

INTRODUCTION TO EUROPEAN HISTORY

The "A" level History of Europe starts with the French Revolution of 1789. It is therefore justifiable to argue that after the outbreak of the French Revolution, European History rotates around the history of one nation, one event, and one man. The nation is France, which event is the French revolution and the man is Napoleon Bonaparte I. The French revolution was therefore the greatest event in the history of not only France but of the whole Europe. This was partly because it gave rise to the new ideas of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and Nationalism that spread throughout Europe and the world. However, before we sink deep into the French revolution, it is important to analyze the nature and characteristic of major states before the revolution.

The Nature and Characteristics of European States on The Eve Of The French Revolution Century)

By 1789 Europe was composed of several states, both big and small. The bigger states exerted a lot of influence on the small and weaker states. These states were divided into two conceptual regions i.e. Eastern Europe and Western Europe. Eastern Europe composed of Russia, Austrian Empire, parts of Turkish Empire and Eastern Prussia. Western Europe composed of Britain, France, Portugal, Holland, Spain and Netherlands.

1 England

England by 1789 was ruled by George III with Pitt, the younger as the Prime Minister. She was a constitutional monarchy with a functional parliament. George III also granted political liberties and there was religious freedom. The economy was the most progressive in Europe. The Agrarian (agricultural) and industrial revolution had and were making a lot of progress and England was leading Europe in agricultural and industrial productions. This is why she was referred as the workshop of Europe.

2 Austria- Hungary

Austria was a German state ruled by Hapsburg ruling family. She had forged an empire that comprised of different races brought under her control through force and diplomacy. Austria- Hungary was ruled by Marie Theresa from 1740-1780. She was very popular amongst all races because of her

reformist ideas. She is one of the greatest female rulers recorded in History. Marie Theresa was succeeded by her son Joseph II who ruled Austria from, 1780-1790. Like his mother, Joseph II was an enlightened despot who embarked on reforms to improve the conditions of his people. For instance, he reduced the influence of the pope and the church over the state affairs and abolished serfdom within his empire. However, he did not grant religious freedom, political liberties and social class equality.

3 Prussia

Prussia was the most powerful of the German states. She rivaled Austria for dominance over the German states. She was ruled by Hohenzollern ruling family that was-despotic and imperialistic. From 1740-1786, Prussia was ruled by Fredrick the great who was an enlightened despot. He carried Prussia to a very high level during his reign. He modernized agriculture, constructed new canals and encouraged industrial development by subsidizing industrialists. He allowed religious freedom and was prepared to allow Moslems to come to Prussia so long as they could contribute to the development of his country. He kept in touch with the common man through tours and occasionally ploughed the field physically, to boost the morale of farmers. Frederick the great died in 1786 and was succeeded by Fredrick William who was a weak minded and undecided ruler. He developed hostility towards Austria and Russia. He however enjoyed the strong foundation laid by Fredrick the great.

4 Russia

She was the biggest state of Europe; She had ever been strong since the reign of Peter the great (1786- 1825). On the Eve of the French revolution she was ruled by Catherine II. Although she was luxurious and despotic, she was however an enlightened despot who gave full attention to state issues and adopted Peter the great's policy of territorial expansion, which kept Russia high on the map of Europe. For instance, she got the greatest part of Poland that was shared between Austria, Prussia and Russia. Her achievement abroad can be described by her own words that she came to Russia as a poor girl, Russia gave her a lot of dowry but she repaid it back by giving Russia Azov, Ukraine and Crimea. However she granted no religious freedom and political liberties. She had a very big number of serfs. Their conditions were similar to, slaves. All the same, her economic policy was reformed in line with the views of encyclopidists like Diderot. Indeed she at one time invited Diderot and discussed Russia's economic policy with him.

5 France

France was ruled by the Bourbon ruling family that had reigned for over 400 years. The Bourbon monarchs were very despotic. By 1789, France was ruled by Louis XVI who was a weak despot; Louis XVI ruled from 1774 up to 1792. During his reign, there was no functional parliament, constitution and proper law. Besides, there were corruption, embezzlement and extravagancy that caused financial crisis by 1789. He was over influenced by his strong-minded Queen Marie Antoinette who was very unsympathetic to the French men since she was an Austrian princess. The clergy and the nobles were privileged at the expense of the peasants and the middle class. However compared to other parts of Europe, the conditions of the French peasants were better and she even had the biggest number of middle class.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The meaning of a revolution

It refers to the fundamental change that can either be political, social or economic in a society. Revolutions are either gradual which are often peaceful, or sudden / rapid where changes are realized with violence. In a revolutionary situation, two things are always visible:

The old features of society are changed either positively or negatively i.e. upside down new things/changes appear in a society either for better or worse.

Thus, French revolution refers to the social, political and economic changes that France experienced from 1789 up to the rise to power of Napoleon Bonaparte in 1799. It begun as a peaceful political reform movement on the 5th may 1789 but later took a violent dimension and involved the social and the economic structures as well. The Revolution was staged by the peasants and the middle class against the privileged nobles and the clergy. This is why the Marxist looked at it as a class struggle between the unprivileged peasants and the bourgeoisie (middle class) against the privileged nobles and the clergy.

The French revolution can be categorized into three main phases. The first stage was from May 1789 to 1791 (up to the death of Mirabeau) which was generally peaceful. The second stage was from 1792 to 1794 which was characterized by violence i.e. the reign of terror and the third stage was

from 1795 to 1799 led by the Directory of Government. These phases were marked by a number of events which aimed at solving political, social and economic problems that had sparked off the revolution in 1789.

Causes of the French Revolution

The revolution was a product of many forces or factors, which had different but important magnitudes / weights in causing the revolution. It was caused by both long term factors which can be traced down to the 17th century and the immediate factors that went up to the late 18th century. By 1789, the social, political and economic conditions in France had outlived its usefulness and the revolution was inevitable as peacock puts it; condition in society must be very bad before men in large numbers under take its over throw by violence. Although the revolution was caused by a number of factors, it is worth observing that the contribution of these factors varied in degree and magnitude. In other words no single factor however great it appears to be can adequately explain the occurrence of the revolution.

The causes of this most important event in the history of Europe can generally be grouped under social, political and economic problems that France faced by 1789. However this grouping is only for the purpose of simplifying them so that students as well as teachers find it easy to understand them. This is because it is very hard to differentiate between something that is political but not economic or social i.e. some factors can be considered political, asocial as well as economic.

1- Unfair political system (the nature of the ancient regime)

Despotism

By 1789 France was ruled by the Bourbon Monarchy whose administration was characterized by corruption, sectarianism, nepotism, human right abuses, lack of democracy and above all despotism. Power was absolutely in the hands of the king who was looked at as a demi-god. He was the law and the law was himself and that is why Louis xvi boasted that; "The thing is legal because I wish it so." Even the king's ministers had unlimited powers that could not be checked. For instance through the Lettres-de- cachet (arrest warrant) the king and his minister could arrest and imprison anybody at any time. This inflicted a lot of sufferings to the French men most of whom were innocent who responded through the 1789 revolution.

NB. The ancient regime was the hereditary Bourbon monarchy that existed in France prior to 1789. From 1610-1643 it was under Louis xiii, 1643-1715 under Louis xiv, 1715-1744 under the leadership of Louis XV and 1774-1792 led by Louis xvi. It should be noted that despotism that was practiced by Louis xvi was inherited from Louis xiii.

Lack of a functional parliament.

There was no functional parliament upon which people's problems could be articulated. The estate general had not sat for a period of 175 years since 1614. The provincial and district assemblies were replaced by royal assemblies known as intendants under the King, Therefore the Frenchmen had nowhere to forward and settle the social evils, political discontents, and the economic hardship since there was no functional parliament. The only ugly way had to be a revolution.

It's of paramount importance to stress that it was the calling of estates general meeting on the 5th may 1789 and the hectic disagreement over the seating arrangement that sparked off the revolution. Louis xvi insisted on the undemocratic and archaic ancient system of voting by houses against the third estate interest of voting by individual show of hands. This forced the third estate representatives to turn themselves into the national assembly and this was the beginning of the revolution.

Unfair Judicial system

The French legal system made no small contribution to the 1789 revolution. There were no uniform codes ' of law and one could be tried as much as 50 times for a single offence he or she committed. By 1789 there existed up to different feudal codes of law in different parts of France, which created judicial confusion and chaos within the judiciary. Besides, there were two different modes of appeal i.e. the Roman law in the South and the common law in the North, Worst of all there was no trial by jury and in most cases the nobles were the accusers as well as judges against the peasants and the middle class. Surely the peasants and the middle class could not expect a fair trial against the nobles and the clergy which conditioned them to revolt,

Lack of constitution

Apart from the chaotic judicial system, there was no constitution that could have guaranteed people s rights and provide equality of opportunity. This also meant that there Were lib checks and balances to the kings' excessive powers and unfair policies. The Frenchmen therefore resorted to a

revolution in a bid to have a constitution to safeguard their rights and properties against the Kings' excessive powers.

The Grievances of the army

The only "messiah" for the unpopular and despotic French monarchy was the army. Unfortunately, the army had a lot of grievances and was dissatisfied with the government. For instance, they hated the unfair promotions where high ranks were reserved for the nobles. They were also irritated by the severe punishments for minor offences; poor feeding and low pay amongst others. This explains why they fraternized with the revolutionaries when they were ordered to suppress them. Henceforth, the success of the French revolution counted so much on the support of the army.

Administrative structure

Political unfairness in France was also characterized by unfair administrative structure, which favored the nobles and clergy at the expense of the peasants and the middle class. The nobles and clergy were dominant in key positions in the army and public offices yet they were incompetent and corrupt which created a lot of inefficiency. The middle class because of their high levels of qualification and wealth felt it was an insult to exclude them from top administrative positions. This made them to mobilize the peasants and spearhead the revolution.

However, the role of political unfairness in the French revolution should be handled with care. This is because it was part and parcel of the Bourbon monarchy and the French men had tolerated it for over 400 years without violently protesting against it. This therefore suggests that political unfairness on its own could not have caused the revolution.

Nevertheless one should take extra care because whereas such political unfairness was fashionable in the 16th and 17th centuries, it was out of fashion in the 18th century since no society is static. In this respect Louis XVI should have reformed the French political system to suit the dynamic and revolutionary 18th century Frenchmen. All the same whatever the arguments against political unfairness, it still remains a significant long-term factor that contributed to the 1789 French revolution.

2. THE ROLE OF PHILOSOPHERS, ENCYCLOPAEDISTS AND OTHER WRITERS.

Philosophers are great thinkers who are highly educated about world affairs. They are intellectual giants who had put their ideas into writing. In

their writings, they condemned the social, political and economic situations in France and created more awareness of the grievances/problems of France. This sharpened the minds of the Frenchmen and created in them a revolutionary spirit. The four most outstanding philosophers who made significant contributions to the French revolution were; Voltaire, Montesquieu, J.J Rousseau and John Lock.

Francois-markarovet-voltaire, 1694-1778

Voltaire was a historian and a poet who attacked and exposed the traditions, beliefs and abuses of the ancient regime i.e. its shortcomings. For 25 years he flooded France with plays, poems, philosophical tales, histories, essays, drama, pamphlets and won for himself the reputation of "the intellectual ruler of his age". He was most particularly against the Catholic Church, its corrupt clergy and nobles, heavy taxation, the tithe and the system of Lettres-de-cachet. He denounced religious intolerance and advocated for freedom of worship. He projected the British-political system with religious freedom as the best for France. In the "Letters on the English" he wrote; An Englishman goes to heaven by the way he pleases. There are no arbitrary taxes, a noble or priest is not exempted from paying tax. In other words Voltaire was preaching for religious freedom, fair taxation and abolition, of social class privileges. All these incited the peasants and the middle class to revolt by 1789.

Although Voltaire attacked the church and critically undermined the throne on which it rested (government), he was neither a democrat nor a republican. He only wanted reforms within the monarchy and not its destruction. This is why he remarked that, I would rather be ruled by one Lion than by a hundred rats. This was because a violent change would destroy his wealth.

Apart from being a strong believer in the Bourbon monarchy, Voltaire was a very faithful religious believer. He was not an atheist; his views were that; If God did not exist, it would be necessary to create him. He was against the Catholic Church because of its interference on state affairs.

Baronde-Montesquiev, 1689-1755

Montesquieu was a great traveler, and while in Britain, he had studied the British political system, which he advocated for in France. In his book "The spirit of the laws, 1748" he criticized the Divine rights of Kings and compared despotism to cutting down a tree in order to get its fruits. He praised the British political system of equality as the best for France. To limit

absolutism of the ancient regime, he advocated for a constitutional monarchy with an independent judiciary, executive and legislature. Each of these was to check the powers of the other and this would bring justice and liberty to the people.

Montesquieu's political philosophy became more pronounced in France after the successful American war of independence of 1776-1783. From 1783, America adopted an elected government with a legislative assembly, an executive, a constitution and an independent judiciary. The success of Montesquieu's ideas in America provoked the Frenchmen to revolt against the Bourbon monarchy. That is why they demanded for the reduction of the King's despotic powers and equal political representation in the estates-general meeting (according to Montesquieu's ideas) on the eve of the revolution in the cahiers (list of grievances). In short, Montesquieu contributed revolutionary ideas that made the Frenchmen more revolutionary than ever before.

Jean Jacquesroussea U, 1712-1778

J.J Rousseau was the most democratic philosopher whose ideas were most prominent to the French revolution of 1789-1799. His book, "The social contract" became the bible of diehard revolutionaries and, Robespierre was its high priest. In this book, he explained that a government is a contract between the ruler and the ruled and that the ruled has the right to rev. At if the rulers fail to protect, promote and defend their social, political and economic rights as was the case with the Bourbon monarchy.

Rousseau's theory of the "general will of the people" called for a democratically elected government of the people, by the people and for the people. By the people, he meant the majority French peasants and the middle class who were oppressed. He therefore instilled in them, the spirit of questioning and doubting the worthiness of the nobles, clergy and above all the bourbon monarchy. In short, Rousseau contributed to the revolution by inciting the majority French peasants and middle class against the minority clergy and nobles

Rousseau's most memorable and revered statement was that man is born free but everywhere in chains. He continues that; the surroundings of the society destroy the natural simplicity of man, tainted his virtues and were responsible for his sufferings and sins. In this way, he shows how the Bourbon monarchy was responsible for problems in France through political unfairness, economic hardships and social discrimination. All in all,

Rousseau contributed revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty, and democracy which made the French revolution inevitable.

NB. Rousseau's views were that in the initial stages man was not barbaric but was a liberal wild animal. He called people to end artificial social structure that had enslaved and restricted man's freedom. He says man should adopt the primitive simplicity when he was ruled by natural laws, when he was ignorant and innocent, as nature had made him.

Paradoxically, Rousseau was not even in favor of constitutional monarchy of the British type. He wrote that the British were mistaken to consider themselves to be free. He says they were free only during elections, after elections they were forgotten by their elected representatives. However, Rousseau like his counterparts believed that it was better to reform the monarchy than to abolish it. Nevertheless, his views were very instrumental during the course of the revolution.

John Lock (1632-1704)

John Lock was one of the classical philosophers whose ideas contributed to the outbreak of the French revolution of 1789. He observes that people freely enter into a social contract to create a government in order to protect their freedom, properties and lives. He argues that if a government fails to promote and protect the natural rights and security of its citizens, then it's in a state of rebellion against its own people and violated the terms of the social contract. The people in such a situation have the right to rebel against it and establish a new one. He also castigated absolute monarchy as an illegitimate form of government. He argues that the powers of a government come from the people rather than God, which helped to undermine divine rights of King Louis XVI. Consequently, Lock advocated for a democratic government where the parliament, executive and judiciary have powers that are not absolute but are given in trust by the people. People are free to withdraw such powers in case a government fails to effectively perform responsibilities entrusted to it. All these were viable options for the French peasants and middle class to revolt because of nonfunctional parliament, judicial and administrative in justice that favored the nobles and the clergy.

The Encyclopaedists in their encyclopedia (book of knowledge about politics, religion, history and economics) exposed the social, political and economic evils of the ancient regime that needed reforms. Their editor was Denis Diderot who compiled the writings of other writers in one big volume (encyclopedia). The encyclopedia was widely circulated and read in

France and the whole Europe. It gave more enlightenment and inspiration to the French peasants and the middle class that dragged them to revolt.

The economists like Adam Smith, Diderot, D'Alambert, etc denounced the unfair taxation system, corruption, embezzlement of public funds and royal extravagancy. They also called for universal education and an end to state injustice. Their spokesmen were Quesney and Turgot. The economic reforms that were advocated by the physiocrats were later adapted by Necker, Turgot and Brienne. However, these were ignored and rejected by Louis xvi with his poor advisors, which accelerated France into the revolution of 1789.

Generally, philosophers, encyclopaedists and other writers awakened the oppressed Frenchmen to demand for a change of government. They were also the authors of the French revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty, fraternity and democracy. These ideas created a class of elites like Mira beau, Robespierre and Napoleon I who became revolutionary leaders.

Nevertheless the significance of philosophers should be treated with reservations due to the following considerations:

They had criticized the French political system since the reign of King Louis xv without causing any revolution. If their ideas counted so much, then the revolution would have started during the reign of Louis XV.

By 1789, the re-known philosophers were all dead. If their writings were very significant, then the revolution would have started during their lifetime and they would have been the leaders of the revolution.

Even if what survived their death (writings) implied a revolution, the majorities of the Frenchmen were illiterate and could not understand their works. Even the few liberates could not properly grasp the abstract and logical writings of the philosophers which were in big vocabularies, poems and parables amongst others.

(iv) None of the philosophers wanted a violent revolution of the French type since it would destroy their wealth. They simply wanted a peaceful reform of the monarchy. This could mean that the contributions of the political philosophers were accidental since they never wanted a violent revolution.

(v) The writings of the philosophers were widely circulated and read throughout Europe. The fact that it caused a revolution only in France shows that France had specific problems that called for a revolution. Indeed the

evils within France were so conspicuous (open) that even if the philosophers had not exposed them, a revolution would still have taken place in France.

In summary, it was mostly the role of other factors other than the influence of the philosophers that contributed to the great French revolution. It was the social, political and economic evils that the philosophers criticized, otherwise without these problems they would have had nothing to criticize and write about. Nevertheless, the critical influence of the philosophers magnified such problems to a revolutionary level. In short, the role of philosophers complemented other factors in causing the French revolution of 1789.

3. SOCIAL CLASS DIVISION (CLASS STRUGGLE).

The Marxist interpretation of the French revolution is that it was a product of class struggle between the unprivileged and privileged classes. The 1789 French population was partitioned into three discriminative and rival estates. The first estate was composed of the clergy and royalists, the second was for the nobles and the third estate was composed of peasants and the bourgeoisie (middleclass).

Generally, the 1st and the 2nd estates were called the privileged class. Although the privileged class numbered about 300,000 out of 25 million, they enjoyed a lot of unjustifiable privileges. This includes owning 1/5 of the whole property in France, domination of key government posts, exemption from taxation, forced labour and conscription into the army. These widespread privileges were seriously opposed by the peasants and middle class, which provoked them to revolt.

The influence of the Catholic Church and the clergy in the social, political, economic and religious affairs of France made the outbreak of the revolution inevitable. The church and the Pope had a lot of influence on politics and administration of France. The clergy who dominated key government positions were not only incompetent but messed up the country through corruption, bribery and embezzlement of public funds. They enjoyed a yearly income of 500 million Francs and exploited peasants through feudalism and serfdom. They also denied the Frenchmen freedom of worship and made the church tithe to be compulsory to everybody in France yet they were exempted from all forms of taxes. Thus, the church pursued worldly interest more than spiritual interest, which provided philosophers with issues to criticize and incite the Frenchmen to revolt.

However, even within the privileged class, there existed contradictions and sharp divisions. The 1st estate (clergy) was subdivided into upper clergy who enjoyed the highest pay and key positions in government yet they did little pastoral work and the lower clergy who were overworked with little payments. The salary of an upper clergy was 10 times more than that of a lower clergy. The nobles were also subdivided into the upper nobility, the lower nobility and the nobility of the robe (those who brought their noble status). The upper nobility were more privileged than the lower nobility. They (the upper nobility) were very arrogant and despised the other two nobles and this is why the French developed a maxim that; that the nobles fight the clergy pray and the people pay. This discrimination within the privileged class boosted the revolution because some of such nobles and the clergy joined the peasants and the middle class during the revolution.

The third estate was for the peasants and the middle class. The peasants were about 23 million out of a total population of 25 million. However, they were denied all sorts of freedom and subjected to unjust practices like taxation, denial of land, forced labour etc. By 1789, they were in a very desperate condition that made them to flock the streets of Paris where they ended up becoming revolutionary mobs, this greatly led to the success of the revolution.

The Bourgeoisie (middle class) was composed of businessmen and professionals like teachers, lawyers, doctors, scientists, philosophers, industrialists and merchants. In spite of their economic strength (wealth) and education, the middle class was unprivileged and deprived of political rights. For instance, they were excluded from top positions in the church, army, education and the judiciary. A number of them had lent huge chunks of money to the government and were not sure of recovering their money due to financial crisis. By 1789, they had read and interpreted the writings of political philosophers to the peasants and urban dwellers, making them more aware and conscious of the need for change. It is important to stress that revolutionary leaders like Mirabeau, Danton, Herbert and Robespierre were middle class men. Moreover, political philosophers who made remarkable contributions to the revolution were also middle class men.

Nevertheless like political unfairness, social class division was not a new thing in the history of France. It existed during the reigns of Louis xvi and Louis xv without causing any revolution. One can therefore argue that maintaining social class system without other grievances could have caused discontent but not a revolution. But this kind of argument should not be over emphasized because unfairness in France was the outcome of social class

divisions. Even financial crisis was due to the fact that the privileged class who were most wealthy was exempted from taxation. From this point of view, one can conclude that social stratification is one of the paramount long term causes of the French revolution.

Emphasis must be made that class system led to the failure of the Estates General meeting of 5th May 1789 through which the revolution emerged. It must be noted that the French revolution was sparked off by disagreement over the seating arrangement, when the representatives of the privileged classes insisted on the ancient system of voting based on class system. This was resisted by the representatives of the unprivileged class who wanted voting by universal suffrage i.e. individual show of hands. This is why class struggle is considered one of the immediate causes of the 1789 French revolution.

4. ECONOMIC FACTORS

Land

The feudal system of land ownership was important in bringing about the French revolution of 1789. Land was unfairly distributed amongst the nobles and the clergy at the expense of the majority peasants. For instance they owned up to 3/5 of the land yet they formed only 1/8 of the total population. The church had 1/5 of the fertile state land on top of a yearly income of 500 million Francs. The 23 million peasants (majority) in spite of being producing agents and taxpayers were landless and survived as tenants or serfs on their landlords' estates. The conditions of the peasants could better be felt than described. They suffered constant harassment and exploitation from their landlords and that is why they demanded for land reforms during the revolution.

Taxation

By 1789, the taxation system of France had made the ancient regime "very sick" and no wonder that it was referred to as "the cancer of the ancient regime". The poor peasants and the idle class, who were least able to pay, were forced to pay while the wealthy nobles and the clergy were exempted from all forms of taxes. The tax system was particularly so burdensome to the peasants that it claimed over 80% of their annual income. This left them under a very miserable socio-economic condition, which can be better felt than described. Worst of all, the taxation system was privatized and the tax farmers (tax collectors) were so brutal that they often killed or inflicted physical injuries like mutilation of tax defaulters.

Besides, the profits of the Bourgeoisie were seriously reduced by heavy taxation. All these dragged the peasants and the middle class in the revolution in a bid to bring an end to unfair taxation system

Financial crisis/Bankruptcy

By 1789, France was bankrupt with a heavy debt burden mostly from the middle class. Financial crisis was brought about by corruption, embezzlement of government funds, financial mismanagement, extravagancy of court nobles and Marie Antoinette which constituted 1/12 of government revenue leave alone the wastage of state resources on useless and expensive wars like the 7 years war with Britain in India (1756-1763), the American war of independence (1776-1783). The roles of financial crisis/bankruptcy in the French revolution were as below:

(a) The government resorted to internal borrowing from the middle class in a desperate attempt to service the heavy debt burden and meet the cost of administration. However, Louis XVI resorted to drastic measures of reducing interest on small loans and refusing to pay back huge loans. By 1789, it was abundantly clear that the Bourbon monarchy under Louis XVI's leadership could not repay the debts of the middle class. Thus, the middle class decided to "do away" with the monarchy and establish a new government that would clear their debts, hence the revolution.

b) It undermined people's confidence in the government and exposed the dangers of financial mismanagement and extravagancy. This made the monarchy unpopular and vulnerable to the revolution of 1789.

c). It made the government very inefficient in providing basic necessities and state enterprises like education, health, agriculture, industry, and transport. Besides, the government failed to pay civil servants, the army and resorted to unpopular policies such as retrenchment, excessive taxation, and free trade treaty with Britain etc. All these led to inflation, unemployment, general poverty and starvation, which forced the masses into the revolution.

d) Financial crisis made the government incompetent in combating the effects of natural disasters especially winter. There was no money to stock food and provide relief to the people. This worsened famine leading to the creation of mobs like those of Paris that cheered the revolution.

e) Financial crisis forced Louis XVI to call the estate general from where the French revolution exploded. He wanted to consult the representatives on the solutions to financial bankruptcy. Otherwise, if France was not in an

awkward financial situation, it would probably not have been called after all, I had never been called for 175 years (since 1614).

(f) Financial crisis lead to the dismissal of reform oriented financial ministers i.e. Turgot (1774 -1776), Necker (1776-1781), Colonne (1781-1787) and Bishop Brienne (1787-1788). They had suggested reforms like the scrapping of privileges in France and taxing the wealth of the nobles and the clergy. However, these reforms made them very unpopular to the Queen and the court nobles. Consequently, the strong-minded queen and the court nobles engineered their dismissal and replacement.

Introduction

An attempt to explain why a revolution broke out in France alone in 1789 inspite of the generally parallel (similar) conditions between France and the rest of Europe. The question of all questions is that if the conditions in France were generally parallel (similar) to many states in Europe, why then did France experience a revolution alone in 1789. Again, if the condition in France was better in some instances considering the peasants and middle class, why then did she host a revolution alone in 1789? In other words, why were the peasants and middle class at the fore front of the revolution in spite of the irrelatively better conditions when compared to their counterparts elsewhere?

By 1789, the social, political and economic conditions between France and the rest of Europe were generally the same. With the exception of Britain (to some extent), Europe was ruled by despotic rulers, the society was divided into classes and the masses lived in poor economic conditions. Although these conditions were favourable to revolutions throughout Europe, a revolution broke out in France alone in 1789 because of the extraordinary conditions in France. Even when the conditions in France were better than the rest of Europe, such better conditions acted as a catalyst leading to the revolution.

As already noted, France like Austria, Prussia, Russia and Spain were under despotic rulers. Whereas despotism in France was still absolute, the rest of Europe had enlightened despots who had improved the conditions of their people. For example, in Spain Charles III had eliminated corruption and reformed the taxation system while in Prussia Fredrick the great had codified the Prussian law. These reforms sharply contrast with France that was infested with corruption, unfair taxation system and absence of the

law. This difference explains why a revolution first broke out in France and not in any other state of Europe.

Whereas the church influence and privileges in France was still maintained by 1789, this was reduced and abolished in other parts of Europe. For instance, Joseph II of Austria had granted religious freedom, dismissed the church's influence in state affairs and confiscated its land. Even in Spain the church was under state control. The Frenchmen therefore wanted a revolution to destroy the church's influence in the social, political and economic affairs of France and have religious freedom that was already put right elsewhere in Europe.

Enlightened despots in other parts of Europe had also reformed the tax department while France still maintained the ancient system of taxation. In Austria, the privileges of the aristocracy were abolished and everybody who owned land was taxed. In France the tax burden was heaviest on the peasants while the nobles and the clergy who had a lot of land were exempted. This rigidity in the social class system is what made France to raise little revenue leading to the financial crisis that became one of immediate causes of the 1789 revolution.

NB. The taxation department in France was privatized. This made the contractors to overtax and mistreat the Frenchmen in order to make profits. This is why taxation was referred to as the cancer of the ancient regime.

The repercussions of natural disaster were worst in France due to economic rigidities created by tax farmers' collectors). The numerous taxes and road toll made it difficult to ration goods from where it was plenty to areas of scarcity. This made economic hardship to hit France hardest by 1789 leading to a revolution. Besides France was still relying on agriculture, which is more vulnerable to devastations by natural disasters. Other states like England, Belgium and Prussia were investing heavily in industries, which reduced the impact of natural disasters.

Although the conditions of the French peasants were better than any other country in Europe, it instead morale boosted their determination to struggle for better conditions. This is in line with Denis Richards's argument that; It tends to be people with something to loose and not merely something to gain who think most eagerly of improving the existing state of society. Actually the French peasants were relatively better and were able to pay taxes to the nobles, clergy and the state. They were therefore very disappointed by the diversion of their taxes to the luxuries of the

unproductive minorities-the clergy and nobles. This is why they participated in mobs and mob actions that made the French revolution inevitable.

Even in Russia where the conditions of the peasants were worst a revolution was avoided by 1789. Infact, there was little difference between a slave and a peasant but she survived a revolution because of the ability of the iron lady Tsar Catherine II who used force timely and promptly. For example she brutally suppressed the peasant revolt of 1773 and 1775. This contrasts with Louis XVI who failed to use force as the third estate declared themselves the national assembly and took the Tennis court oath which made the revolution of 1789 to progress.

NB. Louis xvi's inability to use force appropriately was partly due to the fact that he had lost the control over the army. By 1789 the French army were divided into two i.e. those who were still loyal to him and those who had lost trust to him (and therefore disloyal). This is why when things turned hot, he tried to flee to Austria and get foreign troops to suppress the revolution that only made the revolution to progress. It's important to stress those other despotic leaders like Joseph II of Austria, Tsar Catherine of Russia, and Fredrick the great of Prussia had firm control over the army and there was no disloyal element within the army. It's partly why Catherine was able to crush the peasant's revolt before it could spread throughout Russia.

Like the peasants (with the exception of Britain), France had also developed a highly enlightened middle class who nursed bitterness at being excluded from top political jobs. Indeed it is France where the middle class was most numerous, most prosperous and most desirous of change. Such were learned men and professionals like Robespierre, Desmoulin, Camille and Stanislus who championed the revolution during its course. One can therefore argue that whereas the oppressed masses of Europe desired change, they did not have the leaders to mobilize them hence an insight as to why a revolution occurred in France than elsewhere in Europe.

Apart from Britain, France by 1789 had a centralized administration. Paris was the locus (centre) of .administration with a population of over half a million people. These became the Paris revolutionary mob that cheered and supported the revolution when it began. Centralization also explains why the effects of natural disasters forced the masses to flock to Paris yet in other parts of Europe centralization was either still rudimentary or entirely lacking. In these areas unrest in the villages does not necessarily disturb the Centre (capital) and disorder in the Centre had little impact m the countryside unlike France.

The influence of England has also been advanced' to explain the unique occurrence of the French revolution. The British political system was reformed long time by the revolution of 1668. The Frenchmen therefore had to struggle to attain what the British had successfully achieved more than a century ago. On the other hand, whereas other despotic powers like Russia, Austria and Prussia were also vulnerable to the English influence like France, they were (and are) geographically far from England than France. This made France to have more of the English influence and hence the revolution of 1789.

The American war of independence of 1776-1783 also explains why France experienced a revolution single handedly. It contributed to bankruptcy which forced Louis xvi to summon the estate general meeting. Besides there was no foresight and proper planning for the war. Spain and Britain had a sound economy and financed the war using state funds but France borrowed from the Bourgeoisie (because of financial bankruptcy) who spear headed the revolution to recover their money, which Louis had failed to repay.

NB. Although Britain lost in the America war of independence and France succeeded in assisting the Americans to regain their independence, Britain could not experience a revolution since she had a genuine reason of defending her Imperial interest in America. France had no proper justification in the war. Moreover Louis xvi's myopia made him fail to realize that the oppression and injustice he was fighting in America needed to be stopped in France. This is why veteran soldiers of American war of independence led by Lafayette supported the French revolution when it started in 1789.

The weaknesses and character of Louis xvii shield high in explaining why France hosted a revolution alone in 1789. He was physically weak, undecided and a non-reformist leader. This is what made the estates General meeting of May 1789 to explode into a revolution. Even after the explosion, he failed to use force at the right time since he had even lost control over the army. If Louis xvi had the ability and determination of Tzar Catherine II who ruthlessly suppressed the peasants revolts of 1795 (at Pugachev), the French revolution would have been averted.

Louis xvi's administration was very loose. He was either a sleep or hunting during crucial state meetings. He was therefore not well versed with the problems of his people. This made him an isolated king to be ejected by the revolution of 1789. This was not the case in Prussia where Fredrick the

great made tours and regular inspection throughout the country. He was in touch with the common man that many times he physically ploughed the field as an exemplary leader. This increased his popularity that averted a revolution of the French type.

Russia, Austria and France had the influence of women in the state affairs before the French revolution. However out of all of them, the influence of Marie Antoinette in France was negative while those of Catherine II of Russia and Marie Theresa of Austria were positive. For instance while Marie Theresa (Antoinette's mother) of Austria was a reformer who was very popular, Marie Antoinette was so unsympathetic to the Frenchmen, a non-reformer and thus very unpopular. This also added to the unpopularity of Louis xvi which caused the 1789 revolution.

NB. Marie Theresa who ruled Austria from 1740-1780 was the mother of Marie Antoinette, the queen of ice. Joseph II who succeeded her was her son and a brother of Marie Antoinette. Joseph tried to advise sister not to over involve herself in French politics and at one time wrote a lengthy letter in which he warned her to have nothing to do with public affairs and think only in deserving the king's affection and confidence.

The works /writings of philosophers were widely read throughout Europe. Suffice to note is that philosophers never wanted a revolution of the French type since it would jeopardize their wealth. Voltaire stood for a reformed despotism that was practiced in Prussia, Russia and Austria but not in France. For instance Tsar Catherine of Russia had improved the economy using ideas of the philosophers. She even invited Diderot and discussed her economic reform programs with him. These moves were contrary in France because Louis dismissed the financial reforms proposed by Turgot and Necker which were based on Diderot's writings. Thus, much as it appears parallel that philosophers wrote for the whole Europe, France experienced a revolution alone in 1789 due to neglect of philosophical ideas, contrary to other states.

Lastly, philosophers enjoyed a wider and public reception in France than elsewhere because she had the widest middle class who wanted change. Secondly, in spite of censorship there were many ways and media through which their ideas circulated in France. These were liberal pamphlets, journals, shops, Lodges, saloons and recreational places. In these places the ideas of philosophers were analyzed and interpreted by the middle class to the peasants.

5. THE ROLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

It should be noted that the privileged class (clergy and nobles) indirectly contributed to the revolution since their privileges were at the expense of the peasants and middle class. The role of the unprivileged classes i.e. peasants and middle class were direct since they actively participated in the revolution due to the numerous grievances they had against the privileged class and the ancient regime.

Role of the Clergy/Catholic Church

1. The clergy fostered religious intolerance where Catholicism was the state religion yet there were Protestants and Moslems in France. Protestants and Moslems were not allowed to worship publicly and were often subjected to intimidation, Imprisonment, torture and exile. These robbed the church and the government of support from the anti-Catholic elements in France and forced them to revolt in 1789.

2. The Catholic Church had unjustifiable influences on State affairs and state policies. Most of the clergy including the pope were very poor advisors who made Louis XVI to mess up with state affairs.

3. The Catholic Church was the most privileged institution in France. The clergy enjoyed a yearly income of 500 million francs and dominated Land at the expense of the peasants. They exploited peasants on such land through Feudalism and serfdom. This made the peasants who were the producing agents to revolt for redistribution of Land.

4. In spite of the vast resources it had, the Catholic Church was exempted from all forms of taxes, clergy made "a free gift" to the government than contribute appropriate revenue to the nation treasury from its wealth. This contributed to financial crisis since they should have been the best contributors to the government revenue.

5. While the Catholic Church was exempted from all forms of taxes, the church tithe was compulsory for everybody in France. The church therefore fostered economic motives more than religious objectives in the exploitation of the common man. This dragged the non-Catholics to the revolution of 1789.

6. The French education system prior to 1789 was controlled by the clergy other than the state. Education policies were manipulated to indoctrinate the Frenchmen with ideas favourable to the state in an attempt to frustrate anti-government critics. This made the French men to revolt in order to reinstate education under state control.

7. Besides education, the Catholic Church controlled the press. It censored all newspapers, journals, pamphlets and other publications that were against the king and the monarchy. Liberal books and ideas were prohibited with a false hope that it would keep the Frenchmen ignorant. However, this boomeranged and made the Frenchmen more conscious of the need for changes, hence the revolution.

8. The clergy were a corrupt, embezzlers and extravagant group of people. They lived a parasitic life at the expense of the poor peasants. This led to economic hardship and the revolution of 1789.

9. The dominant position of the Catholic Church and the clergy provided the philosophers with something to criticize and incite the Frenchmen to revolt. Voltaire for instance condemned the catholic religious intolerance and its privileges at the expense of the oppressed peasants.

10. The representatives of the clergy together with the nobles provoked the third estate into the revolution by insisting on the ancient system of voting and deliberations during the estates general meeting of 5 May 1789. This brought a very chaotic disagreement which forced the third class to form the national assembly, take the tennis court oath and progress with the revolution. NB. By 1789, the Catholic Church was badly in need of reforms. Its role provoked hostility, hatred and criticism from liberals and philosophers because it was corrupt, oppressive, exploitative and conservative to forces and demands of reforms.

However, some section of the clergy betrayed the king and supported the revolution at the eleventh hour. These were the lower clergy who were less privileged like their counterparts the upper clergy. For instance the salary of a Bishop was about 100 times that of a parish priest and much more than that of a catechist. Some clergy fell out with the monarchy because of its too much concern with economic motives other than religious objectives

6. THE ROLE OF THE NOBILITY

1. Like the clergy, the nobility were a privileged minority who were favored by virtue of their birth. They were a parasitic group of people who survived on the sweats of the peasants and middle class and this is why they were nicknamed the "the spoilt child of France". They monopolized Land and exploited the peasants on such Land as serfs. This forced the peasants to take a revolutionary stand in 1789.

2. The nobility were also exempted from taxation and conscription in the army. On top of these, they had the right to levy unnecessary taxes like feudal dues and toll taxes that made the peasants miserable and frustrated the middlemen's profit. This prompted the peasants to ally with the middle class to cause the revolution in 1789.
3. The nobility monopolized key and important government posts at the expense of even the suitably qualified middle class. For instance, they were ambassadors, top civil servants, army and naval commanders not on merit but by virtue of their birth right. This greatly annoyed the middle class who felt it was an insult to them since they were better educated than the nobles hence they had to mobilize the peasants for the revolution.
4. Like the clergy, the nobility were very corrupt, extravagant and mismanaged state resources, which brought financial crisis and economic hardship. For example, the court-nobles lived luxuriously at the royal palace and the Bastilles and that is why the revolutionaries could not spare these places during the revolution.
5. The incompetent nobles who monopolized key positions in the government gave poor and often fatal advice to the king. For instance they advised the king to insist on the ancient system of sitting during the 5th May 1789 estates general meeting that triggered off the revolution. They also advised Louis to dismiss Necker and Turgot which dismissal caused wide spread political discontent to the king and the monarchy.
6. The greater nobility were too influential as court nobles from where they administered severe punishments to the unfortunate peasants and middle class. They were very biased in their judgment, which called for a revolution to end such French society.
7. The nobility were arrogant and had developed a superiority complex over the common man in France. They collected their feudal dues and products (food crops) from the peasants with a lot of brutality. They even demanded strict obedience to their decisions and failure to comply means heavy punishment.
8. Lastly, the nobility also had internal wrangles which arose from discrimination within their rank and file. The greater nobility were more privileged than the lesser nobility and the nobility of the robe. They were entitled to the best promotions, pensions, appointments and other states favors. This caused internal jealousy and hatred, which made the lesser

nobility and the nobility of the robe to jump on the revolutionary vehicle in order to reform the monarchy.

7. GRIEVANCES AND ROLE OF THE BOURGEOISIE

Although the Bourgeoisie were considerably wealthy and enjoyed some exemptions like conscription, feudal rural taxes and owned most of France's non-agricultural Wealth, they had serious causes of discontent. They were prominent on the French revolution because they provided ideas and words of encouragement to the oppressed peasants.

1. The elite Bourgeoisie had the ambitions of achieving political and social prestige, which was monopolized by the unqualified nobles and clergy. This was because they were excluded from politics. In spite of their wealth and education they even had no prospect of promotion in the army because all commissioned ranks were reserved for the children of the nobility. These made them to be critical of the Bourbon monarchy and spear head the revolution.

2. Besides political grievances, the Bourgeoisies had economic grievances as well. They were opposed to unfair taxation system which reduced their profit margins and benefited the "unproductive nobles and clergy". The middle class were frustrated by Louis xvi's free commercial treaty with England in 1786 that made them to be out competed by the British merchants. The greatest grievance was that by 1789 they had lent huge chunks of money to the government. However, with the financial crisis in France, the Bourgeoisies had no prospect of recovering their money. They therefore advocated for a change of government in order to establish one that would improve the economy and pay their debts.

3. The philosophers whose critical analysis contributed to the revolution belonged to the intellectual Bourgeoisies. Even after the death of philosophers, it was the middle class who interpreted the writings of the philosophers to the oppressed peasants and urban dwellers. This made the peasants and urban dwellers politically conscious and it's what partly made them to participate in the revolution.

4. Similarly, most of the revolutionary leaders came from the middle class. Compared to other European states, France had the greatest number of prosperous middle class who were eager for change. They financed and provided leadership to the revolution of 1789. The middle classmen were the master brains behind the tennis court oath and the formation by the national assembly.

5. The middle class recruited and financed the revolutionary army (National Guard). The role of the National Guard was very significant in defending the revolution from internal and external enemies.

6. It was the middle class that provided the tri-colour flag of the revolution which manifested that France was in a revolutionary state. The tri-colour flag replaced the white flag of the Bourbon monarchy. It was therefore a symbol of change in France.

7. The middle class was the architect of reforms and changes in France during the revolution. They were at the forefront of the civil constitution of the clergy declaration of rights of man and citizens, nationalization of land, storming of Bastilles, march of women and the reign of terror

8. it's a general belief that the French revolution was a Bourgeoisie revolution. This is so because the Directory government which Napoleon succeeded was dominated by the middle class and Napoleon himself had become a middle class man by 1799.

8. GRIEVANCES AND ROLE OF THE PEASANTS

1. By 1789, the French peasants were in serious demand for Land, abolition of uniform tax system, forced Labour, conscription in to the army, feudalism, and serfdom and wanted Law and order to prevail. While the peasants in other despotic states like Prussia, Austria and Russia had given up the struggle for change and accepted their status as sufferers, the conditions of the French peasants were relatively better and this motivated them to struggle for better conditions. This is because change can always be caused by people who have something to sacrifice in order to achieve such desired changes.

2. The peasants formed the Paris revolutionary mob that greatly cheered and supported the revolution. This forced Louis xvi to summon the estates general meeting partly to find a way of handling the chaos caused by the mobs. Otherwise, had it not been because of the disorder and Lawlessness caused by peasants, possibly the estates general meeting would not have been called and there would be no mobs to cheer and support the revolution.

3. Beside the peasants were active in revolutionary events such as the reign of terror, storming of Bastilles, March of women, confiscation of property and setting up barricades against government troops.

4. The peasants participated in the election of representatives to the chamber of deputies. Their representatives stood against the old order of sitting arrangement and joined the middle class in the declaration of the national assembly.

5. The peasants dominated the National Guard that protected the French revolution from internal and external threats. They were not afraid of losing their life for they had nothing to lose and everything to gain.

6. Lastly, it was the peasants who aborted Louis attempt to flee to Austria (to seek foreign support against the French revolutionaries). They arrested him and his family members at Varrennes (150 kms from Paris) and brought him back as an enemy of the revolution. This frustrated the hopes of foreign assistance that Louis had wished to use against the revolutionaries.

9. THE ROLE/CONTRIBUTIONS OF PERSONALITIES

1. Predecessors of King Louis XVI i.e. Louis XV, Louis XIV, Louis XIII etc

The previous French kings (Louis XV, Louis XIV, Louis XIII etc) from whom King Louis XVI inherited the throne laid foundation that contributed to the outbreak of the French Revolution of 1789. They are blamed for introducing and perpetuating extravagancy, unfair; political, social and economic system that favored the privileged class (clergy & nobles) against the unprivileged class (peasants and middle class) in the history of France. Louis XV for instance caused financial crisis in France when he wasted huge chunks of state money in the 7 years war with Britain in India (1756-1763). The humiliating defeat of the French troops in the war is what partly made Louis XVI to venture in the American war of independence that worsened financial crisis and caused the 1789 revolution. Thus, the weakness and unfair system of King Louis XVI's predecessors had already antagonized the Bourbon monarchy from the French peasants and middle class, thereby becoming a long term factor that caused the 1789 revolution in France.

2. General Lafayette.

Lafayette was a general in the French army and a veteran of the American war of independence. He was influenced by the democratic, constitutional and liberal ideas of the Americans which he assisted them to attain against the British. This experience inspired him with a revolutionary attitude against the oppressive, exploitative, dictatorial and undemocratic French government. It's this attitude that made him to turn round and support the revolution when he was ordered to suppress the revolutionaries. He is

blamed for being one of the ring leaders of the revolution against the Bourbon monarchy.

3. Count Mirabeau

Mirabeau was a noble who unlike other nobles had passion/zeal for equality, liberty, fraternity and democracy. It's this sentiment that made him to be elected to represent the third estate in the French parliament of 5th May 1789. The same sentiment explains why he easily became the leader and president of the national assembly. Under his leadership, the third estate representatives rejected the ancient system of separate meetings of the 3 estates in favour of a single assembly. When King Louis XVI ruled against the idea of a single assembly and ordered the third estate delegates to leave the parliament, Mirabeau confronted the master of ceremonies that; Go tell your master that we are here by the will of the people And that we shall not leave except at the point of the bayonet!

