia. Thus, William II gave up one of the cardinal principles of Bismarckian diplomacy, and thus, directly promoted the formation of the Franco-Russian Dual Alliance.

Since the end of the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71) the current of events had been steadily flowing in the direction of an alliance between France and Russia. The loss of Alsace and Lorraine converted France into the irreconcilable enemy of Germany, and the desire to wipe out the blot of national humiliation overpowered every other consideration in her mind. France realized that an alliance with Russia would put an end to her isolation and would give a guarantee against any unprovoked attack on the part of her neighbours. On her side Russia was also keen to have close relations with France. The rise of the German Empire had been a great blow to Russian pride. The superiority of the German military forces had made Germany a predominant power in Europe. It was

the Eastern Question, which shaped the course of events. The rivalry of Austria and Russia in the Balkans, and Bismarck's partiality towards Austria in the Congress of Berlin (1878) alienated Russia from both Austria and Germany.

From this moment onwards an alliance between Russia and France was only a matter of time. The diplomatic maneuvers of Bismarck and Alexander III's distrust of French democracy, continued for some years to delay the Franco-Prussia alliance. However, two circumstances hastened the conclusion of an alliance between these two Powers. In 1888 French financiers came to the support of the Russian government with huge loans. In 1890 Bismarck fell from power, and his successors, under the direction of Emperor William II followed a new line of policy. The next year the French fleet visited Cronstadt and received an official welcome from the Tsar. A Russian fleet made a return visit to Toulon in 1893. The Tsar and the President of the French Republic exchanged telegrams. These developments led to a Franco-Russian Military Convention which was signed on 31 December 1893. The Military Convention was of a defensive nature. By his Convention Russia agreed to assist France if attacked by Germany or by Italy supported by Germany. In return France agreed to assist Russia if attacked by Germany, or by Austria-Hungary supported by Germany. The clauses of the treaty were to be kept secret and the treaty was to last as long as the triple Alliance lasted.

The Franco-Russian Dual Alliance was revealed to the world only in January 1895. It was an event of great importance. The Franco-Russian Dual Alliance was opposed to the Triple Alliance and Germany had a formidable enemy on either side. Europe was thus divided into two armed camps.

20.10. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902): The nationalist and imperialist rivalries among the European Powers had disturbed the 'balance of power' particularly after 1900. The existence of the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, and a Dual Alliance of France and Russia had driven England into a 'splendid isolation'. On the eve of the twentieth century a considerable amount of anti-British cooperation between the two Continental alliances, especially in China and during the Boer War in South Africa alarmed England and caused it to depart from its traditional isolationist policy and to seek special friends abroad. To obtain them on the Continent was at first very difficult. On one hand an intense naval and commercial rivalry was developing with Germany; and on the other hand, imperialistic rivalry was acute with France in Africa and with Russia in the Far East.

England believed that it would be easier and more rewarding to obtain the friendly cooperation of Germany than that of the Dual

Alliance of France and Russia. England made overtures to Germany in 1901 for an understanding between the two countries. However, Germany insisted that England should join the Triple Alliance. However, England was unwilling to assume the definite and far-reaching commitments of that alliance. Thus, the Anglo-German negotiations broke down, and England looked elsewhere for allies.

In 1902, in order to check Russian advances in Asia, England entered into an alliance with Japan on 30 January 1902. The terms of the Anglo-Japanese alliance were as follows: Both Powers recognized the *status quo* in Eastern Asia, particularly in Korea and China. In case of war between Russia and Japan, England promised to be neutral. But if a second Power (France) came to the aid of Russia (or any other state at war with Japan), England promised to intervene and to support her ally with arms. The arrangement was to be valid for five years. In 1905 the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was renewed for ten years, with the added stipulation that both nations would fight if either should be attacked by a single Power in India as well as in the Far East.

20.11. Anglo-French Entente Cordiale (1904): Strengthened by an alliance with Japan in Asia, England next sought to safeguard her position in Africa through a friendly understanding with France. The British overtures were favourably received by the French Foreign minister, Delcasse, who was strongly anti-German and perceived the British overtures as an opportunity to secure for France another friend against Germany. Several Franco-British treaty conventions were signed in 1904. These conventions and agreements paved the way for the development of cordial cooperation between the peoples and governments of France and England, which came to be known as the *Entente Cordiale* or friendly understanding.

The *Entente Cordiale* was not an alliance. Neither England nor France was placed under a definite obligation to do anything particular in any future contingency. The object was to settle all the controversial questions, to heal all the sore points of contact between the British and French Empires in every part of the world. They were many-Newfoundland, Siam, Madagascar, Senegal, Egypt, and Morocco. However, it was found much easier to settle them all at once than to settle any one of them by itself. On any one point either England or France would have to give way; but when they were all taken together, a concession by one empire in one part of the world could be balanced by a concession by the other in another part. The most important problems by far were Egypt and Morocco. England had long been in Egypt; France was hoping soon to be in Morocco, which would round off the most important section of her African empire. France agreed to recognize the British position in Egypt. On the other hand England undertook

not to obstruct French action in Morocco provided that the coast opposite Gibraltar was left unfortified.

20.12. The Anglo-Russian Entente (1907): The Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) had highly important effects on the balance of power in Europe. The war in its early stages endangered the recently formed Anglo-French Entente by pitting Russia, the ally of France against Japan, the ally of England. British sentiment was then strongly anti-Russian, and the impressionable Russian Tsar seemed to be pro-German. However, with the final defeat of Russia, and the collapse of the project for a Russo-German Alliance, the situation changed radically. Russia reacted sharply against German influence, which was blamed, rather unjustly for the disastrous outcome of the Russo-Japanese War. On the other hand, England lost its fear of Russia and began to perceive advantages in coming to terms with France's ally.

Since France and Russia were allies, it seemed necessary that Anglo-French *Entente* should be followed by an *entente* with Russia. Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Minister of England set about bringing about this agreement with Russia. Consequently, in 1907, the British and Russian governments managed to arrive at a mutual understanding concerning disputed spheres of influence in Persia, Afghanistan, and China, and to sign conventions which were similar in character to the entente between England and France. Roughly speaking the agreement was that the Russian bear should be free to prowl in northern Persia and the British lion in southern Persia, and that there should be a middle zone where the Persians should be free from the attention of both these powers. Thus, the mutual ententes and agreements between France and Russia and Russia and England led to the emergence of the Triple Entente between England, France and Russia in 1907.

In Germany, meanwhile, many publicists and the government itself were viewing with alarm what was termed a 'hostile encirclement'. Italy was suspected of disloyalty to Germany and Austria-Hungary. Russia was allied with France. England was in *ententes* with France and Russia. Japan was allied with England. Austria-Hungary, alone of the great powers, stood by Germany. Thus, the division of Europe into two rival armed camps was complete by 1907, which ultimately led to the World War I.

Questions

1. What were the chief aims of Bismarck's foreign policy between 1871 and 1890? Review the measures taken by him to achieve these aims.
2. Trace the circumstances that led to the formation of the Triple Alliance.

3. Examine the course of events that led to the emergence of the Triple Entente.
4. Discuss the various stages through which Europe came to be divided into two systems of Alliances.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - a. The Three Emperor's League(1872)
 - b. The Reinsurance Treaty (1887)
 - c. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902)
 - d. The Anglo-French Entente Cordiale (1904)



21

ROAD TO WAR AND PEACE – II

CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF WORLD WAR I

Objectives:

1. To analyze the causes that led to World War I.
2. To briefly trace the course of the World War I.
3. To study the consequences of the World War I.

21.1. Introduction: The World War I (1914-18) involved more countries and caused greater destruction than any other war except World War II (1939-45). An assassin's bullets set off the war, and a system of military alliances plunged the main European powers into the conflict. Each side expected quick success, but the war lasted four years and took the lives of nearly ten million troops. The World War I was more widespread than any other previous war. The knowledge of science and technology was applied for producing new and more destructive weapons like machine guns, explosive shells, armoured tanks, submarines, airplanes and chemical and biological weapons. Unlike the previous wars, the World War I was a multi-dimensional war. It was fought on the land and under it in trenches, on the sea and under the sea and in the air. For the first time almost all countries of the world were directly or indirectly involved in it. Similarly, its impact was also felt by the entire world.

21.2. Causes Of The World War I: The assassination of the Austrian Prince Archduke Francis Ferdinand sparked the outbreak of the World War I. But historians believe that the war had deeper causes. Its causes are to be understood only by a consideration of the history of the continent since the establishment of the German Empire. The World War I resulted chiefly due to the secret military alliances, the growth of extreme national pride among various European people, an enormous increase in European armed forces and development of a military cult, a race for colonies and imperial rivalries and lack of an effective machinery to settle mutual disputes among the European nations which led to a number of armed conflicts.

21.2.1. Rise of Nationalism: Nationalism was the belief that loyalty to a person's nation and its political and economic goals comes before any other public loyalty. That exaggerated form of patriotism increased the possibility of war because a nation's goals inevitably came into conflict with the goals of one or more other nations. In addition, nationalistic pride caused nations to magnify small disputes into major issues. A minor dispute could thus quickly lead to the threat of war.

Nationalism in Germany became egoistic and aggressive. It was based on the theory of 'my country, right or wrong'. The Germans felt superior to others and believed in a manifest destiny to rule over Europe. German egoistic and aggressive nationalism was reflected through the war machine built up by Bismarck, industrial progress and German attitude towards other neighbouring states, especially France. France on the other hand, nursed the wounds of the humiliating defeat she had suffered in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71). The wounded and outraged nationalism of France demanded revenge on Germany.

There was suppressed and submerged nationalism in the eastern European empires of Austria-Hungary, Russia and Ottoman Turkey. Those empires ruled many national groups that clamoured for independence. Conflicts among national groups were especially explosive in the Balkans. The Balkan Peninsula in southern Europe was known as the 'Powder Keg of Europe' because tensions there threatened to ignite a major war. Most of the Balkans had been part of the Ottoman Empire. First Greece and then Montenegro, Serbia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania won independence in the period from 1812 to 1913. Each state quarrelled with neighbours over boundaries. Austro-Hungary and Russia also took advantage of the Ottoman Empire's weakness to increase their influence in the Balkans.

Rivalry for control of the Balkans added to the tensions that erupted into the World War I. Serbia led a movement to unite the Slavs of

the regions. Russia, the most powerful Slavic country, supported the Serbian move. But Austria-Hungary feared Slavic nationalism, which stirred unrest in its empire. Millions of Slavs were the subjects of the Austria-Hungarian Empire. In 1908 Austria-Hungary greatly angered Serbia by annexing the Balkan territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbia wanted control of those lands as many Serbs inhabited those territories.

21.2.2. System of Military Alliances: Bismarck, the architect of the unification of Germany and the Chancellor of the German Empire was chiefly responsible for the division of Europe into two rival alliance system. In his attempt to isolate France, Bismarck entered into a number of alliances and agreements. The first of these agreements was the League of Three Emperors (Germany, Austria and Russia). Following the withdrawal of Russia from the League of Three Emperors (1878), Bismarck brought about the Dual Alliance (Germany and Austria) in 1879. When Italy joined the Dual Alliance in 1881, the Dual Alliance was converted into the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria and Italy). Later Bulgaria and Turkey also joined the Triple alliance. Members of the Triple Alliance were known as the 'Central Powers'. In order to keep Russia in the orbit of the Triple Alliance and prevent a possible Alliance between Russia and France, Bismarck managed to strike an understanding with Russia through the Re-insurance Treaty (1887) whose terms were to be renewed periodically.

The accession of Kaiser William II and the resignation of Bismarck in 1890 brought about drastic changes in the foreign policy of Germany. Kaiser William's refusal to renew the Re-insurance Treaty with Russia liberated the later from the orbit of the Triple Alliance and brought her closer to France into an alliance in 1895. England and Japan concluded an alliance in 1902. After resolving their mutual colonial differences, England and France entered into an alliance in 1904, which came to be known as the *Entente Cordiale*. In the same manner, England and Russia also came to an understanding in 1907. Thus, the mutual agreements and alliances between England, France and Russia led to the emergence of the Triple Entente. The members of the Triple Entente were also known as the Allies.

21.2.3. Militarism and Race for Armaments: Military Alliances divided Europe into two rival armed camps. The vast majority of Europeans hoped that disputes between these camps would be settled by negotiations. But the anxiety of the governments to negotiate from strength led them to increase their armed forces. No government was prepared to renounce war as an instrument of policy. The competition in armaments involved a very heavy financial burden on the great powers.

By the beginning of the twentieth century except England all European powers had adopted compulsory military service. As a

result the continental powers possessed not only substantial peacetime armies, but they had also vast reserves of men with military training. The powers also had equally formidable stocks of weapons, both of small arms and of artillery. The killing power of these weapons grew steadily with technological improvement.

The destructive power of the twentieth century weapons was particularly evident at sea. The navy which Tirpitz constructed for Germany was led by vast steel *dreadnoughts*, armed with twelve-inch guns of great power. England, so far had been a superior naval power. Furious competition followed between Germany and England, as each sought to build more *dreadnoughts* and lighter warships. Even other European nations did not lag behind.

The arms race between the members of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente was a source of ill-will and of tension. It excited public opinion, and it inflamed national passions. The camps were armed to the teeth and popular nationalism, stirred by the cheap press and inflamed by economic rivalry, was beginning to focus hatred on emotional issues like Alsace and Lorraine in France, the naval race in England and Germany and the Slav problem in Austria-Hungary. When war came in 1914 a German poet helped to focus nationalism and hatred still more sharply. 'Hate by water and hate by land; Hate of the heart and hate of the hand; we love as one; we hate as one; we have but one foe - England'.

21.2. 4. Imperialism and Colonial Conflicts: During the late 1800's and early 1900's, European powers embarked on the course of imperialism. With the progress of the Industrial Revolution, the European countries were in search of regions which would provide them with cheap raw materials and serve as markets for their manufactured goods. Guided by these chief motives industrially advanced countries of Europe engaged themselves in the race for colonies. In the nineteenth century the continent of Africa was partitioned by the European imperialists. The Asian countries also became the victims of European imperialism. China was divided into spheres of influence by European imperialist powers. As an industrially advanced Asian country, Japan too joined the race for colonies on the main land of Asia.