It was this tough stand under Mirabeau's guidance that forced King Louis XVI to allow the three estates to sit debate and vote in a single assembly. This was a fundamental change because it was the first of its' kind in the political history of France during the ancient regime.

4. Turgot

He was a senior economist who was appointed a financial controller by King Louis XVI in 1774. He had greatly improved the economy of the province of Limousin and the king expected him to do the same for the French economy. Turgot summarized his reform agenda in the following words. No increase in taxation, no bankruptcy, no more borrowing. Consequently, he proposed an end to tax exemption of nobles and clergy. He also stopped wastage of public money on unnecessary expenses and saved millions of money. However, these reforms made him very unpopular to the Queen, upper clergy and nobles who pressurized King Louis XVI to dismiss him in 1776. His dismissal was a big disappointment to the French masses to which Voltaire lamented in these words;

I see nothing before me now but death; I am struck to the heart by this blow and shall never be consoled for having seen the beginning and the end of the golden age that Turgot was preparing for us. % Turgot's dismissal became one of the long term grievances that made the French masses to lose hope in the ancient regime's prospect of addressing the ever worsening financial crisis and led to the outbreak of the 1789 revolution.

5. Necker.

He was an accountant from Switzerland who was appointed by King Louis XVI to replace Turgot in 1776. He used his experience to persuade the king to reduce court expenses at Versailles and privileges of the nobles and clergy such as tax exemptions. However, he worsened French financial bankruptcy by borrowing heavy loans to meet Frances' expenses in the American war of independence. In 1781, Necker published a financial report of income and expenditure in which he dubiously tried to show that the financial situation was better than it actually was. His aim was to maintain some public confidence in the government.

However, the published statement exposed serious issues that antagonized the Frenchmen with the ancient regime. For instance, it shows the governments' continuous yearly payment to the hair dresser of Princess D'Artois who had died long before the age of 3years. It also exposed huge figures that were paid as pensions to court favourites. Like Turgot, these made Necker to bed is missed by King Louis XVI on the advice of Marie Antoinette, court nobles and clergy. His dismissal was disastrous as he was replaced by Calonne who misused the little money in the treasury, hence worsening the financial awkwardness of the French treasury. The failure of Calonne and later Bishop De Brienne forced Louis XVI to recall Necker in 1788 who reaffirmed De -Brienne,s earlier advice to the king to call the estates general meeting of 5th may1789 that triggered off the revolution.

6. Calonne

Calonne was a court favourite who replaced Necker in 1781 as a financial controller. He proposed to tax exemptions of the nobles and clergies. He also suggested imposition of new land owners in order to raise money to address financial crisis. He contradicted himself by excessively borrowing money to the extent of 300 million dollars within 3years. This worsened the problem due to the debt he had and undermined the popularity of the Bourbon monarchy. Although he was dismissed' the situation nevertheless worsened financial bankruptcy and indirectly prepared ground for the revolution by 1789.

7. Arch-Bishopde-Brienne.

He was a cleric appointed to replace Calonne as a financial minister. He persuaded the notables (nobles, clergy, state officials etc) to accept the financial reforms proposed by previous financial ministers like Turgot and Necker. De-Brienne advised King Louis XVI to use his powers to tax the nobles, which resulted into a noble rebellion of 1788. He advised the King to call the estates general meeting which provoked hostile opposition from

the privileged class and caused Louis XVI to recall back Necker. His idea was however emphasized by Necker and Louis could no longer object to call the estates general meeting from where the great revolution of 1789 emerged.

Other Personalities

8. The contributions of King Louis XVI (see point 6 on causes of the revolution)
9. The role of Marie Antoinette (see point 7 on causes of the revolution)
10. The role of Voltaire (point 2 (a))
11. The role of Montesquieu (point 2 (b))
12. The role of J.J Rousseau (point 2 (c))
13. The role of John Lock (point 2 (d))
14. The role of Encyclopaedists like Diderot (page 6)
15. The role of Economists like Adams Smith and D'Alambert

Introduction

The French revolution can generally be categorized in to three major phases/stages. The first stage 1789 - 1791 begins with the estates general meeting of 5th May 1789 and ends with the death of Mirabeau in 1791. It involved a number of events and resolutions passed by the National Assembly over;

The clergy

The nobility

Judicial and Administrative structures,

The Bourbon monarchy.

The second stage 1792 - 1794 was characterized by violence, where the peaceful revolution turned into terror, deviating to dictatorship and anarchy. It began after the death of Mirabeau in April 1791 and ended with the death of Robespierre in July 1794. The leadership of the revolution at this stage was under the lower class people and political parties that had sprung up.

Las stage was when the spread of the revolution by 1799 was under the directory government ruled by five directors. It was marked by the spread of revolutionary ideas from France to the rest of Europe. It also witnessed the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte where he staged a coup against the directory government and assumed power in France. Although the French revolution was considered to have ended in 1799, this should not obstruct us from the fact that Napoleon continued with the revolutionary principles up to his downfall in 1815.

It should be noted that by 1789, France was a rotten society and a revolution of any nature inevitable. Denis Richards summarizes that

“ All the materials for a great combustion was now present, an outworn, inefficient, unfair and bankrupt system of government, a strong body of reforming opinion created by philosophers, the successful example of the Americans, a weak king and unpopular queen, wide spread economic distress, and desperate mob of an exceptional size in Paris. It needed only a spark to set it ablaze, to turn the smoldering of 1787-1789 into fire”.

In other words, the Frenchmen were only waiting for an opportune moment to revolt which came through the estates general meeting of 5th may 1789.

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

1.The Estates General Meeting of 5th May 1789.

The estates general meeting of 5th May 1789 comprised of 621 representatives of the third estate, 308 clergy and 285 nobles. Louis xvi and his poor advisors thought that each estate representative would present a list of grievances (cashiers) and offer some advice which would help in solving financial crisis and other problems that France was facing. The cashiers expressed loyalty and fidelity (faith) to the king; most of them reflected the radical philosophy of the age and demanded for reforms in the government and society. Many of the cashiers demanded for the abolition of social inequalities in the society. The mood of the third estate was expressed in a pamphlet written by Abbey Sieyes which was circulated in large numbers on the eve of the French revolution

What is the third estate? , Asked Sieyes, Everything'

What has it been in politics up to now?

Nothing

What does it desire?

To become something.

Louis xvi expected separate deliberations from each estate than a joint assembly, of the clergy, nobles and third estates representatives. He thus insisted on the ancient system of sitting and voting where each estate would sit and vote as one house. By this procedure, the privileged estates (clergy and Nobles) would always out vote the third estate by a ratio of 1:2 (one vote for the third estate, and two votes for the first and second). This was because the 1st and 2nd estates were the privileged class and had similar interest of defending their privileges.

The third, estate objected to this arrangement and wanted a single assembly of the three, classes where deliberations and voting would be on the principle of one man one vote (show of hands). They were aware that a joint assembly would offer them opportunities for reforms since they had twice as many representatives as the clergy and the nobles combined.

However, the privileged class rejected the demands of the third estate and influenced Louis, xvi to rule against it under the guidance of Mira beau, the third estate refused to accept the ruling. There, were a number of deliberations and on 17th June 1789 the third estate declared itself the national assembly. They were strengthened when dissatisfied nobles and clergy joined the assembly.

1. The significance of this event in the course of the French revolution is that it was the beginning of the revival of the parliament and parliamentary democracy in France. For about 175 years, the estates general had never sat and the 5th May 1789 assembly resurrected it. From 1789 onwards, the estates general met continuously and enacted a number of reforms in France.

2. This event triggered off the revolution. The self-conversion of the 3rd estate into the national assembly marked the beginning of the French revolution. They had taken up the responsibility of acting on behalf of the whole nation. This weakened the position of the Bourbon monarchy and Louis xvi over state affairs.

3. The meeting gave the third estate the chance to begin fighting for their rights. Had it not been because of the hectic disagreement over the sitting arrangement, the third estate would have found it difficult if not impossible to start the revolution in 1789. This is so because they used the disagreement over the sitting order as an excuse to revolt against King Louis xvi and the monarchy.

4. it's also of significance that the national assembly is known as the constituent assembly because its main responsibility was to make a constitution. It was the beginning of constitutional system of governance in France. The constitution later became the guarantor of people's freedom and rights.

5. It portrayed the unity that existed amongst the third estate and disunity within the privileged class. The unity of the third estate was evidenced in the tennis court oath and disunity of the privileged class was witnessed when the lesser nobles and lower clergy joined the 3rd estate against the monarchy.

6. The event exposed the king's inconsistencies and weaknesses. His failure to settle the sitting arrangement and his order to the privileged class to join the assembly is a testimony of his wavering character.

However, the higher clergy and the greater nobility refused to join the national assembly. This undermined the nationalistic outlook which the assembly was to portray.

2. The Tennis Court Oath June 1789

In order to overcome the pressure from the 3rd estate, the king decided to hold a special royal session in which he planned to give his last order. Unfortunately, the delegates of the third estate were not informed of the royal session. When they arrived at the assembly hall on 20th June 1789, they found the doors blocked by soldiers. They were informed of the royal session and that the hall was closed for making the necessary preparations (including cleaning of the hall). At the same time rumors were spreading that the king was planning to use force against the representatives of the third estate.

For a moment, the third class delegates were stranded. However after sometime, they proceeded to a neighboring building which served as a tennis court and held a memorable session there under the presidency of Bailly. They took the famous tennis court oath in which they swore;

Never to separate and to reassemble whenever circumstances shall require until the constitution of the kingdom shall be established,

3. The Royal session, June 1789

On 23rd June 1789, a special royal session was held. In his speech, the king announced a number of reforms which satisfied the demands of the third

estate but made some fatal mistakes. He declared the recent actions of the 3rd estate in converting itself into the national assembly illegal and unconstitutional. He also ordered that the three estates should meet separately. The king, the nobility and the clergy left the hall in the spirit of victory.

However, the third estates representatives remained in the hall. The master of ceremonies reminded them of the King's orders and told them to quit the assembly hall. Soldiers were also seen at the gate. They were to force the 3rd estate delegates out of the assembly hall. This provoked Mirabeau, who went straight to the M.C and blasted him that,

Go; tell your master that we are here by the will of the people and that we shall not leave except at the point of the bayonet •

Humiliated by the tough stand of the third estate, Louis XVI ordered the 1st and 2nd estates to join the national Assembly. He allowed all the three estates to sit, deliberate and vote as one body. This was a triumph for the 3rd estates that had been in the backyard of French politics for centuries. The third estate had therefore succeeded in reforming and restricting the ancient regime in France.

4. The Storming Of Bastilles 14th July 1789

The Bastilles, was the state prison where those arrested under the infamous lettres-de-cachet were imprisoned. After the declaration of the national assembly by the third estate, the king's diehard nobles and clergy continued to oppose it. Rumours were that the king was organizing to destroy the assembly using foreign troops. Besides, Necker was expelled for the second time on 11th July 1789. This was a great disappointment because he was the only 'messiah' of reforms in France. The news spread throughout France and on 13th July Camille Desmoulins a journalist argued people to take immediate action he proclaimed;

To arms, to arms, no moment must be lost Monsieur Necker has been dismissed. Tonight the German and Swiss battalions will come out to kill us, we have but one chance left, to fly to arms.

Consequently, the Paris mob led by Desmoulins invaded the armoury at Invalids and stormed Bastilles on 14th July 1789. This was to release the innocent prisoners and demolish it as a symbol of despotism. There was heavy fighting between the mob and the guards but with time their commander, Governor de-Launay surrendered but was murdered.

i) The fall of Bastilles was applauded in France and elsewhere as the greatest and most significant event of the century. It signified the fall of despotism' the end of lettres de-cachet and other forms-of oppressions in France. This was because the Bastilles was a symbol of despotism where the victims of lettres-de-cachet were thrown.

ii) Its fall led to the release of prisoners most of whom were innocent. However, the freed prisoners took up to revenge against those who had imprisoned them (nobles). They killed such nobles and looted their farms and homes.

iii) The fall of Bastilles ushered in violence not only in Paris and other surrounding provinces but also in other districts. The revolutionaries acquired more arms, which they used against the hated nobles and clergy.

iv) The violent destruction of the Bastilles and the violent events that followed forced the Émigrés in to exile (under the leadership of comte-de-Artois). This is yet significant because the émigrés later re- mobilized against the revolutionaries who contributed to the reign of terror and war with other powers in Europe.

v) It also led to the dissolution of the Royal guard which was replaced by the National Guard. The National Guard was to protect the revolution and all what it stood for i.e. its achievements. It was under the command of Lafayette, the hero of American war of independence and Trour, the vice president of the national assembly. Foreign troops were withdrawn immediately and to avoid chaos Necker was reinstated.

vi) The National flag of France was changed from the white colour to the current tri-colour of red, white and blue. This symbolized a change from the Bourbon monarchy to the revolution.

vii)The storming of Bastilles was quickly followed by an almost complete decentralization of government. Anew government was formed to govern Paris only while the king was in charge of Versailles. The appointed Royal intendants in the local government were replaced by elected council leaders signifying the rise of democracy in France.

Viii)The success of the revolutionaries bonded the 3rd estate together and gave them courage to fight for more reforms. It became a day for liberty not only in France but the whole world. Indeed this event is so important that 14th July has remained a day of national celebrations in France,

However the event of the fall of Bastilles was very unfortunate. Several captives of the garrisons were murdered. Even the governor, De-Launay who ordered his troops to surrender was beheaded and his head r/as paraded around Paris on a pike. This was despotism and violence of the highest order.

5. The Session on 4th August "The night of dupes" Or stupid Dukes

After the storming of Bastilles, Peasants went on rampage attacking the castles/residences and property of the clergy and Nobles. Consequently by August the remaining nobles who had not given up their privileges had seen the sense in sacrificing their privilege to save their lives. On 4th August when the national assembly was in a night session, it abolished feudalism and all its forms throughout France. The nobles and clergy denounced their privileges and the ancient system of taxation was scrapped off. Thus, the long-term grievances, which had made the revolution inevitable, were removed. This was a total destruction of the foundation of the ancient regime and a relief to the peasants.

The event is memorable because it guaranteed equality of all the men before the law and other forms of taxation, thus burying social class discrimination in France.

The way feudalism was destroyed makes it significant. It was very peaceful where the nobles and clergy just denounced their privileges hence compromising with the third estate in the spirit of brotherhood.

It guaranteed admission and promotion in to public offices on merit than birth. This gave way to competent and talented men of ability to rise to power irrespective of birth right.

This event became a social revolution that laid a firm foundation of fraternity between the three classes compared to their position prior to 1789. This strengthened the spirit of patriotism and nationalism in

France.

However, the event forced most nobles and clergy to flee to exile from where they regrouped in Austria and started planning a counter-revolution. This took France to war with foreign powers and contributed to the reign of terror in the course of the revolution.

In short the destruction of feudalism was a landmark that modernized France in Europe compared to Austria, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Poland. It was a stepping-stone for the declaration of the rights of man and citizens.

6. The declaration of The Rights of Man and Citizens, 27th August 1789

The National assembly was known as the constituent assembly because its role was to make a constitution for France. But before the constitution could be made, it was necessary to guarantee the rights of man. On 27 August 1789, the constituent assembly met, its discussion was centered on the restoration of people's political freedom and how to protect them. By the end of the session, it had come out with a document called the declaration of the rights of man and citizens, which was to act as a preamble to the French constitution. It had the following declarations amongst others;

i) People had the rights to rule themselves and that men were by nature equal and therefore entitled to equal rights and privileges from the state. This includes equality before the Law and taxation.

ii) It granted freedom of press, speech, worship, Association, ownership of property, security and resistance to oppression.

iii) All government officials are public servants and are responsible to the people. It continues that sovereignty is vested in the people who have the final voice to determine their leadership.

iv) Imprisonment was not allowed except by laws decided only by the people. No one was to be arrested without a proof of his or her guilt.

SIGNIFICANCE AND EVALUATION OF THE DECLARATION

i) It's on record that the declaration of the rights of man and citizens was the noblest side of the 1789 ; French revolution, without which it might not have been a great even tin European History (Grant and ' Temperly, 1952, P24). The human rights that were declared became the foundation for people's rights and freedom not only in France but the entire world. These have been adopted by the present UNO. The UNO charter has a special article (16) on the rights of man and citizens, which was Xeroxed from that of France. Although the political liberties were short-lived with the reign of terror France, they were resurrected and have survived up to now.

ii) The declaration destroyed the remains of segregative social system that had characterized the French society prior to 1789 i.e. between the nobles

and the clergy against the third estate. It asserted equality of all men by nature irrespective of social status or birth.

iii) The declared rights of man confirmed the abolition of feudalism and feudal dues in the history of France. However the abolition of feudal dues worsened the financial crisis in France.

iv) David Thomson describes the declaration of the rights of man, as the most important event in the development of democratic and republican ideas. This is justifiable because every citizen had the right to influence state policies through elected representatives. This was through national elections (direct or indirect), parliamentary debates in framing national laws as against royal decrees. These were drastic measures that challenged and reformed Bourbon despotism.

v) The declared rights especially political liberties inspired the oppressed masses outside France to struggle for their freedom. This was witnessed in the future revolutions of Germany, Italy, Belgium, Poland, 1848 and Russia. These revolutions were caused by the violation of human rights, which were declared in France.

vi) Although the declaration of the rights of man and citizens corrected the wrongs in the French society, it had several loopholes. It accorded Louis xvi a legal status on the forefront of French politics. He was allowed to have power to choose, discipline, demote, promote and even dismiss ministers. He was also given power to Veto the decision of the national assembly. It was this that he used to refuse to sign the declaration of the rights of man and citizens and the civil constitution of the clergy.

vii) The document made people aware of their rights but did not tell them about their duties yet the politically charged atmosphere of France required people to know more about their duties instead of their rights. This raised a lot of expectations by the people from the government which was impossible considering the financial situation of the country. Moreover most of the taxes had been abolished yet the government had no other sources of revenue to meet people's needs. Thus as "Kettleby" puts it;

In the declaration of human rights the assembly lifted the curtains, which veiled an impossible liberty only to drop it again.

viii) The declaration of the rights of man ignored the rights of women until 1791 when it was adopted. Madam Olympe-de-Gouges pleaded for the rights of women and citizen in vain. When she submitted it to the national assembly in 1791, she was condemned as "outrageous and

scandalous and consequently she was guillotined. This was against the principle of equality and gender balance.

ix) Lastly, the freedom granted by the declaration of rights of man and citizens made the Frenchmen crazy under emotional excitement of freedom. They resorted to violence as a means of achieving whatever they wanted. This is justified by the fact that;

"It was useless to take people on top of a mountain and show them wonderful plains that could not be given to them"

The document made the Frenchmen knowledgeable about their rights and it became a yardstick for measuring the worth of any government in France. This is why the Frenchmen easily resorted to Violence against the government when it failed to grant them such declared rights. '' '

7. The March of Women, 5th October 1789

The Paris commune organized women to March (in a demonstration) from Paris to Versailles. The causes of the demonstration were; the king's refusal to accept reforms especially the civil Constitution of the clergy, his attempt to suppress the revolution using foreign troops, desire to bring the king to Paris, famine and unemployment. ' '

Women were chosen because the impact of their demonstration would be most felt and their cries for food would be most heard. So on 5th Oct, a crowd of 6,500 women including men dressed in women's attire marched the 21 miles distance from Paris to Versailles to present their petition to the king. Lafayette was ordered to follow them with thousands of soldiers of the National Guard. He was to maintain law and order and bring the king to Paris where he would be out of reach of the aristocracy. The King yielded to their demands and was escorted to Paris with his entire family. On reaching Paris they were lodged/ kept in the Tuilleries palace in a condition of prisoners.

SIGNIFICANCE

i) The role of women in the demonstration shows the concern of everybody in the revolution. Since the beginning of the revolution women had not been very active and their participation in the marching shows the national outlook of the French revolution. This upheld the revolutionary principle of equality since women had actively joined men in the revolution.

ii) It acted as a preamble for the transfer of the national assembly from Versailles (a monarchical stronghold) to Paris (a revolutionary center). From then onwards, French politics and the revolution was championed from Paris by the Paris commune.

iii) The king was forced to accept some reforms which went a long way in meeting the demands of the revolutionaries. He promised special food for Paris and to reduce the price of bread. He agreed to sign the declarations of the rights of man and citizens and he also accepted the National Guard to be entrusted with the defense of Versailles.

iv) However, the mistreatment of Louis to the extent of being kept in the Tuilleries provoked internal uprisings from the royalists and foreign condemnation by foreign powers. This contributed to the reign of terror and war between France and her neighbours.

8. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy, July 1790

Before the revolution, the pope and the Catholic Church had a lot of influence on the political, economic, social and religious affairs of France. The Catholic Church and the clergy were the most privileged in France. It's on this account that the revolutionaries targeted the vast resources and influence of the church. So in July 1790, the national assembly passed a law, which incorporated the church in to state and the clergy in to civil service. This became known as the civil constitution of the clergy. It had the following implications/effects on France and Europe.

i) It abolished the church tithe since it was a sign of feudalism and a source of exploitation. This was a relief to the peasants who were able to save part of their meager/ little incomes.

ii) The Catholic Church monopoly over land was terminated. The church land was nationalized, and, sold to the French citizens at a fair price. Such a resolution availed land to the majority peasants and increased their productivity and socio-economic welfare.

iii) For the first time, the clergy (church officials) were to be elected by the general public and their salaries were to be paid by the government. The salaries of the lower clergy were increased while those of the upper clergy were reduced. These measures turned the clergy in to paid civil servants of France.

iv) The pope's influence and interference on the politics of France and the Catholics in France were nullified. He was not to have any power on altering elections and payments of the clergy and any policy in France.

v) It abolished old dioceses and established new ones, which corresponded with the newly established districts. This decentralized the church administration and increased its efficiency. Besides, the title of Arch Bishop was abolished and each of the 83 Districts of France were to have a Bishop.

vi) Through the sale of the church Land and abolition of its privileges, the national assembly temporarily raised some money for the administration of the country. A paper form of money called Assignats was printed according to the value of Land. However, by 1796 the value of Assignat was undermined by inflation due to over printing.

vii) The civil constitution of the clergy delivered a deathblow to religious intolerance that was dominant in France by 1789. It asserted freedom of worship by legalizing other religion besides Catholicism.

viii) In Dec 1790, a decree was passed by which all the clergy/church officials were to take an oath of allegiance to the civil constitution. This divided the clergy in to two i.e. those who took the oath who were called Juring priests and those who refused who were known as Non-Juring priests. This produced civil strife where the Non- Juring priests staged revolts against the revolutionary government and the Juring priests (at Lavandee District of western France). This contributed to the reign of terror in France.

ix) The civil constitution of the clergy brought hostility and war between France and the rest of the Catholic states in Europe. The pope condemned it and sought support from all catholic states against the revolutionary government in France. Besides, it forced the clergy in to exile from where they organized counter revolutionary forces with assistance from catholic states like Austria, Prussia and Russia.

X) The civil constitution of the clergy made King Louis XVI to attempt the abortive flight to exile i.e. Austria. He had hesitantly signed it out of the fear that his veto might bring him more troubles with the revolutionaries. However, when the Pope denounced it, Louis xvi regretted signing it. He confessed; I ask God to accept my profound repentance for having affixed my name though against my will to acts which are in conflict with the discipline and belief of the Catholic Church. It was this that made him attempt to escape from Paris and join the émigrés in Austria. This had

disastrous consequences because he was arrested and brought back as an enemy of France and the revolution.

9. The King's flight to Varennes, 22nd June 1791

It ought to be recalled that Louis XVI was forced to accept reforms from the national assembly against his free will. He felt the condition under which he was kept at the Tuilleries were unbearable. He said; I would rather be a king of Metz than remain king of France in such a position but this will end soon.

Eventually, he decided to join the émigrés in Austria for a counter-revolution. So, Louis XVI and the royal family stealthily (secretly) left the Tuilleries at night and headed for Austria. However, he was detected and arrested by peasants at Varennes, a few miles from the border of Austria and France. They were brought back to Paris amidst great humiliation.

The significance of this abortive flight is as follows.

1. It depicted King Louis and his family as traitors and conspirators against the revolution. This event made the revolutionaries to lose the little trust that they had for the king.
2. It revealed further the king's inconsistent nature and his wavering character. This is because he succumbed to ill advice of the queen and the aristocrats to flee abroad and fight against the reforms he had endorsed.
3. The event was a serious humiliation to the king amongst his subjects. He was arrested by peasants and escorted back to Paris as an enemy of France and the revolution. The king and his family were kept as prisoners in the Tuilleries which was a disgraceful event.
4. It strengthened the spirit of republicanism in France. Men like Robespierre and Danton demanded for the replacement of the monarchy with a republican form of government. However the National assembly was still dominated by constitutional monarchists and no action was taken against the monarchy. The king took an oath of allegiance to the constitution and the matter rested there. Nevertheless, the spirit of republicanism spread fast and that's why the monarchy was replaced by a republic the next year (1792). One historian correctly observed that; At Varennes, the monarchy had died; all that Paris had to do a year later was to hurry it
5. While the Jacobins were agitating for a republican government, a number of people wanted a constitutional monarchy. This marked the

diversion of opinion and the development of political parties in France. Henceforth, France entered into an era of multi-party politics although it was short lived.

The humiliation of the royal family provoked internal protests from the aristocrats and external war that contributed to the reign of terror.

7. Those who had acquired the church Land and some revolutionaries, began to fear that they would be killed if the king got military assistance from outside, this also contributed to the reign of terror in

France.

8. Lastly, the event increased the hostility between revolutionary France and her neighbours. European monarchs condemned the French revolutionary mistreatment and humiliation of Louis xvi. Prussia and Russia issued the Pilnitz declaration of August 1791 in which they threatened war against France in case the king was hurt. This was responsible for war between France and her neighbours with all its disastrous consequences.

REIGN OF TERROR

The reign of terror was the second significant stage in the course of the French revolution. It began after the death of Mirabeau and ended with the death of Robespierre. The reign of terror was characterized by violence, total breakdown of law and order, economic crisis, under development, loss of property and heavy massacres. It was championed by lower class people with burning desires for power like Herbert, Danton, Marat and Robespierre.

There were three forms of terror i.e. political, terror, which was against anti-revolutionary elements especially the clergy and the nobles, economic terror which was designed to eliminate currency manipulators and hoarders of essential commodities and religious terror which was directed against the catholic church, its practices and privileges.

It should be noted that the French revolution was initially a peaceful reform movement that merely demanded for changes within the monarchy. However by 1793, the peaceful reform movement had changed to a violent one that demanded for too much blood and heads of the Frenchmen. This can be attributed to internal and external factors.

CAUSES OF THE REIGN OF TERROR

1. Tension between the Liberals and conservatives.

The French revolution destroyed the old order of despotism and super imposed a new one of Liberalism. This brought direct conflict and confrontation between the Liberals who wanted changes to survive and the conservatives (nobles and clergy) who resisted such changes. For example, the nobles and the clergy resisted the scrapping of their privileges. Henceforth, the revolutionaries resorted to violence to ensure that the changes brought by the revolution survive which led to the reign of terror.

2. The civil constitution of the clergy.

The civil constitution of the clergy made the Catholic Church an enemy of the revolution. The non- Juring priests refused to it and led revolts against the revolutionary government. For instance, in the Lavandee district of western France, they waged a serious revolt which was brutally suppressed. Thus, the revolutionaries had to resort to violence as a political survival mechanism hence the reign of terror.

3. The declaration of rights of man and citizens.

The declaration of the rights of man and citizens also contributed to the reign of terror. It dealt only with the rights of citizens and neglected their duties towards the state. This left the people with a lot expectation from the state on one hand and ignorant of their duties towards the state on the other hand. This indirectly paved way for violence and the reign of terror. Besides, the declaration made the Frenchmen crazy under emotional excitement of freedom. The Frenchmen had lived in the darkness of freedom for centuries and when they were granted, they became so confused and surprised that they over amplified freedom to killing one another, mistreating and executing the king etc. These escalated the scale of violence to the reign of terror.

4. The threat of émigrés.

The threat of the émigrés made the reign of terror inevitable. By Jan. 1792, they had mobilized themselves on the French boarder to a tune of about 20,000 troops. They wanted to suppress the revolution, restore their privileges and king Louis xvi to his throne. They had internal collaborators

who were providing them with valuable military secrets and strategies. This made the revolutionaries to resort to violence as a means of eliminating internal collaborators and external enemies (Émigrés).

5. Foreign invasion

Foreign invasion made the outbreak of the reign of terror inevitable. The ambitions of the revolutionaries to export the French revolutionary ideas brought confrontation between France and other European nations. The first coalition of Britain, Austria, Russia and Holland was formed in 1793. They invaded France, defeated the French troops and occupied important towns like Verdun. This made the revolutionary government to issue the law of suspect which was so extravagantly applied that even those guilty of lack of interest in the revolution were guillotined. Besides, the hysteria of defeat made the revolutionaries to resort to terror against opponents both actual and assumed. For example, over 1000 royalist sympathizers were butchered under the pretext of methods essential for the safety of the nation. This policy was extended to other provinces which spread violence throughout France.

6. The death of Mirabeau (April 1791).

The death of Mirabeau led to power struggle and the reign of terror. It's urged that if he had lived beyond 1791, he could have counseled Louis XVI and cooled the violent tempers of the revolutionaries. He had the wisdom and courage in advising the King to accept all that had so far been achieved by the revolution for there was no going back to the past, (Peacock H.L 1982, P.35). He foretold the fate of the monarchy when he lamented that; I carry with me the last rags of the monarchy. Had Mirabeau lived up to 1793, the monarchy and Louis could have been saved from destruction. Thus, his death robbed France of a political conciliator who could have maintained some degree of harmony between the monarchy and the revolutionaries. In short, his death left behind self-opportunists like Robespierre who had overwhelming desire for power that drove France to the reign of terror.

7. Role of the mob.

Economic hardship in the villages forced people to move to towns and cities. This led to the formation of mobs and mob justice became the order of the day in settling cases. The impression created, was that the mob was always right and it became difficult to control the mob even when they were obviously wrong. The Paris mob was used by radical revolutionaries to

eliminate their opponents hence the reign of terror. On top of this, the democratic system of open debates and judgment in the national assembly, conventions, conference and seminars was utilized by diehard revolutionary leaders to spread terror throughout France.

N.B France during this period was so chaotic that suspect were tried and brought to the streets to be lynched by the mob. There was even free entrance of debate in the parliament for anyone who wishes to do so!

8. The death of Louis xvi and his wife.

The execution of King Louis xvi and his wife contributed to the reign of terror in two ways. Internally, it led to violent protests by the royalists. Externally, it caused fear and panic amongst European powers and forced them to declare war against France. This pressure from within and without made France to be at crossroads and only terror could clear the way for her. To Danton, France and the Revolution; Were caught between two fires, the enemy at the frontier and the enemy at home, in order to survive it was necessary to frighten the enemy. The fact that the whole king could be manhandled and killed by the revolutionaries shows that life was "worthless" in France. It means ordinary persons could easily be massacred without any regrets. This attitude escalated violence and the reign of terror in

France.

9. The weakness of Louis xvi

The reign of terror owes its origin to the failure of Louis xvi to accept the reforms proposed by the revolutionaries. All that the revolutionaries wanted in the initial stage of the revolution were reforms and no one wanted violence. But Louis and his supporters proved to be road blocks to the reform demands of the masses. He stubbornly refused to sign the declaration of the rights of man and citizens, the civil constitution of the clergy and amnesty for the return of émigrés. These, together with the dismissal of popular Necker provoked violence from the revolutionaries leading to the storming of Bastilles and frequent attacks on the castles (mansions) of the nobles and clergy. This is why the revolution entered into an era of mob action and mob justice.

b. Louis xvi's attempt to suppress the revolution using the royal guard and foreign troops made the revolutionaries to start using violence as a counter measure (right answer) to violence and injustice. This made the leadership of the revolution to fall to the hands of bloodthirsty^ men like Danton and

Robespierre who used the policy of blood and iron to achieve their hidden political ambitions.

c. Louis xvi's attempted flight and his arrest at Varrenes made the outbreak of the reign of terror inevitable. Pressure of events forced Louis to make an abortive flight to Austria from where he expected to join the émigrés, mobilize foreign support and suppress the revolution. He was arrested at Varrenes and brought back to Paris as a traitor and collaborator with the enemies of the revolution. This event made Louis xvi and his supporters to lose the little Support he hitherto, and had strengthened the popularity of diehard revolutionaries like Robespierre who started the reign of terror. On the other hand, the humiliation of Louis xvi during and after his arrest provoked internal resistance from the aristocrats and external war. All these made a revolutionary government to embark on the reign of terror.

10. 1791 constitution

The 1791 constitution greatly contributed to violence and consequently the reign of terror. It had numerous loopholes in the sense that it never satisfied all interest groups m constitution still granted King Louis xvi some degree of power, which made him stubborn. The worst was the power to veto the decision of the national assembly that he used against the reforms proposed by the assembly like the declaration of the rights of man and citizens. This brought a constitutional crisis which forced the revolutionaries to resort to the reign of terror. Secondly the constitution disqualified the majority of Frenchmen from voting. It went against the declared rights of man and citizens by making property qualification the basis for one to vote or to be voted. It classified people into active and passive citizens. Active citizens were men of over 25 years who paid direct taxes equivalent to 3days work and enrolled in the National Guard. Passive citizens were those especially peasants who could not afford the stipulated conditions. This was opposed by radical revolutionaries. Desmoulins criticized the criterion for categorizing active citizens and declared that; Active citizens are those who have taken the Bastilles, they are those who till the fields, while the idlers of the church and court are parasitic plants that should be thrown to the flames like the barren tree in the Bible

In short, this led to violent protests from the disciples of Rousseau's democratic ideas like Robespierre, Marat, Desmoulins and Danton.

11. Economic crisis

The unabated economic hardship climaxed in to the reign of terror. Inflation, unemployment and shortage of basic necessities were common issues. This was because there was wide spread smuggling, profiteering and hoarding by businessmen. Business men were therefore accused of economic sabotage which led to massive destruction and looting of their property and commodities. Henceforth this led to economic terror which was designed to eliminate unscrupulous businessmen who thrive (prosper) on people's misery.

12. The role of political parties

Power struggle between the different political factions in France made the peaceful revolution to take a violent dimension. These included the Jacobins, the Cordeliers, the Girondins and the Feuillants. These parties engaged in serious intrigues in an attempt to eliminate their rivals. They resorted to politics of elimination (killing) to achieve their hidden political ambitions. This led to political instability and violence hence the reign of terror.

13. The role and character of Revolutionary Extremists

The role of diehard revolutionary leaders was very influential in the reign of terror. Marat provoked the masses against the aristocracy and the monarchy through his revolutionary paper *L'Ami du peuple*. The paper was very critical of the government and the aristocrats. He was also behind the Paris mob and was the main instigator of the September massacre (1792). Robespierre guillotined his enemies and friends for the sake of incorruptibility and virtue (goodness). Robespierre, Danton and Marat carried terror to a point where one had to kill in order not to be killed. By 1794, Robespierre had eliminated almost all his political rivals and colleagues and remained as the champion of terror. Within the 7 weeks of his reign, more people went to the guillotine than the period before. One can therefore say that, the reign of terror was perpetuated by ambitious politicians who used violence as a political strategy to eliminate their rivals and rise to power.

14. The flight of Lafayette and Dumouriez

The flight of Lafayette and Dumouriez to exile also contributed to the outbreak of the reign of terror. Lafayette, the commander of the National Guard and sympathizer of the monarchy after receiving news of the fall of the King, attempted to incite the army against the revolutionaries. However, he found himself in danger when he discovered that the army

was not ready to support the monarchy .against the revolution. This made him to flee to exile from where, he was imprisoned by Austrians. Dumouriez, another army officer also found himself in a similar situation and fled to exile after the army refused to support his coup attempt against the revolutionary government. The treasonable actions,; by such senior army officers alarmed the revolutionaries and .led them to start executing unpopular and un successful army officers. It also made the revolutionaries to lose trust in the army, which paved way for mob justice and eventually, the reign of terror.

15. The worship of reason.

The emergency of religion of reason under the leadership of Herbert accounts for the outbreak of the reign of terror. On Nov 1793, Herbert and his followers started the worship of reason to undermine the catholic religion and its practices. The Catholic Church condemned the worship of reason and some priests went to the extent of holding rallies in which they protested against the new constitution of France. This generated more tension between the revolutionary government and the Catholic Church. It led to religious terror where Herbert and his followers started arresting, imprisoning, slaughtering and exiling rebellious Catholics and priests.

16. The downfall of Girondists

The downfall of Girondists also contributed to the outbreak of the 1:793 - 1794 reign of terror in France. The Girondists who had dominated the national assembly were humane, conciliatory and had a good relation with the King. They opposed the trial and execution of the King by January 1793. However, they were overthrown in May 1793 by Jacobins, which led to civil war in France. Civil war was inevitable because people were afraid of persecutions by the Jacobins whose hostilities were well known. The Girondists also took up arms against the Jacobins with Austrian support which intensified civil war and the reign of terror. One can assert that if the Jacobins had not overthrown the Girondists, the Girondists would have continued with the reconciliatory/moderate policies and the reign of terror could have been avoided.

17. The role of the committees of public safety, general security and revolutionary tribunal. Lastly, the establishment of the committees of public safety, general security and revolutionary tribunals by the convention government marked the beginning of the reign of terror. The role of these committees was directly or indirectly related to terror. The committee of public safety issued the law of suspect, sent agents and spies to

government departments who arrested those with anti-revolutionary ideas. The committee of general security was in charge of internal affairs such as prisons, police and intelligence network. There revolutionary tribunal was a special court to try anti-revolutionary suspects which condemned and sent even innocent people to the guillotine. All these committees were manipulated by Robespierre and Danton to begin and sustain the reign of terror.

The death of Robespierre and the end of the Reign of Terror

The 7 weeks reign of Robespierre made him very unpopular and the Frenchmen decided to guillotine the guillotiner on 28th July 1794. His terror was so much that everybody in France decided to risk his or her head by joining the opposition. He was first imprisoned by the convention government but was forcefully released by his close followers. However, he was re-arrested and guillotined as a criminal.

With the death of Robespierre, the leadership of France passed in the hands of moderates who ended the reign of terror. They enacted measures that promptly ended the reign of terror. For instance, the revolutionary tribunal was re-organized on August 10th 1794 to be in harmony with the ordinary French law. The committee of public safety although continued to exist was no longer independent. The committee of general security as well as the Jacobins club was abolished. Most political prisoners were also released. Finally the convention government enacted a new constitution and voted for a new government, which came to be known as the directory government (1795 - 1799).

EFFECTS OF THE REIGN OF TERROR

Negative effects

1. The reign of terror led to massive loss of life. About 17,000 people were guillotined and these included high level persons like King Louis xvi, Queen Marie Antoinette, Danton, Marat, Robespierre to mention but the most important ones. Several other people were butchered by the mob. Most of these victims were nobles and clergy although some suspected traitors were also executed.

2. Besides, there was destruction of property and infrastructure. These included Hotel-De-Ville and the Bastilles, which were destroyed by the mob.

Several castles and mansions including property were attacked and destroyed by the revolutionaries.

3. There was a general economic decline that arose from the unstable political atmosphere. Inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation reached their highest level during the reign of terror. This was because of total breakdown of law and order, industries and economy.

4. The reign of terror brought war between France and her neighbours. Countries like Britain and Russia formed a coalition in 1793 and invaded France. This was because they were scared by the massive loss of life and property, including the barbaric execution of King Louis xvi and his wife. Their fear was that the Frenchmen were teaching their subjects a lesson to behead them, the way they did to King Louis xvi.

5. There was displacement and exile due to the reign of terror. The fear of the guillotine and mob injustice led to the self-exile of several nobles and clergy. They fled to neighbouring states like Austria, Prussia and Russia from where they become known as the émigrés. They regrouped and joined the allied powers in the first coalition against revolutionary France.

6. The downfall of political parties and political pluralism in France was also due to the reign of terror. Before the reign of terror, there were political parties such as the Jacobins, Girondins, Cordilliers and Feuvillants. But the terror machinery killed the leaders of all these political parties and clubs. Such were men like Danton, Marat, Herbert and Robespierre. The execution of these leaders and their burial led to the "death and burial "of their political parties as well.

7. Outside France, the reign of terror made conservative kings more conservative and autocratic. For instance, despotic kings of Austria, Prussia and Russia became more oppressive and repressive to safeguard themselves from the terrorist acts of the Frenchmen. Even Pitt, the Prime Minister of Britain expelled all suspicious characters and passed the Act of treason in which it was treasonable to say or do anything against the state.

Positive effects

8. The rise of Napoleon to power was also due to the reign of terror. Before the reign of terror, Napoleon was an inexperienced and insignificant artillery officer. But during the reign of terror, he gained experience and significance especially when he suppressed the royalist uprising at port Toulon in 1793 besides, the reign of terror led to the disappearance of senior

army officers and politicians, which opened the military and political space for the rise of Napoleon to power.

9. The directory government was a product of the reign of terror. The socio-economic and political destructions caused by the reign of terror paved way for the rise of the directory government. It was instituted in 1795 as a final full stop to the reign of terror and to end dictatorship in France.

10. The reign of terror restored order in France and helped to fight the first coalition. It was used by diehard revolutionaries to suppress internal resistance which restored peace. It also helped the revolutionaries to deal with traitors and cowards which made them succeed in 'defeating the first coalition. It must be stressed that the reign of terror made it easy to conscript and mobilize the French men to fight the first coalition.

11. Lastly, the reign of terror strengthened the spirit of republicanism and led to the setting up of a republican government in France in 1792. The violence speeded up the collapse of the Bourbon monarchy and the execution of King Louis was the last event. It was the political instability created by the reign of terror that gave the diehard republicans the chance to make France a Republic.

General observations:

From 1792-1802, France faced and battled out two major coalitions (alliances). The first coalition (1793- 97) of Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Spain, Holland and Sardinia was formed by British Premier, Pitt the younger. Pitt mobilized the alliance in the aftermath of France's declaration of war against England in 1793. The war was that of conquest, plunder as well as self-defense.

The second coalition (1798-1802) of Britain, Russia, Austria, Turkey, Naples, and Portugal was provoked by Napoleon's campaign in Egypt. European powers were upset by the aggressive foreign policy of the directory and when they learnt that Napoleon was engaged in Egypt they decided to act. It was to destroy the revolutionary government at Paris and to confine France to her natural borders.

The root of this war is a very controversial issue amongst historians. While some scholars emphasize the ambitions and recklessness of the revolutionaries, others have traced it to the fear and Jealousy of the great powers. But the real root of the war was lack of mutual understanding

between revolutionary France and conservative Europe. Generally, the war was due to internal and external factors.

Causes

1. The French revolution of 1789 isolated France from her contemporary monarchical powers. They were scared by France's attempt to export revolutions and revolutionary ideas to their states. The French revolutionaries used provocative doctrines which were carelessly enforced through loose catchwords like republicanism to replace monarchism, war against tyrants and peace to people. These provoked the alliance of European monarchs against revolutionary France. Their desire was to suppress the revolution and restore the Bourbon monarchy, which made the war inevitable.

2. The expansionist programs of the revolutionaries produced hostility and consequently war. They wanted the boundaries of France to extend to the Alps, Rhine and Pyrenees. To show that they were neither Joking nor making fun, the revolutionaries conquered Nice, Savoy, Belgium and Holland. This brought the rest of European states within the immediate danger of being conquered and annexed. Henceforth, they were forced to gang (ally) and fight France before they could be taken by surprise.

3. The composition of the new legislative assembly (Oct 1791-Sept 1792) was also responsible for the - war. The old constituent Assembly (C.A) barred its members from being elected to the new assembly. This made the destiny of France to pass in the hands of a group of inexperienced, eloquent and enthusiastic young men who desired war as a source of prestige and wealth. This is why they recklessly issued the "Edict of Fraternity" in which they vowed to assist all those who rose against their king. This made war inevitable because the European monarchs began to associate the revolution with the threat to their survival.

4. The need by the revolutionaries to destroy the influence and threats of the Émigrés, across French borders made the war inevitable. By 1791, the émigrés had mobilized about 20,000 troops with frequent attacks on the revolutionary government. This forced the revolutionaries to declare war on the powers supporting the émigrés. For example, they declared war on Austria after she failed to comply with the January ultimatum, which demanded that she ceases to support the émigrés. After this Prussia and Piedmont joined Austria and the war dragged on.

5. The massive killing of important personalities like King Louis xvi, Marie Antoinette, Danton and the September 1792 massacres terrified Europe and forced them into action against France. Pitt, the British Premier protested the execution of Louis xvi as a barbarous and unwarranted act. France reacted by declaring war on England on Feb. 1793. Within a small time, other powers joined Britain against France.

6. Commercial reasons were also responsible for the war. The revolutionary government made a drastic measure and counseled all commercial treaties that France had made with other European countries. This was a serious threat to the pockets of traders in such countries which made them to argue their governments to fight France. Britain was forced into action when France declared war on Holland that was Britain's strong trading partner. Britain feared that France would colonize Holland and frustrate her trade interests not only in Holland but also in S. Africa and India that were Dutch colonies. It has to be emphasized that Britain and Holland fought France not because of the revolution and its threats but due to economic considerations.

7. The civil constitution of the clergy forced the catholic states to fight France. It undermined the powers and privileges of the Catholic Church and the clergy in France. The Catholics in Europe asked their countries to fight France in order to liberate their fellow brothers and sisters in faith. The Pope also condemned it and asked for alliance of catholic states against France. This partly explains why Austria, Russia, Spain and Italian states joined the war against France.

8. Lastly, war was made inevitable on the side of France because nearly everybody wanted war. The monarchists and Louis xvi were praying and hoping for a war in which the revolutionary forces would be defeated. This would give them the chance to suppress the revolution and restore the monarchy. The Jacobins favoured war because they thought that the king would side with the enemies of the revolution which would give them the chance to set a republican government. The Girondins who dominated the national assembly regarded war as a means of spreading revolutions and revolutionary ideas over Europe. With all these war fever in France, there was no way France could avoid fighting her neighbours.