The simultaneous overseas expansion of European powers brought them into frequent conflicts in different parts of the world. The colonial rivalries added to the tensions which were growing in Europe. The British proposal to construct the Cape-Cairo Railway in Africa clashed with the imperialist interests of Germany, Belgium and France. The project of the Trans-Siberian Railway of Russia and Russian penetration into the Far East was partly responsible for the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05). Kaiser William II's imperialist policy was viewed with great suspicion by the British. He was eager to build a railway from Berlin to Baghdad, and it was begun in 1899 although remained uncompleted in 1914. The British

saw the railway as a threat to their interests in the Middle East. The Franco-German rivalry over Morocco nearly plunged European powers into a war. However, diplomatic skills avoided a conflict for the time being.

21.2.5. Policies of Kaiser William II: The German Emperor William I died in 1888, and after the brief reign of his son Frederick, William II came to the throne. The young Kaiser was a very different man from the ageing Chancellor, Bismarck. Bismarck was a shrewd statesman and calculating diplomat. The Kaiser, on the other hand, was at the mercy of his moods and emotions. He was born with a deformity which crippled one of his arms. Being afflicted with a handicap which, if he had been a private citizen, would have excluded him from a military career, he nonetheless found himself 'supreme war lord' of the greatest military power in the world, and he was resolved to prove himself equal to his position.

The old chancellor had been content with military predominance in Europe. The new Kaiser looked beyond Europe, and in both directions. He wanted to build a supreme navy to dominate the Atlantic and desired to extend German influence beyond Austria to Turkey. In 1898 the Kaiser made a spectacular tour to Constantinople and Jerusalem. He proclaimed his friendship with the Sultan Abdul Hamid. This double policy of expansion, on sea to the west and overland to the east antagonized both England and Russia. The Kaiser could never correctly calculate the indirect consequences of his actions because he could never understand any other point of view except his own.

21.3. International Crisis

21.3.1. The Moroccan Crisis (1905): By the terms of the *Entente Cordiale*, the British accepted the French position in Morocco and return the French accepted England's privileged position in Egypt. However, Kaiser William II, who had been coveting Morocco, objected to this arrangement. He visited Tangier during a Mediterranean cruise and loudly upheld the independence of the Sultan of Morocco against French infiltration. He thus challenged the French position in Morocco and the newly made *Entente Cordiale*. This was typical of the rash, impetuous policy of the young Kaiser.

The result of the Moroccan crisis was that it drew England and France closer and plunged Europe into a political crisis. The Kaiser demanded that the Moroccan question should be submitted to an international conference. The conference met at Algeciras in January, 1906. At the Algeciras conference William II was dismayed when only Austria-Hungary supported the German argument. England and Russia supported France, arguing that

administrative reform and better policing were needed in Morocco, and Italy and USA agreed, though keeping a lower profile.

21.3.2. Annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria (1908): The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 forced the Ottoman Sultan, Abdul Hamid to grant a constitution to Turkey. The Young Turks, who were eager to introduce western liberalism into the Ottoman Empire were supported by certain officers in the army. Fearing the loss of her hold on Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had been placed under her administrative charge by the Treaty of Berlin (1878), Austria annexed these provinces.

Serbia had for many years hoped for a union with Bosnia and Herzegovina, which were inhabited by Slavs. Hence, she protested the unilateral annexation of these provinces by Austria and was supported by Russia. A European war seemed imminent. But the German Emperor informed the Tsar that, if Russia assisted Serbia against Austria, Germany would aid her ally. Russia hesitated to risk a war following her humiliating defeat in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), and gave way. Thus, Serbia was forced to withdraw her protest, and the Austrian annexations were recognized by the powers. This incident led to a bitter hatred among the Serbs against Austria which finally led to the assassination of the Austrian Archduke.

21.3.3. The Agadir Crisis (1911): Following the breakdown of law and order in 1911, French troops occupied Fez, the country's northern capital. The Kaiser promptly challenged the French again. He argued that this was a breach of the Algeciras Act and sent a German gunboat, *Panther* to the Agadir port on the Atlantic coast, allegedly to protect German interests. Germany also demanded compensation from the French territories in Central Africa. For weeks there was acute danger of war. Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, made a very warlike speech which encouraged France and exasperated Germany. In the end Germany contented herself with a small slice of French Equatorial Africa, which was added to the German colony of Cameroon.

21.3.4. The Balkan Wars (1912-13): There was uneasy peace in the Balkan Peninsula. By the year 1912, except Macedonia, the entire region was liberated from the Turkish domination.

The Balkan nations dropped their rivalries and formed the Balkan League against Turkey. The members of the Balkan League were Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro. They asserted their solidarity and common interest in freeing the Balkans from foreign powers. However, what they underestimated was that, while it was easy to agree on hostility to the Ottoman Empire, it would be less easy to reconcile their own conflicting ambitions when it came to dividing the spoils.

In the First Balkan War (1912-1913) the Turkish forces were completely defeated and the Sultan appealed for the mediation of the great powers. Before the end of 1912 a conference assembled in London to work out a settlement which would be internationally acceptable. By the Treaty of London (May, 1913) Turkey surrendered most of her European dominions to the victors.

Dissensions appeared among the members of the Balkan League on the issue of sharing the territories surrendered by the Sultan. Serbia and Bulgaria could not agree about the partition of Macedonia, and Bulgaria suddenly attacked Serbia. But she was defeated by the combination of Serbs, Greeks and Romanians, and the Second Balkan War ended with the Treaty of Bucharest (August, 1913). By this treaty Serbia secured northern and central Macedonia, while southern Macedonia, with the port of Salonika, was assigned to Greece. Bulgaria had to be satisfied with eastern Macedonia and part of Thrace.

The importance of the Balkan wars lay in the fact that they emphasized the gains which could be won in a short and quick local war. The Ottoman Empire had lost almost all its Balkan possessions. Attention seemed certain now to begin to focus on the Habsburg Empire, where subject races were still not free. Nationalist ambitions brought the new Balkan states into conflicts among themselves, and they looked for supporters among the major powers.

21.3.5. Assassination Of Archduke Francis Ferdinand Of Austria: Out of the Balkan wars Serbia emerged with increased territories and enhanced prestige. The disfavour with which Austria had for many years regarded Serbia was increased by these events. She feared that Serbia would champion the cause of the oppressed Slav peoples within the Austrian Empire. Thus Austria desired to check Serbia, if needed even by the use of force.

The crisis came without warning in June, 1914. The Archduke of Austria, Francis Ferdinand and his wife, Sophie were shot dead in Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia on 28 June 1914. On the following morning *The Times* carried the headline: *Austrian heir shot. Double assassination. Bombs and bullets in Sarajevo.*

The assassin was Gavrilo Princip, a member of the secret society of *Young Bosnia*, and his weapons had been supplied by the *Black Hand*, a secret society in Serbia. Its aim was to bring about the union of all Serbs by a ruthless campaign of violence. The Austrian government chose to regard the murder as having been inspired by the Serbian government. Austria delivered an ultimatum to Serbia. The Serbian government was required to renounce all propaganda directed against Austria-Hungary, to suppress all propaganda within Serbia and to dismiss all officials associated with it. It was to report the measures taken to Vienna and "to accept the

collaboration in Serbia of representatives of the Austro-Hungarian Government for the purpose of suppressing the subversive movement directed against the territorial integrity of the Habsburg monarchy". Austria-Hungary gave Serbia forty-eight hours to reply.

The Serbians accepted most of the Austrian terms, but they asked that others be referred to the Court of Arbitration at The Hague, or to an international conference. They could not agree to the policing of Serbian affairs by Austro-Hungarian 'representatives'. Austria was bent on war, and the ultimatum was little more than a formality. The Serbian reply was brushed aside. Austro-Hungarian troops were mobilized, and war was declared on Serbia on 28 July 1914.

21.4. Course of the World War I: With the declaration of war by Austria on Serbia on 28 July 1914, the World War I began. Russia mobilized her troops in favour of Serbia. As Russia refused to halt the mobilization as demanded by Germany, she declared war on Russia on 1 August 1914. Germany also declared war on France on 3 August 1914, as France refused to be neutral. When German army invaded Belgium on 4 August, England declared war on Germany as the neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed by the European powers. Italy was a member of the Triple Alliance along with Germany and Austria. However, she was not prepared to help Austria and Germany in their aggressive wars. Italy made a secret agreement with France and remained neutral till 1915. Later Italy joined the Allies being promised that the territories inhabited by Italians which were within the Austrian Empire would be granted to her.

Russia invaded Germany and Austria. However, the Russian army was neither well trained nor well equipped. The Germans defeated Russians and occupied Russian Poland. Following the success of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, Russia withdrew from the World War I by signing the Treaty of Brest Litovsk.

Turkey entered the war in 1914 on the side of the Central Powers (Germany and Austria-Hungary). In February 1915, England inflicted a crushing defeat on Turkey and captured the straits of Dardanelles and the port of Constantinople.

The Allies also attacked the German colonies in Western and Eastern Africa. They also deprived Germany of her concessions in China. Alarmed by these successes of the Allies, Germany intensified the submarine warfare and sunk a number of British ships. England and France launched a counter offensive and inflicted heavy losses on the Germans.

The United States of America remained neutral when the World War I broke out. In May a German U-boat sank a British steamer *Lusitania* with 1,200 passengers including 100 Americans. This created a strong public opinion in the United States for joining the war on the side of the Allies. Besides, Germany violated the

freedom of seas and the Americans came to know about a secret plan of Germany to attack Mexico and Japan. Under these circumstances, the United States declared war on Germany on 6th April 1917 and on Austria in December 1917. The entry of the United States was a turning point in the World War I. It greatly strengthened the Allies by placing at their disposal enormous resources in men, money and material and boosted the morale of the Allies.

In the Eastern sector Greece helped the Allies in scoring a victory over the Central Powers. Bulgaria, which had joined the Central Powers, was defeated in September 1918. One by one the Central Powers were defeated. On 9th November 1918, Kaiser William II fled to Holland and on 11 November 1918, Germany signed the armistice with the Allies.

21.5. Consequences Of World War I : The World War I had far reaching consequences on the subsequent history of Europe in particular and world in general. The World War I produced disastrous consequences in the field of politics, economy and society. There was greater political instability in the war ravaged countries as their governments were unable to solve the post-war economic and social problems. This consequently led to the rise of dictatorships in different countries of Europe. The dictators were to shape the future course of the European history leading the world to another major catastrophe. The chief results of the World War I are the following:

21.5.1. Loss of Human Lives and Destruction: The World War I caused immeasurable destruction. Nearly ten million soldiers died as a result of the war - far more than had died in all the wars during the previous 100 years. About twenty one million men were wounded. No one knows how many civilians died of disease, starvation and other war related causes. Some historians believe that as many civilians died as soldiers.

Belligerent governments had spent more than £ 40,000,000,000 in pursuit of victory. The cost of devastation was incalculable. Property damage in the World War I was greatest in France and Belgium. Armies destroyed farms and villages as they passed through them. The war resulted in the destruction of factories, bridges and railroad tracks. Artillery shells, trenches and chemicals made the land barren along the Western Front.

21.5.2. Damage to European Industry and Trade: The real problem for the European nations in the post-war years was to restore Europe to its pre-war position in world trade and industrial production. For four years Europe had been shut out of world markets and new competitors, the United States, Japan and South America had taken over her markets. The war was followed by a

boom in production caused by the need to rebuild industry and towns, to replace basic consumer goods which were in short supply. The boom broke in 1921, and though there was a slow improvement up to 1929, the World Trade depression of 1929-31 hit trade and industry not only in Europe, but all over the world. Thus, Europe was unable to regain her former position in the international trade and industrial production which she had enjoyed in the years before the war.

The burden of war debts, the growth of tariffs, the fall in the prices of raw materials and foodstuffs which hindered the less developed countries from buying industrial goods, the weakness of national currencies, the lack of a stable system of international finance, the decline in demand for the basic industrial products of Europe such as coal, iron and steel, textile and ships, all these factors kept European exports low and unemployment high. The European nations had changed from creditor nations to debtor nations.

Nations involved in the war raised part of the money to pay for the war through income taxes and other taxes. But most of for the war through income taxes and other taxes. But most of the money came from borrowing, which created huge debts. Governments borrowed from citizens by selling war bonds. The Allies also borrowed heavily from the United States. In addition, most governments printed extra money to meet their needs. But the increased money supply caused severe inflation after the war. The Allies tried to reduce their debts by demanding reparations from the Central Powers, especially Germany. Reparations worsened the economic problems of the defeated countries and did not solve the problems of the victors.

21.5.3. Changes in the European Society: The World War I brought enormous changes in society. Europe's rising population was checked only temporarily by the War, by the influenza epidemic which followed it and by the further upheavals such as those in Russia. The rate of increase in population nevertheless slowed down in the twentieth century. Developing technology, improved nutrition and advance in medicine helped in increasing the standards of living and better quality of life.

Many people chose not to resume their old ways of life after the War. Urban areas grew as peasants settled in cities instead of returning to farms. Women filled jobs in offices and factories after men went to war, and they were reluctant to give up their new independence. Many countries recognized the right of vote women. In England women over thirty were given the right to vote in 1918.

The distinction between social classes began to blur as a result of the World War I and society became more democratic. The upper classes, which had traditionally governed, lost some of their power and privileges after the war. Men of all classes had faced the same

danger and horror in the trenches. Those who had bled and suffered for their country came to demand a say in running it.

21.5.4. Political Impact

(a) Establishment of Democratic Republics: Germany set up the Weimar Republic with its parliamentary constitution to replace the old empire. Austria also became a democratic republic. The establishment of the League of Nations with forty-one members in 1920 raised democratic government to the international level and stressed the liberal principles of world peace and the rule of law.