Note; the rise of Napoleon in 1799 transformed the revolutionary war into Napoleonic war. This is because it was him (because of his overwhelming ambitions) who revived the war policy against the 2nd coalition that had defeated the Directory Government.

Effects Of The Revolutionary Wars

Negative effects

1. There was heavy loss of lives and destruction of properties. A number of allied and French troops plus civilians lost their lives. Besides, there was massive looting, confiscation of property that hitherto belonged to the nobles and clergy.
2. The war led to the spread of revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and nationalism to other European states. These ideas were responsible for the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe, 1848 revolutions plus the German and Italian unification struggles. Note that these ideas were strengthened by French troops and rule in the conquered states.
3. The outbreak of the reign of terror in France was also due to the war. The initial defeat that France experienced made the revolutionaries to resort to violence in order to eliminate internal collaborators and spies. This led to heavy shedding of blood that included innocent citizens.
4. The revolutionary wars led to economic decline in France as well as in Europe. It created a lot of instabilities in France and undermined diplomatic cooperation in Europe. It also halted industrial revolution and paralyzed international trade. This slowed economic progress in Europe and thus led to economic decline.
5. It contributed to the expansion of France and the fall of empires. The Italians and Germans were conquered, and this led to the collapse of the Austrian empire that hitherto included the Germans and the Italians. France therefore became a dominant power, which destroyed the balance of power in Europe. This created tension and led to poor diplomatic relations in Europe.
6. The French success in the war made her to be plunged in a protracted war with the rest of Europe for over 20 years. This made France more stubborn and Europe more determined to crush her. This is why the 3rd, 4th and 5th coalitions were formed against France. Although France was finally defeated in 1815, her ideas and influence were already deeply rooted over Europe.

Positive effects

7. Internally, the war strengthened the ideas of patriotism and republicanism and hastened the collapse of the Bourbon monarchy. Louis

xvi was accused of collaborating with foreign powers, which led to his execution in 1793. The execution of the king marked the end of the monarchy. This created a political vacuum that led to the establishment of a republic in France in 1792.

8. The war became a stepping-stone for the rise of Napoleon to power. It led to the death and exile of senior Army officers and politicians, which left a military and political vacuum that Napoleon occupied. Besides, it gave Napoleon the opportunity to display his skills and gain popularity, for instance in the Italian campaign of 1796, which popularized him in Italy and France.

9. The war brought the idea of unity and co-operation in settling world disputes. The coalitions that were formed against France (1793, 1798) were gradually transformed and concretized in the congress system. The war therefore brought the idea of alliance and co-operation in handling crucial issues of common concern.

THE DIRECTORY GOVERNMENT

Introduction

The Directory government was a conservative middle class oriented government that ruled France from 1795-1799. Administration was in the hands of a committee of five members who were called Directors. Each Director was to rule for one year. The Directors were assisted by a council of five hundred composed of persons above the age of 30 years and the council of Elders, which comprised of persons of over 40 years. These councils were responsible for making and amending the constitution.

Achievements of the directory government:

1. The Directory government ended the reign of terror and restored Law and order in France. Before the directory government, France was in anarchy where one had to be a killer in order not to be killed. However, the directory government abolished the committees of public safety, revolutionary tribunals and general security which were instruments of the reign of terror. The government also released political suspects and prisoners most of whom were unfairly imprisoned during the reign of terror. These restored peace, stability, the rule of Law and order.

2. Politically, The Directory government should be applauded for reconciling various factions that was very antagonistic during the reign of terror. It released political prisoners and allowed émigrés who had fled political persecution to unconditionally return to France. They were integrated to serve in a new unitary government on the principle of reconciliation. The Girondins and moderate Jacobins were scattered in different government departments to neutralize their perceived threats against the government. This explains why there was relative political stability, peace and order contrary to the pre 1789 era in France.

3. The influence and threats of the royalists against the government was checked and minimized by the Directory government. It was decreed that 2/3 of the posts in the government were to be held by former members of the convention government. This made the government to be dominated by revolutionary persons, which undermined the royalist dominance and negative influence that could have destabilized the government. Although the principle of equality was ignored, such a decree nevertheless helped to restore peace and stability in France, hence an achievement.

4. The Directory government initiated a number of reforms that were accomplished by Napoleon Bonaparte. For instance, the codification of the French laws, centralization of administration, public works e.g. roads and railways, educational, industrial and agricultural reforms. Some of these reforms were perfected by Napoleon Bonaparte, which qualified him to be great.

5. The Directory government is credited for restoring democratic system of government in a country that had experienced the worst dictatorship during the reign of terror. It was a liberal government that was headed by a committee of five directors who were men of high reputation. The directors were regularly replaced annually to avoid dictatorship and struggle for power. The government also upheld the principle of parliamentary democracy. The new constitution of 1795 created the council of five hundred and elders who were responsible for making and amending the constitution. France remained a republican government and elections were held in 1797 and 1798 although by only those who could afford the tax qualification to vote. This preserved some fundamental rights such as the right to vote and participation in government.

6. Besides, the Directory government restored constitutional rule in France. Before 1795, France was under the most brutal and single party dictatorship of Robespierre. But the Directory government amended the 1791

constitution in 1795. This safeguarded people's freedom and rights throughout the 4 years of the Directory government. It should be noted that the constitution disenfranchised the majority Frenchmen due to tax qualification in order to check violence especially by the low income earners i.e. the Paris mob. They were prohibited from attending parliamentary sessions. Although this was undemocratic, it nevertheless left French destiny in the hands of propertied Frenchmen who had a high degree of political acumen and strong desire for peace as a means of protecting their property.

7. The government improved the military capacity of France, it re-organized, retrained and re-

Equipped the French army to a very high level of military efficiency. The National Guard was transformed into a strong force led by men of rare talents like Director Carnot and Napoleon Bonaparte. The army was used to maintain Law and order bring wealth and military glory from abroad.

However, it should be noted that the Directory government lost control over the army and that is why Napoleon used the army to take over power in 1799.

8. The Directory government defeated the first coalition of Britain, Prussia, and Holland, Austria etc. that was formed against France in 1793, the aim of the coalition was to suppress the revolution and restore Louis XVI to his power. But the directory government launched an aggressive campaign and defeated the coalition powers in 1795 with the exception of Britain. This kept the revolution intact and restored people's confidence in the government.

9. Internal uprisings and plots against the government were suppressed by the army. For instance, the royalist uprising of 1795 was brutally suppressed by the young "one meal a day artillery officer"; Napoleon. The Babeuf plot to assassinate the directors, topple the government and establish a socialist government in France was foiled in 1797. Babeuf and his followers were arrested, charged and guillotined/murdered. This destroyed internal opposition and made potential enemies to keep aloof.

10. In its foreign policy, the directory government was very successful in the Italian campaign of 1796 against Austria. Austria had been a headache to the revolutionary government since 1792. In 1796, Napoleon commanded French troops, defeated Austria and forced her to sign the Campoformio treaty of 1797. By this treaty, Austria surrendered Belgium, Rhine lands and

Northern Italian states to France. These states paid annual tributes to France. For instance, the Duke of Modena paid 10,000 Francs annually to France. Napoleon also looted Italian works of art and used them to beautify the French museums. All these earned France wealth, military glory and led to the expansion of French territory. On top of those, the government liberated Italians and Germans from the oppressive Austrian rule.

The Weaknesses and Failures of the Directory Government

The Directory government had fundamental weaknesses that made some historians to grossly underestimate its achievements. Madelin expresses this that; The Directory government was the more incompetent and most corrupt government ever setup in France. Hay expresses the same sentiments that; the history of the four years of the directory was troubled; uncertain and ended in its violent overthrow. It should be noted that the Directory government contributed to its own downfall in 1799. Its weaknesses were exploited by Napoleon I to rally support and stage the coup of 1799 leading to the end of the road for the Directory government.

1. The Directory government was messed up by corruption, embezzlement of public funds and inefficient administration. It over printed the assignats (currency) and it lost its value to the lowest level. All these led to industrial breakdown, unemployment, inflation, famine and starvation. This caused public outcry for a liberator which was utilized by Napoleon to rise to power.
2. The government went against democratic rights by making tax qualification the criteria for one to vote or be voted in an election. For example, those who were voted in the upper chamber of parliament had to pay 40,000 Francs. It disenfranchised the majority of poor Frenchmen most especially the peasants. This was a violation of the French revolutionary principles of liberty, equality, fraternity and nationalism. In short, it was a return to the pre 1789 conservative ancient system which the Frenchmen had destroyed through the 1789 revolution.
3. The government lacked confidence in itself. It over relied on Napoleon in suppressing internal revolts and fighting foreign wars. For example, the royalist uprising of 1795, Italian and Egyptian campaigns of 1796 and 1798 respectively. These increased Napoleon's popularity and ambitions which made him to stage the coup of 1799.
4. The Directory government failed to bring reconciliation between the Catholic Church and the government of France. It encouraged the worship of reason and altered the calendar to contain names of revolutionary

events and leaders other than saints and the birth of Christ. The worship of reason (philanthropy) that was led by Herbert was anti-Christian and dogmatic. It was therefore very unpopular to the majority of the Frenchmen most of whom were staunch Catholics. This provoked more rebellions in the catholic dominated western provinces of Brittany and Lavandee districts. The government failed to pacify these areas and they remained a source of political/ instability to the government.

5. The Directory government was disorganized and weakened from its structure and hierarchy. 'Disharmony existed between the council of 500 and the council of elders. There was power struggle within the directors. The government also failed to reconcile with the parliament that was dominated by the Jacobins supporters. This explains why the parliament refused to approve newly elected members of parliament in 1797 and rejected several government programs This situation gave rise to political intrigues which destroyed the government. For Instance, Abbey Sieyyes and Duccas disagreed with other directors and used Napoleon to stage the coup of 1799.

6. The Directory government is blamed for manipulating and rigging elections in France. The government used the army to terrorize people to vote for its candidates and rig the elections of •" 1797, 1798 and 1799. It nullified the election results of 1797 simply because the royalists and moderates had won most of the seats in parliament against state candidates. This explains why Carnot, the chairman of elections was deposed. In a nut shell, this was militarization of elections and an attack on the democratic rights of the Frenchmen.

7. Directory government worsened economic crisis in France when it scrapped the law of maximum price. The law was initiated by Robespierre to protect consumers against exploitation by hoarders of essential commodities in times, of crisis. The law was abolished and France became a free market economy managed by the forces of demand and supply. This was used by traders and Industrialists to hike prices of commodities. Consequently, it led to Inflation, poverty, famine and starvation that made life of ordinary French men very miserable

8. The amnesty to the émigrés and release of political prisoners did not amount to total reconciliation. Diehard revolutionaries protested their return as a threat to the progress of the revolution. This was because they were hardcore conservative persons who were suspected to return with a hidden agenda to advocate for the restoration of the pre 1789 privileges

and properties such as Land. Indeed when they returned, many of them joined the opposition and undermined government programs through their representatives in parliament.

9. The foreign policy of the Directory government over the Egyptian campaign was a failure.

Napoleon had commanded 38,000 soldiers to conquer Egypt and force the British out. Although

Napoleon successfully conquered the Island of Malta from the British and defeated the Mameluks (Egyptian rulers) at the battle of pyramids, he was finally defeated by Nelson. He withdrew to France in two tiny boats with a few escorts leaving his soldiers in Egypt. Thus, the Egyptian campaign was a fiasco.

10. Lastly, the Directory government was too weak and incapable of consolidating the territorial glory and gains which Napoleon I had achieved through the Italian campaign of 1796-97. The second coalition of 1798 was formed against France, defeated her and Austria regained all the Compofonio- treaty territories that she had lost to France in the 1796 Italian campaign. Indeed by 1799, France was driven out of Switzerland, Germany and Italian states. Napoleon questioned the military effectiveness of the government in the following words;

I go and I leave you in peace, I come back, I find war, I left you victorious but found you defeated! What have you done for the French society?

Much as Napoleon reorganized the French troops and defeated the second coalition in 1802, the war left France isolated from the rest of Europe who fought her in a series of coalitions until 1815 when Napoleon was finally defeated. France was only reconciled to the rest of Europe in 1818 when she was admitted to the congress system.

Reasons For the Collapse Of The Ancient Regime

i) The outbreak of the French revolution of 1789 was a landmark in the collapse of the ancient regime. The Ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy failed to address the political, economic and social problems of the French men that dragged them to revolt by 1789. After the outbreak of the revolution, the revolutionaries established the national assembly that was monopolized by diehard revolutionary personalities who enacted policies that undermined the existence of the monarchy. They hijacked the Kings powers and left him as a "figure head" in French political affairs. Besides,

revolutionary principles of liberty, equality and fraternity antagonized the political, social and economic structures of the ancient regime/monarchy and made its collapse inevitable.

ii) Revolutionary events in the aftermath of the revolution speeded up the collapse of the Ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. The declaration of the rights of man and citizens (Aug 1789) unveiled fundamental human rights and freedoms like freedom of press, association, worship, ownership of property, participation in government and equality of all by nature. It was a one sided declaration that dealt with the rights of citizens and ignored people's duties to the monarchy. Thereafter, the French revolutionaries struggled for their rights at the expense of their duties that could have supported the monarchy. The document destroyed unfair political system, class system, feudalism and serfdom that had sustained the ancient regime/monarchy. It also gave rise to revolutionary ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity that were incompatible to the existence of the monarchy, ^he declaration therefore consolidated the ideas of republicanism and influenced the revolutionaries to substitute the monarchy with a republican government by 1793.

iii) The civil constitution of the clergy, July 1790 was yet another revolutionary event that contributed to the collapse of the ancient regime/ Bourbon monarchy. It destroyed the Catholic church influence on state affairs, religious intolerance and privileges of the Catholic Church and Clergies in France. The upper clergy and the Pope influenced King Louis xvi to veto it, which increased the determination of hardcore revolutionaries to do away with the monarchy/ ancient regime. Apart from uprooting the Catholic Church influence, the document brought to an end church alliance with the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. This led to the collapse of the monarchy because the Catholic Church was its strongest base and greatest supporter.

iv) The calling of the estates general meeting of 5th may 1789 also propelled the collapse of the ancient regime/ Bourbon monarchy. The delegates were summoned by King Louis xvi to find solutions to pending problems most especially financial crisis in France. The failure of King Louis xvi to handle the crisis over seating arrangement forced the third estate delegates to declare themselves the national assembly. This sparked off the 1789 revolution, which came with events that hastened the collapse of the monarchy. It was thus the beginning of the-revolutionary government that formally ended the reign of the regime/monarchy and instituted a republican government by 1793.

v) The rise of the national assembly also influenced the collapse of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. When the King failed to settle the disagreement over the seating arrangement, the third estate delegates defied him and converted themselves into the national assembly on 17th June 1789. This undermined the powers of the ancient regime/ monarchy as the third estate- used the national assembly to make laws that trimmed the powers of the monarchy and the King in French affairs. The assembly kept the third estate delegates united against the monarchy as they made laws on behalf of all the Frenchmen.

vi) The March of women to Versailles was also responsible for the collapse of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy by 1793. On 5th Oct 1789, about 6500 women including men dressed in women's clothes marched from Paris to Versailles to petition King Louis xvi to accept reforms and settle socio-economic problems of famine, unemployment inflation etc. The King yielded to their demands and was brought back to Paris with, his entire family. However when they reached Paris, they were put under house arrest in the Tuilleries palace as prisoners. This made it easier to transfer the national assembly from Versailles 'that was a stronghold of the ancient regime/ Bourbon monarchy to Paris, which was a revolutionary centre controlled by the mob. It became a big setback to the powers of the regime/monarchy as it lost control of the destiny of France.

vii) The destruction/fall of Bastilles was very crucial in the collapse of the ancient regime/ Bourbon monarchy. On 14th July 1789, the Paris mob under the leadership of Desmoulins destroyed the Bastilles that were a symbol of despotism where victims of *lettress-de-cachet* were imprisoned. Prisoners most of whom diehard revolutionaries were released. The released prisoners revenged by joining the Paris mob to cause more chaos that contributed to the death of Louis xvi and the downfall of the Bourbon monarchy. The fall of Bastilles also implied the end of dictatorship, *lettress-de-cachet* and centralization of power that had been part and parcel of the monarchy. It forced the nobles and clergy into exile thereby narrowing the support of the monarchy while increasing the determination of the third estate to uproot it from power. Besides, the destruction of the Bastilles was preceded by change of the national flag from the white flag of the Bourbons to the tri-colour flag of the revolutionaries and dissolution of the royal guard that was replaced by the National Guard. This denied the ancient regime/monarchy of its symbol and protection hence accelerating its collapse.

viii) The promulgation of the first French constitution also contributed to the collapse of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. On 5th Sept 1791, the constituent assembly enacted the first constitution in the history of France. It confirmed people's rights in the declaration of the rights of man and citizens ignoring people's duties that was very important in strengthening the monarchy. Above all, the constitution drastically reduced the traditional powers of the monarchy and the King. It established a new administrative system where the King's powers were decentralized to be exercised by junior officers. This left King Louis xvi and the Bourbon monarchy with very limited power that made the collapse of the ancient regime inevitable by 1793.

ix) The weaknesses of King Louis xvi contributed to the collapse of the ancient regime in a number of ways. In the first place, Louis' failure to settle the political, social and economic problems in France led to the outbreak of the French revolution that undermined the survival of the ancient regime.

b) It was Louis who blundered by calling the estates general meeting and failed to settle the issue of the sitting arrangement that graduated into the revolution. Louis' personal weakness could not enable him to hijack the revolution on its eve. This is why the revolutionaries took control of events and destroyed the monarchy by 1793.

c) Louis xvi's insensitivity to reforms made the revolutionaries to take a radical and violent step of destroying the ancient regime and executing him by 1793. The French revolutionaries of 1789 were merely demanding for reforms but Louis xvi used his veto powers to block the proposed reforms. For instance, he refused to sign important documents like the declaration of the rights of man and citizens, the civil constitution of the clergy and the general amnesty to the émigrés. These made Louis xvi and the ancient regime an obstacle to the French revolution and that is why they were destroyed by 1793.

d) Louis xvi's treasonable acts against the French revolutionaries led to the downfall of the monarchy / ancient regime and his own death by 1793. His attempt to suppress the revolution using foreign troops, calling the royal session and closing the third class delegates out of the assembly hall forced the revolutionaries to destroy the monarchy and replace it with a republican government. This is because the revolutionaries saw Louis and the ancient regime as a threat to the survival of the revolution and hence decided to eliminate them for the sake of the revolution.

e) Louis XVI's aborted flight to Varennes was a blunder that led to the collapse of the ancient regime.

This was a secret move where Louis intended to flee to Austria in order to seek foreign assistance, link up with the émigrés and suppress the revolution. However, he was arrested and imprisoned as an enemy of the revolution. Investigators found secret documents in his office drawer and house that linked him to the émigrés and other hostile foreign states like Austria. Consequently, he was charged with treason and guillotined as a closing chapter to the ancient regime.

x) The negative role/character of Queen Marie Antoinette was instrumental in the disintegration of the ancient regime. Marie Antoinette was arrogant, cantankerous and unsympathetic to the problems of the Frenchmen. She gave poor and unfortunate advice to Louis XVI which made him to pursue negative policies against the Frenchmen. For instance, she advised the king to dismiss Turgot and Necker and reject all reforms proposed by the national assembly. This forced the revolutionaries to attack the Bastilles and destroy the ancient regime.

xi) The untimely death of Mirabeau was also responsible for the collapse of the ancient regime. Mirabeau was the chairman of the national assembly and a counselor to Louis XVI. Unfortunately, he died in 1791 and this gave rise to blood thirsty and power hungry men like Danton, Marat and Robespierre whose role led to the collapse of the ancient regime. Mirabeau foretold the destruction of the monarchy when he said on his death bed that; I carry with me the last rags of the monarchy. It's therefore logical to say that the death of Mirabeau robbed France of a political conciliator who could have saved the ancient regime and Louis XVI from destruction and death respectively.

xii) The role of political parties / clubs such as the Girondins, Jacobins, Cordilliers etc weakened the monarchy and led to its demise / downfall by 1793. These parties intensified violence and instability that undermined people's confidence in the monarchy. The Jacobins terrorized and assassinated all those who were still sympathetic to the ancient regime and monarchy. They also exposed and exaggerated the weaknesses of the ancient regime that undermined its existence by 1793.

xiii) The rise and role of revolutionary extremists was of paramount importance in the collapse of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. Marat used his revolutionary newspaper, L' Ami du peuple to decampaign the Bourbon monarchy and incite the masses to overthrow it. He was a

supporter of the Paris mob and the master planner of the September massacre where over 1,000 imprisoned monarchical supporters were murdered in cold blood. Robespierre, Danton and Marat perpetuated violence and killing of supporters of the monarchy including King Louis xvi and Queen Marie Antoinette. They were blood thirsty radical republicans who brought the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy to an end and established a republican government in France by 1793.

xiv) Persistent financial crisis affected the performance of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy and contributed to its downfall. Financial bankruptcy forced Louis xvi to call the estates general meeting of 5th May 1789 that triggered off 'the-revolution, which led to the collapse of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. The outbreak of the revolution did not give the King and his Ministers time to consult the members of parliament on the solutions to financial crisis. Consequently, the crisis persisted and worsened the problems of inflation, unemployment, poverty, famine and starvation. It eroded the little confidence that some Frenchmen still had in the monarchy and consolidated the spirit of republicanism. This was used by radical republicans like Robespierre to destroy the monarchy and institute a republican government in France by 1793.

xv) The establishment of Convention government and a republic sealed the fate of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy in France. On Sept 1792, the national assembly suspended King Louis xvi but feared to pass a final judgment on him and the monarchy. A resolution was passed that a new government that would be called the convention government should be formed (through elections) to determine the fate of the monarchy and the King. In the aftermath of its formation, the Convention government deposed King Louis xvi and declared France a republic on 22nd Sept 1792. This became the end of the road for the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy in France.

xvi) The abolition of Feudalism influenced the collapse of the ancient regime/Bourbon monarchy. On 4thAug 1789, the national assembly nullified feudalism and scrapped the oppressive ancient system of taxation in France. It also guaranteed equality in accessing public offices and services. These influenced some clergy and nobles to denounce their privileges and join the third estate in a spirit of brotherhood. This undermined the basis of survival for the monarchy and caused its collapse by 1793.

xvii) The role of mobs and mob injustice cannot be underrated in the collapse of the ancient regime. During the reign of terror, there was total

breakdown of law and order which made the mob to take control of events in France. This was manipulated by ambitious and opportunistic politicians like Robespierre to destroy the ancient regime and achieve their hidden political ambitions.

xviii) The hostility of European monarchs towards the French revolution forced the revolutionaries to destroy the ancient regime and replace it with a republican government. The Pilnitz declaration and the Brunswick manifesto where Prussia and Austria threatened (and even invaded) France forced the revolutionaries to "do away" with the ancient regime before it could be saved.

xix) The effects of American war of independence and the failure of the army to support the ancient regime also led to its collapse. Apart from contributing to financial crisis, the war politicized the

French soldiers negatively against the monarchy. This made it very easy for power hungry men like Robespierre, Danton and Marat to use the politicized soldiers in bringing about the downfall of the ancient regime.

xx) The better political, social and economic conditions in England partly influenced the Frenchmen to cause the collapse of the ancient regime. England had a constitutional monarchy with a functional parliament, independent judiciary, a modernized agriculture and industries. Besides, the socio economic conditions of the English were better than those of the Frenchmen. This influenced radical Frenchmen to replace the monarchy with a republic that was to resemble the form of government in England.

xxi) The role of political philosophers, encyclopaedists and physiocrats undermined the survival of the ancient regime beyond 1793. Their writings politicized the Frenchmen against the rule of Louis xvi and the Bourbon monarchy. They compared the conditions of the Frenchmen with those of the English and exposed the "rottenness" of the French monarchy. This biased the Frenchmen with negative attitudes against the monarchy and contributed to its collapse by 1793.

xxii) The growing threats of the émigrés also contributed to the collapse of the ancient regime. By 1792, they had mobilized themselves to a tune of 20,000 men with a declared intention to suppress the revolution, restore their privileges and King Louis to his throne; They were supported by foreign powers and had internal collaborators who provided them with military secrets and strategies. King Louis xvi and the monarchy were key suspects

amongst internal collaborators. This biased the revolutionaries to eliminate them as a strategy to deal with the threats of the émigrés

xxiii) Conclude generally without taking a standpoint.

POSITIVE CHANGES AND ACHIEVEMENTS

The French revolution that started in 1789 brought fundamental social, political and economic changes in the history of France. The changes caused by the revolution were both positive and negative. One should note that the classical/lasting changes brought by the revolution in France and Europe explain why historians have regarded the revolution as the most important event in the history of Europe during the 18th Century.

Destruction of social class system

The French revolution destroyed the discriminative social class system in France and declared equality for all by nature. Segregation in terms of birth, religion, sex and class against peasants and middleclass were brought to an end. The revolutionaries came up with the idea of equality and career open to talents where promotions and appointments to any position in the society were based on talents and abilities. This led to the rise of the middleclass who had better education to positions of responsibility as opposed to incompetent nobles and clergy who dominated such positions before the revolution. However, peasants remained spectators inspite of their massive participation in the revolution.

2 Rise of Napoleon Bonaparte

The French Revolution contributed to the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte to power, without which he would have died a common man. It destroyed the segregative social class system and offered opportunity for talented peasant men who used to be discriminated like Napoleon Bonaparte to rise to power. Revolutionary changes and events like the 1793 and 1795 uprisings gave Napoleon opportunity to exploit his talents and maneuver his way to power by 1799.

3 Declaration of the rights of man and citizens

The French revolution led to the declaration of the rights of man and citizens. The Constituent

Assembly/parliament in 1789 deliberated and came up with a document of on the rights of man and citizens. It granted political liberties like; freedom of speech, press, worship, association and ownership of property. Although these were abused especially during the reign of terror, they nevertheless became the foundation of people's rights and freedom.

4 Revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity

The revolution gave birth to revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity. These ideas were consolidated in France and spread to other states such as Italians and Germans. Such ideas promoted equality, freedom, democracy and good governance. They were also used by the by the revolutionaries to dominate other nations. Above all, such revolutionary ideas glorified France and made her a prestigious nation in Europe.

5 Destruction of the Bourbon monarchy

The Bourbon monarchy that had ruled France for over 400 years was brought to an end by the French revolution. The revolutionaries declared the monarchy abolished in 1792 and replaced it with a republican form of government. Henceforth, France adopted a republican government that was the first of its kind in the history of -Europe. Although the. Bourbon monarchy was restored by the great powers after the downfall of Napoleon in 1815; it could not survive beyond 1830 because the monarchy was already weakened due to changes caused by the revolution.

6 Political pluralism

France became a multiparty state as a result of the 1789 revolution. The freedom of association led to the rise of different political parties such as the Feuillants, Girondins, Cordilliers and Jacobins that competed for power. These Parties kept the government under checks and balances by criticizing the unfair policies and programs. However, these parties became institutions that promoted the reign of terror as they embarked on violence to eliminate rival political groups. This made them to destroy themselves to the extent that none of them existed beyond 1795.

7 Parliamentary democracy

The French Revolution consolidated parliamentary democracy in France. The national assembly

(Parliament) that was called by King Louis VI in May 1789 was maintained by successive revolutionary governments. France had a functional

parliament where different parties were represented. For instance in 1792, the parliament had 120 Girondins, 50 Jacobins and 60 Independent members. Thus, the Frenchmen were able to participate in governing themselves through their elected representatives.

8 Constitutionalism

The French revolution introduced the rule of law in the history of France. Before 1789, France had no constitution to safeguard people's rights and freedom. However, in 1791 the parliament enacted a constitution that was amended in 1793 and 1795. The constitution clearly separated the powers of the executive, judiciary and legislature (Parliament). It reduced the King's excessive powers and guided the government in planning, policy making and implementation.

9 Land

The French revolution brought a lasting change on land ownership in France. Before the revolution, land was dominated by the clergy and nobles who exploited peasants through feudalism and serfdom. However, the revolutionary government came with reforms that revolutionized / changed the land tenure system in France. The revolution brought the idea of private ownership of land where everybody had the right to own land. This provided peasants with a chance to own land for the first time and brought an end to feudalism and serfdom in the history of France. The civil constitution of the clergy nationalized church Land, which was sold to peasants at a giveaway price. Land that formerly belonged to absentee land lords were nationalized in 1790 and given to former tenants who were peasants.

10 The Catholic Church and the clergy

The revolution undermined the power and influence of the Catholic Church in France. Before the revolution, the Catholic Church was the most powerful and privileged institution in France. However, the revolutionary government through the civil constitution of the clergy destroyed its power, privileges and influence. Church influence on state and education were stopped. Freedom of worship was granted and the catholic religion was no longer a state religion. Church privileges were terminated to the extent that Bishops and Priests were made civil servants on government payroll. The Pope's influence in French politics also ceased to exist. However, this later caused conflict between the church and state on one hand, the French government and the rest of the catholic states on the other hand.

NB. The poor relationship between the church and the state in France was corrected by Napoleon I when he signed the concordat (an agreement) with the pope in 1801. Nevertheless, Napoleon I later worsened the poor relationship in 1808 when he imprisoned the pope for failure to implement the continental system.

11 Socio-Economic changes

The revolutionary government enforced some reforms in the social and economic structures of France. In trade, a uniform metric system of weights and measures was introduced to avoid exploitation. A minimum price for bread was also fixed and a new currency (assignats) was introduced to control inflation. In the field of industrialization and labour, polytechnic institutions to train skilled man power were established and the right to work and receive fair payment was guaranteed. The education system was liberalized and the church's influence on education was terminated. Agriculture was boosted by introduction of better farming and scientific methods. Taxation was reformed to include the privileged classes.

NB. Most of the above Socio -economic changes created were undermined during the reign of terror and the directory government. Achievement in the fields of agriculture and transport were not so much. Inflation persisted during the reign of terror and the directory government worsened it by over printing the Assignats. Exploitation of peasants continued through over taxation, discrimination in employment and fraudulent weights and measures. However, reforms in the social and economic fields survived and became permanent benefits of the revolution after the reign of terror.

12 Formation of the National Guard

There was the formation of the National Guard that replaced the royal guard of the Bourbon monarchy. The National Guard was a local militia force/revolutionary army that was made up of volunteers whose role was to protect the achievements of the revolution. By the end of 1793, there were about 700,000 well trained and disciplined soldiers in the National Guard. They defeated the first coalition and exported revolutionary ideas to countries like Belgium, Italian and German states.

13 Creation of the revolutionary Tri-colour flag

The French revolutionaries created the tri-colour flag to replace the white flag of the Bourbons. The three colours in the flag represented the three revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity. It was a symbol of

changes that France went through from the ancient regime to the new revolutionary government

NEGATIVE CHANGES AND FAILURES

1 Loss of lives and destruction of property

There was massive loss of lives and destruction of property most especially during the reign of terror. There were heavy massacres of the nobles, clergies and their sympathizers by diehard revolutionaries key personalities like Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, Danton, Marat and Robes Pierre; all lost their lives during the French revolution of 1789. Important places like Hotel De Ville, Bastilles and Mansions of the nobles and clergy were demolished. Properties belonging to exiled nobles and clergy especially land were confiscated and sold cheaply to peasants.

2 The reign of terror and revival of despotism

The French revolution that initially started as a peaceful reform movement in 1789 resulted into the reign of terror from 1793-94. There was total breakdown of law and order, heavy massacres and extreme dictatorship especially under the leadership of Robespierre. These were made worst by internal resistance to revolutionary changes by the privileged class and foreign war.

3 Displacement and exile

The French revolution led to displacement and exile of dissatisfied nobles and clergy to countries such as Austria, Prussia and Russia. Persecution and confiscation of property forced the wealthy clergy and nobles to exile. This led to capital flight which had negative effects on the economic development of France.

4 General economic decline

The revolution led to a general decline on the level of economic activities. Progress in agriculture, trade, industries, transport and communication were hindered and seriously undermined especially during the reign of terror. These led to unemployment, inflation, poverty, famine and starvation. The women's march to Paris in demand for food and the role of the mob during the revolution is a testimony of the desperate economic condition created by the revolution.

5 Conflict between the Catholic Church and the state

The revolution led to a serious conflict between the Catholic Church and the state. Before the revolution, the Catholic Church and the state were in a perfectly good relationship. However, the negative changes created by the revolutionary government against the Catholic Church created a serious rebellion by the clergy and fanatic Catholics. The scrapping of church privileges, appointment of the clergy by the government and nationalization of church land brought an end to the formally cordial/ good relations between the state and the church.

6 Loophole/weakness of the rights of man and citizens

The rights of man and citizens that was declared by the revolutionary government had some loopholes. It emphasized only the rights of man and ignored the duties of man towards the state. It left the Frenchmen Ignorant of their duties to the extent that some of them started evading taxation. Above all, it made the Frenchmen irresponsible and crazy under emotional excitement of freedom that led to the outbreak of the reign of terror.

7 Loophole of the constitution

The constitution also had some loopholes. In the first place, it disqualified majority Frenchmen from voting by making property qualification the basis of voting. Secondly, it still left Louis XVI with power to veto/reject the resolutions of the parliament, which he stubbornly used to block reforms proposed by the parliament. This made the Frenchmen to lose confidence in the constitution and resort to lawlessness that led to the reign of terror.

8 Diplomatic relations

The French revolution led to poor diplomatic relations between France and other European states. The changes caused by the revolution and the threats of the revolutionaries against their neighbours forced states like Austria, Russia, Prussia, Britain and Italian states to ally against France in 1792. This caused war between revolutionary France, and, other powers in Europe. France therefore lost her citizens and resources in an attempt to preserve and export revolutionary ideas to her neighbours.

Effects of The French Revolution On Europe:

The French revolution started peacefully as an internal revolt but as it progressed, it drifted from a peaceful reform movement to a violent movement and ended up affecting Europe and America. The revolution came up with new principles that were either exported by the French armies or adopted by the oppressed peoples due to similar conditions.

These principles affected the entire socio-economic and political structures of Europe as can be seen below.

Positive Effects

1. Rise of revolutionary political parties

The rise of political clubs in France influenced radical reformers to organize similar political parties in a bid to pressurize the existing governments for reforms. By 1792, constitutional information clubs had been organized in almost every district of England and Scotland. Society of the friends of the people and the corresponding society were also in place. Members of these societies were from the lower middle class. These societies had strong solidarity with the French political clubs and the French national assembly.

Their operations were secret for fear of government repressive machinery.

MB. The role played by French clubs during the reign of terror made Britain to regard political clubs as a threat and suppressed them in order to have strict control over its people.

2. Chain reaction

The French revolution of 1789 acted as a springboard for revolutions in Europe. Subsequent revolutions like the 1830 and 1848 revolutions in Europe were inspired by the great French revolution of 1789. In the words of a Greek fighter for independence T. Colocrolos;

The French revolution and Napoleon opened the eyes of the entire world. Before it the people were really ignorant and thought that the kings were the Gods on earth. Whatever they did, people had to praise them. The change brought about by the French events had made it difficult now to rule people.

Before the French revolution, the oppressed masses of Europe and America could not take the law in their hands. However, they learnt from the French revolution that power resides in the oppressed people and that violence or terrorism can bring the biggest political change. This is partly why the 1820's, 1830 and 1848 revolutions became inevitable.

3. Unification of Italy and Germany.

The French revolution laid foundation for the unifications of Italy and Germany; France conquered and re-organized the Italian and German States in 1796 and 1807 respectively. French soldiers who liberated

Italians and Germans preached the revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty, fraternity and nationalism. It inspired Italians and Germans with a high spirit of unity and independence against foreign domination. Italians for instance started fighting for unity and independence in 1809 against France and continued against Austria from 1815. This foundation combined with other factors to lead to the unification of Italy in 1870 and Germany in 1871.

4. Abolition of feudalism and serfdom

Feudalism and serfdom in Europe were also abolished as a result of the French revolution. The revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity influenced the abolition of feudalism and serfdom first in France and later in other European States like Prussia, Hungary, Italy, Germany and Spain. Land was nationalized and given to peasants, which ended monopolization of Land by the Church and the nobles. By 1917, feudalism and serfdom were nowhere in Europe except in Russia. Even then, it was also abolished after the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolutions of 1917.

5. Abolition of social class system

The French revolution also influenced the abolition of the discriminative social class system that existed in Europe. The revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and career open to talents influenced the oppressed peasants and middle class in other States to pressurize their governments to end social class discrimination.

This influenced hitherto (until then) conservative states like Russia, Spain and Prussia to abandon social class division and grant equality between the nobles, clergy, middle class and peasants. For instance, there were equality of taxation, access to education and fair trial before the law, which were not the case before the outbreak of the revolution.

6. Rise of new States men

There was the rise of new States men in the politics of Europe. The destruction of the segregative social class system and the revolutionary ideas of equality offered opportunity for talented men like Napoleon I in France, Mazzinni and Cavour in Italian States and Bismarck in German States to rise to positions of importance in their respective States. These were liberal men who fought for freedom and independence of their nationals/ people. However, others like Metternich took advantage of unity of Europe against the threats of the French revolution to dominate European politics after the downfall of Napoleon i.e. from 1815-1848

7. Rise of new forces of change i.e. Liberalism, Nationalism and Socialism.

The French revolution led to the rise of new forces of change i.e. Liberalism, Nationalism and Socialism in Europe. The revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity undermined the old order of Europe that was characterized by conservatism and despotism. It opened way for a new political order dominated by the forces of liberalism, nationalism and socialism. The new forces were consolidated in Europe by Napoleon Bonaparte I. However, confrontation between the new forces and the old forces led to revolutionary movements in Europe in 1820's, 1830 and 1848. This was because of attempts by conservative Statesmen like Mettemich to suppress the new forces of change.

NB

i) The development of socialism brought antagonism and tension that led to the cold war in the 20th century. It was because socialism later dominated Eastern Europe and "started challenging Western Europe that was dominated by capitalism. This divided Europe into two hostile and antagonistic camps that made the outbreak of cold war inevitable.

(ii) Nationalism has continuously influenced world politics up to today For example; it has led to the collapse of USSR and Yugoslavia. It has also been responsible for the decolonization of Africa and some parts of Europe like India that were formally under foreign rule.

8. Constitutionalism

Revolutionary ideas led to the rise of constitutionalism as a check and balance to despotism in Europe. Political movements sprung, up demanding for liberal constitutions exemplifiably the Carbonari in Italy. Indeed, the U.N charter on Human rights (1948) has borrowed a lot from the declaration of the rights of man and citizens in France.

9. Diplomatic alliances / understanding

The revolution initiated the idea of diplomatic co-operation in handling European and world affairs. Alliances against revolutionary France that started from 1793 were gradually transformed into the concert of Europe after the defeat of Napoleon I at the battle of Waterloo. This inspired the rise and existence of subsequent international organizations like the congress system, the League of Nations and the U.N

Chronological Time Frame Of significant events

- 1774-1776: Turgot as a French financial controller.
- 1776-1781: Necker as a French financial controller.
- 1787: King Louis XVI summoned Assembly of the notables.
- 1788, July; King Louis XVI made a decision to call the estates general meeting.
- 1789: The outbreak of the great French revolution
- 5th May, The summoning of the estates general meeting after 175 years.
- 17th June, The self proclaimed declaration of the third estate as the national Assembly.
- 20th June, The Tennis court oath by national assembly delegates.
- 23rd June The summoning of the royal session.
- 27th June, King Louis XVI ordered all the three estates to sit and deliberate as one body.
- 1 July, Necker and his colleagues dismissed for the second time.
- 14th July, The storming and fall of Bastilles.
- 4th Aug, Abolition of special privileges by the national assembly: •
- 27th Aug, Declaration of the rights of man and citizens
- 5th Oct, The march of women to Versailles. •
- 1790: The rise to power of King Leopold II in Austria Hungary.
- Feb, Suppression of monasteries and other religious groups.
- April, Proclamation of religious freedom.
- July, Enactment of the civil constitution of the clergy.
- A decree passed requiring all catholic clergymen to take oath of allegiance to the civil constitution.
- 1791; Death of Mirabeau.
- Promulgation of a new constitution, the power of the monarchy limited.
- June, King Louis XVI's attempted flight from France, Arrested at Varenne
- King Louis XVI with no choice accepted the new constitution
- 30th September, The national assembly concluded its work and was dissolved
- 1791- 1792: The legislative assembly.
- 1791, The assembly constituted to replace the national assembly, Antagonism with the King who vetoed decrees against the émigrés and non juring clergy.
- 1792; April, France issued ultimatum to Austria and declared war against Austria and
- Prussia.

- Brunswick declaration.
- Invasion of France by the allied powers.
- 20th June, Parisian mob attacked King Louis XVI's palace. '
- Aug, Revolt in Paris. •
- 10th Aug, King Louis XVI suspended.
- 20th September, French troops defeated allied powers at the battle of Valmy.
- 22nd Sept, Massacre of suspected royalist prisoners i.e. September massacre. •-
- 1792-1795: The national convention.
- 1792, 21st Sept, Formation of the convention to replace the legislative assembly.
- Deposition of King Louis XVI
- Republican system of Government declared in France
- Struggle between Jacobins (radicals) and Girondins for political dominance
- 1793-1794: The reign of terror in France
- 1793 Jan, King Louis XVI was tried, sentenced to death and guillotined on 21st
- Feb, Compulsory levy (payment) for all Frenchmen introduced.
- Establishment of the committees of public safety and revolutionary tribunal. '
- April, Marat attacked by the Girondins f
- Formation of the first coalition consisting of England, Prussia, Russia, Austria, Spain, Holland and
- Sardinia, The alliance was sustained up to 1797.
- Conscription for military service ordered for all Frenchmen from 18 and 25 years old.
- May, The downfall of the Girondins, proceeded by massive arrest of their leaders, " fueled" by the Jacobins.
- Massive execution of nobles, clergy, wealthy men and sympathizers of the ancient regime.
- Oct, Execution of Queen Marie Antoinette.
- 10th Nov, Execution of Madam Roland.
- Nov, Inauguration of the worship of reason, Abolition of Christian worship and promulgation of the republican calendar.
- Dec, Napoleon Bonaparte suppressed the royalist uprising at Port Toulon.
- 1794 April, The guillotine of Danton.
- 28th July, Robespierre guillotined with 20 supporters.

- End of the reign of terror with the death of Robespierre.
- 1795 Establishment of the Directory Government (1795-1799)
- Re-organization of the committee of public safety, and revolutionary tribunal.
- Abolition of the Jacobins club and revival of the power of the convention.
- Amendment of the 1791 constitution. -
- Suppression of the uprisings in Paris (Port Toulon inclusive) and restoration of
- Constitutionalism.
- The treaty of Basel by which Austria and Spain abandoned the first coalition.
- Establishment of the Batavian republic by France.
- 1796 April 1796-April 1797, The Italian campaign, Napoleon I defeated Austrian troops the battles of Lodi, Peschiera and Mantua.
- The Babeuf plot.
- 1797 13th and 14th July, Napoleon I defeated, Austria. . '
- Napoleon I appointed commander of the French troops to attack England
- Battle of the Cape St. Vincent in which Spanish troops was defeated.
- Declaration of the Cisalpine republic by France. (Northern Italy). ,
- 17th Oct, The Campoformio treaty between France and Austria.
- 1797 The battle of Pyramids in which Napoleon I defeated the Mameluks.
- The battle of the Nile where Nelson defeated Napoleon I.
- Formation of the second coalition by England, Russia, Austria, Turkey and
- Naples.
- Establishment of the Helvetic republic (Switzerland), Roman republic (Rome)
- and Ligurian republic (Genoa).
- 1798-99, The Egyptian campaign against Britain

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

Background

Napoleon was born at Ajaccio in the Island of Corsica (Genoa in Italy) in August 1769: The Island of Corsica was annexed to France a year before

he was born (1768). Napoleon was therefore an Italian by descent and a Frenchman by birth. He was from an obscure and poor family background. Napoleon was one of the eight children who survived death out of the 13 children born of his mother.

From childhood, Napoleon was militaristic. He liked listening to stories of soldiers and wars. He was fond of wearing military uniforms and carrying mock fights and games with his fellow children. His ambition was to become a professional soldier and that's why he would joke that; I will become a soldier and will win every battle.

Thus in 1779, his father who was close to French governors fluked for him a place at the military academy of Brienne from where he changed to the military academy of Paris in 1804. He studied military science and graduated as an artillery officer at the age of 16 with the rank of second Lieutenant.

However, Napoleon's family background made life difficult for him at school. He was isolated and lacked good relationship with children from rich family background. Worst of all, he was not a bright student since he was amongst poor performers in class. Nevertheless, although Napoleon led a miserable life at school because of his poor family background, he did well in mathematics and Military Science. This is why he graduated as an artillery officer at a tender age of 16 years. So, the 1789 French revolution came when Napoleon had modeled himself into a professional soldier.

Napoleon had earlier thought of leading the Corsican nationalistic rebellion (against French annexation) but before he could start, the 1789 revolution broke out and he welcomed it since it had come with favourable opportunities that were necessary for achieving his ambitions. In 1791, he went for leave in Corsica and to him; this was a heaven-sent opportunity to spread revolutionary ideas to his people and liberate them. This was however resisted from patriotic French men like Pauli, which made Napoleon and his family members to be expelled from Corsica. He returned to Paris only to find that he had been dismissed for overstaying his leave. But owing to the acute shortage of artillery officers, he was reinstated back to the army.

Napoleon made a great contribution to the events of the French revolution. In 1793, he destroyed a royalist uprising, which was supported by the British naval force at port Toulon. This he accomplished through what is historically known as the whiff of grapeshot. In 1795, he saved the newly elected

Directory government from a mob of demonstrators who were supported by the royalist. This earned him the rank of a general.

In 1796, he embarked on the Italian campaign against Austria. He was given an idle, famine stricken, naked and demoralized army that was a potential source of insecurity, to command for the invasion of Italy. Napoleon established confidence in these soldiers and himself (Napoleon) through his moving speech when he said;

Soldiers you are hungry, naked and destitute. The government owes you much but can give you nothing. I will lead you to fertile plains; rich provinces and great cities will be in your hands. There you will have honour, power and glory.