(b) Rise of New Nations: The World War I resulted in the end of monarchies, collapse of empires and rise of new nations. The first monarch to fall was Tsar Nicholas II of Russia in 1917. Kaiser William II of Germany and Emperor Charles of Austria-Hungary left their thrones in 1918. The Ottoman Sultan, Muhammad VI, fell in 1922. The collapse of old empires led to the creation of new nations on the basis of the principle of self determination proclaimed by the United States President Woodrow Wilson. The pre-war territory of Austria-Hungary formed the independent republics of Austria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, as well as parts of Italy, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Russia and Germany also gave up territory to Poland. Finland and Baltic states-Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania gained independence from Russia. Most of the Arab lands in the Ottoman Empire were placed under the control of France and Britain. The rest of the Ottoman Empire became Turkey. Collapse of the empires and rise of new nations led to the redrawing the map of Europe.

(c) Emergence of Dictatorship: Outside Britain and France the democratic honeymoon in Europe was brief. The war had devastated the countries. The European democracies, apart from England with her solid two-party system, had parliaments based on five or six different political groups. Their governments were based on coalitions with narrow majorities. This weakened the democratic governments. They were unable to solve the post war economic problems and provide strong and stable government. Thus, the post-war Europe witnessed the rise of dictatorships in various countries. Fascist dictatorship was established in Italy under Mussolini; Nazi dictatorship in Germany under Hitler; Communist dictatorship in Russia under Stalin and military dictatorship in Japan under Tojo. Dictators also emerged in Spain (General Franco), Portugal (Dr. Salazar) and Turkey (Mustafa Kemal Pasha).

(d) Change in the European Balance of Power: The war and peace settlement destroyed the old balance of power in Europe. Communist Russia withdrew into isolation. The Turkish and Austrian Empires were broken up. The new nations which arose out of the peace settlement, such as Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia were not strong enough to fill up the power vacuum created in

Europe. When Germany grew strong again under Hitler she was able to dominate the new Europe more easily.

21.5.5. The Peace Settlement: The terms of the peace settlement which followed the World War I were debated around the programme of war and peace aims included in President Wilson's *Fourteen Points*. Wilson believed that the Fourteen Points would bring about a just peace settlement, which he termed "peace without victory". In November 1918, Germany agreed to an armistice. Germany expected that the peace settlement would be based on the Fourteen Points.

In May 1919, the Peace Conference approved the Treaty of Versailles and presented it to Germany. Germany agreed to it only after the Allies threatened to invade her territory. With grave doubts, German representatives signed the treaty in the Palace of Versailles near Paris on 28 June 1919. The date was the fifth anniversary of the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand.

In addition to the treaty of Versailles with Germany, the peace-makers drew up separate treaties for the other Central Powers. The Treaty of St. Germaine was imposed on Austria in September 1919, the Treaty of Neuilly with Bulgaria in November 1919, the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary in June 1920 and the Treaty of Sevres with the Ottoman Empire in August 1920.

By the Treaty of Versailles, Germany gave up territories to Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France and Poland and lost her overseas colonies. France gained control of coal fields in Germany's Saar Valley for 15 years. An Allied military force, paid for by Germany, was to occupy the west bank of the River Rhine for 15 years. Other clauses in the treaty limited Germany's armed forces and required the country to turn over materials, ships livestock and other goods to the Allies. A total sum of reparations was not fixed until 1921. The total indemnity to be paid by Germany was fixed at \$ 33 billion by a Reparation Commission.

The Treaty of St. Germaine and the Treaty of Trianon reduced Austria-Hungary to less than a third of their original area. The treaties recognized the independence of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia. These new states, along with Italy and Rumania, received territory that had belonged to Austria-Hungary. The Treaty of Sevres deprived the Ottoman Empire of Egypt, Lebanon, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria and Trasjordan. Bulgaria lost territory to Greece and Rumania. Germany's allies also had to reduce their armed forces and pay reparations.

21.5.6. Encouragement to Nationalism: The ideals of Woodrow Wilson, such as the justification of the U.S. entry into World War I 'to make the world safe for democracy' and 'the principle of self-determination of the people' greatly inspired and encouraged the people of Asia, struggling under the European imperialism. In many

of the Asian countries such as in India, national movements were already in progress. The colonial powers under pressing demands from the nationalist organizations such the Indian National Congress in India were forced to grant some measure of political reforms to their respective colonies. In India the Mont-ford Reforms were introduced in 1919, providing for - Diarchy in the provinces through which partial representative and responsible government was introduced at the provincial level.

21.5.7. Foundation of the League of Nations: The horrors of death and destruction witnessed during the World War I convinced leaders all over the world that war must be avoided and peace should be promoted. Woodrow Wilson in his Fourteen Points made a provision for the establishment of the League of Nations bound by a Covenant or agreement to prevent war and to settle aggression or disputes between nations by peaceful means and the rules of international law.

Questions

1. Analyze the factors that led to World War I.
2. Discuss the causes and consequences of World War I.
3. Trace the course of events that led to the World War I.
4. Critically examine the results of the World War I.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Military Alliances
 - (b) International Crisis
 - (c) Immediate cause of World War I
 - (d) Political Impact of World War I



ROAD TO WAR AND PEACE – III

PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE**Objectives:**

1. To trace the circumstances that led to the Paris Peace Conference (1919).
2. To understand the different approach of the 'Big Four'.
3. To analyze the Treaty of Versailles (1919) and to point out its impact on Germany.
4. To study the other treaties imposed on other defeated Central Powers.

22.1. Introduction: In January 1919, diplomats gathered at the Versailles Palace near Paris to negotiate a peace treaty to end World War I. The Paris Peace Conference of 1919 was a conference organized by the victors of World War I to negotiate the peace treaties between the Allied and Associated Powers and the defeated Central Powers. The conference opened on 18 January 1919 and lasted until 21 January 1920 with a few intervals. The high cost of the war, in terms of both human life and money, made negotiations difficult, and it is not surprising that the resulting treaties have long since been the subject of contentious analysis, opinion and debate.

22.2. Fourteen Points Of Woodrow Wilson: The 'Fourteen Points' were listed in a speech delivered by President Woodrow Wilson of the United States to a joint session of the United States Congress on 8 January 1918. In his speech, Wilson intended to outline a blueprint for lasting peace in Europe after World War I. The idealism displayed in the speech gave Wilson a position of moral leadership among the Allies, and encouraged the Central Powers to surrender.

The speech was delivered over 10 months before the Armistice with Germany ended World War I, but the Fourteen Points became the basis for the terms of the German surrender, as negotiated at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and documented in the Treaty

of Versailles. The Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson are the following:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.
2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.
3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.
4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.
5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.
6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia.
7. Belgium must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations.
8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.
9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.
10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.
11. Romania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to

one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of an autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

Eight of Wilson's Fourteen Points dealt with specific political and territorial settlements. The rest of them set forth general principles aimed at preventing future wars. The last point proposed the establishment of the League of Nations.

The basis of the peace conference was not, as has sometimes been asserted, the Armistice, but the pre-Armistice negotiations. These resulted from Germany's suing for peace on 3 October 1918. In ultimate result the Allies made an offer on 5 November 1918. They stated that peace could be had on the basis of the terms laid down in Wilson's speeches of 8 January 1918, which had listed the Fourteen Points. Germany signified her consent to this whole offer on 5 November 1918 and signed the Armistice on 11 November 1918, which was intended to be purely military and naval in character.

22.3. Paris As The Venue Of The Peace Conference: It had been decided to exclude the enemy states from the Peace Conference until the Allies should have agreed among themselves upon the terms of peace. It had been also decided that the Peace Conference should be held at Paris, the very centre of Allied hostility to Germany. The inaugural session of the Peace conference was held on 18 January 1919 in the Hall of Mirrors of the Versailles Palace. It was on the same date forty-eight years ago

and in the same Hall of Mirrors that the king of Prussia, in the midst of a successful war against France was proclaimed as the German Emperor.

22.4. The 'Big Four': The Peace Conference was attended by foremost statesmen and diplomats from thirty-two Allied and 'Associated' countries, except Russia. The Peace Conference, after its formal inauguration on 18 January 1919, met rarely. The real work of the Conference was done by special committees of diplomats and 'experts' selected as needs arose, and it was done in privacy. For all practical purposes the Paris Peace Conference was dominated by the 'Big Four' – Clemenceau, the Prime Minister of France, Lloyd George, the Prime Minister of England, Orlando, the Prime Minister of Italy and Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States. It was they who took important decisions in the peace process.

Clemenceau was an old man of nearly eighty. He had been Prime Minister throughout the last year of the war, and was affectionately known as 'the Tiger'. He had a much more profound and detailed knowledge of the problems of Europe than the other members of the 'Big Four'. He was the only one among the four who was fluent in all the three languages, French, English and Italian. Moreover he was not an idealist like Woodrow Wilson and cared nothing for the latter's 'Fourteen Points' or his League of Nations. His only interest was the security of France. The purpose of the treaty, in Clemenceau's mind, was to convert the victory into a permanent security for France. To him nothing else mattered.

President Woodrow Wilson was quite different in his outlook. He had crossed the Atlantic to supervise the reconstruction of a new and better world. The United States had no selfish aims, and had no need to be anxious for her security. All that Wilson wanted was a peace that would do justice to all. Unfortunately he was ignorant of the complexities of European problems, and he showed himself stubborn and unskillful in discussion. Like Clemenceau and Lloyd George, he did not have a lifelong experience as a parliamentary politician. He had been a professor of political science, principal of a university, governor of a state, and finally president. Moreover, while Clemenceau and Lloyd George really represented the democratic vote of their countries, Wilson had ceased to do so. The American elections of November 1918 had gone against him. However, due to the peculiarity of the American constitution, he was secure for another two years in his presidential office.

Midway between Clemenceau and Wilson was Lloyd George, who had been Prime Minister of England for the last two years of the war. His attitude was much less clearly defined as he was a man of action and expediency rather than a man of thought and principle.

As a liberal idealist he might have been expected to side with Wilson. However, in the British general election, held between the armistice and the peace conference, he had made many rash promises in response to the blind hatred of Germany which he found to prevail at election meetings. In particular he had promised to make Germany pay, as far as possible, for the entire cost of the war. This approach of Lloyd George suited Clemenceau as it would prolong the economic ruin of Germany.

Orlando, the Italian Prime Minister, was a less distinguished person than his colleagues. Since Italy's war had been primarily against Austria, he was not much concerned with the treaty with Germany. His aim was to make sure that Italy got as much as possible on the east side of the Adriatic at the expense of what had been Austria and had now become Yugoslavia. However, in this respect Orlando faced stiff opposition of Wilson and indifference of Clemenceau. In spite of this Italy secured a good deal: the Triol with a quarter of a million Austrian Germans, the Port of Trieste, and a good deal of coastland beyond it, including Fiume which was seized by an Italian expedition in defiance of the peace conference.

22.5. The Treaty Of Versailles :The draft of the proposed peace treaty with Germany, containing about 80,000 words, was agreed to by the 'Big Four' and endorsed by the Peace Conference in plenary session on 6 May 1919. On the following day the German delegates were admitted to the Peace Conference and presented with the draft of the treaty. The German delegates protested that it was intolerably severe and contradictory of the 'Fourteen Points' on the basis of which they had consented to the armistice. They pleaded for its radical amendment.

The publication of the peace terms sent a wave of bitterness all over Germany. The Allies were condemned for their treachery and deceit. The German government submitted a detailed memorandum on the treaty. Following these developments a few minor alterations were made in the original treaty on the suggestion of Lloyd George and the revised treaty was given to the Germans and was given five days to accept the same and was warned that if they failed to do so, their country would be invaded. Under this pressure the German Constituent Assembly at Weimar finally voted to accept unconditionally the Allied terms of peace on 23 June 1919.

On 28 June 1919, in the Hall of Mirrors in the stately old Palace of Louis XIV, the Treaty of Versailles was signed by the representatives of Germany and of thirty-one nations which had joined against Germany and the other Central Powers. One of the thirty-two delegations on the Allied side, China, refused to sign the Treaty of Versailles because of concessions to Japan. The scene

was that in which in 1871 the Hohenzollern Empire had been proclaimed, and the date was that on which in 1914 the Archduke Francis Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary had been assassinated. The World War I was thus formally ended on the fifth anniversary of the immediate occasion of its beginning.

The chief provisions of the Treaty of Versailles were the following:

22.5.1. Territorial Adjustments: The Treaty of Versailles was the price, which Germany paid for her defeat in the First World War. She lost territory both in Europe and overseas. The map of Europe was redrawn. By the terms of the treaty: (1) Germany ceded Alsace and Lorraine to France 'to redress the wrong done by Germany in 1871'. (2) Small districts including the towns of Eupen and Malmady were ceded to Belgium. (3) Posen and a 'corridor' about 60 miles wide separating Pomerania and East Prussia, to provide an access to the Baltic sea were granted to the newly created state of Poland. (4) Germany surrendered the important Baltic port of Danzig, which became an international 'free city'. (5) The Saar Basin was provisionally severed from the German Empire, 'as compensation for the destruction of the coal mines in the north of France and as part payment towards the total reparation due from Germany'. (6) In the north the fate of northern and central Schleswig, wrested from Denmark in 1864, was determined by a plebiscite. The northern Schleswig voted for incorporation in Denmark and the central zone voted for Germany. (7) The treaty provided for the cession of Mamel to the Allies. However, Mamel was appropriated by Lithuania in 1923. (8) After a plebiscite, Upper Silesia was divided between Germany and Poland. (9) Germany recognized the independence of Belgium, Poland Czechoslovakia and German Austria.

In addition to territorial loss in Europe, Germany parted with all her overseas possessions. (1) Her lease of Kiachow and privileged position in the Chinese province of Shantung, as well as her Pacific islands north of the equator, were transferred to Japan. (2) Germany's portion of Samoa was given to New Zealand. (3) Other Pacific possessions south of the equator were ceded to Australia. (4) German South-West Africa was given to the Union of South Africa. German East Africa was shared between Britain and Belgium. Cameroon and Togoland were divided between Britain and France. In most cases the powers receiving German colonies did so not as absolute sovereigns but as mandatories of the League of Nations.

22.5.2. Restrictions on Military and Naval Power: In order to make Germany militarily weak, severe restrictions were placed on her armed forces and manufacture of armaments. Accordingly:

- (1) Germany promised to reduce her army to 100,000 men.

- (2) Compulsory military service was abolished and voluntary enlistment was to be for a period of twelve years for private soldiers and twenty-five years for officers.
- (3) Germany agreed to reduce her navy to six battle-ships, six light cruisers and twelve torpedo boats. However, no submarines were allowed.
- (4) Germany gave up military and naval aviation.
- (5) The entire area west of the river Rhine and a zone fifty kilometers to the east of the Rhine was demilitarized. All fortifications were to be destroyed and garrisons were prohibited.
- (6) Germany also agreed to demolish fortifications at Heligoland, to open the Kiel Canal to all nations, to refrain from building forts on the Baltic and to surrender her trans-oceanic cables.
- (7) The manufacture of arms and ammunitions was to be supervised by an Allied Commission. All heavy armaments were prohibited.

22.5.3. 'War- Guilt' Clause and Reparation: Germany was forced to accept the responsibility for the World War I. As such she had to shoulder the burden of compensating the Allies for all damage done to their civilian population and property. The Article 231 of the treaty, the so called 'War Guilt' clause states the following: *The Allied and Associated Governments affirm, and Germany accepts, the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing 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 the aggression of Germany and her allies.*

The intention behind the Article was to introduce and support the section of the treaty, which dealt with reparation. The treaty did not immediately deal with how much financial reparation Germany should pay. The question was referred to an Allied Reparation Commission. In the meantime Germany was to pay shipping damage on a ton-to-ton basis by giving up most of her existing merchant marine. Her existing resources were to be utilized to the rebuilding of devastated areas in France. She had to supply coal to France, Belgium and Italy and return works of art taken from Belgium and France. The Reparation Commission completed its calculations in 1921 and fixed the total amount of reparation to be paid by Germany at \$ 27,000,000,000.

22.5.4. Guarantees: In order to force Germany to respect fully the Treaty of Versailles, Allied armies were to occupy the German area on the west bank of the river Rhine. Besides the bridgeheads on the right bank of Cologne, Coblenz and Mainz were also to be occupied by the Allies. If Germany duly fulfilled its obligations, the

Allies would evacuate Cologne at the end of five years, Coblenz at the end of ten years and Mainz at the end of fifteen years.

22.6. An Assessment Of The Treaty Of Versailles: When Wilson announced his Fourteen Points in January 1918, the Allied nations were united in a final major effort to win the war. However, the post-war emotions which set nations looking for revenge or compensation, and the differences which arose at the conference-table, made the task of applying Wilson's principles a very difficult one. In spite of this, it is to the credit of the peacemakers that they remained faithful to many of the Fourteen Points. New independent nations were created and the old dynastic empires, which Wilson considered to be the cause of the war, were broken up. The Germans were moved out of France and Belgium and France recovered Alsace and Lorraine. However, the Treaty of Versailles had a number of defects.

22.6.1. It was a Dictated Peace: It has been said that the Treaty of Versailles contained the seeds of the Second World War. According to Prof. E. H. Carr, the Treaty of Versailles had certain special characteristics, which determined much of the subsequent history. It was not a negotiated peace, but a dictated treaty, a treaty imposed by the victorious powers on defeated Germany.

22.6.2. It was a Vindictive Treaty: The Treaty of Versailles was vindictive. The terms of the treaty were too harsh. By this treaty, Germany was economically crippled, politically outcasted, militarily humbled, physically exhausted and territorially reduced. The huge war indemnity imposed upon Germany was beyond her capacity to pay. The reparations not only created problems for Germany and the countries that were to receive Germany's payments, but also prolonged the bitterness of the war. The principle of self-determination was denied to the Germans inhabiting those regions, which were incorporated in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium and France.

J.M. Keynes, the economist, vigorously attacked the settlement of 1919 in his book, *Economic Consequences of the Peace*. He predicted that reparations would damage European economy for years to come. There was no doubt that they caused economic disruption. However, they did not cripple Germany as Clemenceau had wished them to do. Reparations were cancelled during the financial crisis of 1931 - 1932. By that time Germany had paid only about a quarter of the sum demanded. On the other hand it had received more than what was paid, in foreign loans, most of which were never repaid.

22.6.3. It Led to the Rise of Hitler: Hitler and the Nazis were the staunch critics of the Treaty of Versailles. They rejected the whole of the treaty. The Nazis maintained that Germany had not lost the

war, but that she had been stabbed in the back by a conspiracy of democrats, Communists and Jews. Thus, the Treaty of Versailles created a sense of revenge among the Germans. Failure of the Weimar Republic to solve the post-war problems paved the way for the rise of Hitler and his Nazi party, who promised to undo the Treaty of Versailles.

22.6.4. It Created Dissatisfaction among other Nations: The victors were also dissatisfied with the Treaty of Versailles. The French were uneasy, obsessed with fears of a German revival. The Italians alleged that they had been cheated. The Russians, though not directly involved in the settlement, regarded it as a hostile conspiracy, which robbed them of lands such as the Baltic provinces, now independent nations. Some of the new states, however, not really nation states, like Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, were unions of peoples.

22.6.5. It Failed to Maintain Peace: Much of the criticism, which was aimed at the peacemakers, could more properly have been aimed at the later statesmen. They were more pre-occupied with their alleged grievances than with constructive effort to consolidate the peace. Many leaders such as Mussolini, showed greater concern for national self-interest rather than for international law. Clemenceau had perhaps set a poor example, working above all in the peace settlement for the interests of France. In due course it became fashionable to explain the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 in terms of the alleged injustices of the Treaty of Versailles, but the aggressiveness of Nazi Germany offers a more obvious explanation.

22. 7. Other Treaties :

The Treaty of Versailles was the most important of the series of treaties, which constituted the general peace settlement of Paris. Following the Treaty of Versailles with Germany in June 1919, it remained for the Allies to make peace with Germany's wartime confederates, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire. Just as representatives of Germany had been called upon to accept the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, so, in turn, representatives of Germany's confederates were summoned to other suburbs of Paris to sign their respective treaties. Peace treaties were thus, signed at St. Germaine with Austria (10 September, 1919); at Neuilly with Bulgaria (27 November, 1919); at Trianon with Hungary (4 June, 1920); and at Sevres with the Ottoman Empire (1 August, 1920).

22.7.1. Treaty of St. Germaine with Austria (1919): By the Treaty of St. Germaine Austria was required to recognize the independence of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia, and to cede to them many territories which formerly were included in the Dual Empire of Austria-Hungary. The result of this treaty was that Austria was reduced to a small republic with an

area and population smaller than that of Portugal. Her provinces, in which a mixture of races had existed in uneasy union such as Germans, Magyars, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenes, Serbs, Croats, Rumanians and Italians, were divided out among her neighbours. The liberation of subject nationalities was in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

22.7.2. Treaty of Neuilly with Bulgaria (1919): By the Treaty of Neuilly, Bulgaria gave up most of those territories which she had acquired in the Balkan War of 1912-13 and the World War I. She gave up the greater part of Macedonia to Yugoslavia, the Thracian coast to Greece and Dobruja to Rumania. Bulgaria was asked to pay an indemnity of half a billion dollars and reduce her army to 33,000 men.

22.7.3. Treaty of Trianon with Hungary (1920): The Treaty of Trianon determined the fate of Hungary. She was separated from Austria and was forced to cede Transylvania to Rumania, Croatia to Yugoslavia, and Slovakia to the Czechs. The Banat was divided between Yugoslavia and Rumania. The loss of territory reduced her population from nearly twenty one millions to seven and a half millions. Her army was reduced to 35,000 men.

22.7.4. Treaty of Sevres with Ottoman Empire (1920): Determination of the fate of the Ottoman Empire was delayed due to acute differences among the Allies, especially between France and England, and between Italy and Greece. The differences were about the distribution of the spoils, and also by the existence of rival Turkish governments, that of the Sultan at Constantinople and that of Mustafa Kemal at Ankara. An agreement was eventually reached among the Allies and the Treaty of Sevres was signed by the Sultan's government. By the Treaty of Sevres the Arab state of Hejaz, comprising the strip of territory east of the Red Sea was nominally freed and placed under British control. Armenia was created as a Christian Republic under international guarantees. Palestine, Mesopotamia (Iraq), the Trans-Jordan area, and Syria were detached from the Ottoman Empire. The first three were 'mandated' territories of England and Syria was placed under France as 'mandated' territory. Galicia was recognized as a French sphere of influence; southern Anatolia, including the port of Adalia was placed under the Italian sphere of influence. Smyrna and adjacent territory on the coast of Asia Minor, together with Thrace, Adrianople, the peninsula of Gallipoli, and the remaining Aegean islands were surrendered to Greece. The Dardanelles and the Bosphorus straits were internationalized.

22.7.5. Treaty of Lausanne with Turkey (1923): The Treaty of Sevres imposed on the Ottoman Empire was very severe and was extremely unpopular among the Turks. The discontent of the people for the loss of the Turkish territories and the treatment meted out to their country by the Allies led to the rise of Mustafa

Kemal Pasha in Turkey. Mustafa Kemal resisted the Treaty of Sevres which led to a war between Turkey and Greece. The victories of Mustafa Kemal and his Turkish Nationalists led to the scrapping of the Treaty of Sevres and called for a new peace settlement in the Near East. After another series of difficult and delicate negotiations, peace was finally concluded between Turkey and the Allies at Lausanne in Switzerland on 24 July 1923. By the terms of the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey resigned all claims to Hejaz, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Iraq and Syria, but it retained the whole of Anatolia and likewise Galicia, Adalia, Smyrna, Constantinople, and Eastern Thrace. It consented to the freedom of the Straits and their demilitarization, but it escaped any foreign control of its internal affairs.

22.8 An Assessment of the Paris Peace Conference : While making an assessment of the peace treaties between 1919 and 1923, it is important to take into consideration the circumstances under which they were drafted. In the first place, the nations represented at the Peace Conference at Paris, were concerned with the satisfaction of their own claims, whether it was for territory in Europe or colonies in Africa, rather than with a general desire for peace. In the second place, popular demand at home forced the members of the supreme council, in which authority was vested, to press a particular measure upon their reluctant colleagues or to veto decisions for which unanimity was required. Thus, the statesmen from different countries found it difficult to harmonize their discordant views. In the third place, the peace treaties reflected a very varied authorship. The Treaty of Versailles was drawn up in sections-political, economic, financial, military and naval. This prevented the cumulative effect of the obligations imposed on Germany from being recognized at the moment. Thus, with the passage of time the Treaty of Versailles came to be condemned as a bad treaty. It is possible that if the victorious Powers had shown less severity in their treatment of Germany, she might have reconciled more readily to her altered status.

Later events showed that the peacemakers had been guilty of misplaced optimism. After 1920, there was only limited support for democracy and for international co-operation. The main weakness of the settlement of 1919-1920 lay not in the victimization of the defeated, but in the defenselessness of the small states, which had been created from the wreckage of the former empires. These small states proved too tempting to the bullies of Europe and too weak to be able to resist them. With the weakness of the League of Nations in its 'collective security', the Second World War was inevitable.

Questions

1. Examine the achievements of the Paris Peace Conference (1919) following the end of World War I.
2. Critically analyze the Treaty of Versailles (1919) imposed on Germany by the Allies.
3. Trace the circumstances that led to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919.
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Wilson's Fourteen Points
 - (b) 'The Big Four'
 - (c) Treaty of Versailles (1919)
 - (d) Treaty of Sevres (1920)



23

TRANSFORMATION OF RUSSIA-I

REACTION AND REFORMS UNDER TSARS NICHOLAS I AND ALEXANDER II

Objectives:

1. To trace the emergence of the Russian Empire in the eighteenth and nineteenth century.
2. To understand the conditions that existed in Russia during the first half of the nineteenth century.
3. To review the reactionary policies followed by Tsar Nicholas I.
4. To critically study the reforms introduced by Tsar Alexander II.

23.1. Introduction: ***Russia is the world's largest country in area. Russia extends from the Arctic Ocean south to the Black Sea and from the Baltic Sea east to the Pacific Ocean. It covers much of the continents of Europe and Asia. Moscow, the capital, is one of the world's largest cities in population. St. Petersburg, on the coast of the Baltic Sea, is Russia's chief***

seaport. Most of Russia's people are ethnic Russians--that is, descendants of an early Slavic people called the Russians. More than 100 minority nationalities also live in Russia.

Russian history can be traced back to a state that emerged in Europe among the East Slavs during the 800's. The first Slavic state was organized in the ninth century in the region of Kiev. By about 1240, the Kievan state of 'Rus' had disintegrated into small independent principalities due to Mongol conquest. The north-east of Kiev, which survived the Mongol invasion, came to be known as 'Great Russia'. Around 1450, the principate of Moscovy freed itself from the Mongol control, consolidated control over the Great Russia and expanded into Belorussian and Ukrainian regions. In the early eighteenth century, Tsar Peter I (Peter the Great) renamed Moscovy as the Russian Empire.

Over time, large amounts of territory and many different peoples came under Russian rule. The Russian Empire also had many non-Slavic nationalities like the Fins, Poles, Estonians, Latvians, Kazaks of Central Asia, Uzbeks, Turkmens, Azerbaijanis, Armenians and the Georgians. Many of these minorities had their own history and culture. However, the name 'Russian Empire' implied the official reference to the Russian language and the Russian Orthodox Church. The Tsars had almost complete control over most aspects of Russian life. Under these rulers, the country's economic development lagged behind the rapid industrial progress that began in Western Europe in the 1700's. Most of the people were poor, uneducated peasants.

23.2. Emergence Of The Russian Empire: *Peter the Great (1682–1725), consolidated autocracy in Russia and played a major role in bringing his country into the European state system. From its modest beginnings in the fourteenth century principality of Moscow, Russian Empire had become the largest state in the world by the time Peter ascended the throne. It spanned the Eurasian landmass from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. Much of its expansion had taken place in the seventeenth century, culminating in the first Russian settlement of the Pacific in the mid-seventeenth century.*

However, this vast land had a population of only fourteen million. Grain yields trailed behind those of agriculture in the West, compelling almost the entire population to farm. Only a small fraction of the population lived in the towns.