This raised the soldier's morale and made the campaign a success. Austria was defeated and forced to sign the Campoformio treaty where she surrendered the whole empire to Napoleon (i.e. Belgium, Lombardy and some Rhine territories). He returned to France with a lot of loot, fame and glory and to this effect a street in Paris was named Napoleon. While in Italy, he won the support of the masses when he told them; people of Italy, the French army comes to break your chains. Greet it with confidence; your property, religion and customs will be respected.

By 1797, the Directory government was threatened by Napoleon's popularity yet they had Britain as the last external enemy. So in late 1797 he was sent with 38,000 soldiers to lead the Egyptian campaign against British interest in the far and near east. They expected Napoleon to perish in the campaign. However, he bravely conducted the campaign, defeated the Mamelukes at the battle of Pyramids and captured Alexandria. However, in July 1798, Nelson defeated him at Alexandria. At the same time, he learnt from an English newspaper that a coalition had been formed against France. Consequently, he escaped to Paris in 2 small boats leaving his soldiers in Egypt. In spite of his defeat and failures, the Frenchmen only talked of Bonaparte as "the conqueror of Italy and hero of Egypt". He found Paris and the whole France messed up by the Directory government.

In an attempt to avoid embarrassment caused by the fiasco in Egypt coupled with ambitions. Napoleon executed a successful coup against the Directory government on 9th November 1799. This he did with the conspiracy and assistance of Abbé Sieyès, Roger Ducos and Barras. He established a consulate government of 3 counselors of whom he was the first. In 1800, the consulate was confirmed by a referendum that granted him a 10 years term of office. In 1802, he manipulated another referendum,

which confirmed him a counsel for life, and in 1804 he self styled himself life emperor of France.

Generally, Napoleon was one of the greatest soldiers and statesmen who have ever existed in world history. He dominated his age and his name has survived his death. He was a man of rare character and talents, enormous energy, self-confidence, fear-less and resourcefulness. He was a-fatalist in the sense that he believed from childhood that some hidden power was guiding him to victory and glory. He had the capacity to inspire confidence in all those who followed and heard him. He was an extra-ordinary soldier who planned and won his battles in the head before winning them in the front line.

FACTORS FOR THE RISE OF NAPOLEON TO POWER

1. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1789

There is a common agreement that Napoleon was a product of the French revolution, without which he would have died a common man. This remains a historical fact because Napoleon's rise to power was greatly due to the changes and progressive events of the French revolution. He exploited the opportunities provided by the revolution to rise from a poor Corsican to an Emperor of France. This is why he is called the child of the French revolution. The role of the revolution in Napoleon's rise to power is as follows:

i) The revolution abolished the discriminative social class system and offered equality of opportunities for talented men like Napoleon. Before the revolution, people from poor peasantry origin like Napoleon could not be promoted beyond non-commissioned rank or hold a public office. However, the revolution came with the principle of career open to talents where Napoleon was promoted from rank to rank which gradually increased his popularity, leading to his rise to power in 1799. Therefore it should be stressed that without the French revolution that destroyed the discriminative social class system. Napoleon would have remained a common man because of his poor background.

ii) The revolution led to the exile and death of senior army officers politicians especially during the reign of terror. It created scarcity of senior army officers and that is why Napoleon was recalled in the army in 1792 yet he had earlier on been dismissed. It was also because of this that Napoleon gained quick promotions leading to his rise to power. Besides, the death of senior politicians like Danton, Mira beau and Robespierre left a political vacuum that Napoleon occupied. Had these men survived up

to 1799, there would have been no political vacuum and Napoleon's rise to power would have been a different story.

iii) It was the French revolution that gave Napoleon the chance to display and advertise his abilities. The revolution created internal uprisings through which Napoleon earned rapid promotions and elevated his social status. For example, in 1793, he suppressed the royalist uprisings at port Toulon that earned him the rank of Brigadier General. Again in 1795 he suppressed another royalist uprising in which he was elevated to the rank of a General and commander of the army of the interior. Had it not been because of the French revolution, these uprisings would not have occurred and Napoleon would not have got the opportunity to utilize his abilities. He would therefore not have got those ranks, which were stepping-stones to his rise to power.

iv) The need to export the French revolution generated foreign wars which gave Napoleon more opportunities to exploit his abilities. The most famous was the 1796 Italian campaign that increased his popularity amongst the soldiers, Frenchmen and Italians. This was brought about by his success in the war against Austria in Italy. The war increased his self-confidence and ambitions because for the first time he was able to sleep in the palace of kings, make treaties and declare his will to the Holy Father, the Pope. This is what earned him the loyalty and confidence of the soldiers that he used in the 1799 Coup, which brought him to power. Besides, the Italian campaign earned France looted works of art (which went to the French museums), more territories and revenue in terms of war indemnity. These achievements made Napoleon's name to be a household name to the extent that a street in France was named Napoleon (i.e. Napoleon Street). These were enough popularity that made Napoleon the King of France in 1799.

NB. Although the Egyptian campaign of 1798 was a failure, Napoleon was welcomed as a hero simply because of his earlier military records. The Directory government had totally failed the

Frenchmen and everybody was crying for a liberator. He addressed the anxious and cheerful crowd in the following words; it looks as if everybody had been waiting for me, a little while would have been too soon, tomorrow would have been too late. I have come at the right moment

These cleared way for the 1799 coup that led to his rise to power.

v) Napoleon used revolutionary ideas within and outside France which helped him to build his popularity as a liberator. He studied and learnt

revolutionary literature from the writings of Rousseau and being a close associate of Robespierre. In the struggle to liberate the Oppressed people of Europe, France inclusive, he carried the revolutionary flag and sung the beautiful songs of the revolution. He preached, the revolutionary gospel of liberty, fraternity, democracy and equality. This is what made the Italians and Germans to falsely welcome and support him as a

"Political messiah". These revolutionary ideas also made the Frenchmen convinced that Napoleon was the best person who could uphold the principles of the revolution and these gained him internal support that facilitated his rise to power.

vi) The revolutionary army was very useful in the rise of Napoleon I. The army was re-organized and re-equipped to handle internal and external wars. It was this army that he used to suppress internal uprising and gain promotions. It was even the same army that he used in Italy and earned popularity amongst the Italians, soldiers and Frenchmen. Most important, the army supported the 1799 coup through which he rose to power.

One should also note that much as the French revolution played a primary role in Napoleon's rise to power, other factors supplemented it without which the revolution alone could not have groomed him to power. The fact that the revolution provided equal opportunities for everybody to rise to power meant that one should have special or unique talents or factors on top of the revolution to rise to power. This therefore gives us the chance to analyze the role of other factors.

2. MARRIAGE TO JOSEPHINE

Napoleon's marriage to Josephine also contributed to his rise to power. In 1796, Napoleon I married Josephine who was the daughter of one of the daughters of the directors of the Directory government called Barras. The marriage gave Napoleon greater privileges and powerful connections with leaders of the Directory government. It should be stressed that it was the influence of Napoleon's father in law i.e. Barras that gave him the privilege to command French troops in the Italian campaign yet there were many senior and experienced politicians than Napoleon. This was because Barras diverted the command of the French troops from any of the senior commanders to Napoleon just because he favoured him as his son in law. Besides, the marriage made Napoleon a fully matured and responsible man that gained him more respect and popularity in France.

NB: Although Napoleon's marriage to Josephine gained him aristocratic connection and thus contributed to his rise to power, it should be emphasized that the marriage was possible only because the revolution had elevated his status from a mere corporal to a general by 1796.

Otherwise, Josephine being a daughter of a principle director could not have lowered herself so down to the extent of marrying a corporal from a peasantry family background. Even Napoleon himself would not have got the courage and wealth to marry her if the revolution had not raised his status in the French Society.

3. CLOSE ASSOCIATION WITH REVOLUTIONARY LEADERS

Napoleon's rise to power was also due to his closer personal relationship With leaders of the French revolution. His involvement in the French revolution brought him closer to revolutionary leads and politicians like Robespierre and Directors; Barras. Abbey Sieyes and Duccas. This gave him the chance to exploit their weaknesses and gain experience in French politics that became a cornerstone for his rise to power. His close connection made him attend most revolutionary public rallies from where he got the skills of organizing and addressing public rallies. This helped him to dominate French politics and rise to power after the death of some of such senior revolutionary leaders and politicians most especially Robespierre.

4. THE WEAKNESS OF THE DIRECTORY GOVERNMENT

The directory government was the last government within the revolutionary period (1795-1799). It's weaknesses and hence unpopularity paved way for Napoleon's rise to power in a number of ways. In the first place, it had failed to improve on the socio- economic conditions of the Frenchmen There were massive corruption, bribery and embezzlement that led to inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation. These desperate conditions made the Frenchmen to be in a high mood of change. It explains why Napoleon's coup received a blessing rather than opposition from the Frenchmen.

Secondly, the government had failed to maintain law and order this alone led to winning glory for France abroad. Internally, there was insecurity caused by the royalists, Jacobins and high way robbers. Externally, the French forces were being beaten on almost every front. Napoleon's campofomio treaty gains of 1797 had been lost and France had been driven out of Switzerland, Italy and German states by the second coalition. All these created a popular outcry for a strong and capable

military officer who would liberate the people from such internal and external threats. This is what made Napoleon to be supported in his rise to power since he was the most successful military Generals of the time.

The Directors of the directory government over relied on Napoleon in suppressing internal uprisings and fighting foreign wars. It gave him Opportunities to utilize his abilities and become popular amongst the French masses and soldiers. Worst of all, it was the directors who promoted Napoleon from rank to rank such that by 1799, he had risen to the rank of a Brigadier. All these made Napoleon to become more ambitious and stage the coup of 1799 since he had noted the weaknesses of the Directory Government.

Worst of all, the directors were disorganized and divided by ideological differences. For instance Abbey Sieyes and Duccus opposed the war against the second coalition and wanted peace. Abbey Sieyes also had the ambition to change the constitution and bring an end to the Directory Government. However, he could not do so without the support of the army. This made him to use

Napoleon to organize the 18th Nov, Brumier Coup from which Napoleon conspired and emerged as the 1st consul in France in 1799.

NB. The weaknesses of the directory government greatly elevated Napoleon and made his rise to power inevitable by 1799. Otherwise, had it to be strong enough to meet the socio-economic, political and military expectations of the Frenchmen, Napoleon's rise to power would have been impossible in 1799 even if he was very abled (strong) and ambitious.

5. NAPOLEON'S ABILITIES AND CHARACTERS

a) Military abilities (as a soldier)

Napoleon's abilities were very useful instruments in his rise to power. One school of thought says that; Napoleon was without question a man of extra ordinary force of brain and character, who under all circumstances and in all countries would have won himself a high position (Grant and Temperley P 62). Wellington, the British commander equated Napoleon's presence in the battlefield to be worth 40,000 troops. This claim cannot be disputed because Napoleon was a courageous professional soldier with a powerful sense of Judgment and insights. He planned and won his battles in the mind before winning them in the field.

Napoleon's abilities made him to succeed in suppressing internal revolts and fighting external wars out of which he gained popularity, promotions and power. These were the 1793 uprising, the 1795 revolt and the Italian campaign of 1796. If Napoleon was not a man of exceptional abilities, he would have lost his life while suppressing such uprisings or fighting the second coalition of 1798 and this would be the end of the road for him. Even his tactful escape from Egypt in 1798 was due to his extra-ordinary Judgment and skills. This is because he had realized the strength of the British forces under Wellington and therefore decided to quit Egypt before he would be crushed to death.

Napoleon's skills and organizational abilities explain why Abbey Sieyes picked him to execute the 1799 coup out of which he rose to power. Had somebody else (other than Napoleon) proved more able. Abbey Sieyes would have used that person and not Napoleon. That Napoleon was used and not any one else was precisely because he was the most capable army officer.

b) Napoleon's political abilities.

Besides being a distinguished soldier. Napoleon was a great politician. He preached the revolutionary gospel of equality, liberty and fraternity to the Frenchmen and the conquered states, which made him very popular at the expense of the Directory Government. He also promised a number of reforms in the socio-economic and political structures of France and the conquered states. In all these, he spoke with calmness, dignity and tolerance that convinced everybody who heard him that he was a "political messiah." For example, he is reported to have politicized the demoralized soldiers that he used in the Italian campaign in his address when he said; My army, follow me, here you are badly fed and almost naked, I am going to feed you, cloth and lead you to the most fertile plains of the world, where you will find glory, honour and wealth. This was a political statement that made the soldiers to have more loyalty and trust in Napoleon than the Directory Government. It was these politicized soldiers that he used to destroy the Directory Government in 1799 and gain power. This was not opposed because he had politicized the masses through his reform programs.

c) Napoleon's power of foresight

Napoleon had the abilities to assess situations and know how he could manipulate them to his advantage. After the French revolution, he abandoned his ambition to liberate Corsica Island and became a loyal

French citizen. He did this because he had rightfully foreseen that the revolution had come with opportunities that he would use to rise to power. He also refused to command the

Paris forces when he was commissioned by Robespierre during the reign of terror. He refused the offer because he was aware that Paris was not secured and anybody could be guillotined anytime.

He ventured in the Italian campaign after realizing that it could gain him glory and popularity, which is what exactly he earned. Lastly, he executed the 1799 coup at a time when the directory government was weakest and he himself most popular. All these were successful because he was a foresighted man with a powerful sense of judgment and imagination.

6. EDUCATION

Napoleon's rise to power can also be attributed to his education. He was educated at the military

Academies of Brienne and Paris at a time when 60% of the population of Europe was illiterate. He read and studied history, mathematics, the writings of philosophers, the campaigns of Fredrick the great and the constitutions of England, Switzerland, Turkey etc. These widened his reasoning capacity and leadership skills. He also graduated as a second lieutenant, which meant that he was actually rising to power. Napoleon came out with a theory of speed, diplomacy and force as a solution to human problems. It is this theory that made him successful in suppressing internal revolts and fighting foreign wars that gained him popularity, promotions and power by 1799. Besides, he used the skills he learned from the military academy to plan and organize the successful Coup of 1799 through which he became the master of France.

7. OVERWHELMING AMBITIONS

Napoleon was by nature and orientation an ambitious man. He revealed this to a friend when he said; my ambition is so natural like the blood that flows in my veins and a cat's claws, which are designed to climb upwards not downwards. Napoleon's ambitions were witnessed right from infant stage. He was fond of listening to stories about wars from soldiers. He used to wear military uniforms and carried mock battles with his fellow kids. He would tell them that he would become a soldier and win all battles. It's this ambition that made him to risk the Italian and Egyptian campaigns yet he was a young and junior military officer. It's the same ambition that drove him to the 1799 coup, which became a stepping-stone for his rise to power.

It was even because of ambition that he violated the constitution and declared an empire with himself as the "life emperor of Europe".

NB. i) Ambition made Napoleon so keen and skillful in whatever he did such as in the royalist uprisings of 1793 and 1795, the Italian and Egyptian campaigns and the 1799 coup that brought him to power.

ii) Although overwhelming ambition contributed to his rise to power, it eventually contributed to his downfall by 1815. It made him to conquer and control a number of European states like Italy, Germany and Belgium. This attracted the hostility and hence intervention of other powers who finally ousted him from power in 1815.

8. ANNEXATION OF CORSICA ISLAND FROM GENOA (ITALY) TO FRANCE (1768)

The annexation of Corsica Island to France in 1768 was a blessing disguise for Napoleon I. In 1768, Corsica the Mediterranean Island from Genoa republic was annexed to France. It made Napoleon to be born a Frenchman rather than an Italian and thus eligible to hold any public office in France. The annexation partly enabled him to benefit from the military academies of Brienne and Paris from which he graduated as a second lieutenant. It also entitled him to join the French army from which he was promoted up to the rank of General and made the commander of the army of the interior. He also freely participated in the 1789 revolution and associated with revolutionary leaders since the annexation made him to be born a Frenchman. One can therefore say that without the annexation of Corsica Island, Napoleon would have been born an Italian who perhaps would have not risen to power in France.

9. ROLE OF HIS FATHER, CHARLES BONAPARTE

The role of Napoleon's father, Charles Bonaparte was also influential in his rise to power. His father inspired him to work hard and like his career as a professional soldier. He forged that he was a noble and flunked for Napoleon admission in the military academies of Brienne and Paris. This made Napoleon to fluke education that gave him the necessary political, military and administrative skills, which he used to maneuver his way (rise) to power. He would perhaps have died an illiterate and ignorant common Corsican peasant had it not been for the flunked education.

THE ROLE OF HIS BROTHER LUCIEN BONAPARTE

Napoleon's brother Lucien Bonaparte who was the president of the council of 500 played a very instrumental role in his rise to power. It should be noted that Napoleon's coup flopped when he approached the council, which rejected the coup and shouted at him saying; "Down with the tyrant" They arrested and flogged (beat him severely) him to a near death point. It was Lucien Bonaparte who saved him by openly threatening to kill him while at the same time he ordered the army to disperse hostile members of the council. Afterwards, he officially introduced Napoleon to the few members who favoured him and remained behind, saying;

Here is the man you have been waiting for. He will respect you. He will respect the revolutionary gains. He is my brother. If he fails, I will stab him in the chest.

This made them to accept the coup and vote for a revision of the constitution that made Napoleon the first consul with full powers over France. One can therefore conclude that if it was not because of the timely intervention of Lucien Bonaparte, the coup of 1799 would have boomeranged/ misfired and caused Napoleon's death as a fugitive.

11. HIS FAMILYBACKGROUND

Napoleon's humble family back ground was a blessing in disguise that propelled him to power by 1799. Napoleon originated from a discriminated poverty stricken peasant family background. At school, he was segregated and abused as a commoner and foreigner (because of his Italian accent) by the wealthy sons of the nobles. This experience made him to develop a burning hatred against segregation in France and a desire to work hard to liberate not only him but the whole country from such injustice. Consequently, he became a professional battle- hardened soldier who enjoyed walking and fighting over long distances without much food, water, rest etc. It's this that made Napoleon I a hero and the most successful military officer in France by 1799,

12. SCIENTIFICAND MILITARYINNOVATIONS.

The role of scientific and military advancements was crucial in the rise to power of Napoleon I. Scientific and technological innovations brought in better maps, roads, weapons and more mobile artillery. It made it easy to organize swifter campaigns, rapid concentration of troops and surprise attacks. Such innovations were utilized by Napoleon in his military campaigns and the 1799 coup through which he rose to power. These

made Napoleon's "whiff of grape shot" and surprise attacks to easily succeed, which earned him promotion, popularity and power.

13. LUCK

Special opportunities and favours greatly contributed to the rise of Napoleon to prominence by 1799. There were a number of events and opportunities which Napoleon did not plan but favoured his rise to power. He was lucky that Corsica Island was annexed to France a year before he was born, which gave him the chance to exploit the opportunities provided by the French revolution. His other luck was that his father forged a noble status and fluked to educate him in the military academies of Brienne and Paris. The outbreak of the French revolution and revolutionary changes was an element of luck for it even occurred at a time when he was a soldier specialized in artillery. In 1792, Napoleon was dismissed for overstaying his leave but he was lucky that there was shortage of artillery officers and that is why he was reinstated to active service. Napoleon's survival of the reign of terror can be attributed more to luck than, his abilities.

He was arrested in 1794 with Robespierre plus other 92 of Robespierre's followers. However, he was lucky that he spent only 1 week in prison and was released while the rest of his colleagues were guillotined. Napoleon was also lucky that he was a son in law to Barras and this explains why he was favoured to command the Italian campaign.

Even in Napoleon's military campaigns, there were elements of luck besides his abilities. For example, the Egyptian campaign was a complete disaster for him yet the Frenchmen welcomed him as a hero. Had it not been because of luck, he would have died in the battle, hanged or even imprisoned in Egypt. As to why he succeeded in leaving his troops and reaching France safely was more due to luck than anything else. Napoleon was also lucky that the failures and weaknesses of the Directory Government had created the mood for change in France, which made his coup not to be opposed. The divisions and mistrusts amongst the directors that made Abbey Sieyes and Duccus to support him in the 1799 coup were precisely due to luck. He was also blessed that his brother Lucian Bonaparte was the president of the council of 500 and used his position to save him from death after the initial failure of the coup. This was when he was arrested and was being beaten for having organized the coup. His brother indirectly enabled the Coup to succeed by aiding him clandestinely/secretly. Lastly, Napoleon was lucky that the French king

granted him and his father a general amnesty that made him and his father to return to France as free citizens.

14. THE BRUMAIRE COUP D'ETAT, 18th NOV 1799

The Brumaire coup d'etat of 18th Nov 1799 was the most immediate event that marked the rise of Napoleon to power. Napoleon conspired with other Directors i.e. Barras and Abbé Sieyès to organize the coup and overthrow the directory government. The coup succeeded and the Directory government was overthrown. This created a political vacuum/space through which Napoleon rose to power. He accomplished his great ambition by manipulating the constitutional making committee to enact laws that gave him a lot of power over France.

Assessment of Napoleon's Reforms

ACHIEVEMENTS IN FRANCE (INTERNAL POLICY)

France before Napoleon's rise to power was in acute socio-economic and political crisis. Most of the achievements of the French Revolution had disappeared during the reign of terror and the Directory Government. Napoleon therefore inherited a demoralized nation characterized by inflation, unemployment, financial and religious crisis, power struggle, anarchy and a very desperate socio-economic condition. His first political agenda was therefore to create order out of chaos. These made him to come with a comprehensive socio-economic and political program through which he put things right. This is why it's said that Napoleon corrected the wrongs in the French society.

On top of re-organizing France, Napoleon preserved the achievements/gains of the French revolution and completed the reforms that the revolution had started: He upheld revolutionary ideas and principles and even exported them to Europe through his aggressive war policy. It's this that partly explains why

Napoleon is known as a true child of the French revolution

Generally, Napoleon's achievements in France and Europe were so great that he is popularly known as "Napoleon the Great". Although Napoleon was so successful and dominant in French as well as European affairs, he nevertheless had his weaknesses and failures as we shall analyze in his policies

1. The concordat (1801)

This was an agreement that Napoleon signed with the Pope in 1801. Before Napoleon came to power revolutionary reforms like the civil constitution of the clergy and nationalization of land had turned the Catholic Church into an enemy of the French revolution. Napoleon was however determined to bring reconciliation and gain political support. He was convinced that religion was "a Cement of social order" and that's why he remarked that; a state without religion is like a Vessel without a compass. With these ideas in mind, Napoleon signed the concordat with the pope in 1801, which not only guaranteed freedom of worship but also recognized the catholic religion as a state religion. The church influence on state affairs was brought to an end and the Pope's authority was restricted to spiritual and church related affairs.

The clergy became civil servants who were appointed and paid by the government. The role of the Pope was just to ordain the appointed clergy. By bringing the church under state control leave alone trimming its powers, Napoleon fulfilled the aims of the French revolutionaries who had revolted against the Catholic Church dominance in French affairs. Thus, the concordat strengthened Napoleon's popularity and made him to realize his dream of creating a great French empire. This is proof of Napoleon's greatness and true statesmanship.

2. Ownership of land and property

Free ownership of land and other property was enjoyed by the Frenchmen during the reign of Napoleon. During the course of the French revolution, land and other property that were confiscated from the nobles and clergy were sold to the peasants at a fair price. However, the clergy and nobles started to reclaim their land and property but Napoleon nullified their claims. This made peasants to retain land and other property that they had acquired during the course of the revolution. It avoided the re-emergence of feudalism and, serfdom through which the Clergy and nobles had exploited the peasants. It also increased the productivity of peasants and reduced the problem of famine, and starvation in France.

3. Administration

Napoleon re-organized the administrative structure of France. This brought an end to administrative confusion and weaknesses that used to encourage corruption, embezzlement and inefficiency. He centralized the administration and created Departments headed by prefects, Arrondissement ruled by sub prefects and communes governed by mayors. All these officers were appointed by him and therefore loyal and

answerable to him. Local councils continued to be elected by the people and their role was to advise prefects and sub-prefects. All these maintained law, order and created efficiency in service delivery. It would be emphasized that the centralized government of modern France was adopted from that of Napoleon. It was also used by France in her colonies like Algeria and Tunisia.

4. Education

Before Napoleon, France had poor education system of very low standards. But Napoleon through his reforms laid foundation for the modern French education. He encouraged secondary education by setting up secondary schools that were run by the communes. His government also introduced semi-military, secondary schools called Lycees, which were run by the government. In the Lycees, military science, political science and mathematics were emphasized to strengthen the spirit of nationalism and improve the performance of the army. He also founded the university of France in 1805 (the first university) with 17 branches throughout France. University education was brought under state control and this ended the disagreement between the church and state over education. The schools were non-segregative and nondenominational and produced very bright and innovative students who served the nation with distinctions.

5. Commerce and industry

Napoleon transformed and improved the industrial and commercial sectors of France. Before Napoleon came to power, these two sectors were referred to as the Laughing stocks of Europe. They were completely run down by unnecessary trade restrictions, numerous taxes, corruption, lack of government support and accountability. However Napoleon reversed this situation. For instance, he created the central Bank of France in 1800 to give loans to traders and manufacturers. Taxation was made very realistic and hence friendly. Napoleon created the chamber of commerce, commercial exchanges and advisory boards for manufacturers. By 1815 there were 2000 mills employing 40,000 people and linen production was boosted and was employing about 58,000 people. He also embarked on a policy of protectionism, which sheltered home industries from foreign competition. Thus, Industrial development, opened more employment opportunities and improved on the socio-economic welfare of the Frenchmen.

6. Agriculture

Napoleon's regime greatly improved the agricultural sector. He restored peace and stability, which created a conducive atmosphere for Agriculture. Government expenditure on agriculture was increased to boost production. He embarked on Land reclamation and drainage of swamps to increase cultivatable Land. Farmer's Co-operative societies and the use of better farming methods and techniques were promoted.

Awards were given for successful innovations in the field of agriculture. Consequently, these measures increased the production of food crops such as grains, wheat, potatoes, beat, etc. This solved the problem of famine and starvation that Napoleon had inherited from the Directory government.

7. Finance

Napoleon's reforms improved the French financial situation. By 1799, France had experienced financial crisis and chronic inflation, which was worst during the Directory government. However, Napoleon stabilized the currency on gold standard system. He established the Bank of France in 1800 with the Task of giving Loans and regulating the circulation of money in the Economy. Tax collectors were to deposit tax proceeds to the Bank and it was controlled by very strict and competent men. Defeated and conquered states were forced to pay indemnity to support the French economy and finance Napoleon's military campaigns. Corrupt officials were severely punished. These reduced financial discouragement, corruption and feuds that had caused financial crisis by 1799.

NB One should however note that, the financial stability that Napoleon restored disappeared when he started the continental system. It made the French and European businessmen who could not do without the British (cheap and superior) goods to close their business and industries. This was because the substitutes to British goods were very expensive and yet of very poor quality. This led to inflation, unemployment and the eventual financial crisis.

8. Tax reforms

Taxation that had been referred to as "the cancer of the ancient regime" was reformed and made fair; a centralized administration led by Gaudin was set up to handle assessment and collection of taxes'. Unlike the previous regimes where taxation was regressive, taxation during Napoleon's regime was' progressive. People were fairly assessed according to their ability and there was no tax exemption for the nobles and clergy. In 1803,

Napoleon enacted the tariff law to limit imports in order to safeguard the French infant industries from competition with British goods. He reduced the burden of taxation on the French men over taxing the conquered states such as Italians, Germans, and Belgians etc. Corruption and embezzlement of tax proceeds/revenue were heavily punished. By 1810, tax reforms had made France to have a balanced, budget, something that was a dream in the previous regimes.

9. Provision of a new constitution

From 1800-1810, Napoleon ruled as a constitutional ruler. He distinguished himself by issuing a new constitution in the aftermath of his rise to power. The constitution created an executive of three consuls (Napoleon, Abbey Sieyes and Duccas), A parliament of 300 legislatures and a senate with powers to veto decisions of the 3 consuls. The constitution clearly separated the powers of the executive, legislature and judiciary. It was made public and people were asked to vote in a referendum in favour or against it. It was eventually endorsed by the people and became a working document for the republic of France. The constitution also provided for human rights and freedom such as freedom of worship, press, association, etc. This not only gained him support from the liberals but also gave him a lot of powers that enabled him to have firm control over France.

10. Legal reforms/Code Napoleon. (1804 -1810)

The most memorable achievement of Napoleon was the codification of French laws that is popularity known as code Napoleon. Before Napoleon, France, had no clear Law and Frenchmen were ruled by trial and error method and sometimes decrees. Napoleon realized the need for a unified legal system. He appointed a committee of Lawyers who under his guidance, came out with a clear and systematic uniform Law that promoted equality of all by nature. The Laws were simplified and reduced to only five codes i.e. the criminal code, the civil code, the commercial code, the military code and the penal code these codes are clear evidences of Napoleon's attempt to right the wrongs in the French society and according to a historian Leo Gershoy; it was at once the summary and correction of the French revolution. These codes made Napoleon very popular and were adopted by countries of Europe, America and Africa. The codes have hitherto remained the, most convenient and enlightened set of Laws in. the world, It marked France as a modern state in Europe and to this effect Napoleon said; I shall go down to posterity with my code in my hand.

11. Public works

Through public works scheme, Napoleon permanently beautified and enriched France. Roads, Railways, canals and bridges were constructed, marshes were drained, and sea ports enlarged and fortified, several museums and places were founded and filled with priceless treasures looted from Italy during the 1796 Italian campaign. Streets were enlarged and street pavements were built as well. All these improved the agricultural, industrial, commercial and tourism sectors. These were sources of employment and provided Paris with its modern beauty. This was amazing to Europe and no wonder that all roads and eyes were leading towards Paris. In short, Paris became the political nerve center of Europe during reign of Napoleon.

12. Career open to talents (equality)

Career open to talents was a patriotic policy that promoted the revolutionary principle of equality. It delivered the last blow to the remains of the segregative social class system that existed in France prior to 1799. Napoleon opposed this injustice and royal blood connection in determining appointment and promotion to public offices. He instead used ability and performances as criterion for one's rise to any position of responsibility. This explains why Murat rose to the rank of a General in spite of being a son of a mere innkeeper. The policy therefore created a new set of nobility called nobility of ability that replaced the ancient nobility of birth. It made Napoleon to exploit talents that had been discriminated and wasted due to segregation. This explains why his government was strong and more efficient than those of the revolutionary period.

13. The Legion of honour (love of honour) 1802

This was a form of awards given to men who rendered distinguished services to the state such as in the civil service, commerce, army etc. This was to recognize and encourage people to be more patriotic and nationalistic in serving their nation. It instilled in the Frenchmen the spirit of competition, dedication and self-sacrifice for their Motherland. For the success of this policy, Napoleon said "men are led by toys".

The legion of Honour portrays Napoleon as a true child of the French revolution since he fulfilled the revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity.

14. The army

Napoleon scores highest in the military sector. He modernized and perfected the French army and France had the best infantry in the whole Europe. The army was used to maintain Law and order and deal with political opponents and saboteurs. It was used to expand the French territory and consolidate French rule in the conquered states. The army was also used to collect war indemnity, tributes and suppress resistance in the conquered states. All these improved French Economy that became second to Britain.

NB Exportation of the French revolution

Napoleon made the French revolution an international affair. His greatness was witnessed in the Italian campaign of 1796, the second coalition that he defeated in 1802 and the creation of the French Empire over Europe by 1815. In these areas, he exported the French revolutionary ideas of Equality, liberty and fraternity. This is what sowed seeds for nationalism in Europe such as in Italy and Germany by 1870.

Generally, Napoleon's reforms and re-organization of France laid foundation for modern France. He lifted France from a very low level and carried it to a very high level and this is why he is referred to as Napoleon the Great. More importantly, his achievements were within a very short time in a country that had experienced 10 years of violence and mismanagement.

Although Napoleon died in 1821, nevertheless his achievements have survived his physical death. This is supported by the following evidences; the local government has remained as he had initiated, the education system is still his and his codes of laws are still laws of France although with some amendments, the concordat harmonized the relationship between the church and the state until the 20th century, the principle of equality which he saved from anarchy is still cherished and practiced in France. The fact that Napoleon's reform has survived up to now is a clear testimony that he is a true statesman and Great.

Napoleon 1 is therefore credited for reviving French lost glory at home and over Europe through his expansionist military campaigns.

DEVIATIONS, WEAKNESSES AND FAILURES OF NAPOLEON;

1. Violation of the Concordat

Napoleon is accused for acting in an uncivilized manner towards the Pope. In 1804, He declared himself emperor and invited the Pope to officiate and

crown him. However, when the Pope was on the verge of crowning him, Napoleon snatched the crown from him and crowned himself. He did this just to show that nobody including the Pope was above him. This was not only a national scandal but a humiliation to the Pope and Catholic religion. Napoleon also abrogated the Concordat by arresting and imprisoning the Pope. By 1808, there was a serious conflict between Napoleon and the Pope because of Napoleon's anti-catholic behaviors and policies such as the continental system. Consequently, in 1808, Napoleon occupied the Papal States and officially added Rome to the French empire in 1809. The Pope reacted by excommunicating Napoleon from the church to which Napoleon reacted by arresting and imprisoning him. This disappointed the Catholics and liberals in France and all over Europe.

NB. In 1814, pressure from within and outside France forced Napoleon to hand over the Pope to the Austrians who released him. He was eventually restored to his former position.

Besides, the concordat was received with mixed feelings. Die-hard Catholics could never forget the church Status and privileges during the Bourbon monarchy and therefore rejected it. On the other hand, fanatic revolutionaries denounced the concordat as a betrayal of the revolutionary reforms and a drive to the pre-1789 church privileges, which they had shed blood to abolish. They considered payment of the clergy by the state as unnecessary wastage of state resources. It was not surprising that one of the revolutionaries commented; "the only person missing at this ceremony are the million men dead who died to get rid of this nonsense".

NB. Napoleon was not a deeply devoted religious person who cared about life after death. His feeling was that spiritual forces controlled the lives of the peasants and soldiers and that is why he decided to influence and control those forces. To him, religion was not to be dismissed like an outdated theory in Chemistry. He considered religion as a political instrument to consolidate his power. This is why Napoleon was a multi-religious person as he confessed that; I am a Moslem in Egypt, a Jew in Syria and a Catholic in France".

2. Dictatorship

Napoleon adopted dictatorship, in his administration of France. He centralized all powers to himself and left no room for democracy at higher levels of administration. In 1804, he violated the constitution and declared himself a life emperor. There was no election and parliament which deprived the Frenchmen of a representative government. Worst of all, he

revived the system of Lettres de-Cachet especially from 1810. Napoleon manipulated some codes/laws to strengthen his dictatorship. For instance, he used the Penal and criminal codes to arbitrarily arrest and imprison his political opponents. All these turned France into a fascist state from 1810, contrary to the expectations of the revolutionaries.

3. Revolutionary Subjects

Napoleon was an "intellectual coward." He is blamed for abolishing the teaching of revolutionary liberal subjects like history, philosophy, political science and literature. This is because, these subjects sharpen the reasoning capacity of people, which would incite them to criticize and expose his weaknesses. He admitted his weakness when he said; "I fear an Insurrection caused by Shortage of Bread. I would fear them more than a battle of 200,000 men." Napoleon was generally too fearful of parliamentary debates and liberal critics from higher institutions which made him to ban the teaching of revolutionary subjects.

The ban on revolutionary subjects violated article IV of declaration of rights of man, which provided that "Liberty consists in being allowed to do whatever does not injure other people". This undermined France's capacity to produce future revolutionary leaders and betrays Napoleon as a true son of the French revolution.

4. Education of the Girl Child

Napoleon's education system segregated girls in favour of boys. He commented that; I do not think we need to trouble ourselves with any plan of instruction for young females...Public education is not suitable for them, because they are never called upon to act in public. Manners are all in all to them and marriage is all they look to. To him, women should be taught religion and morals to indoctrinate them with the spirit of tolerance, forgiveness, love and submission to their husbands. This is why he stated that; "What we ask of education is that girls should not think, but that they should believe.... Napoleon believed that women should not play any public role nor hold any public office apart from the "Kitchen". This is against the principle of equality of all men by nature and denied France of talents that could have been exploited from women.

5. The Continental System

The continental system that was designed as a strategy of defeating Britain failed and had negative consequences for France and Europe. The system blocked the British superior and cheap manufactured products to

European Countries, France inclusive. Worst of all, the substitute to British goods were of poor quality and very expensive, which lowered the demand in the market. This made the French and European businessmen to close their businesses and industries. The end result was famine, inflation, unemployment industrial breakdown and financial crisis.

6. Repressive Laws against women

Napoleon used repressive laws that neglected the principle of equality and violated the rights of women.

The code Napoleon was a conservative instrument that legally made women inferior to men. Napoleon remarked that; The angel told Eve to obey her husband...it should be written in our code..! The Penal

Code provided for severe punishment for women who disobeyed their husbands. Women were to be under total control of their husbands and could not acquire or sell property without the consent of their husbands.

This denied women their right to equality, liberty, fraternity and property.

NB Divorce was permitted by mutual consent such as adultery, violence, grave criminal offences. This was contrary to the doctrine/ teaching of the Catholic Church that prohibited divorce for whatever reason:

7. Repressive Laws against Children

Apart from women, the Code-Napoleon also ignored and abused children's rights. Girls of less than 21 years were not allowed to make any decision such as on marriage without the approval of their father and the same applied to boys below 25 years old. Children of less than 18 years were to surrender their income to their fathers. The code also gave fathers power to imprison their children for any unlawful behaviour. All these consolidated the dictatorship of fathers over their children and thus undermined their rights.

Favouritism and Nepotism

Napoleon practiced Favouritism and Nepotism in his domestic as well as foreign policy. The electoral process that was instituted to check favouritism was reduced to Colleges i.e. Electoral College, which gave Napoleon a chance to impose his family members and relatives to key positions of responsibility in France and the conquered States. For instance, his brothers; Louis Bonaparte, Lucien Bonaparte and Jerome Bonaparte were made kings of Holland, Italy and West-Phalia respectively. This was not different

from the hereditary system of appointment of the Bourbons and betrays Napoleon as a true son of the French Revolution.

9. Press Censorship

Napoleon suppressed and restricted freedom of the press through his Police chief, Fouché. Napoleon's view was that Liberty was not for the common people. Consequently, he limited the number of Printers in Paris and their proprietors were made to swear oath of obedience to the government. The number of legal newspapers in Paris was also reduced from 70 in 1800 to only 04 (four) by 1810. Those who defied the government order and published anti-government ideas were either hanged or imprisoned. This explains why the defeat of Trafalgar in 1805 was not published in any newspaper till after Napoleon was overthrown. Thus, Napoleon denied the Frenchmen the right to information (Press Freedom) and undermined the revolutionary principle of liberty.

10. Aggressive foreign policy

Napoleon is blamed for his numerous unending wars that were due to his burning ambition to conquer Europe. The wars that he provoked such as the Spanish (1808) and Moscow campaigns (1812) costed France thousands of soldiers and a lot of financial resources. These ambitions also made European powers to join hands in a series of coalition that climaxed into his final defeat and down fall in 1815. Thus, Napoleon's aggressive war policy led to economic decline in France, heavy losses of lives, destruction of property and isolation of France in Europe.

Conscription into the army

Lastly Napoleon conscripted (forceful recruitment) the Frenchmen into the army just to raise a big army to fulfill his ambition of conquering the whole Europe. By 1812, he had enacted a law that entitled all abled bodied men to join the army. As European powers hardened on fighting him and depleted his soldiers, Napoleon resorted to conscripting young boys who were hurriedly trained and sent to the battle field. Most of such conscripted boys and men were cowards who fought reluctantly and often withdrew from the battle field or fraternized with Napoleon's enemies. For instance, about 80,000 French conscripts defected to the allied powers on the eve of the Moscow campaign. This was because they were forced to join the army against their consent/will. It should be noted that Napoleon's army was also heterogeneous with conscripts from Belgium, Portugal, Denmark, Italian States, and German States etc. It became impossible to have proper

command and instill discipline in the army because they were from different historical, cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

Napoleon's success as the 1st consul in 1804 made him proud and increased his ambitions. He started dreaming of living like great statesmen and conquerors like Julius Caesar, Charlemagne and Alexander the great. His aims and objectives were to conquer and dominate the whole of Europe, spread revolutionary ideas, re-establish the French prestige and colonial influence and gain international prestige. He believed that it was only him that it was only him who had the immediate solution to the problem of instability in Europe. He often remarked that Peace cannot be established in Europe till the whole of Europe comes under one crown.

To show that he was not merely making noise, Napoleon adopted an aggressive and expansionist foreign policy over the whole of Europe for the next 10 years (1804 - 1814). As a true child of the French revolution, Napoleon's ambitions in his foreign policy was to export the revolutionary principles of Equality, Liberty, Nationalism and fraternity to the whole of Europe and indeed the world. He was very successful in the early years but in the years 1808 - 1815 events turned against him as he experienced a series of military defeats that led to his down fall.

ELEMENTS OF NAPOLEON'S FOREIGN POLICY

i) THE SECOND COALITION (1798 -1802)

Napoleon rose to power at a time when the second coalition (Britain, Turkey, Austria, Russia, Portugal and Naples) had defeated the French troops. He swiftly re-organized the French troops and defeated Austria at the battle of Marengo in March 1800. General Moreau also defeated the second coalition forces at the battle of Hohenlinden (in the German states). It forced Austria to sign the Luneville treaty (1801) in which she surrendered Italy, Holland, Switzerland and all territories left of R. Rhine to France. He also recovered the Campofomio treaty territories of Lombardy, Cisalpine Republic and the Rhine Republic that had been lost to the coalition forces

during the war. However, although Napoleon defeated the rest of coalition powers, he failed to defeat Britain. Nevertheless, he formed a temporary alliance of armed neutrality with Denmark, Sweden and Spain to challenge and isolate Britain. This was necessary because

Britain was a monster to vessels in international waters like the Med. Sea and Black Sea.

ii) THE TREATY OF AMIENS, MARCH 1802

By 1802, both France and Britain were fed up with war and decided to sign a cease-fire agreement i.e. the treaty of Amiens. The treaty had the following provisions.

- a) Britain recognized the French boundaries as in 1802.
- b) Britain was to evacuate France's confiscated states of Malta, Egypt, West India and St. Lucia.
- c) France was to evacuate Southern Italy and to restore Egypt to Turkey.
- d) Trinidad and Ceylon (Sri Lanka) were to be retained by Britain.

However, the peace treaty of Amiens was merely a marriage of convenience and consequently was short lived. This was because Britain refused to evacuate Malta and France did not surrender Egypt to Turkey. It led to the renewal of war in 1802. Nevertheless, the war gave Napoleon a chance to re-organize his troops, consolidate his power at home and map out new strategies to defeat Britain.

iii) WAR AGAINST THE THIRD COALITION

In 1805, the third coalition (England, Austria, Russia and Sweden) was formed against France with the aim of forcing France out of Italy, Belgium and the Rhineland states. Britain blocked the French troops and cut them off from the French colonies. Napoleon planned to invade England by crossing the English Channel. He is reported to have remarked that; If I can be the master of the sea for six hours, England would cease to exist. Consequently, Napoleon attacked the British fleet with the assistance of some Spanish fleet. However, he was finally defeated by the British naval commander Nelson at the battle of Trafalgar on 21st Oct 1805. The Invasion was a fiasco (total failure) and a disaster to Napoleon who lost all his naval troops. (In the Atlantic Ocean).

Nevertheless, Napoleon turned his anger on the rest of the coalition members. He defeated Austria and Prussia at the battles of Vim and Jena

respectively. He forced Austria to sign the treaty of Pressburg in January 1806 in which she surrendered all her territories in Italy and Germany to France. Napoleon then amalgamated all the German states in to the confederation of the Rhine to which he personally instituted a leader.

Napoleon's attention after defeating Austria and Prussia was on Russia. He defeated her at the battle of Friedland and forced Tsar Alexander I to sign the peace treaty of Tilsit on 7th July 1807. In the treaty, Tsar Alexander recognized Napoleon as emperor of the West and Napoleon recognized the Tsar as the possible emperor of the East and the ports of the Turkish Empire. Russia also promised to ally with France against Britain. This treaty was significant because through it, the Tsar recognized Napoleon's and French dominance of Europe. Historians have noted that had Napoleon I died in 1807, his military adventures would have been the most spectacular and miraculous event in the history of Europe if not the whole world.

It should be noted that by 1807, the whole of Europe was under Napoleon except Turkey and Britain. He had created new republics like the Cisalpine republic, Helvetic republic, and confederation of the Rhine, Kingdom of Italy, Naples and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. He had therefore created a Bonaparte family oligarchy with himself as the "Emperor of Europe"

iv) THE CONTINENTAL SYSTEM

The continental system was an economic method that Napoleon resorted to in an attempt to defeat Britain. Britain was the pillar of every coalition against France. Napoleon had tried to bring Britain to his knees (defeat her) but the battle of Trafalga (1805) was a clear testimony that it was impossible to defeat Britain militarily. He was advised to strike England at a point where she was most vulnerable i.e. her trade. This was contained in a memorandum presented to him by Montgaillard that;

It's through her commerce that England must be attacked.....

To destroy British commerce is to strike England to the heart.

Napoleon and his advisers had realized that British military power rested and survived on her strong Economy, which was rooted on her dominance of international trade. They therefore decided to destroy the British trade and indeed her strong economy which was to weaken her militarily, cause socio economic problems that would provoke uprising against the British government and eventually make Britain to submit to French control.

To implement the continental system, Napoleon passed the Berlin (from Prussia) and Milan (from Piedmont) decrees of 1806 and 1807 respectively. Through these decrees, Napoleon put a ban on British ships and ordered French allies and subjects to confiscate British goods wherever and whenever they were found. He planned to use the Danish fleet to patrol and ensure that there was no smuggling of British products along European coastline.

In the short run, the continental system was a success and it affected the British trade although not to the extent that Napoleon had wanted. Austria, Russia and Prussia who had been defeated by Napoleon had no way but to support the system of their "master" Napoleon. Napoleon enforced the system in France, Italy, Rhine confederation and Warsaw that were under his control. He forced Denmark and Sweden to join the continental system in 1807. Napoleon annexed Holland to France when Louis Napoleon abdicated from the throne because of the difficulty of implementing the system.