Peter was deeply impressed by the advanced technology, war craft, and statecraft of the West. He studied Western tactics and fortifications and built a strong army of 300,000 made up of his own subjects, whom he conscripted for life. In 1697-1698, he became the first Russian prince to ever visit the West, where he and his entourage made a deep impression. In celebration of his conquests, Peter assumed the title of emperor as well as Tsar, and Muscovite Russia officially became the Russian Empire late in 1721.

The first military efforts of Peter the Great were directed against the Ottoman Turks. His attention then turned to the north. Russia still lacked a secure northern seaport except at Archangel on the White Sea, whose harbour was frozen nine months a year. Access to the Baltic Sea was blocked by Sweden, whose territory enclosed it on three sides. Peter's ambitions for a 'window to the sea' led him in 1699 to make a secret alliance with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Denmark against Sweden, resulting in the Great Northern War. The war ended in 1721 when an exhausted Sweden sued for peace with Russia. Peter acquired four provinces situated south and east of the Gulf of Finland, thus securing his coveted access to the sea. There he built Russia's new capital, St. Petersburg, as a 'window opened upon Europe' to replace Moscow, long Russia's cultural center.

Peter reorganized his government on the latest Western models, moulding Russia into an absolutist state. He replaced the old *boyar Duma* (council of nobles) with a nine-member senate, which in fact became a supreme council of state. The countryside was also divided into new provinces and districts. Peter told the senate that its mission was to collect tax revenues. In turn tax revenues tripled over the course of his reign. As part of the government reform, the Orthodox Church was partially incorporated into the country's administrative structure, making it a tool of the state. Peter abolished the patriarchate and replaced it with a collective body, the Holy Synod, led by a lay government official. Meanwhile, all vestiges of local self-government were removed, and Peter continued and intensified his predecessors' requirement of state service for all nobles.

Tsar Peter the Great died in 1725, leaving an unsettled succession and an exhausted realm. His reign raised questions about Russia's backwardness, its relationship to the West, the appropriateness of

reform from above, and other fundamental problems that have confronted many of Russia's subsequent rulers. Nevertheless, he had laid the foundations of a modern state in Russia.

Nearly forty years later, Catherine the Great (1762-1796) enhanced the European status of her empire and made it a factor of greatest weight in foreign politics. Catherine successfully wages war against the decaying Ottoman Empire and advanced Russia's southern boundary to the Black Sea. By plotting with the rulers of Austria and Prussia, she incorporated territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Partition of Poland, pushing the Russian frontier westward into Central Europe. By the time of her death in 1796, Catherine's expansionist policy had made Russia into a major European power. In spite of her success in wars and diplomacy Catherine the Great did not attempt to solve the internal problems that affected the peasants the most. In the oppressive social system the serfs had to spend almost all their time labouring on the lord's land. This led to a major peasant uprising in 1773, after Catherine legalized the selling of serfs separate from land. The rebels threatened to take Moscow before they were ruthlessly suppressed. However, the specter of revolution continued to haunt her and her successors.

After the death of Catherine the Great, Tsar Paul I (1796-1801) succeeded his and he was succeeded by Tsar Alexander I (1801-1825). During the reign of Alexander I, Napoleon Bonaparte, the Emperor of France invaded Russia in 1812. However eventually Napoleon was defeated and was forced to withdraw from Russia. Tsar Alexander I played an important role in the Congress of Vienna (1815) and the Concert of Europe.

23.3. Conditions In Russia In The First Half Of The Nineteenth Century: ***Before a review of the reaction and reforms under Tsars Nicholas I and Alexander II respectively, it is important to trace the conditions in Russia during the first half of the nineteenth century. One of the worst conditions was the problems faced by the peasants, especially the serfs in Russia. At the time of the Emancipation in 1861, Russia contained nearly forty nine and a half million serfs, of whom twenty-three million belonged to the Crown and an equal number to private landlords. The rest were attached either to the Church and other institutions, or employed in domestic service. The position of the peasants working for the Crown was more tolerable than that of serfs belonged to the private ownership. They were grouped together in village communities known as Mir, where they enjoyed a certain measure of local self-government, regulating their affairs***

through the village elder and an elected council. The peasants suffered from various disabilities. Restrictions were imposed on their movements, and on their right to acquire property and dispose of their belongings. However, their chief grievance was the heavy burden laid upon them in the form of illegal taxes, the extortion of bribes, and the exaction of the forced labour.

The condition of the serfs under private landlords was terrible. Their condition can be inferred from the statement of a Russian patriot in 1826, who stated that "the negroes on the American plantations were happier than the Russian private serfs." Their owners usually sold their serfs like cattle, even separating members of one family, and exacting from those who remained extra dues and labour. The Russian law relating to the serfs stated that "the proprietor may impose on his serfs every kind of labour, may take from them money dues, and demand from them personal service." The private owner could also inflict corporal punishment, hand them over as conscripts to the military authorities, or transport them to Siberia. Historians have given accounts of horrible conditions of the serfs. The peasants of the smaller proprietors were subject to direct oppression at the hands of their masters. Those peasants owned by the great nobles, who lived in St. Petersburg, also suffered at the hands of their stewards and tenants. They perished by hundreds in the factories established, at that period to augment the incomes of these great landed proprietors. They were also subjected to inhuman punishments, imprisoned in underground cellars, kept in chains, or flogged to death, by order of the master or his steward. Earlier, Catherine the Great had deprived the serfs of all legal rights, and ordered that those who ventured to seek redress against their masters should be punished and transported to life to the mines.

The internal administration of Russia at this period was extremely inefficient and corrupt. It was described as: "Everything was corrupt, everything unjust, everything dishonest." Every office in the State was open either to influence or to the highest bidder, without any regard to the competence of the candidate. Bribery existed everywhere. It was rendered worse by the fact that practically all the officials throughout the Empire were paid inadequate salaries. The military governors of the provinces accumulated immense fortunes by fleecing the people. Their example was followed by their subordinates, each according to his degree. It was impossible to get justice without bribery in any civil court from the highest to the lowest.

The French Revolution broke out in France, not because the economic abuses were greater there than elsewhere in Europe, but

due to the growth of an enlightened middle class whose discontent with the existing regime had been promoted by the writings of the 'Philosophers'. Whereas in Russia there was no middle class imbued with liberal ideas to lead a revolt against the government. The peasants were not in a position to throw up leaders from their midst. However, the nobility had their own grounds for dissatisfaction with the government. The nobles resented the preponderance of the official class. The latter had the control over the state affairs. This ill-feeling was intensified by the fact that men of German birth were filling public offices in Russia. Thus, while professing outward loyalty to the monarchy, the Russian nobles were secretly welcomed any attack upon the existing order. Moreover, the officers of the army, who were recruited from the ranks of the nobility, returned to Russia, after a long campaign in Western Europe, with a broader and more sympathetic outlook as the result of impressions gained during their three years' residence in France. As the instrument of their ideas and as a means for their propaganda, the Russian nobles formed secret societies. Drawing their inspiration from the freer atmosphere of Western life, and cherishing a generous passion for freedom, they were never more than a handful of patriots, isolated among contemporaries not yet ripe for their ideas.

23.4. Reaction Under Tsar Nicholas I (1825-1855): When Tsar Alexander I died in 1825, he left three brothers, of whom Constantine, the eldest was induced by the Tsar to renounce his claim in favour of his younger brother, Nicholas. There was some kind of uncertainty and suspense which lasted for three weeks, after which Nicholas ascended the throne in the place of Constantine. Meanwhile all the elements of disaffection had been gathering strength. Under these circumstances the secret societies seized the occasion for a revolutionary outbreak. On 26 December 1825 an insurrection broke out in St. Petersburg, where the Moscow regiment, at the instigation of its officers, refused to take the oath of loyalty to the new Emperor. This rising, known as the Decembrist Revolt proved a complete fiasco. It was purely a military revolt, confined practically to a single regiment and neither the official classes nor the people of the capital had any part in it. The revolt was easily crushed, leading Nicholas to turn away from the Westernization programme begun by Peter the Great and champion the maxim "Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Respect to the People."

The accession of Nicholas I, inaugurated a new era of absolutism. The catastrophe with which his reign opened moulded the character of his rule. For thirty years he governed Russia with an iron hand. Autocracy had triumphed over constitutional principles. At a time when the countries of Western Europe were undergoing a

struggle between liberalism and conservatism, Russia presented to the world an appearance of absolute immobility. In his foreign policy, Nicholas championed autocracy and opposed progressive movements. In 1830 he was only prevented by the Polish insurrection from intervening in France on behalf of the exiled Bourbon King. In 1848 he came to the assistance of the Emperor of Austria, and was responsible for the collapse of the Hungarian Revolution.

In domestic affairs, Nicholas I pursued a policy of resolute repression. He adopted an attitude of rigid conservatism and reaction. His fanatical system of government effectually blocked every avenue of freedom of thought and action. He revived the secret police, which was abolished by his more humane predecessor. The infamous record of this secret police as the *Third Section of the Tsar's Private Chancellery* fills. One of the darkest pages in Russian history. The head of the Section, the Chief of Police, possessed unlimited powers of 'arresting, imprisoning, deporting, and making away with anyone whom he pleased, without any restriction whatever.' This terrible institution, it has been said, "rivalled, if not exceeded, the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition." Nicholas I sought to protect his subjects as much as possible from contact with European influences and Western ideas, which might affect their political convictions and imbibe in them revolutionary ideas.

In order to prevent the Western influence on the Russian people, Tsar Nicholas I imposed restrictions on foreign travel by the Russians. The youth of Russia were forbidden to study abroad. Foreign publications were not allowed to enter into the Russian Empire without first undergoing rigorous scrutiny from the censor. Even the attendance of students at Russian Universities was discouraged. Teaching of philosophy in Universities was replaced by theological studies. In order to prevent criticism of the government strict press censorship was imposed on the press. Thus, reaction became the keynote of the Tsarist administration. Throughout his reign, Tsar Nicholas I tried his utmost to promote conservatism and suppress the forces of progress and enlightenment.

After thirty years of stagnation and passive endurance the discontent of the educated classes in Russia began once again to rear its head. The censorship of the press acted as a restraint upon printed publications. However, it could not prevent manuscript literature circulating from hand to hand.

23.5. Reforms Under Tsar Alexander II (1855-1881): ***Russia fought the Crimean War (1853-56) with the largest standing***

army in Europe, and its population was greater than that of France and England combined, but in that war it failed to defend its territory from attack mainly by the British and French in the Crimea. This failure shocked the Russians and demonstrated to them the inadequacy of their weaponry and transport and their economic backwardness compared to the British and French.

Defeat of Russia in the Crimean War was a great humiliation for Tsar Nicholas I, who died in 1855, toward the end of the war. He was succeeded that year by his eldest son, Alexander II, who had to be careful not to offend the Russian people while seeking an inglorious end to the war. The best he could do was a humiliating treaty, the Treaty of Paris - signed on 30 March 1856. The treaty forbade Russian naval bases or warships on the Black Sea, leaving the Russians without protection from pirates or whomever along its 1,000 miles of Black Sea coastline, and leaving unprotected merchant ships that had to pass through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits. The treaty removed Russia's claim of protection of Orthodox Christians within the Ottoman Empire, and it allowed the Turks to make the Bosphorus a naval arsenal and a place where the fleets of Russia's enemies could assemble to intimidate Russia.

In his manifesto announcing the end of the war, Alexander II promised reform, and it was welcomed by the people. Those in Russia who read books other than the Holy Bible were eager for reform, some of them with a Hegelian confidence in historical development. These readers were more Russian-oriented, from Russia-oriented literature, than Russian intellectuals had been in the early years of the century. Russians were less devoted to the French language and to literature from England and Germany. Russians had been developing their own literature, with authors such as Alexander Pushkin (1799-1837), Nicolai Gogol (1809-62), Ivan Turgenev (1818-83) and Feodor Dostoievski. (1821-81). It is important to note that the Russian literature had been producing a greater recognition of serfs as human beings.

In addition to a more productive economy, many of Russia's intellectuals hoped for more of a rule of law and an advance in rights and obligations for everyone under the rule of the Tsar - the continuation of autocracy but less arbitrary. And from among these intellectuals also came an appeal for freer universities, colleges and schools and a greater freedom of the press. "It is not light which is dangerous, but darkness," wrote Russia's official historian, Mikhail Pogodin.

23.5.1. *Emancipation of the Serfs:* The uppermost on the minds of reformers was the abolition of serfdom and the emancipation of

the serfs. All reformers were of the opinion that the abolition of serfdom was the indispensable starting-point of national regeneration. In Russia there were more than 22 million serfs, compared to 4 million slaves in the United States. They were around 44 percent of Russia's population, and described as slaves. They were the property of a little over 100,000 land owning lords. Some were owned by religious foundations, and some by the Tsar (state peasants). Some worked for people other than their lords, but they had to make regular payments to their lord, with some of the more wealthy lords owning enough serfs to make a living from these payments.

The greatest reform undertaken by Tsar Alexander II was the emancipation of the Russian serfs. In 1856, the Tsar spoke before the gentry of Moscow and asked them to consider emancipation of the serfs. "We live in such an age," he publicly warned the nobility, "that in time it cannot but take place. In this, I think you too agree with me. Consequently, it is better for it to come from above than from below."

In 1858, committees of gentry gathered in Russia's various provinces, and, representing the gentry in general, nine met in what was called a Main Committee, at St. Petersburg, and agreed to the abolition of serfdom should the Tsar decide to do so. In March 1861, on the same day that Abraham Lincoln took his oath office, Alexander issued his Emancipation Manifesto. In charge of the program of emancipation was the adjutant-general, Count Panin, who had owned 20,000 serfs. The lords were to receive compensation in the form of treasury bonds, and the freed serfs were to pay for their freedom not as individuals but collectively. Except in the Ukraine and a few other areas, lands were distributed to communities of former serfs. These communities were called communes. The government hoped that a commune of freed serfs would be more responsible than scattered individuals. By this the government hoped to prevent the creation of numerous isolated persons without property. It was the commune that was to be responsible for distributing land to the former serfs, for collecting taxes, providing recruits for the military and other obligations.

The Emancipation Edict was based on three principles. In the first place it endowed the Russian serf with civil rights, conferring upon him the status of a free peasant, and releasing him from servile bondage to his master. In the second place it divided the ownership of the land between the nobles and the peasants, in order to prevent the expropriation of the peasantry and the growth of a landless proletariat. The third principle embodied in the Edict of Emancipation was that the government should enable the village communities to redeem their annual dues by advancing to the

proprietors a sum equivalent to their capitalized value, obtaining in return from the communes interest at six per cent for a period covering forty-nine years.

Many freed serfs, especially in the fertile agricultural regions in the southern provinces, felt that they did not get all the land that had been promised them. Some serf communities failed to receive forested areas or access to a river and were forced to bargain with their former lords for access to these. According to one source, the former serfs received 18 percent less land than they had been promised, and 42 percent of the former serfs received allotments of land insufficient to maintain their families.

23.5.2. Other Reforms: Alexander II instituted a system of local self-government in the central provinces of the Russian Empire, based on the principle of decentralization and provincial autonomy. There were certain local bodies which already existed in Russia. These included the assemblies of the nobility with the right to lay grievances before the government; and assemblies of the peasants, the *mir* or village community, and the *volost* or canton. In order to give wider representation, Alexander II set up the District Councils through popular election. Above the District Councils was the Provincial Council known as the *zemstvo*. The members of the *zemstvo* were elected by the District Councils. In both the District and Provincial Councils the local gentry and common peasants had representation. The *zemstvo* was responsible for the election of the Justices of the Peace, supervision of education, medical care, veterinary service, insurance, local roads and the storage of food reserves. The *zemstvo* attracted teachers, doctors, veterinary surgeons, bookkeepers and other professionals. However, the activities of the *zemstvos* were restricted due to the power of the governor of the province to veto their decisions, and by lack of adequate financial resources.

In 1870, cities and towns were given powers similar to the *zemstvo* - power to pursue municipal economic development and to look after the welfare of its inhabitants. A limited democracy of sorts was created in the form of town councils, its members elected by property owners and taxpayers.

The reign of Alexander II was also remarkable for the reforms in the legal system. A commission was set up to examine the judicial system. The commission found that the existing Russian judicial system contained no less than twenty-five radical defects. These defects were sought to be removed by setting up new institutions modeled on Western ideas. In 1864, the principles of English and French jurisprudence were introduced. These principles included the separation of judicial and administrative powers, independence

of the magistrates, oral procedure, and trial by jury. Justices of Peace, chosen by popular election, were instituted to deal with minor cases. An appeal could be made from the decisions of individual magistrates to the Monthly Sessions comprising all the Justices of the district. Important matters were reserved for the Regular Tribunals, comprised of trained judges appointed by the Crown. In these cases also appeals could be made from the Ordinary Courts to the Courts of Appeal. Thus, the judiciary became an independent branch of government and a single unified system. Bureaucratic secrecy was replaced by a new openness as to what the courts were doing. Favour under the law for the wealthy and upper classes was replaced by what was supposed to be equality before the law. Trial by jury was created for serious criminal offenses, and for minor civil and criminal cases justices of the peace were created.

Alexander II also introduced far-reaching military reforms. The compulsory military service was reduced from twenty-five years to six. Recruits were drawn by lot and people from all classes were obliged to serve, with exemptions for hardship cases. For the military, corporal punishment was abolished, and an effort was made to improve the professionalism of the officer corps. Elementary education was provided to all the soldiers in the military who lacked it. Alexander II also provided the officers and soldiers better and comfortable uniforms.

Under Alexander II, the system for state finances was improved, laying a foundation for industrial expansion. The industrial expansion in Russia had already begun in the same way that it was in Western Europe and the United States, that is, with the expansion of rail lines. The growth in rail lines enabled farmers to send their crops to consumers farther away, and to sell their crops at a more stable price. Railway expansion increased Russia's ability to export grain, providing Russia with money to invest in more industrialization. Railway expansion allowed for a growth in the mining of minerals. The coal, iron and steel industries were growing, as was the railway-equipment industry. There was more demand for rails, locomotives and other goods, stimulating the economy. Industrial suburbs appeared around Moscow and St. Petersburg and industrial workers grew in number.

Though Tsar Alexander II earned the epithet of the 'Reforming Tsar', it was the irony of fate that, in spite of his great achievements, Alexander was destined to witness in his own lifetime the birth of revolutionary Nihilism. There is a remarkable contrast between the enthusiasm displayed at the beginning of his reign, and the gloom which clouded its end. After ten years of agrarian, administrative and judicial reforms, the government

plunged once more into reaction, and many of the excesses which had affected the administration of Nicholas I began to reappear.

The reasons for the rise of revolutionary Nihilism can be found in the fact that the reforms introduced by Alexander II appeared more imposing on paper than when put to test of actual practice. The peasants discovered that emancipation meant new burdens for old, the improvement in their legal status brought about little change in their economic situation, and no change at all in their moral principles. Russian thinkers had confidently predicted that the abolition of serfdom would create a freer atmosphere and a vigorous and enterprising peasantry. However, they forgot that centuries of oppression cannot be wiped out by a single and belated act of justice. The administrative and judicial reforms laid the foundations of a better system of government, but here again the benefits so eagerly anticipated could not be achieved. For the success of an institution depends primarily upon the men who work it. However, Russia lacked competent administrators and trained jurists.

The chief reason for the growth of a reactionary spirit in the later years of Alexander's reign is to be found in the character of the Tsar himself. He had no instinctive faith in the virtues of liberal institutions. His reforms were conceived not in the spirit of an idealist, but from the conviction that where change was inevitable it ought to proceed from above rather than from below. He did not possess the large creative mind and breadth of statesmanship necessary for the solution of the problems which he was called upon to handle. He was forced to rely upon his councilors who had conflicting interests. He was surrounded by advisers trained in the school of Nicholas, who were imbued with his reactionary doctrines. After 1864, the reforming zeal of Alexander II rapidly cooled, partly on account of the Polish insurrection, and partly from the fear that further reforms would weaken the autocracy.

The spread of Nihilist ideas gradually led to political terrorism. In spite of all his efforts, Alexander II could not suppress the Nihilists

who made repeated attempts on his life. Ultimately the Nihilists succeeded in assassinating Alexander II by a bomb in their fourth attempt (1881).

Questions

1. Give an account of the conditions in Russia during first half of the nineteenth century.
2. Discuss the reactionary policies adopted by Tsar Nicholas I in Russia.
3. Critically examine the various reforms introduced by Tsar Alexander II in Russia.
4. Briefly narrate the reaction and reforms under Tsars Nicholas I and Alexander II respectively in Russia.



24

TRANSFORMATION OF RUSSIA-II

REVOLUTION OF 1917 - IMPACT OF THE REVOLUTION

Objectives:

1. To analyze the causes of the Russian Revolution of 1917.
2. To examine the background and course of the February Revolution of 1917.
3. To trace the circumstances that led to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.
4. To understand the impact of the Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

24.1. Introduction: The roots of the Russian Revolution of 1917 lie deepu embedded in the history of Russia. The impact of Western ideas upon a country which was slowly emerging from Asiatic shell

produced in the early years of the nineteenth century a movement born out of time. For many decades it remained a movement which had leaders but no followers. It was as a direct consequence of the World War I (1914-18) that the revolutionary impulse grew into a mass eruption which shook Russian society to its very foundations, and caused not only the structure of the state but the social order itself to collapse in ruins. There were two revolutions, though perhaps it would be correct to say that there was a single revolution which developed two phases. The political phase of February Revolution, which sealed the fate of the autocracy; and the social phase or October Revolution which brought into existence the first Workers' Republic.

24.2. Causes Of The February Revolution Of 1917: A number of factors contributed to the outbreak of the February Revolution of 1917 in Russia. For many centuries Russia remained the most backward country in all respects before the outbreak of the revolution. The autocratic Tsarist regime that prevailed in Russia was the chief reason for the backwardness of the vast country. While the major part of the European continent was coming under the influence of the French Revolution during the early nineteenth century, Russia remained unaffected and practically isolated from the course of events in Europe. However, Russia could not remain unaffected for long. The underlying currents surfaced during the later part of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, which ultimately transformed into a tornado that swept away the monarchy from Russia. The chief causes of the February Revolution in Russia were the following:

24.2.1. Political Causes: Like Turkey, the Russian Empire was both European and Asiatic. The world's most inefficient, abusive, corrupt, clumsy and unenterprising bureaucracy ruled this vast empire. At the head of this system was Tsar Nicholas II (1894-1917). He was a well-meaning ruler and devoted to his family, but he lacked self-confidence and was too easily influenced by characters stronger than his own. The Tsar ruled with an iron hand. He exercised his autocratic power through a vast bureaucracy, an army that swore loyalty to the Tsar and a repressive political police force that had its presence in virtually every city and town. The Russian political system, often referred to as the Tsarist regime or simply Tsarism, involved the repression of civil liberties, intellectual freedom, and human rights in general. Its policies included the persecution of various religious minorities outside the Russian Orthodox Church, which was supported by the state. The Tsarist regime sought to expand its domination over neighbouring non-Russian peoples. To secure its position as a major world power it brutally subordinated many ethnic and national groups, so much so that the Russian Empire was sometimes referred to as a "prison-house of nations."

The Tsarist government was an inefficient dictatorship. The State Council though advised the Tsar had no real power. The chief aim of the Tsar was to preserve the age-old autocracy. In this task the nobility and the Orthodox Church supported him. The press was censored. Education and the judiciary were controlled by the state. There was a group of councils, which did involve some form of democracy. These councils known as *zemstvo* were rural elected councils which first started in 1864. Their activities were restricted to rural areas only.

24.2.2. Economic Causes: Economically Russia was the most backward country in Eurasia. It was predominantly an agrarian country and two-thirds of the population was peasants. Though feudalism was on the decline in Europe following the French Revolution, the medieval institution still existed in Russia along with its corollary of serfdom. The serfs were 'agrarian slaves' of the feudal lords who were denied even basic rights. Tsar Alexander II, through an *Emancipation Decree of 1861* had liberated the serfs. In spite of their emancipation the condition of the serfs did not improve due to lack of cultivable land or employment opportunities. About sixty percent of the land in Russia was owned by the landlords, the royal family and the church who comprised only ten percent of the population. About seventy per cent of the Russian peasants owned less than ten acres of land. After the abolition of serfdom in 1861, land was sold, not to individual peasants, but to the village commune. The peasants in the commune made heavy payments to the government for the land. The commune itself owned the land. If the peasants wanted to leave the village they required the permission of the commune, which was difficult to obtain. The reason being that the remaining peasants would have to bear the burden of higher payments. With the growth of population the average size of holdings began to shrink. Besides, the agricultural techniques remained backward and production was so low that the early 1900's witnessed famine conditions in vast areas of Russia.

Industrial development began to take root in Russia during the last decade of the nineteenth century and at the turn of the twentieth century. A number of basic industries such as iron, steel and coal were established in Russia. Count Sergei Witte (1849-1915), who was first the minister of transport and later minister of finance was chiefly responsible for the industrial development in Russia. Under his direction the Trans-Siberian Railway was started in 1891 and completed ten years later. Witte encouraged the development of heavy industries such as iron, coal, oil, shipbuilding, chemicals, metalworking etc. Since the industrial backwardness of Russia resulted in poor capital formation, half of the capital for this investment was foreign, especially from France and Belgium. Besides, a large part of the capital of the six leading banks of Russia was in the hands of foreign bankers. In spite of steady progress, Russia was still industrially a highly backward country.

The industrial workers lived in overcrowded and unhygienic dwellings, and suffered from the usual evils of rapid and unplanned industrialization. The poor economic condition of Russia was one of the major causes of the February Revolution of 1917.

24.2.3. Social Causes: The royal family was at the top of a small but immensely powerful layer of wealthy nobles, who owned most of the land. The nobility maintained itself in luxury at the expense of the great majority of the people, who were impoverished peasants. The peasants made up about 80 per cent of the population in 1917.

There were other social classes in Russia in addition to the landed nobles and poor peasants. These other classes included capitalists, workers, and professionals and they became an increasingly important part of the Russian society in the nineteenth century. One new class that resulted from the development of industry was the capitalists, also known as the *bourgeoisie*, or middle class. They were essential to Russian economic development.

The development of industry created another major, and much larger, social class, the wage-earning working class also known as the *proletariat*. The working class made up slightly more than ten per cent of the population in 1917. However, these workers lived in a few large cities. Many could read and write and they were receptive to a growing variety of new social and cultural influences. Moreover, their labour was essential in producing the goods and services of Russia's new factories and service industries. For all these reasons, the working class was a major force for social change. In order to achieve better working conditions and living standards a large number of the workers of Russia were keen to organize trade unions. However, both the Tsarist regime and the capitalists often repressed their efforts for reforms. This repression, combined with poor working and living conditions, led many workers to become highly political and to support revolutionary organizations.

A smaller but still important social class comprised intermediate layers of small-business people and professionals such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, and writers. Some of these people tried to achieve the 'respectability' associated with the upper classes, but others sympathized or identified with the lower classes of workers and peasants. A significant number of men and women from these intermediate layers, as well as small numbers from the upper classes, became critical-minded intellectuals who were drawn in a revolutionary direction.

24.2.4. Intellectual Causes: There had been sporadic reaction to the autocratic Tsarist regime from different sections of the oppressed Russian society. Peasant uprisings had occurred periodically in Russia for centuries. In addition, repressed ethnic and national groups had revolted from time to time, and there was

some religious dissent. However, in the nineteenth century a new kind of revolutionary movement developed which was influenced by the Western European ideas of the Enlightenment concerning democracy, equality, and basic human rights.