Britain reacted to the Berlin and Milan decrees (continental system) by passing the London decrees of 1807 in which all ports of Europe were to be opened to British ships as soon as possible. Those countries that would not comply were to expect bombardment any time. Consequently, in November 1807, Britain bombarded Copenhagen and confiscated the Danish fleet, which Napoleon had planned to use to implement the continental system.

Being the workshop of Europe (i.e. Britain), the continental system led to inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation to Europe as well as France. Consequently, the system became unbearable to even the very powers that had "welcomed" it. It therefore became very unpopular and was rejected by one state after another. Those who broke off from the continental system with disastrous impact on Napoleon's influence in Europe were the Papal States, Portugal, Spain and Russia. Thus, the continental system was a boomerang that finally caused the downfall of Napoleon.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Napoleon's Foreign Policy cnt

V) NAPOLEON AND THE POPE

The Papal States were the first to denounce the continental system. This was due to acute socio-economic hardship caused by the system and the Pope's desire to remain neutral as a spiritual leader. It made the Pope to open his ports to the British trading ships in 1808. Napoleon ignored the 1801 concordat, invaded the Papal States, abducted the Pope and imprisoned him in France. This drastically undermined Napoleon's popularity amongst the Catholics in France and the whole Catholic states in the world.

vi) THE PENINSULAR WAR

Napoleon's ambitions to enforce the continental system drove him to invade Portugal and Spain. When Prince John the regent of Portugal refused to abide by the continental system, Napoleon attacked Portugal through Spain. The Spaniards rose against their King Charles IV for his weakness that made it possible for the French troops to march through their territory up to Portugal. Napoleon used this confused situation to force Charles to resign and impose his brother Joseph Bonaparte on the Spanish throne (1808).

Napoleon's double standard system made the Spaniards and the Portuguese to forget their differences and engage him in acute guerilla warfare from 1808 to 1811. They were assisted by the British troops commanded by Wellington, Sir John Moore and Arthur Wellesley. This war was so disastrous to Napoleon that he lost about 300,000 soldiers. This is why he called it "the Spanish ulcer that destroyed me."

vii) THE MOSCOW CAMPAIGN 1812

Diplomatic relations between France and Russia that was forged by the treaty of Tilsit in 1807 was strained by Napoleon's continental system. The negative effects of the continental system made Alexander I (of Russia) to abandon the system and open the Russian ports to the British goods. In 1811, Napoleon mobilized over 600,000 troops, the largest in history, to teach the Tsar a lasting lesson that he would never forget. On 24th June, he crossed R. Niemen with a lot of enthusiasm as he said; Moscow is the half-way house to India. The Russians tactically withdrew and used scorched earth policy in which they destroyed everything that would be useful to the advancing French soldiers. Napoleon reached Moscow only to find a city

that was burning without anyone in and around it. Vincent Cronin describes this episode as follows;

For seven weeks. Napoleon had been on the march and all he had conquered was empty space.

The further he penetrated into Russia, the more he and his men became aware of empty space

and silence. When they reached what on the map was Moscow, they found it burnt and its food

buried.... even the Russian sky was empty of birds.

Above all, there was no safe water for the French soldiers. The Russians had filled all water wells and poisoned the remaining ones. Famine, starvation, cholera, cold and Russian guerilla attacks led to the death of Napoleons soldiers in thousands. These circumstances forced Napoleon to retreat from Moscow and his retreat is one of the most horrible episodes in history. He lost the bulk of his army as he tried to cross R. Niemen whose bridge collapsed drowning thousands of his troops. He also lost several soldiers on rivers whose bridges were deliberately destroyed by the Russian guerilla men.

The above circumstances made Napoleon to reach France (Paris on Dec 1812) with about 20,000 soldiers out of which only about 1000 were useful for any military service. All these humiliations made Napoleon vulnerable and morale boosted other states to fight him. No wonder that the second coalition was formed and defeated him at the battle of Leipzig and exiled him to the Island of Elba.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE MOSCOW CAMPAIGN

1. The campaign ranks high in Napoleon's as well as the French history as the worst military disaster. Napoleon was humiliated and lost over 580,000 soldiers. This weakened him militarily and according to Talleyrand his foreign minister "...is the beginning of his end". It was therefore a maximum turning point against his control over Europe.

2. Napoleon's defeat in the Moscow campaign contributed to the formation of the second and third coalitions against him. It was a clear testimony that Napoleon was not invincible or infallible. This led to unity of Europe even weaker states against him.

3. The Moscow "disaster" led to the rise of European nationalism against Napoleon's dominance over Europe. It became a source of inspiration for states that were dominated by Napoleon to start struggling for their independence. This led to the war of Liberation in which nationalities like the Germans, Italians and Austrians participated in an attempt to free themselves from the French political dominance.

4. The Russian victory increased the Russian prestige and ambition in Europe. She started interfering in the French dominated states like Poland and the German states in order to destroy Napoleon's influence in those countries. For example, she made the Calish treaty (Feb 1813) with Prussia in which she promised to help Prussia against Napoleon.

5. Napoleon's massive loss of over 580,000 troops made him to resort to compulsory military recruitment from 1813 - 1814. These "new soldiers" were mostly young and inexperienced boys who were hurriedly trained to meet Napoleon's targets of dominating Europe. This brought Napoleon into loggerheads with the French parents who were flabbergasted (shocked) by the massive death of their young boys in the process of executing Napoleon's ambitions.

6. Napoleon's humiliation in Moscow denied him internal support from a section of the Frenchmen. The heavy losses of the French soldiers, armaments, horses, mining of the French treasury and above all conscription made a number of Frenchmen to turn against their once beloved Napoleon. This is what made Talleyrand, (his minister of foreign affairs), Fouché (his police chief) and Bernadette, the heir to the Swedish throne to join the hostile European powers against Napoleon. This is why Napoleon's downfall became inevitable by 1815.

7. Napoleon's failure in the Moscow campaign was the final set back to the continental system. He had mobilized such a huge force to defeat Russia and force her to implement the system. However, his failure to defeat Russia finished the continental system itself. It showed how disastrous the continental system was and made him to abandon it.

THE 4TH COALITION AND THE BATTLE OF LEIPZIG (1813)

Although Napoleon was defeated in the peninsular war and the Moscow campaign, nevertheless the allied powers were too scared of Napoleon that they hesitated to cross R. Rhine and attack France directly. They therefore sent a message to Napoleon from Frankfurt in Germany (Frankfurt proposal) on 9th Nov 1813, in which they stated that they were ready to sign

a peace treaty with him. They said they would accept the Rhine, Pyrenes and Alps as the-Frontiers of France. All members of the French parliament were in favour of his peace proposal but Napoleon rejected it for two reasons. First, he thought that the fourth coalition would disintegrate and end in his success. Secondly, he feared to lose his long accumulated reputation, which might provoke the Frenchmen to lose confidence and rise against him.

Napoleon's rejection of the Frankfurt peace proposals made the allied powers to invade France from three fronts of Belgium, Rhine and Switzerland. Napoleon mobilized a new army of 250,000 troops and defeated the Russian and Prussian forces at the battles of Lautzen and Bautzen respectively. The allies held a secret meeting at Chamaunt and vowed to fight for 20 year until Napoleon was defeated. They also agreed that none of them was to sign a secret treaty with Napoleon without consulting the other coalition members.

They also re-organized their forces and defeated Napoleon at the battle of Leipzig (1813) which is commonly known as "the battle of all Nations". The allied troops drove the French forces from Spain and rapidly advanced towards France. They entered Paris which forced Napoleon to sneak to his palace of Fontainbley from where he later signed a peace treaty with the allied powers on 6th April 1814. According to the treaty of Fountainley, the following were decided;

- i) Napoleon gave up his and family claim on the French throne.
- ii) He was allowed to retain the title of emperor and given a small kingdom of Elba where he was exiled,
- ii) He was entitled to a yearly pension of 2,000,000 Francs.
- iii) Napoleon's wife Marie Louis was given the Dutchy of Parma in Northern Italy.
- iv) France was to retain her frontiers of 1792 and was not to pay any war indemnity;

After these, Napoleon bade fare well to his army, kissed the French flag and went to exile in Elba. Louis XVIII, the brother of the executed Louis XVI was imposed on the French throne.

THE HUNDRED DAYSEPIISODE OFNAPOLEONAND THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO

Napoleon was very disgruntled with the activities of the allied powers who had forced him to exile. This was because they had not allowed his wife Marie Louis and (his, son to accompany him. They were confiscating his mails and he was therefore in a total communication problem. Besides, his pensions were not paid on time. He also knew that Louis XVIII was very unpopular to the Frenchmen and the allied powers were divided and were quarreling on the division of his empire. Considering these factors, Napoleon left Elba on 26th Jan 1815 and reached the French coast on 11th March 1815.

The news of Napoleon's triumphant escape from Elba to France was greeted with a lot of jubilations from the Frenchmen. He arrived with his 1800 trusted followers who were joined by many of his soldiers and other followers who were in France. Louis XVIII sent a big force led by Marshall Ney to arrest Napoleon at Grenoble but Napoleon won them over to his side by a simple statement when he said; "Soldiers, this is your emperor, fire at him"!

This event made the poor Louis XVIII to flee from France and Napoleon once against became the French emperor. Hazen has described Napoleon's triumphant escape from Elba to France as "the most memorable event in history".

Napoleon ruled France between March to June which is referred to as the hundred days. He promised peace, elections, and parliament and became the great and loved emperor of France for the second time. This disorganized the allied powers at the Congress of Vienna where they were celebrating the downfall of Napoleon, amongst other reasons. They consequently forgot their differences and mobilized a huge force of 800,000 troops to fight and defeat Napoleon once and for all. Napoleon proposed for a peace discussion but the allied powers rejected his peace initiative. They knew that he was trying to buy time to re-organize his troops.

THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO AND THE FINAL DEFEAT OF NAPOLEON,
18TH JUNE 1815

By 1815, the allied powers were sure that even if Napoleon won one or two battles, he would finally be defeated. Wellington re-organized his army in Belgium to attack France. Marshall Blucher advanced from Prussia to reinforce Wellington's forces. He joined Wellington and attacked Napoleon from the other side.

Napoleon was encircled and consequently defeated at the battle of Waterloo. Napoleon tried to commit suicide in an attempt to avoid such a

terrible humiliation in his military career. However, he did not succeed and to this-effect he remarked;

I ought to have died at Waterloo but the misfortune is that when a man seeks death most, he

Cannot find it Men were killed around me, behind and everywhere but there was no bullet for

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE IMPACT OF NAPOLEON 1 ON EUROPE

After the battle of Waterloo, Napoleon retreated and reached France from where he abdicated the throne in favour of his son. He also made a fruitless attempt to sneak (escape) to America. The British could not allow him to do so. He was instead forced to surrender himself to the British in the harbor of Roche fort.

He was eventually exiled to a deserted, hilly and rocky island of St. Hellena in the Atlantic Ocean.

Napoleon spent his six years exile life writing his memories. However, on 5th May 1821 he died of stomach cancer. His last will was that he should be buried on the banks of the Siena in the midst of the French people whom he said he loved dearly. Nevertheless, this was ignored and he was buried at St. Hellena. However, in 1846 the Louis Philippe brought his remains to Paris and he was accorded a heroic burial with an erected memorial. This was a fulfillment of Napoleon's last will.

THE IMPACT OF NAPOLEON 1 ON EUROPE

Napoleon Bonaparte I made a classical contribution to the history of Europe. As a child of the French Revolution, Napoleon consolidated and perfected the changes that the revolution had caused in Europe. In his reign, he pursued an aggressive foreign policy (Napoleonic war) that destroyed and shaped the political, social and economic structures of Europe. The impact of Napoleonic activities and wars on Europe were positive and negative as analyzed below.

Positive impact/changes

1) Napoleon laid foundation for the unifications of Italy and Germany. He conquered the Italians and Germans and inspired them with revolutionary doctrines of liberty, equality, fraternity and nationalism. He reduced the number of Italian states from over 300 to 39 states. He also created the Cisalpine republic and the Rhine confederation in Italian and German states respectively. These measures brought the Italians and Germans closer to each other and strengthened their quest for unification. This was later used by Cavour and Bismarck to complete the Italian and German unifications respectively.

2) Napoleon contributed to the abolition of feudalism and serfdom in Europe. He abolished feudalism and serfdom in states that were under French influence like Germany, Italy, Spain, Belgium and Hungary.

Land was nationalized and monopolization of land by the clergy and nobles were ended. The rights of peasants to own land was protected by law. This ended exploitation of peasants, increased their productivity and reduced the problems of famine and starvation in Europe.

3) Napoleonic influence consolidated the new forces of liberalism, nationalism, egalitarianism and socialism.

These were indirectly strengthened in conservative states like Austria, Hungary, Italian and German states.

These new political order became a formidable challenge to the old order of Europe and was responsible for the outbreak of the 1820's, 1830 and 1848 revolutions in Europe. This challenge undermined the influence of conservative personalities like Mettemich and caused their downfall.

4) Napoleon also contributed to the spread of constitutionalism and republicanism in Europe. He granted liberal constitutions to states like the kingdom of Westphalia that was ruled by his brother Jerome Bonaparte. In other German and Italian states, he strengthened constitutional system of government that had been initiated during the French revolutionary period. He also established republics such as Cisalpine, Helevetic and Rhine republics. All these consolidated the influence of constitutionalism and republicanism in Europe.

5) Napoleon established a mighty French empire in Europe by 1815. He accomplished this through conquest, annexation and diplomacy. The

empire included Poland, Belgium, Denmark, Italian and German states. It stretched from Adriatic Sea to Baltic Sea.

6) Through the concordat, Napoleon reconciled the Catholic Church and the state of France. Before Napoleon rose to power there was a hostile relationship between the Catholic Church/pope and the French government as a result of negative policies against the church by the revolutionary government. This was brought to an end in 1801 when he signed the concordat with the Pope in which the church was brought under state control with the consent of the Pope. The concordat also brought reconciliation with the Pope and other catholic states that were hostile to France.

7) Napoleon's military reforms in Europe were amazing. He had a heterogeneous army that was constituted by recruits and conscripts from conquered states like Italy, Belgium, Germany and France herself. The army was given the best military training that it became the-best infantry troops in Europe during his reign.

Napoleon used the army to conquer other states, collect war indemnity and tributes, suppress resistance in the conquered states and maintain law and order. His military innovation explains why France defeated the second coalition of Britain, Austria and Prussia by 1802.

8) Napoleon initiated legal reforms that became the most convenient and enlightened sets of laws in Europe and beyond. He worked with a committee of lawyers to codify the French laws into criminal, civil, commercial, military and penal codes. This was a clear and systematic set of law that promoted equality of all by nature. It was used in France and the conquered states to preserve law, order, peace and ensure justices. It guaranteed fundamental freedoms and rights. These codes were also adopted by other states of Europe to guarantee peoples' freedom, rights, peace and justice.

9) Through career open to talents, Napoleon promoted equality in Europe. In France and the conquered states like Belgium, Italy and Germany, Napoleon used ability and talents as a basis of appointment and promotion to public service. It created a new nobility of ability unlike the previous nobility that was based on birth. This made the empire to be manned/governed by men and women of talents, which ensured more efficiency in service delivery. The policy was equally adopted in other parts of Europe.

10) The legion of honour promoted patriotism and nationalism in Europe. It was a policy of rewarding those who rendered distinguished services to the state such as the civil service, army and trade. It encouraged people to offer selfless service to their nation most especially in the army. The policy was so successful that Napoleon remarked "men are led by toys".

11) Napoleon temporarily promoted European diplomacy through short lived treaties that he signed with other powers. In 1801 he formed a temporary alliance with Sweden, Denmark and Spain against Britain because of her monopolization of the med and black sea. In March 1802, he signed the Amiens treaty with Britain that brought temporary reconciliation between her and France. In July 1807, Napoleon signed the Tilsit treaty with Russia where Tsar Alexander I recognized him as emperor of the west and he recognized the Tsar as a "possible" emperor of the east and parts of the Turkish Empire. All these preserved the spirit of diplomacy that other powers like Britain, France, Austria and Russia later used to defeat Napoleon due to his aggressive foreign policy.

12) Napoleon laid foundation for modern education in Europe. In France and the conquered states, Napoleon promoted primary, secondary, university and military education under the management of government or communes. Admission and promotion was based on merit. Church influence over education system was brought to an end and the curriculum was redesigned to promote patriotism and nationalism. His education system was maintained even after his defeat and adopted by other states in Europe.

13) Napoleon's socio-economic and political reforms were very significant to Europe. In France and the conquered states, Napoleon enhanced/promoted agriculture, industrialization, trade, transport and communication. Co-operative societies, better farming techniques and soft loans helped to boost agriculture and industrialization. The chamber of commerce, commercial exchanges and trade exhibitions were organized to promote trade between France and other states in Europe. Roads, railways, canals, bridges and sea ports were improved to facilitate transport and communication within the French empire.

All these became the basis for modernization, trade and industrialization in Europe. It also reduced the problems of famine, poverty and starvation that had rocked Europe before Napoleon rose to power.

14) Napoleonic threats and aggressions led to the creation of coalitions against France. The success of Napoleon against the second coalition and

the way he consolidated his influence in Italian and German states, dragged Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia etc to form the coalitions that defeated him and led to his downfall.

15) Napoleonic wars led to the calling of the Vienna congress and signing of the Vienna settlement of Sept

1814 - June 1815. The need to collectively find a lasting solution to Napoleonic aggression and war led to the signing of several treaties such as that of Chaumont, and 2nd Paris treaties and Vienna treaty. All these consolidated and formalized the spirit of unity in European politics.

16) Persistent Napoleonic activities and aggressions led to the creation of the congress system. Although Napoleon I was defeated and exiled at the Island of Elba in 1813, he was able to mobilize and bounce back to the French throne for 100 days. This taught European powers i.e. Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia that there was need for a system of meeting to preserve European peace in view of Napoleonic aggression.

It's this feeling that was adopted in article 6 of the 2nd Paris peace treaty (of 20th November 1815) through which the congress system was initiated. The congress system was largely initiated out of the threat of reemergence of Napoleonic aggression. It should be stressed that this idea was adopted at the end of World War I and World War II in the formation of the League of Nations and U.N.O. respectively.

Negative impact/changes

1) Napoleonic wars led to massive loss of lives and destruction of property. The series of war fought by Napoleon against other powers of Europe were very expensive in terms of life and physical infrastructure. For instance, over 300,000 French and European nationals were estimated to have lost their lives in the peninsular war while over 600,000 were expected to have perished in the Moscow campaign. Physical infrastructures like roads, bridges, railways and ships were dismantled. This disorganized Europe and left the problem of reconstruction to be pursued after the downfall of Napoleon.

2) Napoleon's arrest and imprisonment of the Pope (Pope Pius VII) in 1808 uprooted his earlier achievement in the concordat. Napoleon did this because of the Pope's refusal to enforce the continental system and resistance to his anti-catholic policies. The imprisonment of the Pope revived hostility between France and other catholic states of Europe e.g. Russia, Austria and Spain. It also subjected Napoleon to condemnation

from diehard Catholics all over Europe. This is because the imprisonment was seen as sacrilege, humiliation and a sin against the person of the "holy" Pope.

3) Napoleon changed the balance of power and distorted the map of Europe; He did this through military conquests and annexations. By 1814, he had expanded French boundaries to include Belgian, Spanish, Italian and German territories amongst others. Consequently, he created the Rhine republic in German states, the Cisalpine republic in Italian states and the kingdom of Westphalia in Prussia. All these changed the balance of power in Europe in favour of France and led to territorial conflicts that the Vienna peace makers had to contend with.

4) Napoleon is blamed for his exploitative, oppressive and tyrannical rule in the conquered states such as in Italian and German states. He restricted political liberties such as freedom of the press, oppressed women and children using the civil code, embarked on conscription in the army and over taxation amongst others. These denied such states political freedom, their rights and undermined their socio economic standard of living. It explains why there was rise of nationalism and resistance to Napoleon's domination in Spain, Russia, Portugal, Austria, Prussia and Britain.

5) Napoleon is also accused of overthrowing legitimate rulers and imposing a Bonaparte family oligarchy in Europe. In 1808, he conquered the Papal States, imprisoned the Pope and annexed the Papal States to France in 1809. He conquered and overthrew legitimate rulers in Naples, Holland, Tuscany, Piedmont, German states and imposed his close relatives and friends to rule in their place.

Consequently, his brothers were imposed kings to replace legitimate rulers. For instance, Joseph

Bonaparte in Naples and Sicily, Jerome Bonaparte in Holland and Louis Bonaparte in the kingdom of Westphalia. All these portray Napoleon's sense of Nepotism, favouritism and attempt to "resurrect" monarchism and Divine rights to rule that the French revolution of 1789 had challenged in Europe.

6) The continental system of Napoleon disorganized European economies. The system blocked the superior and cheap manufactured British goods from free circulation in Europe yet the French substitutes were of poor quality and very expensive. This forced the French and European businessmen and investors who could not do without the British goods to close their businesses, factories and industries. The system also undermined

international trade leading to the collapse of interstate economic co-operation. It eventually led to acute / serious economic crisis characterized by unemployment, inflation, poverty, famine and starvation in Europe.

7) Lastly, Napoleon's negative influence on Europe and aggression kept European powers United who fought him in a series of coalitions. He was eventually defeated and exiled to the island of Elba in 1813. However, Napoleon reorganized and came back to rule for 100 days until he was disastrously defeated at the battle of Waterloo in 1815. He was finally exiled to the island of St. Hellena from where he died in 1821; His body was returned by Louis Philippe in 1846 and reburied in France.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Effects Cnt

9) Through career open to talents, Napoleon promoted equality in Europe. In France and the conquered states like Belgium, Italy and Germany, Napoleon used ability and talents as a basis of appointment and promotion to public service. It created a new nobility of ability unlike the previous nobility that was based on birth. This made the empire to be manned/governed by men and women of talents, which ensured more efficiency in service delivery. The policy was equally adopted in other parts of Europe.

10) The legion of honour promoted patriotism and nationalism in Europe. It was a policy of rewarding those who rendered distinguished services to the state such as the civil service, army and trade. It encouraged people to offer selfless service to their nation most especially in the army. The policy was so successful that Napoleon remarked "men are led by toys".

11) Napoleon temporarily promoted European diplomacy through short lived treaties that he signed with other powers. In 1801 he formed a temporary alliance with Sweden, Denmark and Spain against Britain because of her monopolization of the med and black sea. In March 1802, he signed the Amiens treaty with Britain that brought temporary reconciliation between her and France. In July 1807, Napoleon signed the Tilsit treaty with Russia where Tsar Alexander I recognized him as emperor of

the west and he recognized the Tsar as a "possible" emperor of the east and ports of the Turkish Empire. All these preserved the spirit of diplomacy that other powers like Britain, France, Austria and Russia later used to defeat Napoleon due to his aggressive foreign policy.

12) Napoleon laid foundation for modern education in Europe. In France and the conquered states, Napoleon promoted primary, secondary, university and military education under the management of government or communes. Admission and promotion was based on merit. Church influence over education system was brought to an end and the curriculum was redesigned to promote patriotism and nationalism. His education system was maintained even after his defeat and adopted by other states in Europe.

13) Napoleon's socio-economic and political reforms were very significant to Europe. In France and the conquered states, Napoleon enhanced/promoted agriculture, industrialization, trade, transport and communication. Co-operative societies, better farming techniques and soft loans helped to boost agriculture and industrialization. The chamber of commerce, commercial exchanges and trade exhibitions were organized to promote trade between France and other states in Europe. Roads, railways, canals, bridges and sea ports were improved to facilitate transport and communication within the French empire.

All these became the basis for modernization, trade and industrialization in Europe. It also reduced the problems of famine, poverty and starvation that had rocked Europe before Napoleon rose to power.

14) Napoleonic threats and aggressions led to the creation of coalitions against France. The success of Napoleon against the second coalition and the way he consolidated his influence in Italian and German states, dragged Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia etc to form the coalitions that defeated him and led to his downfall.

15) Napoleonic wars led to the calling of the Vienna congress and signing of the Vienna settlement of Sept

1814 - June 1815. The need to collectively find a lasting solution to Napoleonic aggression and war led to the signing of several treaties such as that of Chaumont, and 2nd Paris treaties and Vienna treaty. All these consolidated and formalized the spirit of unity in European politics.

16) Persistent Napoleonic activities and aggressions led to the creation of the congress system. Although Napoleon I was defeated and exiled at the

Island of Elba in 1813, he was able to mobilize and bounce back to the French throne for 100 days. This taught European powers i.e. Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia that there was need for a system of meeting to preserve European peace in, view of Napoleonic aggression.

It's this feeling that was adopted in article 6 of the 2nd Paris peace treaty (of 20th November 1815) through which the congress system was initiated. The congress system was largely initiated out of the threat of reemergence of Napoleonic aggression. It should be stressed that this idea was adopted at the end of World War I and World War II in the formation of the League of Nations and U.N.O. respectively.

Negative impact/changes

1) Napoleonic wars led to massive loss of lives and destruction of property. The series of war fought by Napoleon against other powers of Europe were very expensive in terms of life and physical infrastructure. For instance, over 300,000 French and European nationals were estimated to have lost their lives in the peninsular war while over 600,000 were expected to have perished in the Moscow campaign. Physical infrastructures like roads, bridges, railways and ships were dismantled. This disorganized Europe and left the problem of reconstruction to be pursued after the, downfall of Napoleon.

2) Napoleon's arrest and imprisonment of the Pope (Pope Pius VII) in 1808 uprooted his earlier achievement in the concordat. Napoleon did this because of the Pope's refusal to enforce the continental system and resistance to his anti-catholic policies. The imprisonment of the Pope revived hostility between France and other catholic states of Europe e.g. Russia, Austria and Spain. It also subjected Napoleon to condemnation from diehard Catholics all over Europe. This is because the imprisonment was seen as sacrilege, humiliation and a sin against the person of the "holy" Pope.

3) Napoleon changed the balance of power and distorted the map of Europe; He did this through military conquests and annexations. By 1814, he had expanded French boundaries to include Belgian, Spanish, Italian and German territories amongst others. Consequently, he created the Rhine republic in German states, the Cisalpine republic in Italian states and the kingdom of Westphalia in Prussia. All these changed the balance of power in Europe in favour of France and led to territorial conflicts that the Vienna peace makers had to contend with.

4) Napoleon is blamed for his exploitative, oppressive and tyrannical rule in the conquered states such as in Italian and German states. He restricted political liberties such as freedom of the press, oppressed women and children using the civil code, embarked on conscription in the army and over taxation amongst others. These denied such states political freedom, their rights and undermined their socio economic standard of living. It explains why there was rise of nationalism and resistance to Napoleon's domination in Spain, Russia, Portugal, Austria, Prussia and Britain.

5) Napoleon is also accused of overthrowing legitimate rulers and imposing a Bonaparte family oligarchy in Europe. In 1808, he conquered the Papal States, imprisoned the Pope and annexed the Papal States to France in 1809. He conquered and overthrew legitimate rulers in Naples, Holland, Tuscany, Piedmont, German states and imposed his close relatives and friends to rule in their place.

Consequently, his brothers were imposed kings to replace legitimate rulers. For instance, Joseph

Bonaparte in Naples and Sicily, Jerome Bonaparte in Holland and Louis Bonaparte in the kingdom of Westphalia. All these portray Napoleon's sense of Nepotism, favouritism and attempt to "resurrect" monarchism and Divine rights to rule that the French revolution of 1789 had challenged in Europe.

6) The continental system of Napoleon disorganized European economies. The system blocked the superior and cheap manufactured British goods from free circulation in Europe yet the French substitutes were of poor quality and very expensive. This forced the French and European businessmen and investors who could not do without the British goods to close their businesses, factories and industries. The system also undermined international trade leading to the collapse of interstate economic co-operation. It eventually led to acute / serious economic crisis characterized by unemployment, inflation, poverty, famine and starvation in Europe.

7) Lastly, Napoleon's negative influence on Europe and aggression kept European powers United who fought him in a series of coalitions. He was eventually defeated and exiled to the island of Elba in 1813. However, Napoleon reorganized and came back to rule for 100 days until he was disastrously defeated at the battle of Waterloo in 1815. He was finally exiled to the island of St. Hellena from where he died in 1821; His body was returned by Louis Philippe in 1846 and reburied in France.

Attachments



2. AUSTRIA (EMPEROR FRANCIS II AND PRINCE METTERNICH)

2. AUSTRIA (EMPEROR FRANCIS II AND PRINCE METTERNICH)

a) Provided a base for mobilization and training of émigrés to fight and throw out Napoleon from the throne. She provided a training base for émigrés ever since the time of the French revolution against the revolutionary government. This encouraged more defections and flight of dissatisfied persons who were opposed to Napoleon's dictatorship and oppression to converge in Austria. Consequently, they fought against Napoleon in coalitions alongside foreign powers leading to his downfall.

b) Austria rallied behind (supported) the Pope's opposition and objection to the continental system. It added on Napoleon's frustration and made him to imprison the "holy man of God" (Pope). Thereafter, she argued other Catholic states to join hands to throw Napoleon out for humiliating the Pope. This explains why Catholic states like the Papal States, Russians, Spaniards and Italians greatly participated in the battles of Leipzig and Waterloo through which Napoleon lost power.

c) Austria fought Napoleon at the earlier battles of Marengo (1800) Ulm (1805), Austerlitz (1805) and Wagram (1809). Although Napoleon defeated Austria in these wars, such wars nevertheless left him isolated, weakened, exhausted and vulnerable to defeat at the subsequent battles of Leipzig and Waterloo.

d) Mettemich / Austria was a very influential member of coalitions that were formed against Napoleon I.

Prince Mettemich worked with Castlereagh, the British Prime Minister to mobilize other states to form the 4th and 5th coalitions that finally defeated and exiled Napoleon to the Island of St. Hellena.

e) Finally, Austria hosted the Vienna settlement from Sept. 1814 - June 1815 from which plans for the final defeat and exile of Napoleon I were hatched. Mettemich argued the allied powers to forget their differences and unite to ensure that Napoleon was defeated. The result was that about 800,000 soldiers were mobilized, which became impossible for Napoleon to challenge, hence his defeat and exile to the island of St. Hellena.

3. Russia (Tsar Alexander I)

a) Russia was responsible for the downfall of Napoleon Bonaparte I in as far as she, fully cooperated with other powers in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th coalitions against Napoleon. She was also a party to the Vienna Settlement that hatched strategies for the defeat of Napoleon and imposed an army of occupation and war indemnity on France. She also sent her troops as part of the army of occupation, which guarded against Napoleon's attempt to come back to France from the Island of St. Helena.

b) Russia is blamed for inflicting the heaviest military losses to Napoleon in the Moscow campaign of 1812. Napoleon lost over 30,000 horses at the battle of Borodino and over 580,000 soldiers in the campaign. This was due to Russia's scorched earth policy, guerrilla tactics and winter that caused food shortage and massive death to Napoleon's army. All these, dispossessed Napoleon of equipments and experienced soldiers that he could have used against allied powers at Leipzig and Waterloo. It also led to a general discontent and defection of experienced army generals like Bernadotte who leaked Napoleon's secrets, strategies and plans to coalition powers leading to his defeat and downfall.

c) Russia also frustrated the success of the continental system. Russia supported Napoleon's continental system in the initial stage but denounced and rejected it due to its negative consequences on her economy. Eventually, she opened her ports to British goods which forced Napoleon to attack Moscow from where he lost over 580,000 troops.

d) She also contributed to the defeat of Napoleon in the peninsular war of 1808—1811. During the war, French troops relied on food supplies from Russia. However, the Russians deliberately starved the French troops by refusing to supply them with the necessary food and other commodities. This led to acute famine, malnutrition, vulnerability to diseases like Cholera and massive death of Napoleon's cosmopolitan troops that made his downfall inevitable.

e) Russia is blamed for violation of the 1807 Tilsit treaty. The treaty had brought a diplomatic alliance between France and Russia. However, Russia denounced the treaty and joined Napoleon's arch rivals like Britain. It became a diplomatic blow to Napoleon; left him isolated and strengthened his enemies leading to his downfall.

4. Prussia (Frederick William III)

Prussia entangled herself in coalitions against Napoleon I and fought France at the battles of Jena in 1806 and Lautzen in 1813. Although Napoleon defeated her at the battles of Jena and Lautzen, nevertheless the war left him weakened, exhausted, depleted French resources and isolated her diplomatically. This left him vulnerable to defeat at the battle of Leipzig thus contributing to his downfall.

5. Portugal (Prince John)

Portugal was a member of the second coalition that fought and weakened Napoleon I. She also opposed and contributed to the failure of the continental system. She maintained a strong trade link with Britain.

Prince John, the regent of Portugal led the Portuguese to oppose the continental system thereby denying Napoleon support that was necessary in his dominance of Europe.

Portugal also delivered a military blow to Napoleon in the peninsular war. She appealed for Britain's support in the aftermath of Napoleon's invasion thus, allying with Britain against Napoleon I. She engaged Napoleon's army in acute guerrilla war in the peninsular war and defeated him with British support at the battle of Vimiero. This left Napoleon weakened, exhausted, increasingly isolated and unpopular hence his downfall by 1815.

6. Spain (Charles IV; 1788 - 1808, Joseph Bonaparte; 1808 - 1814)

i) The rise of spirited Spanish nationalism against Napoleon undermined his influence in Europe and contributed to his downfall. In 1808, the Spaniards revolted against Charles IV for allowing Napoleon to invade Portugal through Spain. Napoleon forced Charles IV to resign and imposed his own brother, Joseph Bonaparte on the Spanish throne. This provoked a hostile opposition and resistance to Napoleon.

It also dragged Spain to join the 4th and 5th coalitions that defeated Napoleon and brought his reign to an end.

ii) Spain is also accused for non compliance and failure of the continental system. She refused to implement the continental system and continued to trade with Britain. She allowed British goods to be moved freely through Madrid up to Central Europe. This strengthened British capacity to mobilize other states to fight and defeat Napoleon I.

iii) Spain was a champion of the peninsular war that turned out to be an ulcer, which destroyed

Napoleon and led to his down fall. She waged a serious guerrilla war and defeated Napoleon with the support of Britain and Portugal. Napoleon lost about 300,000 soldiers that included some of his battled hardened and experienced commanders. The war also provided Britain with a land base that she hitherto lacked to fight Napoleon. She used this opportunity to move her troops through Madrid to fight Napoleon. The success of Spain in the war weakened and exhausted Napoleon, moral-boosted other powers like Austria, Prussia and Spain herself to join the 4th and 5th coalitions to overthrow him.

7. Role of Papal States (Pope Pius VII)

The Papal States rose against Napoleon for his imprisonment of Pope Pius VII. The Pope declined to enforce the continental system preferring to be neutral as a spiritual leader. Napoleon, reacted by invading the Papal States in 1808 and imprisoned the Pope thereafter. This made the Papal States and Catholics in other parts of Europe to rise against Napoleonic influence in Europe. The Pope called for alliance of Catholic states e.g. Austria, Prussia, Spain and Italian states against France leading to coalitions that crushed Napoleon.

8. Responsibility of other small states i.e. Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Italian and German States

They are blamed for developing a strong nationalistic spirit against Napoleon's policies like conscription and over taxation. Conscripted children from such countries fought lousily and reluctantly to ensure Napoleon was defeated instead of winning victory for him. This explains why they would easily withdraw from the battle field the way they did at Leipzig and Waterloo. Sweden gave asylum to Bernadette who defected and served on the side of the coalition forces against Napoleon. The Dutch opposed the continental system, pressurized Louis Bonaparte to abandon it and Holland joined the 4th and 5th coalition to fight Napoleon. Napoleon took a drastic measure of annexing Holland to France, which made him more unpopular and volatile to fall from power.

9. France

France was responsible for Napoleon's downfall for failure to support Napoleon in the later stage of his rule. By 1815, various opposition groups had sprung against Napoleon's disastrous foreign policy, imprisonment of the Pope and unpopular domestic policy such as dictatorship and conscription. They included the liberals, nationalists, glory seekers and

Catholics. This explains why there were massive desertions of senior politicians and officers like Fouché, Talleyrand, Bernadette etc. to the allied powers.

It should be noted that the French parliament had passed a resolution for Napoleon's abdication on the eve of the battle of Waterloo. This left Napoleon with no other option than to surrender to his arch enemies at Waterloo when he was overwhelmed by the military might of allied powers.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Methods

From 1802 to 1815, Napoleon was so dominant in European affairs that his name was a common talk in every household. Although he experienced serious opposition from 1808 that climaxed in to his downfall, he had dominated the whole Europe with the exception of Britain and Turkey by 1807. He was able to achieve this by using a combination of force and diplomacy.

i). In the first place, Napoleon used force to dominate Europe up to his downfall in 1815. He had a large well motivated and efficient army that he used to conquer states like Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium etc and make them part of his empire. He also maintained an army of occupation to guarantee the loyalty of conquered states and ensure that they paid tributes to France. The army was useful in maintaining law, order and suppressing resistance hence consolidation of power in the conquered states,

ii. Napoleon also used his close relatives and friends to administer the conquered States. For example, Louis Bonaparte was made the King of Holland, Jerome Bonaparte was made the King of Westphalia, Joseph Bonaparte was in charge of Spain and Sister Caroline was the Queen of Naples. Thus, by using his brothers, sisters and very close friends. Napoleon was able to use loyal and trusted administrators who maintained effective control in their areas of influence, which avoided any sabotage against him.

iii. He created a continental Empire that was sub-divided into republics for administrative purposes. For instance, the Rhine, Helvetic and Cisalpine Republics, were administrative units that were entrusted to the people who were loyal to him. He ensured effective control in these states from Paris where he dispatched orders. Therefore, by creating an effectively centralized administrative structure and hierarchy, Napoleon was able to dominate Europe.

iv. Napoleon also used marriage ties as a political tool to gain a natural alliance. In 1810, he divorced Josephine because she was barren and married Marie Louise from Austria. This improved on the diplomatic relationship between France and Austria, which explains why Austria remained a French ally until 1813. Although the alliance system ended in 1813, it nevertheless enabled Napoleon to consolidate his control over Europe from 1810-1813.

V. Economically, Napoleon dominated European economies using the continental system although only for a short period. In 1806, he declared the continental system in which British manufactured products became the forbidden goods in Europe. Eventually, he frustrated the sales and consumption of British goods in States where he was influential like Austria, Prussia, Italy, Holland etc. Although the continental system later backfired against Napoleon, nevertheless, he used it to temporarily dominate trade and European economy against Britain.

vi. Napoleon temporally used alliance system to isolate Britain. In 1802, He formed temporally armed neutrality with the conquered States of Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Prussia etc to isolate Britain that he had failed to defeat militarily. Although this alliance was short-lived, it nevertheless isolated Britain, gained him diplomatic ties and gave him time to consolidate his power at home.

vii. Treaty signing was yet another instrument Napoleon used, to establish his dominance over Europe. He concluded his military victories by forcing the defeated powers to sign treaties of submission to him. For example, Austria was forced to sign the Luneville treaty (1801) in which she relinquished control over Italians and Germans to France. Russia was defeated at Fried land and signed the Tilsit treaty (1807) in which Tsar Alexander re-cognized Napoleon as Emperor of the West. On the other hand in 1802, Napoleon signed the Amiens treaty with Britain in order to re-organize his troops since he had failed to defeat Britain.

viii. Napoleon's Socio-economic and political achievements in France were so great that made the Frenchmen to give him solid support in his conquest and domination of Europe. He modernized France, improved on education, codified the law, centralized administration, improved on French economy, brought reconciliation between the French Catholics and the revolutionaries and above all restored law and order. There was therefore no serious opposition to Napoleon in France that gave him freedom to concentrate on dominating Europe.

ix. Similarly, Napoleon embarked on Socio-Economic developments in the, conquered States, which made him to be welcomed as a liberator. For instance, he constructed and improved on Roads, Railways, Ports and Harbours in the Italian and German States. He also eliminated inequality and destroyed the privileges of the nobles and clergy. This is what made the Italians and Germans to; support Napoleon's conquest without resistance until when he started exploiting them. This (acceptance of Napoleon) was inevitable because Austria's rule was so oppressive, exploitative and discriminative.

X. On the other hand, Napoleon resorted to over taxation and collection of tributes as strategies of dominating the conquered States. By subjecting the conquered states to over taxation and payment of tributes, Napoleon made them so poor and submissive that they could not finance a well coordinated resistance against him. Secondly, he raised money for administration and financing his wars and further conquests.

xi. On the same footing, Napoleon adapted forceful conscription of the conquered States as a means of raising an army to maintain his control over Europe. His grand army was an amalgam (composed of) of Italians, Germans, Poles, Portuguese, and Danes etc. Through conscription, Napoleon raised the biggest army of the time that he effectively used in conquering other states, suppressing resistance in the conquered States and fighting hostile foreign powers. The army was constantly kept busy in military campaigns to reduce the problem of military redundancy and boredom that could have led to a mutiny against him. All these helped Napoleon to be in effective control over Europe.

xii. Napoleon dubiously used revolutionary doctrines of equality, Liberty and Fraternity in Europe to win support as a Liberator. He falsely preached such revolutionary doctrines to cool down resistance in the conquered States and consolidate his power. Much as he later violated such revolutionary

principals through oppression and exploitation, they had nonetheless enabled him to establish a firm and dominant position in Europe.

xiii) Napoleon established firm control over the press and education since they were potential departments that could be used by his opponents to undermine his rule. In the conquered States such as Italian,

German and Spain, he censored the press and journalists who published articles intended to incite people against him were arrested, tortured, killed or exiled. The teaching of liberal and revolutionary subjects like history, literature-and political science were banned. He used the police and spies to ensure that his policies on the press and education were effective. These helped him to identify, isolate and paralyze the activities of his opponents.

xiv) Lastly, Napoleon used the concordat with the Pope to consolidate his influence in Europe. He believed that a friendly relation with the Pope was a friendly relation with the Catholics in France and the whole Europe. This consideration made him to sign the concordat with Pope Pius vii in 1801. It brought reconciliation between the Pope and the government of France. Consequently, it earned Napoleon support from the Pope, Catholic States and the Catholic community all over Europe, France inclusive. Although Napoleon violated the concordat in 1808 when he imprisoned the Pope and lost his support, It nevertheless helped him to consolidate his power in Europe from 1801-1808.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Chronological Time Frame Of Significant Events

1798 9th Nov The Brumier coup, Napoleon overthrew the Directory government.

Dec Promulgation of a new constitution in France.

Establishment of the Parthenopean republic (Naples)

1799-1804, Napoleon as the first consul.

1799 Russians and Austrians reconquered Northern Italy, France defeated at the battle of

Novi and pushed out of Naples and Rome. Cisalpine republic overthrown.

1800 Aug, Napoleon appointed a committee to make the civil code.

The battle of Marengo.

Temporary armed neutrality of France, Russia, Prussia, Sweden and Spain against

England.

Battle of Marengo, Austria defeated, France reoccupied Piedmont and Cisalpine

Republic.

1801 The treaty of Luneville.

The concordat that governed the relationship between the state and church for

at least 103 years.

1802: The treaty of Amiens between England and France.

The creation of the Legion of Honour.

1803: Revival of war between France and England

1804: Napoleon crowned emperor, The Pope attended.

1805: Formation of the third coalition by Austria, Russia, Sweden and England

The battle of Trafalgar where Napoleon's troops were annihilated.

Napoleon defeated Austria at the battle of Ulm

Dec, Napoleon defeated Austria and Russia at the battle of Austerlitz

1806: The treaty of Pressburg between France and Austria.

The battle of Jena in which Prussia was defeated by Napoleon I.

Declaration of the continental system, Berlin decree issued by Napoleon I.

Order in the council issued by Britain as a counter measure to the continental system.

Aug 6th The end of the holy roman empire.

Creation of the Rhine confederation by Napoleon I to check the power of Austria

and Prussia.

1807: Continuation of war between France and the third coalition

The battle of Friedland in which Tsar Alexander I (Prussia) was defeated.

The treaty of Tilsit in which Tsar Alexander I agreed to support the continental

system.

Napoleon issued Warsaw and Milan decrees.

The British bombardment of Copenhagen and confiscation of the Danish fleet.

1808: Invasion of Rome and annexation of the Papal states.

Napoleon issued the code of criminal procedure.

1808-1814, The Peninsular war.

Napoleon deposed Charles iv and imposed Joseph Bonaparte as King of Spain.

The battle of Baylen, French troops defeated with 18000 captured as prisoners of

war.

The battle of Vimiero, French troops defeated.

1809: The battle of Corunna, French troops defeated though Moore (British commander)

was slaughtered.

The battle of Talavera in Spain where Wellesley defeated Victor and Joseph Bonaparte.

The battles of Aspern and Wagram

May, Annexation of Rome into the French empire.

June, Excommunication of Napoleon by the Pope.

Arrest and imprisonment of the Pope by Napoleon I

Appointment of ecclesiastical commission for France by Napoleon I.

1810: Jan, Ecclesiastical commission superseded.

Napoleon issued the penal code.

Fountainbleau decree issued.

Marriage of Napoleon I to Marie Louise, Princess of Austria

1812: The battle of Salamanca where Wellington defeated French troops and entered

Madrid.

The Moscow campaign.

June, Napoleon brought the Pope to France.

1813: Jan, The Pope made a new concordat with Napoleon I.

Formation of the Fourth coalition against France.

The battle of Vittoria in Spain where Wellington defeated Joseph Bonaparte.

The battles of Bautzen and Lützen, Napoleon defeated Russians and Prussians

The battle of Dresden where Napoleon defeated coalition forces.

The battle of Leipzig where Napoleon I was defeated, Retreated to France

Exile of Napoleon I to the island of Elba

1814: Napoleon I released the Pope.

The battles of Toulouse and Orthez, Wellington invaded France and defeated

French troops.

The treaty of Chaumont between Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria.

1815: 1 June, The battle of Waterloo, Napoleon I defeated, overthrown and exiled to

the island of St Helena.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background:

The congress of Vienna refers to a diplomatic assembly/meeting that was held at Vienna, the capital of Austria from September 1814 to June 1815. All European nations were invited but major decisions were made by Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia. The congress was interrupted when Napoleon sneaked back to France from the Island to Elba (from March 1815). However, it was reconvened and the peace agreement was signed on 9th March 1815 before the battle of Waterloo. After this, the powers organized the 5th coalition that defeated Napoleon at the battle of Waterloo in Belgium on 18th June 1815.

At the congress, Austria was represented by Francis I and Mettemich, Britain by her foreign secretary, Lord Castlereagh, Russia by Tsar Alexander I, Prussia by Fredrick William III; the Pope was represented by Cardinal Salby and France by Bishop Tallyrand. All delegates at the conference were grouped into two camps. The group that included Britain and France was led by Austria and the other group that included Prussia was led by Russia. It should be noted that France's position in the congress was maneuvered by the tactful approach and high level of skillful diplomacy exhibited by Tallyrand.

The Congress of Vienna was based on the principles of legitimacy, balance of power, defensive arrangement, rewarding the victors and punishing the Vanguard/defeated powers.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Weaknesses, Negative Impact And Failures Of The Vienna

SETTLEMENT

2. Unrealistic methods in countering further French aggression

The Vienna settlement used unrealistic methods to prevent further aggression from France. States that were culturally, historically and

religiously different were forcefully amalgamated to form buffer states. This was the case with Holland and Belgium which formed the kingdom of

Netherlands. The Belgians were forced against their will to be under Dutch control. This provoked the Belgians to revolt in 1830 which destabilized Europe from 1830 up to 1839 when the Belgian neutrality and independence was declared.

However, to another extent the unrealistic methods used in countering French aggression was justifiable. This is because the smaller states were individually too weak and vulnerable to stand against Napoleonic/French aggression. It was therefore very easy for Napoleon to 'step' on them and cause more chaos in Europe. To this extent, one can exonerate the peacemakers because through such measures, they prevented French aggression and restored peace, which were impossible before 1815.

The big powers are further accused of being too much concerned about further French aggression that they forgot the fact that one of them could also become aggressive. They were therefore absent minded that they did not safeguard aggression from within themselves. Instead, they over strengthened Prussia that enabled Prussia and later Germany to embark on aggression against France in 1870 and the whole world that caused the two world wars.

2. Neglect of Liberalism and Nationalism

The Vienna settlement ignored the forces of Liberalism and Nationalism that were sweeping across

Europe. The settlement disregarded the plight of oppressed nations like the Finns, Italians, Serbs and Poles who wanted to regain their independence. It even went ahead to impose foreign control over the smaller states. For example, the Italians and Germans were subjected to Austria's control which led to the 1830 and 1848 revolutions. Poland was shared between Austria, Russia and Prussia which forced the Poles to revolt in 1830 and 1863. One can argue that the Vienna settlement boomeranged in its attempt to prevent the spread of revolutions simply because it underrated and ignored the forces of Liberalism and Nationalism.

3. The principle of Legitimacy and the restoration of oppressive, dictatorial and tyrannical rulers.

The principle of Legitimacy was ignored where it did not appeal to the interest of the allied powers. For example, legitimate rulers in Poland,

Finland, Denmark and Belgium were not restored. Worst of all, the principle of legitimacy made the "Vienna Tyrants" to restore and protect oppressive, dictatorial and tyrannical rulers such as the Bourbon monarchy in France, Ferdinand I of Naples and Ferdinand VII of Spain. Consequently, there were revolutions against the restored rulers e.g. Ferdinand VII of Spain 1820's and the Bourbons in 1830. It can therefore

be said that the principle of legitimacy apart from being partially achieved, became a catastrophe to Europe in the long run.

4. The 1814 constitutional charter

The 1814 constitutional charter that the settlement provided to France was not totally fair to her. It narrowed the Franchise (voting power) by making property qualification the criteria for voting. It made only about 100,000 Frenchmen out of a total population of 29 million eligible to vote. The charter also gave the king powers to nominate members of the chamber of deputies. All these made the French parliament to be dominated by the propertied (wealthy) nobles, clergy and middle class to the disadvantage of the peasants. Apart from France, the Vienna peace makers did not provide the charter to other restored rulers. For instance, the Pope in the Papal State, Victor Emmanuel I in Piedmont, Ferdinand I in Naples and Ferdinand VII in Spain were all restored to their former thrones without the constitutional charter. One can therefore blame the Vienna settlement for imposing unrealistic constitutional charter on France and ignoring the need for a constitutional rule in other areas where kings were restored.

5. The confederation parliament

The confederation parliament in the German states was inadequate in meeting the expectations of the Germans. The parliament was instead used by Mettemich and Austria to exploit, oppress, dominate and divide the Germans. These were easily accomplished because Mettemich was vested with powers to appoint the president of the parliament whom he used to influence parliamentary proceedings to Austrian advantage. This, apart from undermining the right of the Germans to a fair parliamentary representation, kept the Germans divided, frustrated the unification process and helped to consolidate Mettemich and Austrian dominance and oppression of the Germans.

6. In-balance of power

The balance of power that was achieved was defective since it was for the four big powers at the expense of the smaller powers. The independence

of smaller nations were undermined and they were dished out to the big four in order to balance their power. Even amongst the "big four", the balance of power favoured Austria and Britain compared to Russia and Prussia. In other words,

Britain and Austria over balanced their powers at the expense of Russia and Prussia. This means that the balance of power was a myth and not a reality.

7. The status of France

France was undermined and belittled as one of the great powers in Europe by the Vienna peacemakers. Though France sent Talleyrand as her representative at the congress of Vienna, he was initially ignored and treated with contempt. Much as Talleyrand maneuvered his way through tactical diplomacy, the Vienna congressmen imposed severe consequences on France. For instance, the quadruple powers subjected her to a heavy war indemnity of 700 million francs, an army of occupation, reduced her borders to those of 1790 and restored the Bourbon monarchy back to power. All these, belittled and isolated France within the ranks of great powers up to 1818 when she was readmitted at the congress of Aix la Chapelle.

8. Instability in the smaller states

Although the Vienna settlement restored general peace in Europe, there was no peace to small nations. The congress was dominated by the big powers and the smaller states did not take part in the decision making process. Worst of all, they were forcefully dominated by the big powers. This became a major source of unrest in Europe from 1820 to 1871 when the Italians and Germans unified.

9. Self Interest

Self-interest of the major powers was a fundamental weakness of the Vienna congress. Britain wanted to grab more colonies and continue with her policy of isolation, Russia was interested in dominating the Ottoman Empire and expanding in the Balkans. Austria's interest was to dominate the Italians and Germans. It explains why there were a lot of conflicts over distribution of territories most especially between Russia and Prussia. This undermined common interest that the Vienna settlement was to defend.

10. Inadequate level of Economic co-operation

Economic co-operation that was revived was not a whole sale achievement. Britain continued with her policy of isolationism and jealousy

guarded her areas of economic influence. The free navigation on international waters never survived for so long. This is because Britain dominated these waters at the expense of other powers and Russia was later prohibited from using such waters for navigation. Surplus production due to industrial revolution also made countries to embark on protectionism rather than free trade policy.

11. Russian imperialism

The Vienna settlement attracted Russia into European affairs, which intensified her ambitions to dominate the Ottoman Empire. Russia was granted the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, Bessarabia, parts of Saxony, which became a security threat to other powers most especially Britain and

Austria. This brought more tension and conflict within the Ottoman Empire that led to wars such as the Greek war of revolt and the Crimean war. These were precisely because the settlement had drawn Russian interest from the East to central and Western Europe.

12. Failure to involve the Ottoman Empire

On the other hand, the Vienna Settlement ignored Turkey and Ottoman Empire, which led to violent events that constituted the Eastern Question. By 1815, the Ottoman Empire was a vast heterogeneous empire with many smaller nationalities that were undergoing oppression, exploitation and persecution by the Sultan of Turkey. The Ottoman Empire controlled key religious, strategic and economic areas that were very significant to other powers in Europe.

However, the congress of Vienna neither involved nor considered the fate of Ottoman Empire leading to violent events such as the Greek war of independence, Syrian question, Crimean war and the Balkan wars of 1875-1878. One can argue that if the Congressmen had addressed the problems in the Ottoman Empire, such violent events would have been averted.

13. Promulgation of Metternich's era of Conservatism, 1815-1848

The Vienna settlement elevated Metternich and his unpopular system that ushered an era of conservatism from 1814-1848. Prior to 1815, Metternich's influence was confined to the Austrian empire. However, in 1815, Metternich exploited the Vienna Settlement and dominated European affairs using his conservative anti liberal policies. He manipulated the

Vienna settlement not only to dominate other races e.g. Italians, Germans and Hungarians, but the entire continent of Europe.

His conservative policies in Europe undermined political freedom, nationalism, rights of association, press, worship etc. These brewed discontent that was responsible for the outbreak of revolutions such as those of 1820, 1830 and 1848 in Europe.

14. Delayed the unification's of Italy and Germany

The Vienna settlement created more divisions and disunity in Europe which delayed the unifications of Italy and Germany; It legalized Austria's control and influence over the Italian and German states. This blocked the unification of both nations and led to more violent movements that undermined peace in Europe. Ironically, the very powers assisted the Italians and German's in the unification process. This is the reason why the Vienna congress is sometimes called an absurd gathering.

15. Collapse of the congress system

Although the Vienna settlement gave rise to the congress system, it is blamed of laying a very Weak foundation that contributed to the downfall of the congress system. It implemented very unpopular aims and objectives which the congress system was to defend. These include the restoration of unpopular legitimate rulers and forceful amalgamation of states against their interest.

The settlement therefore laid a fake foundation for the congress system and charged it with an impossible task that made its collapse a foregone conclusion (inevitable).

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background:

The congress system refers to a series of diplomatic meetings or conferences that took place in Europe from 1818-1825 between the great powers. It was established by article VI of the second Paris peace treaty that was signed on 20th November 1815. In the article, the quadruple powers (Austria, Prussia, Russia and Britain) pledged to meet at fixed periods

to consult and discuss matters of common interest. The congress system was constituted by the congresses of Aix-Lachapalle (1818), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821),

Veronna (1822) and St. Petersburg (1825).

The relationship between the congress system and Vienna settlement is that the Vienna settlement gave rise to the congress system. The idea of a permanent alliance for peaceful settlement of disputes that was

Born during the Vienna settlement is what was adopted in Article VI of the second Paris peace treaty. To this extent, one can assert that the Vienna settlement was a "mother" of the congress system. Besides, the congress system was to defend the terms of the Vienna Settlement. This is why the Vienna congress does not become part and parcel of the congress system.

Article VI of the Paris peace treaty, November 1815 the high contacting powers 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 triads shall be considered the most salutary for the purpose and prosperity of nations, and for the maintenance of the peace of tope (Grant and Temperleys

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Aims And Objectives Of The Congress System

1. To defend, protect and implement the terms of the earlier arrangements like the quadruple alliance, Vienna settlement and the second Paris peace treaty.
2. The system was established as an instrument to maintain peace in Europe. It was to maintain international relations and settle disputes peacefully.
3. To create unity and co-existence in Europe. The chief target here was France that had reformed by 1818.

4. To consolidate the quadruple alliance that was established in 1815 against France. Although France was admitted in the congress system, she was still suspected and that is why the quadruple powers decided to isolate her and renew the alliance.

5. To find ways and means of protecting legitimate rulers who were being threatened by revolutions. The formation of a joint force based at Brussels for the purpose of suppressing revolutions.

6. The condition of Napoleon and his welfare was also to be addressed by the congress system. 7. There was a general feeling of fair treatment of Napoleon at the Island of St. Hellena.

8. The question of the Jews was yet another cause of concern to the congress powers. The Jews were scattered throughout Europe and were being persecuted. The congressmen wanted to establish a permanent settlement for them.

9. The issue of pirates especially on the Mediterranean Sea was yet another problem to be addressed by the congress system. They were undermining international trade by hijacking, kidnapping and robbing ships and traders on the sea.

10. To promote economic co-operation in Europe. There was need to re-organize European economies that had not fully recovered from the effects of Napoleonic wars and continental system,

11. The quadruple powers of Austria, Russia, Prussia and Britain; having experienced the dangers of Napoleonic aggression wanted to develop a strategy to frustrate the rise to power of anyone from Napoleon's ruling family line (Bonapartism). This is because they feared that such a person possesses inherited aggressive character of Napoleon I and could attempt to revive Napoleonic empire that was imposed over Europe by Napoleon I.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Congress Systems Cnt.

The Congress Ofatx-Lachapalle (Nov1818)

This was the first congress within the congress system. It was held in 1818 and attended by Castlereagh of Britain, Francis I and Metternich of Austria, Tsar Alexander I of Russia, Frederick William III of Prussia and Richelieu of France. The issues that were discussed included; the position of France in the concert of Europe, pirates in the Mediterranean Sea, maintenance of earlier agreements and condition of Napoleon at the Island of St. Helena. NB. The congress of Aix-Lachapelle was the beginning and climax of the congress system. It was recognized as the supreme council of Europe. It's for this reason that Metternich is reported to have remarked that he had never seen a prettier little congress.

THE CONGRESS OF TROPPAU, 1820

The Troppau congress was called by Tsar Alexander I to find solutions to political unrests and revolutions that were sweeping across Europe. These were serious in the German and Italian states, Spain, France, Poland and England. Austria, Prussia and Russia signed the Troppau protocol in which they vowed to suppress revolutions wherever and whenever it raised its head/occurred. Austria was "licensed" /permitted to restore Ferdinand I of Naples and Ferdinand VII of Spain to their thrones. However, this was rejected by Britain and France who had merely sent observers. Britain, being a liberal country argued that there were genuine reasons against restored leaders and that she was only concerned about preventing the return of Napoleon or his dynasty to France. Castlereagh was so furious when he addressed the parliament that he declared the Troppau protocol "a destitute of common sense" and argued the powers concerned to act within common sense limit. This is a clear signal that the concert of Europe was doomed.

THE CONGRESS OF LAIBACH JAN 1821

This was the third congress held at Laibach in Austria. It was a continuation of the congress of Troppau. The congress was to implement the Troppau resolutions. Austria was granted permission to suppress the revolutions in Naples and Piedmont. This was done and the ousted kings were restored to power. The congress was adjourned with arrangements to re-assemble at Verona.

THE CONGRESS OF VERONA. OCT 1822.

This congress was called at Verona in Italy. It was provoked by the Greek and Spanish revolts. Britain and Austria denounced Russia's secret assistance of the Greeks and the congress failed to resolve the conflict.

Tsar Alexander's proposal to send 15,000 Russian troops to suppress the revolt was greeted with suspicion and consequently rejected. However, Austria, Prussia and even Russia permitted France to suppress the revolution in Spain. France eventually suppressed the revolution and restored Ferdinand to his throne in 1823.

The French adventure in Spain was a practical defeat to Canning who admitted that The entry of the French army into Spain was affront to the pride of England. He made further remarks that; The issue of Verona has split the one and indivisible alliance and so things are getting back to a wholesome state again, every nation for itself and God for us all. He went ahead and said; praise God that there would be no more congresses. This was the biggest blow for the congress system.

The Spanish and Portuguese colonies also revolted in 1823, demanding for independence. The Spanish colonies were strategically and economically very significant for British trade. Britain had acquired a hold there when Spain was involved in the Napoleonic wars. Britain therefore refused any intervention in the Spanish colonies. At the same time, president Monroe of U.S.A warned Europe about America when he said;

Any interference by European powers on the American continent would be regarded as a manifestation of unfriendly disposition to the United States.

Thus, faced with the prospect of confronting both Britain and U.S.A, the other powers backed down and no one intervened in S. America.

5. THE CONGRESS OF ST. PETERSBURG, 1825

This was the last congress that took place at St. Petersburg, the capital of Russia. It was called by Tsar Alexander I to settle the eastern question especially the Greek war of Independence. George Canning of

Britain flatly refused to either attend or send a delegate to the conference but the other powers sat at St. Petersburg In Jan 1825. However, they ended up In total confusion and departed In May on very bad terms without any resolution or achievement. To all purposes and Intents, this was practically the end of the congress system in the history of Europe.

Attachments

No attachments



Achievements Of The Congress System

1. Admission of France in to the congress system

The congress system succeeded in bringing reconciliation and peaceful co-existence between France and other powers. By 1818, France had behaved well and fulfilled the terms of the second Paris peace treaty.

For example, she had paid the war indemnity and there was no threat of aggression from her (France). This enabled France to be admitted in the quadruple alliance which became the Quintuple alliance at the congress of Aix-Lachapalle. It left her reconciled with no spirit of revenge that became a landmark towards peace and stability in Europe.

2. Protection of the Jews

The congress system succeeded in resolving the question of protecting the Jews in Europe. The Jews who had spread throughout Europe were being persecuted and denied citizenship. However, the congress of Aix-Lachapalle granted them freedom to stay anywhere where they had been living before 1118. The Jews were given citizenship in any European country until 1948 when the state of Israel was founded for them.

3. Swedish debt to Denmark

The congress of Aix-Lachapalle settled the Debt problem between Sweden and Denmark. Denmark had borrowed money from Sweden and had failed to pay by 1818. The congressmen of Ax-Lachapalle forced Denmark to pay the debt. This ended hostility between the two states and hence avoided war that would have undermined peace in Europe.

4. Suppression of revolutions

The congress system succeeded in suppressing and containing the flow of revolutions and revolutionary ideas in Europe. At the congress of Troppau, Austria, Russia and Prussia Signed the Troppau protocol in which they vowed to use peaceful means as Well as force to suppress revolutions. It was in the Troppau protocol spirit that Austria and France suppressed the revolutions in Naples and Spain respectively. To this extent, the congress system achieved its aim of maintaining the Vienna settlement.

5. Protection of restored rulers

Legitimate rulers who had been restored by the Vienna settlement were maintained in their thrones by the congress system. By 1830, such restored rulers were threatened by revolutions and in some cases overthrown. The congress powers intervened by crushing the revolutions and restoring such rulers to their thrones. This was the case with Ferdinand I of Naples and Ferdinand VII of Spain who were restored by Austria and France respectively. They were restored according to the principle of Troppau protocol 1820.

6. Balance of power and French aggression

The congress system maintained the balance of power that had been initiated by the Vienna settlement of 1815. The territorial boundaries that the Vienna peacemakers established in 1815 were preserved by the congress powers. Europe from 1818 remained relatively stable because no one power was allowed to be too powerful to disturb the continent. The congress system also maintained stability in France and she was made part of the system. This preserved the balance of power and avoided further aggression especially from France. Even if France intervened in Spain, she did so with the official consent of Austria, Prussia and Russia.

7. Preservation of the reorganized map of Europe

The congress system is credited for maintaining the redrawn map of Europe that the Vienna peace makers had designed. The settlement had reduced the size of France to those of 1790 and partitioned smaller states like Saxony and Poland amongst the big powers. The congress system ensured that this arrangement and permanent border restrictions intended to avoid territorial disputes between nations were adhered to. These helped European powers to respect the territorial integrity and independence of other powers, which explains why there were no open territorial clashes /war in Europe during the congress era/period.

8. Maintenance of Napoleon I's defeat

The congress system maintained the defeat of Napoleon I. Napoleon I was defeated way back in 1815 and exiled to the rocky island of St. Helena. The congress powers closely monitored Napoleon including any communication to or from him in order to frustrate any intention of sneaking back to France as he had in 1814 from the island of Elba. It thus became impossible for Napoleon to reorganize himself, bounce back and wage war against European powers as before. This explains why Napoleon I lived a docile solitary (lonely) life up to his death in 1821.

9. Safeguard against Bonapartism

The congress system safeguarded Europe against the rise of anybody from Napoleons ruling family (Bonaparte dynasty). The congress powers ensured that the Bourbon monarchy that was restored to power by the Vienna congress was maintained as a bull work against the rise of Bonapartism in France. The admission of France in 1818 in the congress system was a strategy to reconcile with France as a nation, integrate her in Europe and sideline Bonapartism. This explains why the Bonaparte dynasty was kept out

Of European politics during the congress era much as Bonapartism was a vibrant political pressure group in France.

10. Preservation of constitutionalism in Europe

The congress system preserved the idea of constitutionalism in Europe. It maintained a constitutional system of monarchy that the Vienna settlement had restored in France. The congress powers prevailed upon the restored Bourbon rulers (Louis xviii and Charles x) to use the 1814 constitutional charter as a fundamental document in their leadership. The monarchy was also protected against Bonapartist threat by keeping Napoleon I at the island of St Hellena up to his death in 1821. Besides, the powers also honoured the constitutional changes that occurred in Naples in the aftermath of the 1820 revolution. The ruler of Monaco was also ordered at Aix-la Chapalle to reform his administration and adhere to constitutional system of leadership. All these helped to promote people's political rights and freedom against expected dictatorial tendencies in Europe.

11. Interstate co-operation

Interstate political and economic co-operation was maintained by the congress system. Freedom of navigation on all big waters like Mediterranean Sea and black sea that was achieved by the Vienna settlement was maintained. This preserved and promoted diplomatic co-operation, commercial prosperity and peace in Europe.

12. Peace

The congress system made a great achievement as an instrument of peace. The constant meetings from 1818 - 1822 kept the powers in touch and settled problems that would have caused war. This included the Swedish debt to Denmark, the question of the Jews, suppression of revolutions e.g. the 1820's revolutions in Spain and Naples and protection of legitimate rulers. By peacefully settling such disputes, the congress system

made Europe to enjoy a period of relative peace and stability for nearly 40 years. This explains why there were no major wars involving the great powers until the outbreak of the Crimean war in 1854.

13. Foundation for future international organizations/Consolidation of European diplomacy

The congress system laid foundation for the subsequent international organizations that maintained peace after deadly wars. It was the first international organization that was devised for the maintenance of peace. It therefore inspired the rise and existence of international organizations like the League of Nations that maintained peace after the First World War and the U.N.O that maintained peace up to 1970 and beyond. These organizations took lessons from the initiatives and examples of the congress system. Thus, the congress system should be credited for consolidating European diplomacy that had been initiated by the Vienna settlement of 1814-1815.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Weaknesses And Failures Of The Congress System

Isolation of France/secret diplomacy

Although France was admitted into the congress system, she was not fully trusted! The quadruple powers (Austria, Prussia, Russia and Britain) were still suspicious of France and decided to isolate her within the system. Consequently, they secretly renewed the Quadruple alliance that robbed the congress powers of harmonious relationship, which weakened the congress system.

2. Lack of a joint Army

The congress system lacked a joint army to enforce its decisions where negotiations could not work.

King Fredrick William III of Prussia had proposed that an international army be formed and stationed at Brussels to suppress revolutions. This idea was rejected by Castlereagh who argued that it would be interfering in the internal affairs of other states. This disagreement and lack of an army

weakened the congress system and left it almost as "a debating club". It left the idea of suppressing revolutions to individual states like France and Austria, which brought more antagonism with other powers most especially Britain.

3. Sea pirates in the Mediterranean Sea

The congressmen failed to handle sea pirates in the Mediterranean Sea yet it was a big obstacle to international trade. At the congress of Aix-Lachapalle, Tsar Alexander I of Russia proposed that a joint military operation on the Mediterranean Sea to stamp out sea pirates be conducted. This was outrightly rejected by Castlereagh who feared the presence of Russian warships in the Mediterranean Sea and considered it as a manifestation of Russian imperialism to dominate the sea. Thus, if the congress powers could fail to agree over such a sensitive matter, one wonders what concert of Europe was guiding European powers in the congress era.

4. Slave Trade

The congress system failed to handle the issue of slave trade. Castlereagh's proposal at Aix-Lachapalle to form a congress navy to monitor and search vessels carrying slaves was rejected by other powers.

They feared that it would give Britain that had the strongest navy, excessive powers of interference given that she was already interfering in the international affairs of other states. With all these suspicions and self-interests, one can conclude that the congress system was a failure.

5. Short Life Span

The congress powers failed to achieve their objective of remaining in a permanent alliance for 20 years. It should be noted that the quadruple powers had pledged to remain in a permanent alliance for a period of 20 years. This turned out to be theoretical than practical because the congress of St. Petersburg crowned the existence of the congress system. Thus, the inability of the congress system to survive beyond 1825 is a clear testimony that it failed to reach its target of 20 years.

6. Discrimination of small and weaker states

The congress system learnt nothing and forgot nothing from the Vienna congress. It remained an alliance of the big five (Austria, Russia, Prussia, Britain and France) from its formation in 1818 up to the end. The smaller nations were not part of it. The problems of the smaller states were ignored

and in most cases worsened by forcing them to remain under foreign powers. The system ignored the ideas of liberalism and Nationalism that led to instabilities in states like Italy, Germany, Belgium and Spain; this undermined the role of the congress system as an instrument of peace in Europe.

7. Protection of oppressive, dictatorial and exploitative rulers

By defending the Vienna principle of legitimacy, the congress system made people to suffer dictatorship, oppression and exploitation under the so-called legitimate rulers. Those rulers who were restored and protected pursued a policy of revenge on their subjects and became worst than ever before. For example, Ferdinand I of Naples and Ferdinand VII of Spain who were protected by the Austrian and French armies respectively became more dictatorial against their subjects. It's therefore not a surprise that none of them was on the throne by 1848.

8. The Greek revolt

The congress system failed to peacefully handle the Greek war of independence.

Tsar Nicholas I's overwhelming decision to assist the Greeks against Turkey made Britain and France to change their attitude and assist the Greeks. It was a calculated move to prevent Russia from acting alone because her unilateral assistance would have made her to dominate the independent state of Greece. This assistance was opposed by Austria and Prussia who supported Turkey in the war. Hence forth, the congress powers resorted to violence other than diplomacy in handling the Greek war of independence, which became a turning point that led to the end of the congress system.

NB. The congresses of Verona and St. Petersburg failed to resolve the question of the Greek war of independence. The issue brought a serious disagreement and exchange of "bad words" that broke the congress system into two i.e. supporters of the Greeks and Turkey.

9. The Spanish Revolution

The congress system failed to diplomatically settle the Spanish revolution. At the congress of Verona, Tsar Nicholas Ts proposal to send 15,000 Russian troops to suppress the revolution was vetoed/rejected by other powers. This is because it was considered as a manifestation of Russian hidden imperialistic ambition to conquer and dominate Europe. As Russia was

being restrained, France sent her troops, crushed the revolution and restored Ferdinand VII to his throne. This ejected Britain out of the congress system and George Canning proclaimed that; "Things are getting back to a wholesome state again. Every nation for itself and God for us all. Thank God, there will be no more congresses"

It should be noted that Britain was afraid that Ferdinand would reclaim the Spanish colonies in

America, which would jeopardize her trade with the colonies. This is why she supported the Monroe Doctrine that prohibited interference on American soil

10. Lack of clear principles and experience

Being the first international organization that was devised to maintain peace, the congress system lacked experience from where to learn lessons. This explains why it was not well structured with a clear program of action. That is why there was no written document on how meetings were to be called, where, when and the protocol to be followed. There was even no fixed chairperson and that is why anyone could call a congress anytime e.g. Ferdinand VII of Spain in 1824 over the revolution which was attended by nobody apart from 'himself'.

11. The Monroe doctrine

The congress system failed to challenge the Monroe Doctrine. In 1823 president Monroe of USA supported by Britain issued the famous Monroe doctrine which seriously warned the congress powers against any attempt to help Spain recover her colonies in S. America. Austria, Prussia, France and Russia who had decided to use the congress spirit to help assist Spain to recover her colonies cowardised and thus failed to challenge the Monroe Doctrine

12. Pre dominance of Metternich and conservatism

The congress system made Metternich and his outdated conservative ideas dominant in European politics. Metternich manipulated the Congress system to promote his conservative (Metternich) system and undermine the forces of liberalism and nationalism. It was opposed by Britain right from Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 and partly explains why Britain withdrew her membership from the congress system in 1823. It also set in a struggle by the liberals and nationalists against conservatives (supported by Metternich) that led to uprisings in Europe in the 1820's e.g. Spain, Naples, Greece etc.

This undermined the political, social and economic development of Europe during the congress era.

13. delayed the unifications of Italy and Germany

Like the Vienna settlement, the congress system is also blamed for delaying the unifications of Italy and Germany. It united the European powers defending the Vienna settlement that had given Austria control over Italians and Germans. It made Austria diplomatically strong and rendered it impossible for Italian and German nationalists to secure foreign assistance. At the Congress of Troppau, Austria, Russia and Prussia signed the Troppau Protocol in which they vowed to suppress revolutions in Europe. It's this that Austria used to suppress the revolution in Naples, hence frustrating the unification of Italy.

14. Selfish interest

The congress system was weakened by selfish national interests of its members. Each congress Power wanted to exploit the congress system to fulfill its own interest and had little concern for the interest of the other powers. For instance, Austria wanted to dominate Italians and Germans, Russia aimed at dominating the remains of Ottoman Empire, Britain wanted more colonies and France wanted to revive her influence in Europe. This explains why there was suspicion, mistrust, jealousy and unnecessary disagreements over sensitive issues like joint army, slave trade, pirates etc.

15. In-balance of power

The congress system is blamed for perpetuating (promoting) in-balance of power in Europe. From 1820, Austria, Prussia and Russia who had signed the Troppau protocol turned the congress system into an authoritative instrument for suppressing revolutions, which was opposed by France and Britain.

This tilted/changed the balance of power against France and Britain, which partly explain why Britain withdrew from the congress system in 1823. Even amongst the signatories of the Troppau protocol, Austria under Metternich exercised much influence over congress affairs than Prussia and Russia. It should be noted that Russia's assistance to rebellions such as the Greeks' was partly a protest to Metternich's domineering role in the congress system. Thus, the congress system failed to maintain the balance of power.

Attachments

No attachments



Factors For The Failure/Collapse Of The Congress System

By 1830, the congress system had failed to achieve its noble objectives and was already languishing in the dustbin of history. The factors for the downfall of the congress system were too varied and complex. They range from the selfish and divergent interests of the powers to the absence of an agreed principle of political faith and the social developments of a new Europe against conservative forces leave alone the emergence of new and inexperienced leaders.

1. Self interest of the congress powers

The congress system was doomed from the onset due to conflicting aims of its participants. It was a combination of different states with different aims and objectives that became a source of mistrust, suspicion, jealousy and conflicts amongst the powers. This was because each power wanted to satisfy its national interest and refused to sacrifice it for the sake of common interest. Austria wanted to use the congress system to dominate the Italians and Germans and expand her empire, to central Europe.

Prussia wanted to annex Saxony and the Grand Duchy of war-saw. Russia aimed at dominating the remains of the Ottoman Empire. Britain needed more colonies to promote her trade and France wanted fair treatment and a revival of her influence over Europe. These explains why there were disagreements and lack of consensus over sensitive issues like a joint army, pirates, slave trade, Spanish revolt and colonies and the Greek war of independence. Each power was motivated by selfish interest that dug a political grave for the congress system.

NB. Britain rejected the formation of an army to suppress revolutions because she was a liberal country and wanted to maintain her policy of isolation let alone wasting taxpayer's money and men in suppressing such movements. She also vetoed the proposal to deal with pirates because the pirates feared the union jack and British ships. Other powers reacted by throwing a way British proposals to deal with slave traders because it would give Britain that had the strongest navy excessive powers of interference. Britain again resisted the suppression of Spanish revolution and the

restoration of Ferdinand because it would undermine her booming trade in the area.

Russia assisted the Greeks because of the need to dominate the remains of the Ottoman Empire.

Britain saw that Russia's assistance would jeopardize her commercial and strategic interests in the region and decided to join Russia. France also realized that Russia's assistance would jeopardize her religious claims over Greek Christians and decided also to assist the Greeks. Austria and Prussia saw that Russia's intervention would increase her influence in the Balkans and threaten their survival and interest. These forced Prussia and Austria to oppose the Greek war of independence. Thus, self interest scattered the congress powers in different and opposite direction that became a countdown for its downfall.

2. Admission of France (1818)

The admission of France in the congress system was a blessing in disguise that contributed to the collapse of the system. The congress system was partly formed to safeguard against further French aggression and the return of Napoleon to power. The admission of France in 1818 destroyed the possibility of French aggression and the death of Napoleon in 1821 erased the fear of his return to power. These two events undermined the co-operation and unity amongst the allies most especially Britain who decided to concentrate on her own internal problems. Castlereagh made this clear on May 5th 1820 in his "State paper" where he stated that Britain was only committed to preventing the return of Napoleon I or his dynasty to France. Furthermore, France was never fully trusted and was isolated within the congress powers. This robbed the powers of the unity, co-operation and harmony upon which the system was to survive.

3. Principle of intervention

The principle of intervention in the internal affairs of other states alienated Britain from the congress system and paved way for its demise. Britain opposed this right from 1818 up to the end of the system, inspite of British opposition, Austria, Prussia and Russia signed the Troppau protocol of 1820 in which they pledged to intervene militarily against revolutions. This drifted Britain apart and Castlereagh branded the protocol "a destitute of common sense". Britain opposed French intervention in Spain and withdrew from the congress system at the congress of Verona. This was the last kick to the downfall of the congress system.

4. The Monroe Doctrine

The Monroe Doctrine was yet another blow to the existence of the congress system. In Dec 1823, president Monroe of U.S.A proclaimed the doctrine which threatened war against the planned move by the congress powers to restore Spanish colonies in South America. He was supported by George Canning of Britain who was afraid that such a move would undermine British trade with South American colonies. It defeated the principle of intervention and forced Austria, Prussia, France and Russia to back down. Henceforth, the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 created more antagonism between Britain against other congress powers, thus rolling the congress system to its grave.

5. The Vienna Settlement

The Vienna settlement laid a very weak foundation for the congress system that made its collapse a foregone conclusion. The congress system was to maintain the Vienna settlement, which unfortunately had enforced very unrealistic principles. These were for instance, the principles of legitimacy, balance of power and defensive arrangements against the principle of nationalism. It should be stressed that the principle of legitimacy made the Vienna peacemakers to restore some of the worst rulers Europe ever had. This created a viscous cycle of revolts like against Ferdinand I of Naples and Ferdinand VII of Spain. These revolts created more conflicts and antagonism amongst the congress powers. This is because other powers preferred intervention which was bitterly opposed by Britain. The end result was the end of the congress system.

6. Discrimination against small states

Discrimination against small states was a fundamental, weakness that led to the downfall of the congress system. It was dominated by the "big^ five" at the expense of smaller states yet they would have reduced the differences between the big powers. Consequently, the system failed to capture European public opinion and no wonder that it was branded "a league of despots" for the suppression of revolutions and nationalism in the smaller states. The congress system therefore became a narrow association of the big powers against smaller states which met stiff opposition from the smaller states hence its collapse.

7. Lack of Experience

Inexperience also accounts for the disintegration of the congress system. The system was the first international organization that was designed to

maintain peace. The congress powers therefore lacked experience from any previous attempts from which it could have learnt lessons and avoided various weaknesses that made the system to collapse. This partly explains why the congressmen tried to rewind Europe to the pre 1789 order that became a total disaster. It should be noted that the League of Nations and the U.N.O learnt lessons from previous organizations and this partly explains why they existed for so long. The congress system was experimental or on trial and error and no wonder that it collapsed within less than 10 years.

8. Lack of clear principles and protocol

The congress system failed partly because it was a disorganized organization with no clear principles and protocol. There was no memorandum on how meetings were to be called, where, when and the procedure to be followed in such meetings. There was even no fixed chairperson and this explains why anybody could call a congress anytime. Besides, there was no penalty for those who would wish to withdraw and this explains why Britain easily pulled out of the system in 1820.

9. Lack of a joint army and a resolution enforcing organ

The congress system was doomed by its failure to organize a governing body and "a congress peace keeping force" to implement its resolutions. Besides, there was no court of justice that could have punished those who violated the objectives of the system. For instance, France, Britain and Russia who diverted and supported liberal and nationalistic movements like in Greece would have been brought to book. If the court of justice was there, it could have saved the concert of Europe from disintegration through strict enforcement to the norms and principles of the congress system. Similarly, a joint force would have enforced the resolutions of the congress system where diplomacy could not be viable. The absence of a joint force undermined the strength of the congress system and made it more theoretical than practical which accounted for its collapse.

10. The Greek war of Independence.

The Greek war of independence was the last blow to the existence of the congress system. The Greeks revolted demanding for their independence against Turkey. The war became an event amongst others where the divergent interest of the major powers converged and hastened the collapse of the congress system. It divided the congress powers into two i.e. Britain, France and Russia who supported the Greeks and Prussia and Austria who sympathized and hence supported Turkey. In 1827, Russia,

Britain and France signed the London treaty that recognized the independence of Greece amidst protest from Austria and Prussia. This gave the congress system that had died in 1825 an unceremonial burial.

11. Death of founder members and the rise/role of new men.

The Death of some of the pioneers of the congress system and the rise of new men without parental care for the system was a serious setback for the survival of the system. Castlereagh died a suicidal death in 1822 and was replaced by George Canning. George Canning unlike Castlereagh was too aggressive and uncooperative to the ideas of collective action. He refused to neither attend nor send a representative to the 1823 congress over Spanish colonies and the 1825 congress over the Greek war of independence. This frustrated diplomatic solutions to the revolts and left it for a violent solution that divided the powers. It was the same Canning who withdrew Britain from the congress system in 1825 and embarked on a policy of "every nation for itself and God for us all". This individualistic tendency did not spare the congress system.

In Russia, Tsar Alexander I died in 1825 and was replaced by Tsar Nicholas II. Tsar Nicholas II had a more aggressive and expansionist foreign policy over the Balkans. He was too confident in Russia's military might that he felt insulted to be restrained in foreign ventures. Nicholas' imperialistic ambitions made Britain and France to turn round and support liberal movements such as the Greek revolt. This was against the norms and principles of the congress system and betrayed the system to doom.

In France, Charles X succeeded Louis XVIII in 1824, Unlike Louis XVIII, Charles X was pro-British and very often against Metternich. He consistently cooperated with George Canning like in the Greek war that left Metternich isolated and annoyed.

All in all, George Canning, Tsar Nicholas I and Charles X carried the congress system to its final rest because unlike the founders, they had no parental fondness and love for it. They had not participated in its formation and its existence meant little to them. Unlike Metternich, the new leaders were inexperienced and had a narrow/limited knowledge of European affairs prior to and after the congress system.

12. The British policy of Isolationism and non Intervention

Britain was primarily responsible for the downfall of the congress system. She pursued a policy of Isolation (non-interventionist foreign policy). This was to

avoid pocket touching matters (unnecessary expenses), loss of British citizens in areas of no interest and parliamentary outcry in case of failures.

These made Britain/Castlereagh to veto important congress revolutions like checking pirates on the Mediterranean Sea and the formation of a joint force right from Aix-Lachapalle in 1818. This was very unfortunate for the congress system because it was Britain who championed the defeat of Napoleon I.

Her role was therefore paramount in the reconstruction of post Napoleonic era and the survival of the congress system thereafter.

Secondly, Britain sympathized and offered moral and logistical support to liberal and nationalistic movements like in Spain, Naples, Greece, German and Italian states. This was against the principles and interest of the congress system. Indeed, the British official policy was made clear by Castlereagh in his lengthy State paper, thus;

.....Britain owed her present dynasty and constitution to an internal revolution. She could not therefore deny to other countries the same

right of changing their form of government (Grant and Temperleys pp/142 - 143).

Britain therefore opposed the idea of suppressing revolutions right from Aix-Lachapalle. This is why she rejected the Troppau protocol which Castlereagh called "a destitute of common sense". This drifted Britain apart from Russia, Austria and Prussia hence the collapse of the congress system.

Thirdly, Britain allied with U.S.A. against Austria, Russia and Prussia over the issue of Spanish colonies.

She overwhelmingly supported the Monroe doctrine against other powers who wanted to intervene over the issue of Spanish colonies. This left the rest of the congress powers hopeless and defeated the principle of intervention.

Fourthly, it was Britain through Canning (the British foreign secretary from 1822) who "killed" the congress system. Britain declined to send a representative to a congress that was called by the Spanish king over the Spanish colonies. She also refused to attend the congress of St. Petersburg that was called by Tsar Nicholas I to settle the Greek war of independence. This frustrated Russian's intentions to diplomatically settle the Greek question and gave way for war that divided the powers.

Fifthly, it was Britain who officially withdrew from the congress system in 1823. George Canning was angered by the French intervention in Spain and withdrew British membership of the congress system at the congress of Verona. Thereafter, Britain under Canning resorted to the policy of every nation for itself and God for us all". This was the actual disintegration of the congress system.

Lastly, Britain had profound hatred and dislike for Russia and Austria. She hated Russia for her imperialism over the Balkans and the Mediterranean Sea, which was a threat to her commercial interest.

She was against Austria because Austria and Metternich had centralized European affairs in their favour.

Canning wanted European affairs to be centralized and settled in London than Vienna or Austria. In other words Britain wanted to hijack the balance of power to favour her. Therefore, one can safely conclude that Britain's hatred for Russia and Austria robbed the congress powers of any harmonious relationship or mutual co-existence and led to its collapse.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Contributions/ Role Of European Powers In The Dowfall Of The Congress System

1) Britain (Lord Stewart Castlereagh and George Canning)

1) Britain was primarily responsible for the collapse of the congress system. She pursued a policy of isolation from continental obligations i.e. non interventionist foreign policy. The policy was to avoid unnecessary expenses, loss of her citizens in suppressing revolutions and negative public opinion in case of failures. The policy was unfortunate for the congress system because it was Britain that played the greatest role in the dawn fall of Napoleon and her role in the post Napoleonic re-organization of Europe was therefore of paramount importance. Above all, Britain was the most politically stable state and the greatest economic and military power in Europe. The British isolation therefore denied the congress system of her enormous economic resources and military power that could have improved the capacity of the congress system to meet its challenges. Her

isolation gave Metternich an added advantage to impose his conservative, anti-liberal and nationalistic policies on Europe against smaller states. This led to the outbreak of revolutionary movements in 1820's that destabilized Europe and divided the Congress powers, thus leading to the downfall of the congress system.

ii). Britain is blamed for her moral and logistical support to liberal and nationalistic movements in Greece, Spain, Naples, Argentina, Italian and German states. Being a liberal and democratic state where respect for fundamental human rights and freedom were adhered to, Britain did not see any sense in suppressing revolutions that were intended to overthrow oppressive, exploitative and tyrannical leaders. Lord Castlereagh made it very clear in his state paper which was published in 1820 that:

... Britain owed her present dynasty and constitution to an internal revolution. She could not therefore deny to other countries the same right of changing their form of government (Grant and Temperleys, PP 142 - 143).

This explains why Britain opposed the idea of suppressing revolutions right from the Congress of

Aix-la-Chapelle as interference in to the internal affairs of other nations. It antagonized Britain with Austria, Prussia and Russia who favoured the policy of suppressing revolutions hence the collapse of the Congress system.

iii). Britain supported the Monroe doctrine against the interest of other congress powers. In Dec 1823, President Monroe of America issued the famous Monroe doctrine in which he warned other powers against intervention on American affairs especially on matters related to the Spanish colonies.

George Canning of Britain overwhelmingly supported the doctrine against Russia, France, Prussia and Austria who had declared their intension to help Spain recover her colonies that she had lost as a result of the 1823 revolution. Besides, Britain threatened to fight any power that would cross the Atlantic Ocean to South America be it in Spain or France irrespective of the motive. This left the rest of the congress powers frustrated, defeated the principle of intervention, and tore the congress system further apart.

iv). George Canning of Britain officially withdrew British membership of the congress system in 1823.

Britain was committed to alliance system mainly to safeguard her commercial interest against French and Napoleonic aggressions. This

threat ended with the defeat of Napoleon and admission of France in the congress system, leaving Britain uncommitted to congress affairs thereafter. The French intervention in Spain in 1823 gave George Canning the opportunity to officially withdraw British membership to the congress system at the congress of Verona. He considered the French restoration of Ferdinand VII to his throne in Spain as "... an affront to the pride of England," He further commented that: The issue of Verona has split the one and indivisible alliance and so things are getting back to a whole some state again, every nation for itself and God for us all.

He concluded that "Praise God that there would be no more Congresses" and resorted to the policy of every nation for itself and God for us all. This was the practical disintegration of the congress system.

v). After withdrawing from the congress system, Britain declined to review her policy. She refused to participate in the 1824 congress that was called by Ferdinand VII of Spain to settle the issue of

Spanish colonies, which made the intended congress to abort. She also declined to attend the 1825 congress of St. Petersburg that was called by Tsar Nicholas I to settle the question of the Greek struggle for independence. This frustrated Russian intension to peacefully address the question of Greek independence and gave opportunity for escalation of violence that left European powers more divided.

vi). Britain openly rejected the Troppau protocol that was declared by Austria, Prussia and Russia. In 1820, the three powers at the congress of Troppau passed the Troppau protocol in which they pledged to suppress revolutions whenever and wherever they occurred. Lord Stewart Castlereagh argued that such a measure would frustrate genuine internal struggle to overthrow oppressive, exploitative and autocratic rulers. He was so furious when he addressed the British parliament that he sarcastically declared the protocol "a destitute of common sense" and argued the concerned powers to confine the congress system within the limits of common sense. This weakened the principle of intervention and provoked liberal and nationalistic revolutions in smaller states that became a challenge leading to the downfall of the Congress System.

vii). Britain had long term negative feelings and hatred for Russia and Austria. She disliked Russia for her imperialism in the Middle East and the Mediterranean Sea because it threatened her commercial interest. She hated Austria because Metternich had dominated Europe and centralized European affairs in Vienna. George Canning wanted European affairs to

be centralized and settled in London than Vienna (Austria). In other words, Canning wanted to hijack the balance of power from Austria in order to consolidate British supremacy in European affairs. The British preconceived hatred and negative feelings against Russia and Austria led to unnecessary disagreements involving her and other powers such as the issues of joint army, piracy, slave trade, Spanish revolution and Greek independence. It thus led to mistrust, suspicion and disharmony that doomed the Congress system.

viii). Britain was a big force behind the Vienna congress which laid a poor foundation for the congress system. The congress unfairly restored the most oppressive and dictatorial rulers and undermined the forces of liberalism and nationalism of the smaller states. She was also a signatory of the quadruple alliance that set foundation for discrimination of the smaller states. Above all, Britain manipulated the Congress to gain too much territory to the annoyance of Russia and Prussia.