In the mid-nineteenth century many intellectuals and university students from the upper and middle classes became increasingly discontented with Russia's repressive regime and rigid society. They began to engage in illegal political activity, such as forming discussion groups and distributing pamphlets. Some were influenced by an idealistic political philosophy known as *populism*. These people advocated social changes that would benefit the masses of Russian people, especially the peasants. Still others were influenced by anarchist ideas, opposing all forms of government. However, many revolutionaries were increasingly influenced by a variety of socialist ideas.

Some socialist revolutionary groups focused their attention on the peasant majority. They hoped that terrorist actions such as assassinating the Tsar or a tyrannical public official would help spark a revolutionary uprising. Such an uprising would make possible the creation of a new economy, largely based on traditional peasant communes. Those who held these ideas eventually formed the Socialist Revolutionary (SR) Party in 1901.

Most of the Socialist Revolutionaries identified themselves with the ideas of Karl Marx and came to be known as the *Marxists*. They believed that the working class would become the primary force for revolutionary change. The Russian Marxists formed the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) in 1898. By 1903, however, the RSDLP had split into two factions. The faction called the *Bolsheviks* (from the Russian word for 'majority'), led by Vladimir Ilich Lenin, favoured a more centralized and disciplined party. The faction called the *Mensheviks* (from the Russian word for 'minority') was more loosely organized and included a less politically cohesive mixture of radicals and moderates.

Some individuals who favoured revolutionary change in Russia but who were not socialists formed a liberal party in 1905. They were known as the Constitutional Democrats (nicknamed the Cadets). This party represented primarily the educated and propertied classes.

Initially, all of these political groups, Socialist Revolutionary Party, Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and Cadets, believed that what Russia needed immediately was a revolution to replace Tsarism with a democratic republic. They all believed that this first step would promote the development of a more intensive capitalist economy. The liberals believed that democratic and capitalistic development in itself was a desirable goal, while the Marxists believed that it would pave the way for socialism.

24.2.5. Humiliating Defeat in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05): Russian imperialist expansion in the Far East and her attempt to extend her influence over Manchuria and Korea was viewed with great suspicion and envy by Japan. The clash of interests between these two countries finally led to the Russo-Japanese War in 1904. The humiliating defeat of Russia in the hands of the 'Asiatic dwarf' Japan in 1905, thoroughly exposed the utter inefficiency of the Tsarist military system. The war became unpopular with the Russian masses. They held the Tsarist regime responsible for the national disgrace and demanded the overthrow of the autocratic Tsarist regime.

24.2.6. Revolution of 1905: Revolutionary movements began to gain popularity in Russia. Riots and terrorism in the countryside and strikes and demonstrations in the towns became widespread. The Minister of the Interior, Plehve, known for arresting and deporting the leaders of the peasants and workers was assassinated in July 1904. In the same year, Russia ventured into a disastrous and humiliating war against Japan. In November 1904, the members of the *zemstvos* (Russian Provincial Councils) demanded agrarian and industrial reforms and a national assembly elected on the basis of universal suffrage.

In 1905, it appeared that a democratic revolution might take place in Russia. On Sunday, 22 January 1905, an Orthodox priest, Father Gapon, led a peaceful labour demonstration of workers and their families. As they approached the Winter Palace of the Tsar in St Petersburg, then the capital of Russia, the Tsar's troops opened fire. Nearly a thousand demonstrators were killed and many thousands were wounded. The events of the so-called *Bloody Sunday* followed by the massacre sparked a massive uprising of workers. Strikes and insurgencies spread throughout the countryside, towns and cities. All the revolutionary parties suddenly gained mass followings. On 30 October 1905, Sergie Witte persuaded Nicholas II to issue the *Imperial Manifesto*. This manifesto offered a variety of concessions, which included an expansion of civil liberties and the creation of an elected legislative body, with very limited powers, called the *Duma*. The government's change of policy won the support of the moderates, and the alliance between liberals and revolutionaries was broken. However, the leftwing continued their opposition. It was in this period that workers established the first *soviets* (democratic councils) in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and other cities.

By the end of 1905, however, the Tsarist regime reasserted its authority through military and paramilitary forces. It suppressed peasant unrest, victimized non-Russian ethnic minorities, and repressed workers' organizations, specially the *soviets* that had been organized in St. Petersburg and Moscow. The government arrested or drove into exile thousands of revolutionary activists. But

the experience and ideas of 1905 contributed to later revolutionary developments in Russia.

24.2.7. Failure of the Duma: In the middle of May 1906, the First Duma was convened which was elected for five years. Liberals dominated it and other parties opposed to the policies of the Tsarist regime. When the Duma met it found that its powers were drastically reduced. When the Duma demanded a series of reforms they were summarily rejected by the government and after ten weeks it was dissolved.

In March 1907, a Second Duma was summoned. By manipulating the electoral system the government tried to fill the Duma with pro-government members. However, the large majority of the members elected to the Duma were again opposed to the government policies. Following the deadlock between the Duma and the government it was also dissolved after three months. As per the electoral reforms of Stolypin (the Prime Minister of Russia from 1906 to 1911) a third Duma came into existence with amiable moderate representatives. It met late in 1907 and lasted its full term of five years. Its function was to act as a rubber stamp for decisions taken by the government. The Fourth Duma also worked fairly harmoniously with the government from 1912 to 1917.

24.2.8. Great Disaster in World War I: When World War I broke out in August 1914, Russia joined with England, France, and other nations in waging war against Germany and Austria-Hungary. In Russia, as elsewhere, enthusiasm for the war effort among the masses was whipped up under patriotic slogans of saving the nation from foreign aggressors. All German sounding names were changed in Russia. For instance, St. Petersburg was changed to Petrograd. Opponents of the war were denounced as traitors and suppressed.

World War I turned into a disaster for both the Russian people and the Tsarist regime. Russian industry lacked the capacity to arm, equip, and supply the 15 million men who were sent into the war. Factories were few and insufficiently productive and the railroad network was inadequate. Repeated mobilizations for the war efforts further disrupted industrial and agricultural production. The food supply decreased and the transportation system became disorganized. At the warfront, the soldiers went hungry and frequently lacked shoes, munitions, and even weapons. Russian casualties were greater than those sustained by any army in any previous war. Within Russia, goods became scarce, prices skyrocketed, and by 1917 famine threatened the larger cities. There was discontent among the Russian soldiers and the morale of the army suffered due to successive military defeats. These reverses were attributed by many to the alleged treachery of Empress Alexandra and her circle, in which the peasant monk Gregory Rasputin was the dominant influence. When the Duma protested

against the inefficient conduct of the war and the arbitrary policies of the imperial government, the Tsar and his ministers simply brushed it aside. To make matters worse, the Tsar left the government at the hands of his wife Tsarina Alexandra and went to the war front to supervise personally the war efforts.

As the war dragged on, Russia's cities experienced increasing inflation, food shortages, bread lines and general misery. The impact was felt especially in the major cities, which were flooded with refugees from the front. Despite an outward calm, many Duma leaders felt that Russia would soon be confronted with a new revolutionary crisis. .

As the tide of discontent mounted, the Duma warned Nicholas II in November 1916 that disaster would overtake the country unless the 'dark' or treasonable, elements were removed from the court. The Tsar ignored the warning. In December a group of aristocrats, led by Prince Felix Yusupov assassinated Rasputin in the hope that the Tsar would then change his course. The Tsar failed to respond.

24.3. The February Revolution, 1917: In February 1917, the unplanned combination of four events in Petrograd led to the outbreak of the revolution and the overthrow of the Tsarist regime. These four events were: a strike at the Putilov steel works, a socialist holiday (Women's Day), large bread queues, and the reluctance of the police and troops to suppress the disturbances.

It all started in a shop in the Putilov engineering works in Petrograd on 18 February 1917. On that day some workers went on strike demanding higher wages and re-employment of some dismissed workers. The strike continued until 22 February. As the management declared a lockout all Putilov workers went on strike.. The next day was the International Women's Day, and the striking workers joined the women who were fed up with long queues for bread. By 25 February the strike movement comprising of workers, women and young people assumed the character of a general strike. Troops, which were ordered to suppress the uprising, joined the protesters. Tsar Nicholas II tried to put down the uprising by force and to dissolve the Duma. But the Duma refused to obey and the revolutionaries took over Petrograd. Within five days of the beginning of the revolution, Tsar Nicholas II was forced to abdicate. However, he abdicated in favour of his brother, but he refused to accept the throne.

24.4. October (Bolshevik) Revolution And Role Of Lenin

24.4.1. Provisional Government: Following the abdication of the Tsar, the Fourth Duma set up Provisional Government. From February to October 1917, the Provisional Government ruled Russia in theory, pending the elections to a constituent assembly. Alexander Kerensky, who was a member both of the Government

and of the Petrograd Soviet was the Minister of Justice in the first cabinet of the Provisional Government. Later, he became the Minister of War and finally became the Prime Minister. Kerensky was in favour of bringing about liberal democracy in Russia.

The Provisional Government consisted of the representatives of middle classes. It believed in constitutional government and introduced a number of reforms in various fields. It allowed freedom of speech and of the press. People were also assured of the freedom of religion and to form unions to protect their interests. Arbitrary arrest and imprisonment was discontinued. Discrimination against the Jews, which was a legacy of the Tsarist regime was abolished. They were granted political, civil and military rights. Political prisoners were released. Those who had been exiled to Siberia during the Tsarist regime were allowed to return. A promise was made for the election of a Constituent Assembly based on adult franchise to frame a new constitution for Russia. Autonomy was promised to the people of Poland and constitutional rights to the people of Finland.

24.4.2. Problems Faced by the Provisional Government:

- (a) *Dual authority of the Provisional Government and Petrograd Soviet:*** Though the Provisional Government conducted the business of the government and introduced a number of reforms, the Petrograd Soviet exercised the real power. When the Provisional Government took power, the Petrograd Soviet of deputies, representing workers, peasants and soldiers, also began to meet regularly. Initially the aim of the Soviet was to keep a watchful eye on the government and to protect the interests of the masses. It issued its own newspaper *Izvestia*. Soviets were established in different parts of Russia, which were linked in regional and national congresses. Broadly, the Provisional Government represented the middle classes and the soviets represented the masses.
- (b) *Failure to meet the demands of peasants and workers:*** The Provisional Government was too slow in dealing with the peasants' demand for the redistribution of land still under private ownership. The peasants were opposed to any compensation to the landlords for the lands acquired from them. A decision on this problem was postponed until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly. However, desperate peasants began to take possession of private land. As the news of this reached the army, peasant soldiers gave up their army postings and joined in the land grabbing. There was also a demand to nationalize industries without offering any compensation to the capitalists. As the Provisional Government had assured full individual freedom, it found it difficult to accept these demands.

- (c) **Continuation of Russia's participation in World War I:** In spite of the general opposition, the Provisional Government continued Russia's participation in World War I. The Russian armies suffered many defeats and casualties. The war caused great sufferings to the soldiers in particular and the people of Russia in general. The war made the Provisional Government unpopular among a large section of the people. The Bolshevik Party was against the continuation of Russia in the war as it condemned it as an imperialist war. The Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda* wrote: "Turn the imperialist war into civil war for the liberation of the people from the yoke of the ruling classes". An attempt by the Bolsheviks to stage an uprising at Petrograd was foiled. Bolshevik leaders were arrested and *Pravda* was banned.
- (d) **Mutiny of General Kornilov:** Though Kerensky succeeded in resisting an attack from the extreme left wing, he was faced by an attempted *coup d'état* by the right wing. General Kornilov, the commander-in-chief of the Russian army, enjoyed the sympathy of the landlords and capitalists. He tried to dismiss both the Provisional Government and the Soviet in September 1917. However, the attempt ended in a failure as the Soviet and particularly the Bolsheviks crushed the mutiny. With this the Bolsheviks gained in popularity and the Provisional Government was losing ground.

24.5. Role Of Lenin In The Bolshevik Revolution

Lenin (1870-1924) was born in the city of Simbirsk in central European Russia. He was the third of six children born to Ilya Nikolayevich Ulyanov and Maria Alexandrovna Blank. While Lenin was finishing school in Simbirsk in 1887, his elder brother, Alexander, was arrested and executed in St. Petersburg for his involvement in a conspiracy to assassinate Russian Emperor Alexander III. Later that year Lenin entered Kazan University, where he intended to study law. Before completing his first term at the university, however, Lenin was expelled for his involvement in a student demonstration. He continued his study of law as an external student of St Petersburg University.

24.5.1. Marxist Influence: While studying law, Lenin began to acquaint himself with the radical political literature of the time. He was very much impressed by the novel *What Is To Be Done?* (1863) by Russian writer Nikolay Chernyshevsky. At this time, Lenin became acquainted with the revolutionary ideas of German philosopher Karl Marx through his greatest work *Das Kapital*. Marx's ideas had a profound influence on Lenin, and he soon came to consider himself a Marxist.

Lenin received his law degree in 1892, and began to practice law. However, he soon began to get himself involved in revolutionary

politics. In the mid-1890s Lenin quit his law practice and settled in St. Petersburg. There he became associated with a group of radicals who were similarly impressed by the ideas of Marx.

The Marxist activists of St. Petersburg under the leadership of Lenin began working with the industrial workers of the city. They tried to increase their awareness regarding their political and economic power. They also attempted to help organize strikes to improve working conditions in the factories. In 1895, the St. Petersburg Marxists formed an organization called the *Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class*.

24.5.2. Arrest and Exile: The St. Petersburg union was short-lived. The state police arrested Lenin along with other prominent Marxist leaders. After serving 15 months in prison, Lenin was sentenced in 1897 to three years of exile, which he spent in the southern Siberia. It was during this period in Siberia that Lenin produced his first major work, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899). Lenin believed that Russia was ready for a revolution led by the lower classes, a revolution that would result in the overthrow of the imperial regime and the establishment of a socialist economy and state.