These became a very weak foundation on which the congress system was built and thus contributed to its eventual collapse.

ix). The British selfish desire to safeguard her economic interest ejected her out of the Congress system. She had a hidden agenda of using the congress system to protect her trade zone and acquire more territories for her merchants. However, her interest in the Middle East and

Mediterranean Sea was threatened by Russian imperialism and influence in the area. This left

Britain that had initially opposed the Greek war of independence to turn round and support the Greeks alongside Russia when she noted that the success of the struggle was inevitable. She did this because Russia's assistance in establishing a new Greek state on the map of Europe would be a serious setback to her commercial interest in the Middle East and Mediterranean Sea. She also supported the Monroe doctrine and warned other powers not to cross the Atlantic Ocean to suppress the revolution in Spain because her trade with Latin American states had drastically improved since Ferdinand YD was ousted from power. Thus, British selfish economic interest conflicted with common interest that the congress system was to promote leading to its down fall by 1825.

x). Britain opposed and vetoed the idea of forming a Joint international army at the congress of Aix -La Chapelle in 1818. Fredrick William III of Prussia had proposed the formation of a joint army based in Brussels to suppress

revolutions, Lord Castlereagh rejected it that it would amount to interfering in the internal affairs of other states. It left the congress system without a force to implement its resolutions, which encouraged smaller states like Italy, Spain, Naples and Greece to wage a struggle for their freedom without fear. Absence of a joint army weakened the congress system and made it more theoretical than practical hence accounting for its downfall.

xi) Lastly, Britain's desire to safeguard her naval supremacy, also contributed to the downfall of the congress system. At the congress of Aix - La Chapelle (1818), Tsar Alexander I of Russia suggested a joint military operation in the Mediterranean Sea to fight Sea pirates. This was outright rejected by Castlereagh who feared that the presence of Russian warships in the Mediterranean sea would be a big challenge to her naval supremacy and monopoly of the sea. It should be noted that pirates were not a big threat to Britain because they feared and respected British ships contrary to those of other powers.

This therefore left a legacy of suspicion and intense bitterness in other powers against Britain that made the collapse of the congress system inevitable.

2. Austria (Francis II and Prince Metternich)

i). Austria hosted the Vienna congress that laid a shaky foundation, which led to the collapse of the congress system. Prince Metternich who chaired the congress manipulated the congress to restore unpopular legitimate rulers and maintained them by suppressing revolutionary movements against them. He also influenced the congress to undermine nationalistic and liberal feelings of the smaller states by subjecting them to foreign domination. This consolidated conservatism and led to the outbreak of liberal and nationalistic revolutions that undermined the Congress system. Besides, Metternich's desire to maintain Austria's supremacy and Vienna as the diplomatic theatre of Europe angered Britain and partly influenced George Canning to withdraw Britain's membership from the congress system.

ii) Austria is blamed for her imperialism and domination of the smaller states. She used the Vienna congress to dominate European affairs and smaller states e.g. Italians and Germans. It promoted imbalance of power that other powers did not admire. Her domination of the smaller states triggered nationalistic protests such as the 1820's revolts in Naples and Piedmont that divided the congress powers. It should be stressed that Austria's suppression of such revolts and restoration of ousted kings was authorized by the

congress of Laibach (1822) amidst British opposition, which partly influenced Britain to pull out of the congress system by 1823.i

iii) Austria was influential in issuing the 1820 Troppau Protocol in which Prussia, Russia and herself vowed to suppress revolutions and restore ousted kings in Europe. The spread of liberalism and nationalism was a formidable threat to the heterogeneous Austrian empire as they would trigger nationalistic movements that could break the empire into pieces. This background made her influence Prussia and Russia to issue the Troppau protocol, which Britain rejected out rightly and France accepted with reservations. This widened the gap between liberal countries (Britain and France) Vis-a Vis conservative states (Prussia, Russia and Austria), thus leading to the collapse of the congress system.

iv) Austria's conservative ideology dragged her to oppose the granting of the Greek independence. She supported Turkish autocratic rule over the Greeks and opposed the Greek struggle for freedom from the congress of Verona up to the end of the congress system. It brought her into conflict with Russia, Britain and France who assisted the Greeks to attain their independence. This explains why no more congress was held after the heated debate at the congress of St. Petersburg where Austria and Prussia protested to Russian, British and French assistance to the Greeks.

v)Austria is also blamed for her opposition to the formation of a joint naval force to right slave dealers.

Castleragh proposed this idea at the congress of Aix - Lachapalle in 1818 but Austria rejected it on suspicion that it would give Britain more power to support revolutionary movements in other states.

This undermined the spirit of cooperation and togetherness that was essential for the survival of the congress system.

vi).Austrian influence through the Metternich system made the downfall of the congress system inevitable. Metternich manipulated the congress system to consolidate Austria's supremacy, promote conservatism and suppress the revolutionary forces of liberty, equality and fraternity. He used the congress system to enhance his oppressive anti; liberal and nationalistic policies of press censorship, spy net work, divide and rule, force etc. This could not be tolerated after the rise of Charles X in France, George Canning in Britain and Tsar Nicholas I in Russia. These new generations of leaders were opposed to conservative Metternich policies and influence over the congress system. No wonder that they sympathized and supported

liberal struggles such as in Greece against Metternich's expectation. This killed the congress spirit and brought the congress system to an end.

3. Russia (Tsar Alexander 1, 1801-1825, and Tsar Nicholas 1, 1825-1855)

Russia was part of the unrealistic Vienna Congress and the Troppau Protocol that consolidated

Metternich's conservatism against the forces of liberalism and nationalism. The Vienna Congress discriminated small states and restored oppressive and unpopular kings to their thrones. The 1820 Troppau protocol brought Russia, Austria and Prussia in alliance to defend oppressive rulers that Britain rejected and France accepted reluctantly. All these led to tension in Europe and undermined the congress system leading to its downfall.

Russia's imperial ambitions in the Balkans were also responsible for the downfall of the congress system. Her desire to take control of the Balkans by supporting nationalistic movements brought her into logger heads with Austria and Britain. Austria protested such support because it would spark off nationalistic movements within her heterogeneous empire. Britain objected because it would undermine her commercial interest in the Middle East. Thus, Russian imperialism in the Balkans threatened the interest of other powers and brought disharmony that led to the downfall of the congress system.

iii). Russia was the first power to support the Greek war of independence, which is an event that accelerated the downfall of the congress system. She incited the Greeks against Turkey and proceeded to support them militarily. Although Britain and France initially opposed Russia's secret assistance to the Greeks, Russia's continued assistance and the high prospects of Greek success made them to change their mind and join Russia to assist the Greeks. This was a desperate measure by Britain to safeguard her economic interest and France to safeguard her religious motives against Russia's threatening influence. On the other hand, Austria and Prussia opposed such assistance including the granting of independence to the Greeks. Thus, Russia's support to the Greeks divided the congress powers into two and caused its collapse.

iv.) Russia's ambitions to challenge Britain's naval supremacy brought disharmony between her and Britain. She provoked Britain's suspicion by stationing her warships in the Mediterranean Sea. Tsar Alexander I went ahead at the congress of Aix - La Chapelle to propose the formation of a joint force to fight pirates in the Mediterranean Sea. This was rejected by

Lord Stewart Castlereagh as a move to strengthen Russian influence in the Mediterranean Sea in order to challenge Britain's supremacy.

Indeed, British suspicion to Russia's challenge to her naval superiority was too deep rooted that she could not accept her (Russia's) noble call to fight pirates that was a common threat to trade across the Mediterranean Sea.

v) The death of Tsar Alexander I in 1825 led to the rise of Tsar Nicholas I whose attitude and policies buried the congress system. Tsar Nicholas I was too proud, arrogant and confident in Russia's military strength that he felt insulted to be restrained in his foreign policy. He developed a more aggressive and interventionist foreign policy that was reflected in his determination to assist the Greeks against Turkey. Besides his inexperience and narrow/little knowledge of European affairs, Tsar Nicholas I was not one of the historical founders of the Congress system and thus cared little for its existence. His character and support of the Greeks was seriously protested by Prussia and Austria at the congress of St. Petersburg and ended in total confusion. This destroyed the congress spirit and there were no more congress held thereafter.

4. Prussia (Fredrick William III)

i) Prussia is blamed for being a signatory to the Vienna settlement and the Troppau protocol. The Vienna resolutions and the Troppau protocol consolidated conservatism and undermined the spirit of liberalism and nationalism in Europe. The principle of intervention that Prussia supported in the protocol was unacceptable to Britain and small powers that were oppressed. It brought liberal and nationalistic protests that divided the congress powers leading to the disintegration of the congress system.

ii). Fredrick William III joined other powers in opposing Castlereagh's proposal for a joint operation to stop slave trade at the congress of Aix - La - Chapalle. This left Castlereagh frustrated and partly forced her to resort to her usual policy of isolation that led to the collapse of the congress system.

iii). Prussia opposed the Greek war of independence and the granting of Greek independence. This brought her into conflict with Russia, Britain and France who were assisting the Greeks to regain their independence. Prussia allied with Austria and stood against supporting the Greeks and the granting of Greek independence at the congress of St. Petersburg that made the congress to end in total chaos.

5. France (Louis XVIII, 1814-1824 and Charles X, 1824-1830)

i). France was the source of revolutionary ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity. These ideas were consolidated by Napoleonic influence on Europe and led to the rise of the spirit of liberalism and nationalism in Europe. They led to the outbreak of revolutions such as the 1820's movements in Spain, Naples and Greece. This brought conflict between the congress powers hence leading to the downfall of the congress system.

ii). The admission of France in the congress system at the congress of Aix - La- Chapelle in 1818 contributed to the downfall of the congress system. It brought reconciliation between France and other powers and ended the danger of French aggression in Europe. It undermined the unity of purpose and the spirit of togetherness that had brought European powers together in defense against revolutionary and Napoleonic aggressions. It also provided Britain with an opportunity to concentrate on her own internal problems and pursue the policy of splendid isolation. Besides, France was not fully trusted and thus treated with suspicion by the quadruple powers most especially Russia. This undermined the spirit of trust, cooperation, harmony and unity that led to the downfall of the congress system.

iii). France is blamed for getting entangled in the Greek war of independence alongside Britain and Russia. As a great Christian state, France felt that Russian's unilateral assistance to the Greeks would make her dominant in the Balkans and jeopardize her religious interest. It is this that drove her to join Russia and Britain to assist the Greeks. This move was however protested by Prussia and Austria leading to the collapse of the congress system.

iv). It was Bishop Talleyrand, the French representative at the Vienna Congress who initiated the unrealistic principle of legitimacy. Richelieu, the French representative in the congress system continued to advocate for the restoration and maintenance of dictatorial, oppressive and conservative kings in Europe. It left the congress system as an alliance to promote conservatism, oppression and exploitation of the smaller states. This earned the congress system enormous unpopularity that could not make it exist beyond 1825.

Louis XVI's suppression of the Spanish revolution and restoration of Ferdinand to his throne is what ejected Britain out of the congress system. By 1823, Spanish revolutionaries had overthrown Ferdinand VII from his throne. At the congress of Verona in 1822, Britain objected to any attempt to restore Ferdinand VII to his throne. However, France was permitted by other powers to suppress the revolution and restore Ferdinand back to his

throne, which she accomplished in 1823. George Canning Was so disturbed by the French action that he lamented:

The issue of Spain has split the one and indivisible alliance and so things are getting back to a whole same state again, every nation for itself and God for us all.

He consequently withdrew Britain from the congress system that became the biggest blow, which led to the down fall of the congress system.

6. USA (President Monroe)

President Monroe of USA issued the famous Monroe doctrine that split the congress powers and led to the downfall of the congress system. On December 1823, he issued the doctrine where he warned that any interference by European powers on American soil would be regarded " as manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States". (H.L Peacock, A history of modern Europe, 7th ' Edition p. 89).This defeated the Troppau protocol and the principle of intervention that Austria, Prussia, Russia and France wanted to use to restore Ferdinand VII to his throne. It was fully supported by Britain against other congress powers hence splitting the congress powers and enhancing the downfall of the congress system.

Spain (Ferdinand VII)

Ferdinand VII is blamed for his exploitative, oppressive and tyrannical rule that triggered a revolution, which divided the congress powers. Besides, Spain had imperial influence in Latin America.

However; Spanish revolutionaries overthrew him and his colonies in America regained their independence. The issue brought a heated disagreement at the congress of Verona where Britain vehemently opposed the attempt by other powers to restore Ferdinand to his throne. When France went ahead to restore Ferdinand to his throne in 1823, George Canning pulled Britain out of the congress system. He later supported the Monroe doctrine that scared the congress powers, from suppressing the revolution in Spain and restoring Ferdinand VII to his throne. This became a big challenge to the principle of intervention and contributed to the downfall of the congress system.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Chronological Time Frame Of Significant events (The Vienna Settlement And Congress System)

1814: 9th March, The treaty of Chamount

30th May, The first Paris peace treaty.

1814-1815, The congress of Vienna.

1815: 9th June, The Vienna treaty.

Holy and Quadruple alliances (Sept and Nov respectively)

20th Nov, The second Paris peace treaty.

The holy alliance championed by Tsar Alexander I

Renewal of the treaty of Chamount

Formation of the quadruple alliance by Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia.

1815-1830, Union of Belgium and Holland to form Netherlands

1818: The congress of Aixla Chapelle

Formation of the quintuple alliance of Britain, Austria, Russia, Prussia and France.

Withdrawal of allied army of occupation from France.

Formation of the Zollverein or customs union by Prussia.

1820: 5th May, Castlereagh's state paper

Oct, The congress of Troppau and the Troppau protocol

1821: Jan, The congress of Laibach

1822: Oct, The congress of Verona

1825: The congress of St Petersburg

Attachments

No attachments



Background:

After the defeat of Napoleon and his 1st exile to the land of Elba (1814), the Vienna Congress powers restored the Bourbon monarchy in France under Louis Stanislaus Xavier de France who took the title Louis

XVIII. This was in accordance to the principle of legitimacy by which rightful rulers were to be restored to their legitimate thrones. Louis XVIII was 60 years and was the eldest brother of King Louis XVI who was executed in Jan 1793.

Louis XVIII was both intellectually and by character suitable to be a king. He had a lot of common sense and had learnt a lot from the French revolution and Napoleonic era. He was aware of the faults of his brother that caused his death. He had suffered enough in exile and would never wish to go back. He therefore stood for a policy of compromise and reconciliation between the new and old order in France.

However on 1st march 1815, Napoleon escaped from Elba and landed in Paris with 1100 men. He received overwhelming ovation and support from the peasants. The soldiers sent to engage him fraternized when he dimply moved forward, opened his coat and asked, "Which of you will fire against his emperor"? This event forced Louis XVIII to flee to exile once again and Napoleon ruled for 100 more days the allies, who had suffered in the hands of Napoleon, reorganized themselves and defeated Napoleon at the battle of Waterloo on 18th June 1815. Louis XVIII returned from exile with a charter to rule as a constitutional king. The support by the French men to Napoleon showed Louis XVIII that the Bourbon monarchy was no longer fashionable in France. He therefore, had no desire to revenge against the supporters of the previous governments. Although he would have like to enjoy life as it was in the old days, he had learnt that the good old days were no more and he was able to let bygones be bygones. He was therefore ready to accommodate the revolutionary and Napoleonic gains and accepted to rule by the provisions o f the constitutional charter provided by the Vienna peacemakers of 1815.

However, Louis XVIII was too old, ugly, sickly and died in 1824. He was replaced by his brother Comte De-Artois who self styled himself Charles X. Charles X's unrealistic policies shortened the reign of the restored Bourbon monarchy and in July 1830, it was overthrown by yet another revolution.

As already noted, the restored Bourbons were not to be absolute monarchs but constitutional ones. This was provided by the victorious allies in 1814 and

became known as the 1814 constitutional charter. It provided for the following amongst others:-

- i. Freedom of speech, association, worship and ownership of property.
- ii. Equality before the law and trial by Jury.
- iii. Parliamentary democracy with two chambers i.e. Chambers of peers and Deputies.
- iv. Equality of all forms of opportunities be it in civil, military or public works.
- V. Permanent ownership of land and property acquired during the 1789 revolution.
- vi. The king alone was the head of the administration, army and had the right to conclude treaties and prepare the bill to be debated in both houses.
- vii. The white flag was considered the national flag.

The significance of the charter was that it recognized the revolutionary and Napoleonic gains in France e.g. equality in all circles, freedom of worship, code Napoleon, concordat etc.

The charter was also not oblivious (unaware) of the principle of divine rights of kings .It was not imposed by the people on the king. It was passed over by the king to the people as a matter of grace and conferred upon him powers over the army, parliament and foreign affairs. The charter was intended to be; a treaty of peace between two parties into which France has been divided, a treaty by which both parties yield some of their pretensions in order to work together for the good of their country.

This constitution was provided in good faith to make the Bourbon monarchy comfortable in a dynamic and revolutionary France. However as time went on, the restored Bourbons violated the charter and pursued unrealistic policies against the interests of the Frenchmen and the European big powers. This shows that they learnt nothing and forgot nothing from the French revolution and Napoleon.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Achievements Of Louis XVIII (1815 -1824)

1. King Louis XVIII was less despotic. He maintained a parliamentary system of government and tried to abide by the provisions of the constitutional charter of 1814. This helped to cool down the French revolutionaries and Napoleonic supporters whose fear was that the restored Bourbon monarchy would revive the despotic and undemocratic pre 1789 system of rule. His acceptance of the 1814 constitutional charter also won him diplomatic recognition from the Great powers especially Britain. All these helped to consolidate the rule of the restored Bourbon monarchy in a dynamic and revolutionary France.
2. Louis XVIII succeeded in paying off the war indemnity that had been imposed on France after the downfall of Napoleon I. At the 2nd Paris peace treaty of 20th Nov 1815, the victor powers imposed a huge war indemnity of 700 million francs on France. King Louis XVI cleared off the whole indemnity within only three (3) years. This made the victorious powers to withdraw the army of occupation from France in 1818 at the congress of Aix La Chapelle.
3. Louis XVIII restored the greatness of France in Europe. France had been in a hostile relationship with Europe right from the revolutionary government through the reign of Napoleon I. However in 1818, Richelieu, the French representative at the congress of Aix La Chapelle advocated for the admission of France in the congress system. This was accepted and France was admitted in the congress system, which ended her isolation amongst the great powers of Europe. This meant that France under Louis XVIII was still a great power to reckon with in European politics.
4. Louis XVIII succeeded in reorganizing and re- equipping the French army under military genius of Marshall Cyr. The French military apparatus and army were completely disorganized by the allied forces that defeated Napoleon. Louis XVIII improved the military position of France by recruiting young Frenchmen into the army and re- deploying old generals. Furthermore, the ministry of Duke de- Decazes (1818-1820), a liberal army law was passed that provided for on merit and voluntary recruitment.
5. Economically, during Villeles' ministry (1821 - 1827), high import duties were adopted to protect home industries from competition. Financial re-organization that was begun by Napoleon I was also successfully accomplished. This helped to restore some degree of financial stability of an economy that had been destroyed by war for over two decades.

6. Louis XVIII was realistic and was not ready to tamper with the achievements of the French Revolution and its heir Napoleon. These included trial by jury and the code Napoleon. He tried to restrain the ultra royalists in their quest for revenge (The white terror). This is why he granted amnesty for the victims of ultra-royalist quest for revenge who had not yet been compromised. All that Louis XVIII wanted was peaceful co-existence between the past revolutionaries and the royalists as he said that, I will not be a king of two people.

7. In his foreign policy, Louis XVIII recorded success when he suppressed the Spanish revolts in 1823 and restored Ferdinand VII to power. This earned him and France glory and prestige showing that he had not learnt nothing and forgotten nothing of how adventurous the French men were.

However, he failed to help Ferdinand VII and Spain to recover the Spanish American colonies due to opposition from Britain and President Monroe of the United States of America nevertheless; he had succeeded in re-establishing the Bourbon dynasty in Spain,

Lastly, Louis XVIII succeeded in his reconciliation policy. He avoided to completely adopt the ultra royalist programs and even warned his brother Charles X about it on the eve of his death. He sided with moderate ultra-royalists. Louis also created a strong solidarity with some former revolutionaries and Napoleon's supporters. For example, he appointed Napoleon's former ministers like Fochi to his cabinet. This brought harmony after the white terror showing that he had learnt something from the reign of terror during the course of the French Revolution.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Weaknesses Of King Louis XVIII

Although Louis XVI had realized that the best way to rule France was through a constitutional charter, he failed to hide his monarchical hang over. He still considered himself as a king by the grace of God other than by the will of the people. He regarded the charter simply as a gift that he was to use according to his wishes. This showed that Louis had not learnt enough

lessons from the French revolutionary aim for the need speed for a constitution.

1. The 1814 charter that he boasted of was not liberal as expected. The new parliament was undemocratic. Louis XVIII utilized his powers and chose ministers and members of the chamber of peers from nobles than the middle class who would have offered his government constructive criticisms. Since the chamber of peers was empowered to propose national laws, it remained favourable to the monarchy in the pre-1789 fashion. He put a full stop to the little Arm of democracy by banning the parliament after the murder of Duke De- Berry.

Louis XVIII maintained a narrow franchise that disqualified a majority of the French men from free participation in politics especially the peasants. For one to be elected in the chamber ...f deputies, he had to be over 40 years of age and pay a direct tax of 1000 francs, while for one to vote one had to pay 300 Francs. Such criteria entitled only about 100,000 citizens out of a population of about 29,000,000 the right to vote. This was against universal manhood propagated by the French revolution.

4. Louis XVIII further banned the popularly cherished revolutionary tri-colour flag and restored the white flag of the Bourbons. This shows how he tended to revive the pre-1789 order. He also failed to either reconcile or harmonize the different political groups in France and to utilize their differences by applying divide and rule policy. The relationship between the republicans, Bonapartists, liberals vis-avis the ultra-royalists remained very hostile even after his death.

5. Although Louis XVIII was prepared to let bygones be bygones, he failed to carry on the activities of the ultra royalists who conducted a revenge program against the Bonapartist, 'liberals and anyone suspected to have anti-Bourbon feelings. About 7,000 Frenchmen either executed, mutilated, imprisoned or exiled between 1816-17 during the "white terror" these included French military heroes like Marshall Bruno, Ney (The bravest of the braves) these created more chaos and political instability in France. It showed that Louis XVIII had learnt and gotten nothing from the reign of terror of 1792 -94.

6. Press freedom that the Frenchmen had achieved through the revolution of 1789 was banned after the murder of Duke De-Berry in 1820. Only newspapers that supported the restored monarchy were allowed to operate, the rest were censored and their offices were locked up including their publishers.

This was against freedom of expression and thought that the Frenchmen cherished.

7. Louis XVIII further restricted political freedom of the Frenchmen between 1816 – 1820. He did this by dissolving the parliament, banning political parties, restricting meetings and stopping by jury.

This was a return to Bourbon despotism of the revolutionary period that the French men had signed off in the 1789 revolution.

8. Louis XVIII also hark the control of education to the Catholic Church. In 1822, a bishop was made the minister of education. He also kept aloof from the claims of the nobles and clergy over their former land that had been acquired by die peasant. This was very unrealistic ^ both the Concordat and the 1814 charter had guaranteed possessions of such land by the peasants.

9. Internally, Louis XVIII did not go so far to alleviate the economic conditions of the Frenchmen.

France had been heavily ravaged by the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. She therefore needed a comprehensive economic recovery program that Louis failed to provide.

10. Lastly, Louis dismissed reformist Chief minister Richelieu and replaced him with Villele who was an ultra-royalist in 1821. Villele took advantage of Louis' poor health and successfully implemented ultra-royalist programs against supporters of the revolutionary and Napoleonic regimes. This showed that he had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing from his brother Louis XVI who dismissed the popular financial controllers like Turgot and Necker and used the influence of his unpopular wife Marie Antoinette that had partly led to the outbreak of the French revolution of 1789.

NB. Louis XVIII tried to control the activities of the ulto-royalist between 1817 -1820 that was making the throne "hotter" for him. However, the murder of Duke De-Berry, a son of Charles X by a Bonapartist (other sources stress a republican) in 1820 was utilized by the ultra-royalists to persuade the king and parliament that liberalism and Bonapartism were bad and must be stopped. Villele accomplished this for example in 1822, he passed a severe law limiting the press, trial by jury and surrounded himself with hard core ultras. The murder of Duke De-Berry was considered a calculated move to destroy the Bourbon monarchical rule in France. The Duke was the son of Charles X mid since Louis XVIII had no son, he was the only heir for the Bourbons after Charles X.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The Crimean war is the third violent event in the 19th century eastern question. It was fought

by Turkey, Britain, France and Piedmont against Russia on the island of Crimea in the black

sea from 1854-1856.

The Crimean war was the first major war between the great powers after the Napoleonic war.

It is one of the most wasteful and useless wars fought without strong reasons. A critical view

of the characteristics of the war has made some historians to conclude that it was a war of

insanity and absurdity fought without clear objectives and principles. The immediate event

that sparked off the war was the Russian occupation of the two Turkish provinces of Wallacia

and Moldavia in 1853.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CAUSES

1. The Russian imperialism in the Balkans was a serious threat to the British, French & Turkish interests.

Tsar Nicholas I of Russia exaggerated the conditions of Turkey as a sick-man of Europe in order to facilitate the disintegration of the Empire. Russian's interest was to dominate the remains of the Ottoman Empire. Russia had gained commercial, strategic and economic benefits within the Turkish Empire through the treaties of Adrianople (1828) and Unkier Skellessi (1833). This strengthened Russian imperialism in the Balkan and forced the great powers to intervene (in the Syrian question) and nullify the treaties in the 1841 straits convention. Russia surprised the powers in 1853 when she conquered and occupied Moldavia and Wallacia. By this time Britain and France were fed up with Russian imperialism and decided to help Turkey to push Russia out of the two provinces which led to the Crimean war.

2. Besides, the Crimean war was caused by Russia's false confidence. Russia disregarded Turkey as a sick man of Europe that would easily collapse with her invasion. Russia had also relatively been peaceful and free from revolutions compared to other powers like France, Prussia, Turkey and Austria. Tsar Nicholas I therefore falsely concluded that such powers were already weakened by revolutions and Russian victory over them would be obvious. This encouraged the Tsar to pursue a reckless policy towards Turkey that led to the outbreak of the Crimean war. On the other hand, earlier events made Tsar Nicholas I to have a misconception that no other power would support Turkey against his aggression. He falsely believed that alliance between Britain and Russia against Napoleon I would still continue against Napoleon III. He was also mistaken to think that Russia's solidarity with Britain against France in Egypt, Syrian question and the 1840 London convention were too recent to make Britain and France ally against him. He also expected assistance from Austria for he had assisted Austria to suppress the 1848 revolution in Hungary. Above all, he believed that no Christian power would ally with Turkey being an Islamic state. All these, gave Tsar Nicholas I false confidence that Turkey was an isolated state prompting him to occupy Moldavia and Wallacia only to be disapproved when France and Britain joined hands to assist Turkey.

3. The Franco-Russian scramble for the control of the holy places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem has been greatly blamed for making the Crimean war inevitable. France was given the right to protect the holy places by the treaty of 1740, but she relaxed due to domestic and financial problems. This made the sultan to give Russia, a nearer neighbour with more pilgrims the right to protect the holy shrines by the Kurchuk kainardji treaty of 1774. However, Napoleon III revived the old French claim and instructed the French ambassador in Constantinople to present this demand to Russia

and the Sultan. The sultan accepted although he didn't accept to exclude the Russians. Russia protested and occupied Moldavia and Wallacia to justify her claim, which sparked off the Crimean war.

4. Napoleon III's ambitions to revenge the Moscow campaign of 1812 was also responsible for the Crimean war. In 1812, Napoleon I who was Napoleon III's uncle was disastrously defeated and humiliated by Russia. Napoleon I lost over 550,000 troops, which became a turning point and contributed to his downfall. In 1848, Napoleon III rose to power by promising to revive the Napoleonic tradition in Europe (i.e. in his campaign manifesto for the 1848 elections). This made him to look for an opportunity to fight Russia and revenge the 1812 disastrous defeat of his great uncle Napoleon I inter-alia. This opportunity came in 1853 when Russia occupied Moldavia and Walachia.

5. Besides, there were personal and political problems between Tsar Nicholas I and Napoleon III. Tsar Nicholas I treated the rise of Napoleon III to the French throne as a challenge to the Vienna settlement, which had provided that no one from Napoleon's line should ever again rule France. He refused to recognize Napoleon III as a legitimate ruler and kept on addressing him as "my friend" instead of "my brother", which was traditionally used in addressing fellow monarchs. This irritated Napoleon III and he decided to teach the Tsar a lesson when he occupied Moldavia and Wallacia, which made the Crimean war inevitable.

6. The absence of international organization and a capable statesman left a vacuum for the explosion of the Crimean war. The congress system and Metternich had maintained peace after the downfall of Napoleon I. But the congress system collapsed by 1830 and Metternich fell in 1848 leaving Europe without an organization and incapable men like Stratford de Red cliff and Napoleon III who had little provision for diplomacy in settling conflicts. This is why the Turko-Russian conflict over Moldavia and Wallacia easily degenerated into the Crimean war.

7. The weaknesses of Turkey as a sick man of Europe played no small contribution to the outbreak of the Crimean war. Turkey misgoverned her subjects, which provoked uprisings within the Empire and attracted the intervention of European powers (to safeguard their interests). This led to clashes and rivalry that climaxed into the Crimean war. Besides, it was Turkey who persecuted Christians in Moldavia and Wallacia and gave Russia an excuse to occupy the territories with a pretext of protecting the minority Christian population. It should be noted that if Turkey was not sick,

there would be no controversy over diagnosis and treatment since there would be no disease. The crux of the matter is that she was sick and that is why there was tension over Russian Medicine of Partitioning the empire to avoid the chaos and quarrels that would arise.

8. The convergent and conflicting interests of European powers over the Ottoman Empire made the war inevitable. Industrial revolution had created an urgent need to acquire colonies and areas of influence for raw materials, markets, investment and resettlement of excess population. This is why there was rivalry for influence in the Ottoman Empire between Russia, Britain and France. Britain that was the most industrialized hated Russian expansion because it would jeopardize her trade within the Ottoman Empire, the Far East and the Mediterranean Sea. This is why Britain and even France decided to force Russia out of Moldavia and Wallacia leading to the Crimean war.

9. The Crimean war was also caused by anti-Russian hysteria in Britain and France. Tsar Nicholas I of Russia was very oppressive and despotic to his subjects plus the poles and Hungarians who were under his influence. The French and British therefore called for war against Russia so as to bring peace and Justice to the Russian subjects. The middle class and the parliament of both countries argued for war as a solution to Russian oppression, exploitation and despotism. This negative public opinion against Russia propelled Britain and France to declare war against Russia in 1854.

10. The downfall of capable statesmen and the rise of aggressive and self seeking ambitious leaders in Europe made the outbreak of the Crimean war inevitable. In Austria, Metternich who had maintained peace in Europe after the downfall of Napoleon I was forced to flee to exile in 1848. Schwarzenburg and later Count Boul who replaced Metternich were incompetent in maintaining diplomatic cooperation between Western and Eastern Europe leave alone the Balkans. In France, Louis Philippe who pursued a peaceful foreign policy was replaced by Napoleon III who was determined to pursue an aggressive foreign policy and revive French influence in Europe. In Russia, Tsar Alexander I was replaced by Tsar Nicholas I in 1825 who was more aggressive and interested in breaking up the Ottoman Empire. In Britain, Palmer stone (prime minister) was replaced by Lord Aberdeen who was weak willed, soft on Russia and not enthusiastic for war as Palmer stone was, which indirectly encouraged Russia to invade Moldavia and Wallacia. Thus, one can conclude that the rise and weaknesses of Schwarzenburg, Count Boul, Napoleon III, Tsar Nicholas I and

Lord Aberdeen brought inexperienced and uncompromising men in sensitive political offices making the outbreak of the Crimean war inevitable.

11. The role of men on the spot was also instrumental in the Crimean war. Prince Menshikoff the Russian representative in Turkey advised Russia to use force as the only way to safeguard her interest in the Balkans and holy Shrines. Stratford de-Red-Cliffe consolidated the British anti-Russian feeling and policy by exaggerating Russian threats in the Balkans. He advised Turkey to declare war on Russia after the Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallacia. Thus, Menshikoff inspired Russia to forcefully occupy Moldavia and Wallacia and Stratford-de-Redcliffe influenced Britain and Turkey to fight Russia, which made the Crimean war inevitable.

12. The Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallacia in July 1853 was a major event that led to the Crimean war. Moldavia and Wallacia were semi-independent provinces of Ottoman Empire under the Sultan of Turkey. Russia occupied them to press the sultan to accept her claim of protecting the holy places of Bethlehem and Jerusalem. The sultan protested the Russian occupation and declared war against her in October 1853. France and Britain joined Turkey and shifted the war from Moldavia and Wallacia up to Crimea in Russia and hence the Crimean or crime war as John Bright the British liberal politician told his son.

13. The Great Sinope massacre of November 1853 was the most immediate incident that triggered the Crimean war. When Turkey declared war on Russia, Russia reacted by sinking the Turkish warship at Sinope in the black sea. This was considered an unjustifiable massacre and created war fever in Britain and France. Britain and France reacted by sending their warships in the black sea and ordering Russia to withdraw from Moldavia and Wallacia, to which the Tsar refused. This made Britain and France to declare war on Russia in March 1854 and follow her up to Crimea in August when she finally withdrew due to pressure of events.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE COURSE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CRIMEAN WAR

The Franco Russian scramble for the holy places of Bethlehem and Jerusalem is one of the issues that made Russia to occupy Turkey's semi-independent states of Moldavia and Wallacia. Britain and France encouraged the Sultan to give Russia an ultimatum to withdraw. At the same time Turkey mobilized her troops, Britain and France protested the Russian occupation and sent their warships up to the Dardanelles which violated the 1841 straits convention.

In spite of all these threats, Russia refused to withdraw from Moldavia and Wallacia. Omar Pasha, the commander of Turkey's army declared war on Russia on 4th Oct 1853. Russia attacked and destroyed the Turkey's fleet at Sinope, which is regarded as the Great Sinope massacre. In March 1854, Britain and France sent their warships up to the Bosphorus in the Black Sea and ordered Russia to retreat from the Black Sea to their base at Sebastopol. However, Russia refused which forced Britain and France to officially declare war on her on 21st March 1854, which began the armed conflict. In July, the representatives of Britain, France, Austria and Prussia met at Vienna and signed the Vienna note which was not wholly accepted by both Russia and Turkey, so the war continued.

In August, pressure of events forced the Russian troops to withdraw from Moldavia and Wallacia to then base at Sebastopol. This was so sudden and surprising that Britain and France who had mobilized their resources and soldiers for a full-scale war refused to consider it a victory. They therefore decided to attack and destroy the Russian naval base at Sebastopol.

This was absurd because the British and French principal aim was to force the Russian troops out of Moldavia and Wallacia. When Russia finally withdrew from the two provinces;

No excuse for the war except that of teaching the Tsar a lesson existed. Hence the diversion of the war from the Balkans where it made sense in relation to the Turkey's Empire to the Crimean Peninsular where it made no sense at all.

The diversion of the war meant that the war that was originally meant for the defense of the Turkey's Empire was transformed into an act of aggression against Russia.

In September, the allied troops landed in the Crimean peninsular. They also conducted naval operations in the Baltic Sea as Turkey and Russia fought in the Caucasus Sea. The allied troops were disorganized because they only had sketches and not actual maps of Sebastopol and Crimea. This

affected allied advance towards Sebastopol. After sometime they landed to the North of Sebastopol and defeated the Russian troops at River Alma. The next move should have been Sebastopol, which was not yet well fortified. But the allied commanders relaxed for three weeks touring the city. This gave the Russians chance to reorganize their army, re-arm themselves and fortify their naval base. When the allies started bombarding Sebastopol, it was much stronger than they had first come. It's this laxity that made the Russians to sustain the war for three years.

The allies were affected by poor transport and communication network. It was so difficult to transport artilleries, which took up to 3 weeks to reach Sebastopol. The artilleries were even so inefficient that their bombs were falling outside Sebastopol. Besides, the allied as well as Russian commanders lacked co-ordination and were suspicious of each other. The worst hazard was winter for which the allied troops were not prepared. Winter affected transport and communication. Poor sanitation, diet, medication, extreme cold and cholera killed both soldiers as well as horses.

Combat operations began in November 1854 where the allies defeated Russia at the disastrous battle of Inkerman. The subsequent military campaigns were fruitless on account of winter and poor medical care.

There were very few dressing stations yet there were heavy casualties. The wounded and sick soldiers were transported for three weeks across the Black Sea to the nearest hospital at Scutari. The hospital lacked basic equipments like beds, blankets, basins, towels, soap, brooms, scissors, bandages and drugs.

Medical supplies were either embezzled from Turkish customs houses or delayed by departmental regulations.

The above desperate condition and sufferings at Scutari attracted the sympathy and intervention of an English woman known as Florence Nightingale. She together with some volunteer nurses mobilized money from friends in England and came to Scutari where they were greeted by loud cries from the neglected, wounded and sick soldiers. She succeeded in treating the soldiers, reorganizing the nursing Laundry, Sanitary conditions, clothings and providing food to the soldiers. By June 1855, Florence Nightingale and her volunteer nurses had reduced the death rate from 44% to 2%. This earned Florence a humanitarian credit and a reputation of a saint.

In 1855, the allied troops were re-organized and Sebastopol was finally conquered in September 1855 which marked the allied victory over Russia in the Crimean war. However, the Russians did not surrender until after the death of Tsar Nicholas I and the rise of liberal Alexander II who had no personal problem with Napoleon III. In Britain, Lord Aberdeen was replaced by Palmer stone (1855-58) who was ready to negotiate for peace. At the same time, Austria issued an ultimatum based on the "allies' minimum terms" to Russia which meant that Austria could join the war if she (Russia) refuses to comply. All these factors forced Russia to surrender and denounce war. The final peace conference was held in Paris in 1856 under the chairmanship of Napoleon III.

The Crimean war was characterized by festivities and adventurism. In spite of the war, many tourists still flocked to Crimea as if there was no war. Some army officers even went with their wives and girl friends to the battlefield. The Russians turned the war into free Cinema and holidaymaking. This means that the Crimean war was a war of insanity and absurdity that was fought without clear objectives and principles.

Lastly, the Crimean war was marked by unexpected support from Piedmont. Cavour sent the Piedmontese troops in 1855 to help the allies and gain a seat in the post war settlement to champion the Italian unification struggle. The Piedmontese troops were instrumental in the final bombardment and surrender of Sebastopol that brought the war to an end.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

ROLE OF EUROPEAN POWERS/PERSONALITIES IN THE OUTBREAK OF THE CRIMEAN WAR;

The powers concerned were Russia, France, Turkey and Britain who were the belligerents (powers at war).

MB: When apportioning responsibility a student has to analyze the reasons for a country's involvement in the (provoking), showing why and how it brought conflict (war) with other powers. However, if strong reasons exist for

a country's involvement in the war, then one has to bring it in an argument to reduce the blame on that particular power.

Note further- that although Piedmont participated in the war and thus contributed to the war, she does not share responsibility for the outbreak of the war. This is because she entered the War late in 1855 when it had already started and was thus ending. This does not make her guilty for the Outbreak/beginning of the War. In any case if Piedmont had not joined the war, it would not have altered the course of events.

1. RUSSIA (TSAR NICHOLAS I AND PRINCE MENSHIEKOEFF)

i) Russia under Tsar Nicholas I was primarily responsible for the Outbreak of the Crimean war.

Russian expansionist towards the Balkans created suspicion and mistrust that climaxed into war.

Russian advance in Balkans was to secure political control over the Ottoman Empire and monopolize trade. This would be against British economic interest in the Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea and the Far East which was opposed by Britain. This made Britain and France to take the risk of fighting Russia in 1854.

ii) Russian influence in the Balkans was a disturbing issue that distorted peace in Europe. The 1828 Treaty of Adrianople gave Russia commercial and territorial gains in the Ottoman Empire which irritated Britain and France. Again in 1833 Russia signed the Unkier Skellessi treaty in which the straits of Dardanelles was to be closed to all warships except to those of Russia and Turkey. Angered Britain and France who sought for an opportunity to eliminate Russia out of the Balkans (for their economic interest), which came when Russia occupied Moldavia and Wallacia.

iii) Tsar Nicholas I's careless diagnosis and prescription to Turkish sickness (problems) was opposed by Britain and France. He had told Palmerston that; **Your Excellency don't you think Turkey is a dying man? I think we must partition the Empire to avoid the chaos and disorder that would follow** To this, Palmerston replied; **Is it to the Doctor or the heir that you address the question.**

The issue is that Tsar Nicholas I proposed that Turkey's Empire Should be broken and shared up which was rejected by Britain who wanted Turkey to survive as a bulwark against Russian imperialism. The blame on Russia is that she disguised her imperialism and over exaggerated Turkey's problems

which made Turkey sicker than ever before. She even went to the extent of supporting revolutionary movements such as that of the Greeks against Turkey.

iv) Tsar Nicholas I's refusal to recognize Napoleon III as a legitimate ruler and calling him "my great and dear friend" instead of "my brother" made Napoleon III to fight in the Crimean war. Tsar Nicolas I clung on the Vienna Settlement of 1815 which had provided that no one from Napoleon's family rules France again.

He saw the rise of Napoleon III as a challenge to the Vienna settlement and decided not to recognize his rule. This made Napoleon III to look for an opportunity to discipline the Tsar that came when Russia occupied Moldavia and Wallacia in 1853. It should be noted that the Vienna settlement and 1815 were old issues and too long a period (respectively) that should not have been carried forward to 1850's. This implies that Tsar had no value for peace and reconciliation which makes Russia guilty of the Crimean disaster.

V. Russia's claims of protecting Orthodox Christians and Slavs who were scattered within the Turkey's Empire brought her into loggerheads with Britain and France. This made Russia to intervene and interfere in Turkey's internal affairs like in Greece, Moldavia and Wallacia, which caused the Crimean war. In fact, Russia's failure to recognize the French guardianship over the holy places according to the Kutchuk kainardji treaty of 1774 is what partly made Napoleon III to declare war on her.

Vi).Tsar Nicholas I's diplomatic miscalculation also contributed to the outbreak of the war. Earlier events blindfolded him to believe that no other power would intervene against him. He expected British co-operation against either France or Turkey. He falsely believed that the Anglo-Russian alliance against Napoleon I would still be renewed against Napoleon III. He also deceived himself that Russia's co-operation with Britain against France in Egypt, Syrian question and the 1842 straits convention were too recent to make Britain and France ally against her. Above all, he believed that no Christian power would ally with Turkey being a Moslem state. These gave Tsar Nicholas I false confidence that he would handle Turkey alone, which prompted him to occupy Moldavia and Wallacia only to be proved wrong when France and Britain joined hands with Turkey.

Vii).The Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallacia in July 1853 was a prelude to the Crimean war.

When Russia occupied the two provinces, Turkey under the influence of Britain and France sent an ultimatum that she should withdraw. However, Russia refused to withdraw which made Turkey and later Britain and France to declare war against her. If Russia had withdrawn peacefully, Turkey, Britain and France would not have declared war against her and the Crimean war could have been avoided.

viii). Russia's sinking of Turkish warship at Sinope (The Great Sinope Massacre) in the Black Sea was the most immediate event that triggered the Crimean war. When Turkey declared war on Russia, Russia reacted by sinking the Turkish warship at Sinope. The French and the British considered it a savage and barbaric attack intended to wipe out the Turks. This made them to send their warships in the Black Sea, which was the Crimean war in progress.

NB: Although Russia was primarily responsible for the war, she had some genuine reasons. In the first place, Russia was a great Slav state and most of the Balkan nationalities spoke Slavonic language. She was therefore morally right to assist fellow brothers against Turkey's poor administration and autocracy. Secondly, Russia was a great orthodox Christian state and Turkey was persecuting Christians. Russia was therefore justified to help fellow brothers in Christ. Thirdly, Russia was right in claiming the right to protect the holy places because France had failed to do so. She had invested a lot in renovating the shrines and she had more pilgrims than France to the ratio of 100:1. The Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallacia was just to express her just demands and make the Sultan withdraw the concession of protectionship from France. The Russian withdrawal from Moldavia and Wallacia should have ended the war but it was Britain and France who followed Russia up to Crimea.

Nevertheless, although Russia had "genuine claims" in the war, her claims were brought up pretentiously to camouflage her imperialism in the Balkans. This did not take other powers time to suspect and even prove. Russia's greatest blame was her interference in Turkey's internal affairs with a hidden agenda of breaking the Empire that makes her primarily responsible for the outbreak of the Crimean war.

2. TURKEY (SULTAN MOHAMOOD¹¹, 1808-1839 AND SULTAN ABDUL MAJID, 1839-1861)

i. The Sultans and Turkey are blamed for being the "sick man of Europe". Turkey had created a vast heterogeneous Empire, which became difficult to administer. The Empire was besieged (surrounded) by a cocktail of political, social, religious and economic problems that provoked rebellions

and attracted the intervention of Russia, Britain and France. The scramble by these powers to share the remains of the Ottoman Empire is what made them to converge and clash at the Crimean Peninsular.

NB: If Turkey had not been sick (weak), there would have been no controversy over diagnosis and treatment since there would be no disease. In other words if Turkey was not weak, the scramble for the Empire would not have arisen and the war could have been avoided.

ii. Turkey's anti-Christian and anti-Slav policy played yet another role in the Crimean war. On many occasions, the Sultans of Turkey were argued and they even promised fair treatment to Christians, which were never fulfilled. Instead, there was a vicious cycle of persecution for example, in Moldavia and Wallacia, which gave Russia a chance to interfere in her internal affairs. If Turkey had not persecuted Christians, Russia would have not found any justification of occupying Moldavia and Wallacia off the war.

iii. Turkey is accused for refusing to grant independence to her subjects even when she was aware of her weaknesses. By 1854, Wallacia and Moldavia were semi-independent states. If Turkey had given full independence to Wallacia and Moldavia, Russia would not have occupied them and the Crimean war would have been avoided. Even if Russia was to occupy them, it would remain a localised affair between them and Russia. This would also be easy to settle on a round table i.e. peacefully.

iv. Turkey is blamed for weak and inconsistent foreign policy that encouraged Russia to interfere into her internal affairs. For instance, the Unkier Skellesi treaty of 1833 established a strong solidarity with Russia that threatened the interests of other powers. The treaty stipulated that Turkey was to close the Dardanelles to all warships except to those of Russia and Turkey herself. This strengthened Russian influence within the Ottoman Empire and partly inspired her to occupy Moldavia and Wallacia which sparked off the war.