24.5.3. Leader of the Bolsheviks: Lenin's term of exile ended in 1900 and he went abroad, first to Switzerland and then he settled in Munich, Germany. Together with other like-minded Marxists, Lenin became one of the principal editors of the newspaper *Iskra* (The Spark), first published in Munich in December 1900. The newspaper's aim was to bring together the Marxist groups scattered throughout Europe, particularly Russia. In 1902 Lenin published a pamphlet *What Is to Be Done?*, asserting his own belief in a dedicated revolutionary party, strictly disciplined and professional, to lead Russians to a Marxist state. In 1903, the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party split into two groups due to differences about membership. Lenin became the leader of the Bolsheviks and the other group came to be known as the Mensheviks.

From 1906 to 1908, Lenin spent most of his time writing revolutionary pamphlets and attending party congresses in England, Germany, and Sweden. Due to restrictions, he found it too difficult to carry on revolutionary activities in Russia. After two years in Finland, Lenin went to Switzerland and then to France. In April 1912, the Bolsheviks established *Pravda* (Truth), a revolutionary newspaper that was sold openly. Lenin became the chief contributor to *Pravda*.

24.5.4. Lenin's views on World War I: Lenin settled again in Switzerland, where he spent the initial years of World War I (1914-1918). The war inspired one of Lenin's most influential works, titled *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916). In this book,

Lenin argued that the world war was an inevitable outcome of Western capitalism and imperialism, whereby the capitalist states of Europe had come to rely upon aggressive foreign expansion in order to maintain economic profits. Lenin was convinced that the war signaled the final decline of the worldwide capitalist economy and thus was bringing nearer the socialist revolution

24.5.5. Return to Russia: When the February Revolution broke out in Russia, Lenin was in Zurich, Switzerland. Lenin was convinced that the revolution must not stop with the assumption of power by the liberal Provisional Government. Instead, he believed it must proceed directly to the final stage of revolution according to Marxist theory: the creation of a *dictatorship of the proletariat*, that is, a government ruling on behalf of Russia's industrial workers and peasants. Lenin was determined to return to Russia to incite further developments in the revolutionary movement and his own Bolshevik Party. His efforts to return home were thwarted by the French and Italian governments. They refused to let him pass through their countries because they feared that his presence in Russia would weaken the Allied war effort. However, Lenin received assistance from the German authorities, who hoped that his return would promote further political unrest in Russia and thereby help Germany win the war. The Germans sent Lenin to Petrograd in a famous sealed train that ensured his safety as he crossed through Germany, Sweden, and Finland. He arrived in his country's capital in early April.

25.5.6. The April Theses: Almost immediately after arriving in Petrograd, Lenin issued his famous *April Theses*, in which he called for the overthrow of the Provisional Government, for the ownership of all land by a new Communist government, and for an end to Russia's participation in World War I. Lenin quickly regained leadership of the Bolsheviks. However, he was unsuccessful in capturing power. In July, Lenin was implicated in an abortive armed uprising in Petrograd and was forced to leave the Russian capital for Finland. During his exile in Finland, Lenin also formulated his ideas about socialist government in the famous pamphlet *State and Revolution* (1917). In this pamphlet, Lenin spelt out how to organize a revolution and what kind of government to establish after the power had been seized. In September, Lenin wrote to the leaders of the Bolsheviks and declared that the time for speechmaking was over. It was time for action. "History will not forgive us if we do not assume power now," Lenin said.

25.5.7. The October Revolution: Lenin returned to Petrograd in October and continued his demands for an armed uprising. By the end of the month, he finally succeeded in convincing a majority of the Bolshevik Party to favour a seizure of power. Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik president of the Petrograd Soviet, got control over some government troops. Naval crews also agreed to support the revolt.

Finally, on 20 October 1917, the Bolsheviks successfully put into effect the long planned overthrow of the Provisional Government of Kerensky. Armed factory workers and revolutionary troops captured the key buildings in Petrograd. The Winter Palace, the headquarters of the Provisional Government, was captured after some resistance. Kerensky fled to an unknown place on 25 October 1917, while some of his colleagues and ministers were arrested. Hereafter, the Bolsheviks controlled the Russian government. They had come to power with the help of a simple slogan, *Bread, peace, land*.

25.6. Russia Under Lenin: The immediate problem of the Bolsheviks was to consolidate their authority. The capital of the country was shifted from Petrograd to Moscow. The administration was reorganized and the Communists filled important positions in the administration. Within a month of coming to power the Communists formed the *Cheka*. This was the powerful political police who organized mass terror against all enemies of the new regime. All over Russia the *Cheka* executed all those suspected of opposing the Communist Government.

The first act of the new government was to issue two decrees: The first decree called for an immediate end to the war in Europe, and the second called for the nationalization of Russian land and authorized the Russian peasantry to forcibly confiscate privately owned lands. Desperate to make conditions more favourable for the new government, Lenin began pushing for peace negotiations with the Germans. In March 1918, the German and Soviet governments signed the *Treaty of Brest-Litovsk*, in which the Soviet government ceded to Germany a vast amount of Russian territory, containing about one-third of Russia's population, one-third of its cultivated land, and one-half of its industry. Although Lenin was convinced that these harsh terms must be accepted in order to end Russia's involvement in the war, the treaty was widely unpopular, even within the Soviet government.

In March 1918, the Bolsheviks renamed themselves the Russian Communist Party. That summer, former officers of the imperial military, landlords and capitalists, Social Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and other disgruntled elements began to form anti-Bolshevik armies in southern Russia and Siberia. Called the *White Armies*, these groups strongly opposed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the antidemocratic seizure of power by the Bolshevik Party. World War I Allies, who believed that their victory over Germany depended on Russia rejoining the Allied cause, supported the Whites. Meanwhile, the Soviet government began to organize its own military force, the *Red Army*, under the direction of Lenin's longtime associate Leon Trotsky. In August 1918 two bullets seriously wounded Lenin in an assassination attempt carried out by

a political opponent. However, Lenin recovered from the wounds and was able to carry on his normal activities.

From 1918 to 1921 Russia was torn by a civil war between the White Armies and the Red Army of the Soviet government. Under the direction of Trotsky, who appealed to the Russian people both in the name of revolution and the fatherland, the Red Army was mobilized which could resist both the foreign invaders and Russian insurgents. In the summer of 1918 the Soviet government, under Lenin's leadership, launched the *Red Terror*, a brutal campaign aimed at eliminating political opponents among the civilian population.

The civil war was accompanied by a crushing economic breakdown. In 1920 total industrial production was only 13 per cent of what it had been in 1913. In order to solve the problem the Communist Government adopted a programme, which came to be known as the *War Communism*. In order to meet the shortages of goods, the government abolished the payment of wages and distributed supplies among urban workers in proportion to their needs. All private trade was abolished; everything produced by the peasants above what they required to subsist was acquired by the state in order to increase the supply of food to army troops and workers in the cities. In urban areas, factories were nationalized and workers were subjected to strict discipline.

Along with fighting the civil war and facing economic crisis at home, Lenin also turned his attention to the international arena. In March 1919 he organized the Third International, popularly known as the Communist International, or *Comintern*, to promote world revolution according to the Russian Communist model. The Comintern initially focused on Europe as the center for the future revolution. However, when a European upheaval failed to materialize, the Comintern shifted its attention to Asia, where it supported the cause of colonial peoples struggling against European imperialism.

The policies of War Communism led to significant decline in Russia's agricultural and industrial output. Widespread strikes and uprisings broke out in cities and rural areas, and by early 1921 mass unrest was threatening the stability of the Soviet government. At the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, held in March, Lenin introduced a policy of economic liberalization known as the *New Economic Policy* (NEP). The policy signified a temporary retreat from Lenin's goal of transforming the Soviet economy into a fully Communist one. Lenin described the NEP as "one step backward in order to take two steps forward". The NEP authorized private manufacturing and private trade on a small scale, reintroduced the payment of wages, and permitted peasants to sell their grains in the open market. In 1924 a constitution was adopted, replacing imperial Russia with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Lenin's health had been shattered by the strain of revolution and war. He was ill by November 1921. In late 1922 and early 1923 Lenin dictated what became known as his *testament*, in which he expressed regret at the direction the Soviet government had taken, with particular emphasis on its dictatorial manner and its complex bureaucracy. He singled out Joseph Stalin, the then general secretary of the Communist Party, as the main culprit in many of these trends. Stalin's aggressive behaviour had brought him into conflict with the ailing Lenin. Lenin suffered strokes in 1922 and 1923, and died on 21 January 1924 due to brain hemorrhage at the age of fifty-three.

Lenin was one of the greatest revolutionary leaders of the twentieth century. As a politician, he possessed remarkable determination, ruthlessness, and sometimes cruelty. It was Lenin's clarity of vision that ultimately guided the Bolsheviks to power. However, his vision for the future of Russia and USSR was less clear. Lenin was more successful as a revolutionary leader than as a statesman. Lenin's greatest achievements were those attained in struggle, such as in the Bolsheviks' attempt to capture power in 1917, and their effort to preserve their authority during the civil war. His leadership, and his conception of the revolutionary party as a disciplined, military-style organization, served as an important model for later revolutionary leaders of the twentieth century, such as Mao Tse-tung of China and Fidel Castro of Cuba. Lenin was also one of the leading Russian writers and thinkers of the period, and his works made important contributions to the development of revolutionary socialist theory.

25.7. Impact Of The Russian Revolution Of 1917: The Russian Revolution of 1917, especially the Bolshevik Revolution is one of the greatest landmarks in the history of the twentieth century. It had great influence not only on the history of Russia but also of the world. The significance of the Russian Revolution of 1917 can be summarized as the following:

- (1) The Russian Revolution of 1917 brought an end to the age old, autocratic, inefficient and corrupt Tsarist regime.
- (2) For the first time in the history of humankind Marxism (Revolutionary Socialism) was introduced in political, social and economic spheres in Russia. The Bolshevik Revolution established the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia.
- (3) The success of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia provided a great scope for Marxism against capitalism. Soviet Russia became a source of inspiration for people all over the world to fight against exploitation by the landlords and capitalists. A number of countries in Asia (China, North Korea, Vietnam) and Eastern Europe (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East

Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Albania) came under Communist regimes.

- (4) The Russian Revolution of 1917 had a universal appeal to the workers all over the world. *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848 was translated into a practical reality. The establishment of the Communist International (Comintern) further encouraged the workers all over the world to stand united against the capitalist class. In order to keep Communism away from their countries, many capitalist governments awarded a number of concessions and brought legislation that benefitted the industrial workers. Thus, Russian Communism indirectly helped the betterment of workers all over the world.
- (5) The Russian Revolution of 1917 created a great awakening among the countries of Asia and Africa exploited by the imperial powers. Communist ideology encouraged freedom struggle in these countries.
- (6) Under the Communist Government Russia emerged as a great economic and military power. It became a highly advanced industrialized nation. Stalin's Five Year Plans were chiefly responsible for the emergence of Russia as a super power rivalling the United States of America. Russia made great progress in economic, social, educational and scientific fields.
- (7) Following the Second World War, two power blocs emerged in the world. The Communist Bloc led by Soviet Russia and the Capitalist bloc led by the United States of America. The ideological differences between these two power blocs led to the cold war politics that shaped the course of post-Second World War politics up to 1990s.
- (8) However, it is important to note that the Bolshevik Revolution resulted in the rise of ruthless communist dictatorship in Russia. Thousands of people were either killed or exiled to Siberia in order to suppress opposition to the communist regime, especially under Stalin. People were denied civil rights and liberalism was rooted out through ruthless measures. Religious freedom was denied and thousands of places of worship were closed down.

Questions

1. Analyze the cause of the February Revolution of 1917 in Russia.
2. Discuss the course of events that led to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia.
3. Evaluate the role of Lenin in the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

4. Review the impact of the Russian Revolution of 1917.



Reading List

1. Albrecht Carrie R., *The Concert of Europe*, New York, 1968.
2. Anderson B., *Europe in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1987.
3. Barraclough Geoffery, *An Introduction to Contemporary History*, Pelican, London, 1977.
4. Belas D., *Risorgimento And The Unification of Italy*, London, 1971.
5. Bergeron L., *France Under Napoleon*, Princeton, 1981.
6. Bertier De Sauvigny De, *Metternich And His Times*, London, 1962.
7. Boshier J.F., *The French Revolution*, London, 1989.
8. Breuning L., *Age of Revolution And Reaction, 1789-1850*, New York, 1977.
9. Brogan H., *The Ancient Regime And The French Revolution*, London, 1966.
10. Carr E.H., *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1926, Vol.I*, New York, 1958.
11. Crawley C.W., *The Question Of Greek War of Independence*, London, 1930.
12. Davies Norman, *Europe: A History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.
13. Dmytryshyn Basil, *A History of Russia*, New Delhi, 1981.
14. Drot E., *Europe Between Revolutions, 1815-1848*, New York, 1967.
15. Fay S.B., *Origins Of The World War*, New York, 1991.
16. Fisher H.A.L., *A History of Europe, From The Early 18th Century To 1935 (Vol.II)*, London, 1935.
17. Gershoy Leo, *The French Revolution And napoleon*, Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1984.
18. Gold Frank D.M., *Origins Of The Crimean War*, London, 1994.
19. Hutchinson J., *Modern nationalism*, London, 1994.
20. Lee Bens F., *European History Since 1870*, New York, 1955.
21. Longer W.L., *European alliance And Alignment*, New York, 1951.
22. Nicolson H., *The Congress Of Vienna*, London, 1945.
23. Plante O., *Bismarck And The Development of Germany,(vol.I)*, Princeton, 1990.

24. Pugh Martin, *Companion To Modern European History, 1871-1945*, Oxford, 1997.
25. Rude George, *Revolutionary Europe (1780-1815)*, London, 1964.
26. Seaman L.C.B., *From Vienna To Versailles*, London, 1964.
27. Seten-Watson R.W., *Disraeli, Gladstone And The Eastern Question*, London, 1935.
28. Sharp A., *The Versailles settlement*, Basingstoke, 1991.
29. Taylor A.J.P., *Struggle For mastery In Europe 1848-1948*, London, 1977.
30. Thomson David, *Europe Since Napoleon*, Jain Pustak Mandir, Jaipur, 1977.