V. Turkey's inconsistency over the right to protect the holy places consolidated the Franco-Russian scramble and led to the Crimean war. In 1740, the right to protect the holy places was granted to France. But due to the French negligence, the Sultan again gave the same right to Russia in 1774 without informing France. When Napoleon revived the Old French claim in the 1850s, the Sultan was confused whether it should be Russia or France. This partly made Russia and France to resort to war to determine who should be the guardian of the holy places, it should be noted that

Russia's occupation of Moldavia and Wallacia was to press the Sultan to accept his claim and drop that of the French.

vi. Turkey's alliance with other European powers i.e. Britain and France against Russia makes her guilty for the outbreak of the Crimean war. Britain and France had their own grievances against Russia but had failed to get a convenient opportunity to fight her. By 1854, Napoleon III of France was longing for war against Russia to revenge the 1812 Moscow campaign and reassert his legitimacy. Britain was interested in war against Russia in order to destroy Russian influence in the Balkans and safeguard her commercial interest. These hidden agenda explains why Britain and France advised the Sultan Abdul Majid of Turkey to declare war against Russia. Turkey is therefore accused for allowing herself and empire to be used by Britain and France to fight Russia to defend their selfish, personal and national interests.

vii. Turkey is blamed for refusing to accept the Vienna note (July 1854). The Vienna note was a document prepared by the representatives of Britain, France, Austria and Prussia. It was to bring reconciliation between Russia and Turkey in order to avoid war. Russia accepted the Vienna note but Turkey refused to accept it unless certain amendments were made. Sultan Abdul Majid I of Turkey was not ready to tolerate Russia's general right to influence her affairs which was provided in the Vienna note. Turkey's defiance frustrated European diplomacy, created more tension and helped to shift the war from Moldavia and Wallacia to Crimea.

viii. Lastly, Turkey stands in the dock of history for her declaration of war on Russia on October 4th 1853. This was after Russia's refusal to evacuate Moldavia and Wallacia. Turkey's declaration of war forced the Russians to destroy her fleet at Sinope, which made Britain and France to join the war.

Besides, Turkey is blamed for accepting to be used by Britain and France to fight Russia for their selfish interests in the Balkans.

NB: The internal problems of Turkey were worsened by the divergent and conflicting interest of the major powers especially Russia. Russia and later Britain and France weakened Turkey by supporting nationalistic movements such as the Greek war from 1821-1832. Britain and France wanted the territory of Turkey reduced in a manner that would favour their commercial, strategic and political interests. Thus, the Crimean war was an opportunity for European powers to safeguard their hidden selfish interests.

3. FRANCE (NAPOLEON ID, 1848-1871)

i. Napoleon III and France fought in the war because they wanted popularity amongst the liberals and Catholics. This made France to ally with Britain against Russia in the Turko-Russian conflict that developed into the Crimean war.

ii. Napoleon III of France is accused for his desire to revenge the 1812 Moscow Campaign. This was unjustifiable because in the Moscow Campaign, Russia was innocent and his uncle Napoleon I was the aggressor who had invaded Russia. Besides, the Moscow Campaign is a minute political issue of the past that should not have been raised in the interest of peace. It was this spirit of revenge partly forced Napoleon III and France to embark on fighting Russia in the Crimean war.

iii. Napoleon III's revival of the old French claim over the holy places brought conflict with Russia who had a more genuine claim. This is because Russia had more pilgrims and was closer to the holy places than France. Besides, France that was granted the right to protect the holy places in 1740 had neglected her role only to resurrect the issue after Russia had invested and repaired the shrines. It was Napoleon's threats in 1850 that forced Russia to occupy Moldavia and Wallachia which sparked off the Crimean war.

iv. Napoleon III and France are said to have fought Russia simply because Tsar Nicholas I had failed to recognize Napoleon III's legitimacy and addressed him as "my great and dear friend" instead of "my brother". Napoleon III took this as a challenge to his prestige and credibility and looked for an opportunity to fight and humble Tsar Nicholas II. This opportunity was found when Russia occupied Moldavia and Wallachia. However, this was so personal and minute and could have been ignored or settled diplomatically.

v. Napoleon III and France shares the guilt of the war because Napoleon III promised support to Turkey which gave her courage to declare war on Russia. After the Great Sinope massacre, Napoleon III mobilized his forces and declared war on Russia in March 1854. When Russia withdrew from Moldavia and Wallachia, France and Britain followed the Russians up to Crimea within the Russian peninsula. This is what amplified the Russo-Turkish war into the Crimean war.

vi. France is accountable for the outbreak of the Crimean war because of her policy against Russian imperialism in the Balkans. Russian advance in the Balkans was a threat to France's commercial, political and religious interests in the region. This is what made France to cooperate with Britain and Turkey to check Russian advance, which caused the Crimean war.

4. BRITAIN (ABERDEEN, PALMER STONE AND STRADFORD DE REDCLIFFE)

i. Britain is held responsible for the Crimean war for resorting to war in order to safeguard her commercial interest. This was threatened by Russia's expansionist policy in the Balkans. Besides,

Aberdeen and later palmer stone (Prime ministers) had preconceived hatred against the Russian despotic government. These considerations made Britain to fight Russia in the Crimean war, hence her guilt.

ii. Britain opposed and rejected Russia's ideas of partitioning Turkey as a solution to the Eastern Question. Britain wanted to maintain an integrated Turkey to block Russian advancement in Europe. This put Russia on tension and made her to occupy the Turkey's semi-independent states of Moldavia and Walachia, before Turkey could be strengthened.

iii. The nullification of the Unkier Skelessie treaty by Palmerstone in the 1841 straits convention was rejected by Tsar Alexander I of Russia who resorted to aggression. Besides in 1854, Palmer stone sent British forces through the Dardanelles to attack Russia. This was a violation of the Straits convention and all that it had stood for i.e. peace.

iv. Stratford De-Redcliffe, the British ambassador in Constantinople made war on the side of Britain inevitable. He had mastered the British policy in the Balkans and considered the Russian Prince Menschikoff as "a mere child". Redcliffe spoilt the relationship between Turkey and Russia and advised the British government to use force against Russia in the Balkans. This is partly responsible for the British participation in the Crimean war.

V. It was Stratford De-Redcliffe who assured Turkey of British support against Russia. This encouraged Turkey to issue an ultimatum to Russia and even declare war on her. If it was not Stratford's assurance, Turkey would not have tried to tamper with the Russia since she was aware of her weakness as a "sick man of Europe".

vi. Britain also induced France under Napoleon III to join the war against Russia. Stratford co-operated with Napoleon III, which made Napoleon III confident of fighting Russia. Otherwise, if Britain had not entered a diplomatic understanding with France, Napoleon III could not have risked fighting Russia. This is because Napoleon III in his foreign policy was too fearful of Britain because of the role of Britain in the defeat and downfall of his great uncle, Napoleon I.

vii. Britain fueled conflict between France and Russia by supporting France's claim of protecting the holy places. Stratford de-Redcliffe and Aberdeen encouraged the Sultan Abdul Majid of Turkey to reject Russia's claim of protecting the holy places and accept the French claim. This made Tsar Nicholas I of Russia to panic and forcefully occupy Moldavia and Wallacia, which began the Crimean war.

viii. Britain's lack of a vigorous and consistent foreign policy towards the Ottoman Empire on the eve of the Crimean war made the war inevitable. In 1852, Palmerstone was replaced by Aberdeen, as prime minister. Aberdeen's cabinet was divided and was unable to impose his will on his ministers. Unlike Palmerstone, Aberdeen was soft on Russia and not enthusiastic for war. The rise of Aberdeen and his weakness made Tsar Nicholas I to falsely assume that Britain would not participate in the war, which encouraged him to occupy Moldavia and Wallacia. Otherwise, as V.D Mahajan argues If Palmerstone had been the premier, the Tsar would have thought twice before sending Menschikoff and provoking a quarrel in which Great Britain was sure to come in

ix. Lastly, Britain is guilty because she declared a full-scale war after the Great Sinope massacre, in August; the Russians retreated to their base at Sebastopol, which could have averted the war. But Stratford De-Redcliffe and Palmerstone followed the Russians to their base at Sebastopol. This is what magnified the Moldavian and Walachian issue into the Crimean war.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES OF THE CRIMEAN WAR

The Crimean war was concluded by the 1856 Paris peace treaty that was signed between Russia and the allied powers. The war and the treaty had political, social and economic impact on Europe both in the short run and the long run. The consequences of the Crimean war were positive and negative in the history of Europe.

1. The war resulted into massive loss of lives and destruction of property that ranked highest in the history of Europe from 1816-1914. It is estimated that Russia lost over 300,000 men, France 100,000 and Britain 60,000. These

excluded thousands of Italians and Turks. Some of these died as a result of the actual fighting but % died of famine, starvation, malnutrition. Cholera, Typhoid, Winter etc.

Besides, there was destruction of properties like ships, estates, buildings and important towns like Sebastopol.

2. The Crimean war laid foundation for Nursing and International Red Cross society. The death and sufferings of Russian and allied troops led to widespread concern about the condition of soldiers in war zones. This made Florence Nightingale to take care of the Scutari hospital where she gave medical services and nursing to the wounded and sick. She did this after realizing that adequate medical attention and services plus humanitarian assistance could have significantly reduced the death toll.

3. The war forced Tsar Alexander II to embark on reforms. Russia was defeated and the 1856 Paris peace treaty was a "bitter pill" for her to swallow. This together with desperate socio-economic conditions made the Russians to develop a revolutionary spirit against the government. This forced Tsar Nicholas II to embark on immediate reforms in agriculture and industries to improve on the standard of living and strengthen her military power, in order to win public confidence and avert a revolution. In 1861, he passed the emancipation act in which all slaves were set free. However, the heavy emancipation fee became a source of tension amongst the peasants that contributed to the outbreak of the Russian revolution of 1917.

4. The Crimean war contributed to the unifications of Italy and Germany. Austria, the main obstacle to both unifications remained neutral during the war. This isolated Austria from the allied powers that fought and defeated Russia. On the other hand, Austria's neutrality also alienated her from Russia because Russia branded Austria "a thankless friend". This is because Tsar Nicholas I of Russia expected Austria's alliance as a compensation for his role in suppressing the 1848 revolutions in Hungary, Bohemia and Vienna that saved the Austrian Empire. This explains why Russia could not support Austria in the course of Italian and German unifications. This favoured both unification for it;

Provided a free and unfettered opportunity for the destruction of the Austrian power in Germany and Italy to those who had courage ... Bismarck and Cavour were the chief beneficiaries of the

Crimean war and without it, there might have been neither a Kingdom of Italy nor a German

Empire for the Italians who actively participated on the side of the allies, the war won for them British moral support and the French military support at the 1856 Paris peace treaty. This is why Britain favoured Garibaldi's liberation of Naples and Sicily while France helped in the Liberation of Lombardy. The Crimean war also gave the Italians military experience, which helped in ousting Austria from Italian peninsular.

5. The war increased the prestige and popularity of Napoleon III in France and Europe. He achieved his aim of revenging the 1812 Moscow campaign and disciplining Tsar Nicholas I for failure to recognize his legitimacy as a rightful monarch. The fact that the peace conference and treaty were held and signed in Paris under the Chairmanship of Napoleon III shows how acceptable and recognized

Napoleon III was amongst the great powers of Europe. It was therefore an honorable diplomatic achievement for Napoleon III and France. This won for Napoleon III the loyalty and support of the French Catholics, Bonapartists, Liberals and glory seekers, which helped to consolidate his rule.

6. As already noted, the Crimean war was crowned up at the Paris peace treaty of 1856. By the treaty, the independence of Turkey was guaranteed and it was clearly spelt out that no power had the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire. Turkey was admitted into the concert of Europe from which she had earlier been excluded. In other words, the "Sick-man" got a new lease of life under the protection of European powers and that is why V.D. Mahajan argues that It appears that the sick man of Europe was put on her legs again.

However, in the long run Russia violated the territorial independence of Turkey by supporting nationalistic revolts such as the Bulgarian affairs of 1878. She even defeated Turkey in 1878 and forced her to sign the treaty of San Stefano.

7. There were some territorial re-adjustments as a result of the Crimean war. Bessarabia was taken from Russia and given to Moldavia. The states of Moldavia, Wallacia and Serbia were granted a large measure of independence and internal self-government. But they were to acknowledge and honour Turkey's over lordship. However, this was absurd (unreasonable) because it was a step towards the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire that the allied powers had fought to avoid. It also encouraged other oppressed nationalities under Turkey to rise up for their independence, which gave Russia an excuse to intervene in the Balkans

the way she did in 1878. This is a testimony that the Paris peace conference settled "almost nothing" and that the war was a wasteful and useless venture.

8. The Crimean war temporarily halted Russian imperialism in the Balkans and made Europe safer from her aggression for some time. Russia was defeated and left weakened after the war. She lost the right to protect the Balkan Christians and territories such as Bessarabia, which isolated her from direct access to the Danube River. The black sea was neutralized and the states of Moldavia and Wallacia were amalgamated to form a buffer or barrier state between her and Turkey. These measures made it impossible for Russia to cause any aggression in the Balkans up to 1870. However, Russian imperialism could not be suffocated forever. In 1870, Russia violated the Black Sea clause and by the San Stefano treaty of 1878, she completely wiped out the humiliation of the Crimea war by recovering and repossessing Bessarabia.

9. The Paris treaty revived the 1841 straits convention and the Black Sea was once again declared neutral.

Its waters and ports were made open to all merchant ships and the strait was to be closed to warships of all nations. Important waters like the Mediterranean Sea, R. Danube and Adriatic Sea were declared free for navigation which promoted trade in Europe. However, this was temporal because Russia with Bismarck's encouragement violated the Black sea clause in 1870 as France was busy fighting Prussia in the Franco - Prussian war.

10. The unfortunate death of non-war combatants and destruction of neutral vessels made the Paris peacemakers to come up with the maritime law. By this law, neutral and civilian vessels or even ships were not to be destroyed or confiscated during war. This also included neutral equipment that could be found in such vessels or ships. There was also a revision of the international law governing the "right to search" which restricted the powers of the British navy from interfering with neutral shipping in times of war.

11. The Crimean war was the first war in which telegraph and steam warships were used as a way of bringing the war to a speedy end. The war therefore laid foundation for the use of steamships and telegraph in modern wars. This has made modern wars to be fought with better plans, tactics and organization. This is what makes modern wars more ferocious and devastating like for instance the First World War.

12. Lastly, the Sultan of Turkey was forced to promise fair treatment of Christians on equal status with the Moslems within his Empire. Russian's claim of protecting Christians was nullified. This temporally ended the Eastern Question. However, the Paris peacemakers were short sighted to rely on the sultan's promise of reforming his administration and giving fair treatment to Christians. By 1876, the sultan had forgotten his verbal promise and written pledge and the Moslems were intimidating, harassing, slaughtering, discriminating and abusing Christians as infidels. For instance, the 1896 Armenian massacres of Christians by Moslems proved that the big men of Paris were very unrealistic in an attempt to end religious persecution in the Balkans.

NB: The fact that neither France nor Britain implored the sultan to reform his administration and treat Christians fairly meant that commercial interest and the end of Russian expansion in the Balkans rather than persecution of Christians were paramount issues in the conflict. In other words, Britain and France considered Turkish autocratic administration a lesser evil compared to Russian threat in the Balkans. One can therefore argue that the Crimean war was accidentally fought in favour of Turkey irrespective of various problems orchestrated or committed by the sultan.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background

Charles X was originally called Comte-De-Artois. He rose to power after the death of his brother King Louis XVIII in 1824 and took the title Charles x after his coronation in 1825. He was a leader of the Émigrés who had suffered the pains of the revolutionary and Napoleonic reforms and actively contributed to the defeat of Napoleon I. After the restoration of the Monarchy in 1815, Charles X became a leader of the ultra-royalists who executed the famous white terror from 1816 -1817 against supporters of previous regimes i.e. Revolutionary and Napoleonic governments.

This experience made him to be an avowed/open enemy to the changes of the French Revolution and the rule of Napoleon I. He pursued and sustained policies that were very unrealistic as he tried to undo the revolutionary and Napoleonic reforms, which were favourable to the

masses. He took pride in the fact that both he and Lafayette had not changed at all inspite of the change of times. He thus learnt nothing from the French revolution and forgot nothing from the mistakes of his brother Louis XVI. On the contrary, he remembered each and every thing of the outlived aristocratic principles that he attempted with disastrous consequences to resurrect. This caused the 1830 July revolution that swept him and the monarchy from the political landscape of France and indeed Europe,

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CHARLES X'S UNREALISTIC POLICIES

1. Compensation scheme

In 1825, Charles X passed a compensation bill by which the émigrés who had lost their properties during the French revolution and the rule of Napoleon were to either regain their property or be compensated. He set aside 1.000 million Francs (£ 40.000.000) for this scheme. Whereas it was necessary to compensate the émigrés, the way the money was raised was very unrealistic. This was achieved by lowering the interest rate on public debts from 5% - 3%, taxing the peasants and die middle class. The peasants and middle class lost the land that they had acquired during the revolution which had even been confirmed by the Concordat,

NB. This aspect of Charles X's policy showed that he intended to revive the privileges of the aristocrats and the unfair tax system which the French men had fought and buried in 1789. He thus learnt nothing and forgot nothing from the French revolution and the ancient regime.

2. His policy towards the Catholic Church

Charles X restored the privileges of the church in disregard to the civil constitution of the clergy and the concordat. He passed a law regarding defiling religious places and things in which death sentence was fixed for theft in churches and making holy utensils in church unholy. This law was so extreme and was never given a practical shape due to intensive opposition against it. Even then, Charles X pursued pro church policies. For instance, he revived the influence of the church on the state and education. A clergy

was made the minister of education and Bishops were permitted to appoint all teachers in primary schools.

This is why Wellington asserts that Charles X established a government by priests, through priests and for priests.

NB. Charles X's religious inclination was shown right from 1825 in his coronation ceremony, e.g. His body was pierced seven times with a golden needle kept right from the 5th century. This was to make him receive blessings from the holy oil. He is reported to have moved from place to place to heal the sick with his holy touch. A Bishop crowned Charles at the Rheims Cathedral. He led a religious procession in Paris. He was dressed in violet robes with a burning candlelight in his hand. The procession moved through the streets of Paris which increased fear in the people. This was an all out restoration of the pre-1789 church privileges showing that he was a deaf monarch to the revolutionary bells.

3. The National Guard

Charles' unrealistic policies provoked a protest from the National Guard, which prompted him to disband it in 1827. He was too suspicious of an armed revolt or coup d'état by the Bonapartists, liberals and republicans who had dominated the National Guard. This was unrealistic considering two things. First, the National Guard was guaranteed by the 1814 Charter. Secondly, it had championed the revolutionary cause against various European coalitions and stood for military glory in the conquest of Europe up to 1814. It was even the only protector of the freedom of the Frenchmen. Charles is reported to have said that; **Concessions ruined Louis XVI** and so he thought that by destroying the National Guard he was learning something and forgetting something from the faults of his brother. However, this boomeranged on him as the National Guard and the regular troops joined the masses in 1830 revolution that destroyed him and the Bourbon monarchy.

4. Dismissal of Comte De-Martinac and the appointment of Polignac

Charles X dismissed his moderate counselor (Reformist minister) Comte De-Martinac (who had succeeded Villele in 1827) and replaced him with Prince De- Polignac in 1829. Polignac was a former prisoner of Napoleon and an ultra of ultras. Like Marie Antoinette, he was very unsympathetic to the masses, a poor advisor and strongly inclined to aristocratic and conservative principles. He bluntly stated that his policy was to; re-organize

society, **give back the clergy their weight in state affairs, create a powerful aristocracy**

and surround it with privileges.

This led to a political consciousness that provoked crisis and confrontation that climaxed into the 1830 revolution.

NB. This showed that Charles X failed to learn lessons from the pre-1789 events that led to the revolution against his brother Louis XVI i.e. he failed to learn from the mistakes of Louis XVI of discarding popular people like Turgot and Necker and using unpopular elements like Marie Antoinette.

5. Despotism

One aspect of Charles administration was despotism. He hated and detested being a constitutional monarch. Asked why he was not adhering to the 1814 Charter, Charles boasted that I would rather chop wood than rule in the fashion of the king of England. He had nothing in his dictionary to do with democracy and constitutionalism. This was very unrealistic. Charles showed that he had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing out of the French revolution considering that despotism had been overwhelmed by the 1789 revolutionary forces of equality, liberty and fraternity.

6. Freedom of the press

Press freedom that was gained out of the 1789 revolution came to a halt when it was suppressed by Charles X due to its critics against his unrealistic policies. Liberal journalists were either punished with a heavy fine or imprisoned for 7 years. Newspapers were to be sanctioned by the king. In 1827, a law was passed which completely destroyed press freedom. This amongst others provoked liberal protests that climaxed into the July 1830 revolution.

7. St. Cloud Ordinance 1830

On 25th July 1830, Charles X issued the St Cloud Ordinance in which he clearly stated that;A government that has not the right to take measures for the safety of the state cannot exist

Consequently, he declared a state of emergency, dissolved the newly elected chamber of deputies, renewed the ban on the press, reduced the life of the parliament from seven years to five years and ordered for fresh elections after reducing the number of voters from 100,000 to 25,000 just to cling on power.

The ordinance was a challenge to the achievements of the French revolution and completely destroyed the 1814 charter. It provoked people who erected barricades throughout the streets of Paris, although the government demolished them. However, the National Guard and the regular troops joined the masses who became the masters of Paris on 29th July 1830. Thiers, Guizot and Talleyrand offered the throne to Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans and the offer was accepted by him. Charles X abdicated in favour of his nine years grandson Henry, Duke of Bordeaux commonly known as Count of Chambord. However, nobody bothered about him and the throne was given to Louis Philippe. Charles X and his family left for England and later Austria where he died in 1836.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

REALISTIC POLICIES OF CHARLES X

Charles appears to have learnt something from the poor economic policies of his brother Louis XVI. This made him to embark on socio-economic developments. In his administration, agriculture, transport and industry progressed; railways and gas lighting were coordinated throughout Paris and its immediate towns by 1830.

In his foreign policy, Charles X pursued an adventurous foreign policy that brought glory to the Frenchmen. He colonized Algeria in 1830 for France and France became the first effective colonial power in Africa. Algeria became a potential area for future exploitation through grains and olives that were shipped as raw materials for French industries.

In the Greek war of independence, France under Charles X allied with Britain and Russia, and assisted the Greeks against the Turks. The French fleet took part in the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino bay in 1827. Although Charles X later withdrew the French troops from the Greek struggle, he had co-operated with England to reduce Russian imperialism in the Balkans.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CHRONOLOGICAL TIMEFRAME OF SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

1814-1824: The reign of King Louis XVIII

1816-1817: The white terror

4th June 1814: King Louis XVIII issued a liberal charter

1821: Lafayette unsuccessfully organized a rebellion against Louis XVIII at Belfort

1822: Appointment of a bishop as the minister of education

1824-1830: The reign of Charles X

1815-1818: 1820-1821, Duke de Richelieu as chief minister

May 1816: Peasant revolt at Grenoble, Suppressed with a lot of brutality.

1818-1820: Decazes as chief minister.

1820: The murder of Duke de Berry, Decazes resigned

1821-1827: The ministry of Villele who became unpopular and resigned

1823: French troops suppressed the revolution in Spain and restored Ferdinand I to his throne.

1825: Coronation of Charles X as King

Compensation scheme to indemnify Émigrés for the loss of their property in the course of the revolution was initiated.

1827: Charles X disbanded the National Guard

1828-1829: Comte De Martignac as Chief minister, Dismissed in 1829.

1829-1830: Prince De Polignac as Chief Minister

1830: The St Cloud ordinance

July 1830 The outbreak of a revolution that led to the downfall of the restored Bourbon

Monarchy and Monarchism in France.

1st Aug 1830: Charles X abdicated the throne and fled to England

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Introduction

In 1830, Europe experienced revolutionary movements in states such as France, Belgium, Poland, Spain, Portugal, Italian states and of German states. Even before 1830, there was a state of unrest / instability in Europe due to tension between the new forces of liberalism and nationalism against the old forces of despotism and conservatism. Such tension gathered momentum and exploded into the 1830 revolutions in Europe.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

GENERAL CAUSES OF THE REVOLUTIONS

1. The 1815 Vienna settlement

The Vienna settlement of 1815 was primarily responsible for the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in

Europe. The settlement ignored and undermined the forces of nationalism and liberalism in Europe. It restored very unpopular rulers like the Bourbons in France, Ferdinand VII in Spain, Ferdinand II in Naples and Victor Emmanuel I in Piedmont' to their thrones. It became a forum for Metternich to impose his anti liberal and anti nationalistic policies against smaller nations like Italians and Germans. The settlement also forcefully amalgamated Belgium with Holland to form the Kingdom of Netherlands. All these were cardinal mistakes that brought instability in Europe, which climaxed in the 1830 revolutions in France, Belgium, Italian and German states. It should be noted that the settlement ignored the independence of Poland and ratified the partition of Poland between Russia, Austria and

Prussia. This left the Poles with no other better option to regain their independence than a revolution.

2. Unrealistic parliamentary system

Unfair parliamentary system also caused the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. In the kingdom of Netherlands, the Belgians whose population was 3.5 million were given equal number of seats in the parliament with the Dutch whose population was only 2million. The Belgian members of parliament were given equal number of seats in the parliament with the Dutch whose population was only 2million. The Belgian mps were government officials/sycophants who supported Dutch interest against Belgian interest in parliament just to gain favour from King William I. This left the Belgians who had social, political and economic problems hopeless, which dragged them to the 1830 revolution.

In Poland, Tsar Nicholas I ignored the polish parliament and never summoned it until 1825. Even then the parliament remained powerless since the king continued to rule according to his wishes. In France, Charles X and his chief Minister Guizot issued the St- Cloude ordinance of 1830 that dissolved the parliament.

They nullified elections because many opposition had won seats in parliament and ordered for fresh elections after reducing the number of eligible voters from 100,000 to 25,000, which left 75,000 Frenchmen disenfranchised. By 1830, there was popular demand for parliamentary reforms and the government's insensitivity to such demands in Belgium, Poland and France is what caused revolutions in such states.

3. Unrealistic constitutional system of governance

Unfair constitutional system of governance was yet another issue that contributed to the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. In the kingdom of Netherlands, the constitution favoured the Dutch to the disadvantage of the Belgians. This was also extended in the courts of law, which conditioned the Belgians to revolt in 1830. In Italian and German states, Metternich and Austria ruled autocratically without a constitution. In France, the 1814 constitution made property qualification the basis of voting, which left about 100.000 Frenchmen out of about 29 million eligible to vote. The violation of the 1814 constitutional charter by the restored bourbons discredited them from liberal Frenchmen

The Belgians, Italians, Germans and Frenchmen therefore wanted a constitutional system of government such as that of Britain, which their leaders refused to adopt, hence the outbreak of revolutions.

4. Political marginalisation

The 1830 revolutions were also caused by unfair distribution of key government positions. The Belgians were marginalized in favour of Dutch, for instance, only one cabinet minister out of 7 was a Dutch, 9 out of 39 ambassadors were Belgians and all the 9 army generals were Dutch. In Poland key government positions were awarded to Russians and Russians replaced Polish officials in high positions. The Belgians and Poles could not tolerate this political marginalisation beyond 1830, hence the outbreak of the revolutions.

5. Press censorship

Denial of press freedom also contributed to the outbreak of 1830 revolutionary movements in Europe. In the kingdom of Netherlands, the Belgian press was severely censored while that of Holland was left free to operate. In France, the restored bourbons (Louis XVIII from 1821 and Charles X from 1824) also censored the press just to avoid their weaknesses from being made public. In Poland, the situation was the same. In all these states there were heavy penalties on liberal journalists who defied the ban on press freedom. This explains why the liberals, journalists, intellectuals and editors spear headed the revolutions in states such as Belgium, France and Poland.

6. The French revolution of 1789

Inspiration from the French revolution of 1789 also occasioned the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. The 1789 revolution came with revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity that inspired oppressed masses with similar problems e.g. Italians, Belgians, Germans and Poles to rebel in 1830. This was because the French revolution of 1789 provided a practical example of how equality, liberty and attained against an oppressive and exploitive government. They also learnt that the power belongs to the oppressed people who can use revolutionary means to cause the biggest political change. In France, the restored Bourbons learnt nothing and forgot nothing from the French revolution of 1789, which made the Frenchmen to stage yet another revolution in 1830.

7. Success of the French revolution of 1830

The success of the French revolution of 1830 against the restored Bourbon monarchy also contributed to the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in other states. By 1830, the Italians were fed up with foreign domination and oppression. They could not revolt due to fear of the Troppau protocol through which Austria, Russia and Prussia had pledged to suppress Lope and maintain the Vienna Settlement. However, they were inspired to revolt in 1830 when they realized that the French succeeded without any opposition/ intervention from neither the signatories of the Vienna settlement nor the Troppau protocol powers. This is because the success of the French men in the Feb. revolution portrayed the vulnerability/ vincibility of the Vienna settlement and how it had lived its usefulness.

8. British support of liberalism and nationalism

The British liberal tendency and support towards liberalism was also responsible for the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. Britain was a liberal and democratic country that was displeased with foreign domination and oppression. She pursued a non-interventionist foreign policy but gave moral and indirect support to oppressed nations who were struggling for freedom. This encouraged the Belgians, Italians, Germans, French and Poles to revolt in 1830. This was because they anticipated support and no opposition from British government.

9. Weakness and collapse of the congress system

The weakness and collapse of the congress system by 1830 also contributed to the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. The congress system was established to maintain the Vienna settlement, which had undermined nationalism and liberalism of the Belgians, Italians, Germans and Poles. These nations were afraid of the congress powers that were bound to crash any revolutionary movement against the Vienna Settlement. However, the weaknesses of the congress system such as lack of joint army, disunity of the members together with self-interest provided a line of weakness for these nationalities to mobilize and revolt by 1830. It's eventual collapse by 1830 left Europe more divided without any spirit of togetherness in defending the Vienna settlement. The Belgians, Italians, Germans and Poles used this as a golden opportunity to mobilize and revolt by 1830.

10. Economic hardship

Economic hardship prior to 1830 made indispensable contribution to the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. There was massive corruption, embezzlement of public funds and excessive/ over taxation of the Italians,

Germans, Poles, French and Belgians. Italians and Germans were exploited through over taxation by corrupt Austrian officials and Metternich. The French were affected by the effects of revolutionary and Napoleonic wars plus the heavy war indemnity that was imposed on her after the downfall of Napoleon. Belgian economy was paralyzed by Leopold's free trade policy and over taxation of bread to the advantage of the Dutch. The overall effects of these were poverty, famine, inflation and unemployment that provided desperate conditions for the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe.

11. Side effects of industrial revolution

The negative effects of industrialization also contributed to the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. It created more problems like unemployment and low payments for long hours of work in poor working conditions. The unemployed population in Belgium and France blamed their governments for their problems. The workers also hated their governments for failing to address their poor conditions of work.

Besides, industrialization led to the rise of a strong middle class with ambitions to gain political prominence/ positions by criticizing their governments for failing to address the problems of unemployment and poor conditions of work. This created the necessary atmosphere for the explosion of the 1830 revolutions in Europe.

12. Religion.

Religion was responsible for the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions especially in Belgium and France. In the Kingdom of Netherlands, Protestant religion was made a state religion amidst protest from the Belgians who were Catholics and excitement from the Dutch who were Protestants. Education was made to be under the church, which meant that catholic schools were indirectly given to Protestants since Protestants dominated key government positions. Belgian religious leaders criticized such policies and thus influenced the outbreak of the revolution. In France, Charles X revived the church influence on state affairs and the privileges of the clergy. This was a resurrection of the pre-1789 church influence and privileges which the Frenchmen had shed blood to abolish in the 1789 revolution. Eventually, it dragged the Frenchmen to yet another revolution in 1830.

13. Despotism

The need to end dictatorship in Europe was also responsible for the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions. In France, Charles X established a perfect

dictatorship in 1830 when he enacted the St. Cloude ordinance in which he declared a state of emergency, nullified elections and ordered for a fresh one after reducing the number of voters from 100,000 to 25,000. Tsar Nicholas I killed many Poles whom he suspected to have played a role in the death of his father. He also proposed to use the Polish army to suppress the revolution in France that made them to mutiny against him. In Belgium, Leopold II dictated policies that favoured the Dutch against the Belgians e.g. he forced the Belgians to use Dutch as official language. In Italian and German states, Metternich system denied the Italians freedom of speech, association, worship, press etc.

The above dictatorial and anti-liberal policies were unacceptable to the French, Belgians, Italians and Germans, hence the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe.

14. The struggle for national independence and unification

The desire to achieve independence and unification also caused the 1830 revolutions in Europe. The Vienna Settlement of 1815 undermined nationalism and subjected Belgium to Dutch control, Poland to Russian rule, Italians and Germans to Austrian influence. Metternich frustrated Italian and German unifications through his repressive policy of divide and rule, espionage and force. This made Italians and Germans who had started struggling for unification earlier to continue after 1815, which climaxed into the outbreak of 1830 revolutions. Thus, one can comfortably assert that the struggle for national independence and unification in Belgium, Poland, Italian and German states contributed to the outbreak of 1830 revolutions in Europe.

15. Role of intellectuals and revolutionary leaders

Lastly, the role-played by intellectuals and revolutionary leaders also caused the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. In spite of press censorship, Journalists, professors, teachers and lawyer's clandestinely/secretly condemned unrealistic policies of their governments and inspired the masses with revolutionary emotions. Their role was very influential in planning and mobilizing the masses and foreign assistance for the revolution. Polignao led the revolution in Belgium while, Lafayette, Louis Philippe, Adolph-Theirs, Lamar tine, Tallyrand and Cavainag worked together to lead the revolution in France. The revolutions in Poland and German states were led by intellectuals especially university students. They

read and interpreted the writings of philosophers to the oppressed masses and made it easy to mobilize them for the revolution.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

EFFECTS/SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 1830 REVOLUTIONS ON EUROPE

The 1830 revolutions had positive and negative effects on the political, social and economic developments of Europe. Some of its effects were short term while others were long term and everlasting in the history of Europe.

Negative effects

1. Loss of life and destruction of property

The 1830 revolutions resulted into massive loss of lives and destruction of property. In Belgium, the Dutch troops attacked and killed thousands of Belgians while the revolutionaries destroyed important places like opera house. In Italian states, Spain and Portugal, civil war developed after the revolutions and led to more death and destruction of property.

2. Downfall of Kings and their governments

The 1830 revolutions led to the downfall of Kings and their governments. The revolution in Belgium overthrew the Belgian crown as the Belgians regained their independence from king Leopold II of the Kingdom of Netherlands. In France, Charles X and the restored Bourbon monarchy were overthrown and never again re-surfaced in the political leadership of France. In the German states of Brunswick, the ruling Duke was overthrown. In the Italian states of Modena and Parma, King Francis IV and Marie Louise were overthrown respectively. The downfall of these Kings and governments were a direct consequence of revolutionary activities against them.

3. Downfall of Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy

The 1830 revolutions in Belgium, Italian states and Poland contributed to the downfall of Louis Philippe and Orleans's monarchy in France. The liberals, Catholics and glory seekers in France pressurized Louis Philippe to assist the revolutionaries in Belgium, Italy and Poland but Philippe declined. It made

them to criticize his government and leadership as incompetent of reviving the French lost glory and prestige in Europe. This undermined the popularity of Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy right from the start and contributed to outbreak of 1848 revolution, which terminated Louis Philippe and the monarchy from the "political landscape" of France.

4. Total Collapse of the Congress system

The 1830 revolutions led to total collapse of the congress system. The congress system that was instituted maintain the Vienna settlement and peace was finally brought to an end by the 1830 revolutions. The revolutions created more divisions amongst the congress powers and consequently undermined the concert of Europe/ spirit of togetherness. For instance, Britain and France supported the revolution in Belgium, which was opposed by Austria, Prussia and Russia. Britain and Russia also supported the revolutions in Italian and German states against Austria. All these undermined the concert of Europe and made it impossible to revive the congress system that had already been weakened by other factors.

5. Outbreak of 1848 revolutions in Europe and 1863 revolution in Poland

The 1830 revolutions also contributed to the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. The suppression of Italian, German and Polish revolutions left them more determined to fight due to unfulfilled aims and objectives i.e. freedom. This partly explains why Italians and Germans kept resisting Austrian influence, which climaxed into the 1848 revolutions. The success of the Belgium and French revolutions of 1830 discredited the Vienna settlement and moral boosted the Italians, Germans and Poles to fight and overthrow the arrangement of the Vienna settlement in their states. Besides, the revolutions made Metternich to toughen his repressive policy against Italians, Germans and Hungarians only to drag them the 1848 revolutions. The failure of the Poles to achieve their aims and objectives in 1830 made them continue with the struggle that led to the outbreak of yet another revolution in 1863.

6. Weakened Metternich's influence in Europe

Metternich's influence and system in Europe were undermined by the 1830 revolutions. In the Vienna settlement of 1815; Metternich influenced the delegates to restore the Bourbon monarchy in France and amalgamate Belgium with Holland. This was successfully reversed in 1830 when the restored Bourbons were over thrown and Belgium broke off from Holland. Metternich failed to influence European statesmen to suppress the

revolutions and preserve the Vienna settlement. The rise of Louis Philippe in France and Leopold Saxe-Coburg in Belgium with anti-Metternich background and policies left Metternich isolated from 1830. It helped to shift the balance of power from Vienna to London. This partly explains why there was increased opposition to Metternich's influence in Europe from 1830 -1848.

7. Oppression and suppression of the masses

The 1830 revolutions had disastrous consequences in areas where the revolutionaries failed to succeed.

Oppressive policies were adopted to safeguard the re-emergence of further revolutionary movements.

Metternich oppressed the Italians and Germans more by tightening his conservative and anti-liberal policies e.g. press censorship, imprisonment and exile of liberals, spy network and use of force. Tsar Nicholas I abolished freedom of press and parliament in Poland. He forcefully took Polish children for military training in Russia. He went ahead to close the University of Warsaw and turned the entire city of Warsaw into a military garrison. It should be noted that severe suppression and militarism in the aftermath of the revolutions forced hundreds of Italians, Germans and Poles into exile especially in Western Europe and America.

Positive effects

8. Success of the revolutions in France and Belgium

The revolutions in France and Belgium succeeded and the revolutionaries were able to take power from conservative and despotic leaders. This strengthened the forces of liberalism and nationalism not only in France and Belgium but also all over Europe. However, the revolutions in Poland, Spain, Italian and German states failed to succeed. The revolutions in Poland were suppressed by Russian troops while those of German and Italian states were crushed by Austrian and local royalists.

9. Success of the Greek war of independence

The success of the Greek war of independence was facilitated by the 1830 revolutions. The Greeks started a rebellion against Turkey in 1821 and were still fighting by 1830. The outbreak of revolutions in France, Belgium, Poland, Italian and German states created more instability in Europe that diverted the attention of European powers. This made the major powers of Europe

unable to oppose the Greek revolt and instead support the declaration of her independence in 1832 i.e. Britain, France and Russia.

10. Rise of new men and governments

The 1830 revolutions also led to the emergence of new men and governments in the politics of Europe. In Belgium, an independent constitutional monarchy was established under the leadership of Leopold Saxe-Coburg, as its first king. In France, the Orleans monarchy under the leadership of Louis Philippe took over power after the success of the revolution. IPs also important to acknowledge that the middle class who had been discriminated in French politics dominated key positions in government. The failure of the revolution in Italian states led to the rise of Mazzini who formed the young Italian movement to fight for Italian independence and unification.

11. Consolidation of constitutional liberal system of government

The revolution led to attainment of constitutional liberal system of government in Europe. In France, the 1814 charter was revised in 1830 and thus the Orleans monarchy became a liberal constitutional monarchy. Belgium was also declared a liberal constitutional monarchy with an independent judiciary, elected parliament and executive. In Brunswick [a German state], Spain and Portugal, the post revolutionary governments were forced to grant liberal constitutions. One can therefore conclude that the 1830 revolutions consolidated the idea of constitutionalism in Europe.

12. Exposed the weakness of the Vienna settlement

The revolutions undermined the credibility of the Vienna settlement and destroyed its achievements. The settlement had undermined liberalism and nationalism in Belgium, Poland, Italian and German states by imposing foreign rule. In France, the settlement underrated the achievements of the French revolution and Napoleon by restoring the rule of the Bourbons. However, the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in these states manifested that the Vienna settlement was unrealistic in maintaining a lasting peace in Europe. The revolutions also helped to overturn the bad arrangements of the settlement in Belgium and France. Even where the revolutions did not succeed e.g. Italian and German states, the forces of liberalism and nationalism were strengthened, which kept undermining the credibility of the settlement. This was shown when the restored Bourbon monarchy was over thrown and Belgium separated from Holland.

Attachments



CHARACTERISTICS/COMMON FEATURES OF THE 1830 REVOLUTIONS IN EUROPE

The 1830 revolutions in Europe occurred in France, Belgium, Poland, German states, Italian states etc.

They possessed similar characteristics in their causes, course and consequences.

1. The roots / origin of the 1830 revolutions can be traced back to the French revolution of 1789. The revolution came with the idea of liberty, equality and fraternity that inspired Italians, Germans and Poles to rebel in 1830. They also used strategies and tactics adopted from the French in 1789. Besides, the success of the 1830 revolutions in France also morally boosted these states to revolt in 1830.

2. The revolutions were also caused by the unrealistic Vienna settlement of 1815. The settlement imposed foreign rule on the Belgians, Italians and Germans. It also restored the unpopular Bourbon rule in France. These brought bitter resentment that flared up into 1830 revolutions.

3. The revolutions were either liberal or nationalistic in nature. The revolutionaries revolted in demand for liberal reforms and independence or liberal reforms only. In France, they demanded for liberal reforms only because they were already independent. In Belgium, Poland, Italian and German states the revolutionaries needed liberal reforms as well as independence.

4. The timing and spread of the 1830 revolutions provides some similarities. The revolutions broke out in the same year i.e. 1830 and those that failed were suppressed by the end of 1830. It started from France in Feb. 1830 and spread to other states.

5. Foreign intervention is yet another feature that characterized the 1830 revolutions in Europe. Britain and France sent their troops to assist the Belgians in 1831. They were also influential in proclaiming Belgium as an independent and neutral state by 1832. On the other hand, Russian troops crushed Polish revolution by the end of 1830. In Italian and German states, Austrian troops were used to quell the revolutions.

6. The revolutions were based in the urban centers. The rural dwellers played little role in the revolutions.

Urban towns like Paris in France, Berlin and Brunswick in the German states, Milan in Piedmont and

Warsaw in Poland became the base for mobilization and fighting by the revolutionaries. This was because urban centers had the greatest impact of industrial revolution. Above all, the workers, middle class and intellectuals were the residents of such towns.

7. The 1830 revolutions were led by intellectuals and middle classmen. They included lawyers, journalists, teachers and university students. For instance, Adolph Theirs, Lafayette, Lamar tine etc. led the revolution in France. Mazzinni, Gilbert and Garibaldi co-coordinated the rebellion in Italian states. University students in German states and Poland provided leadership to the revolutionaries.

8. Apart from the revolutions in Belgium and France, the other revolutions failed to achieve their main objectives. The Italians, Germans, poles and Spaniards were all quelled down by 1831. They failed to dislodge foreign rule and were persecuted there after the revolutions were quelled down.

9. The 1830 revolutions were also characterized by heavy bloodshed, destruction of property and exile to thousands of people. The counter revolutionary measures by the existing governments led to loss of thousands of lives and self-exile of key suspects e.g. Mazzini and Garibaldi in Italian states.

10. The desperate socio-economic conditions coupled with the side effects of industrial revolutions were similar factors that caused the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Europe. Famine, poverty, inflation, unemployment, poor working conditions, income inequality, unfair taxation system and corruption were problems that the pre-revolutionary governments failed to settle. These were issues that drove the French, poles, Italians, Germans and Belgians to take a revolutionary stand in 1830.

11. Other than Belgium, the revolutions occurred in less industrialized countries with poor economies. Countries like France, Poland, Italian and German states were agrarian/ agricultural with poor economies. This explains why the problems of poverty, inflation, famine, unemployment etc. were so profound that the revolutions became inevitable by 1830. On the other hand, Britain survived because of her strong economy and industrial base.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background:

The Belgian Revolution refers to political, social and economic changes that occurred in Belgium from 1830 - 1839. It was a triumph of Belgian Liberalism and Nationalism over despotic and conservative forces of Europe. The root cause of this revolution can be traced to the Vienna settlement of 1815. In

1815, the Vienna peacemakers forcefully amalgamated Belgium with Holland to form the kingdom of Netherlands, as a defense barrier against further aggression from France. The other aim of the Vienna peacemakers was to punish the Belgians for supporting Napoleon and reward Holland for not siding with him. This is why the new state of Netherlands was dominated by Dutch from top to the bottom positions.

The above arrangement was unviable (unworkable) due to historical, cultural, religious, linguistic and Economic differences between the Belgians and the Dutch. The Belgians did not approve and indeed protested this forceful combination and domination of their motherland by the Dutch. This forceful combination together with the unrealistic policies pursued by the Dutch against the Belgians made the outbreak of the 1830 revolution inevitable.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CAUSES OF THE REVOLUTION:

The circumstances that led to the outbreak of the Belgian Revolution of 1830 can be categorized into political, economic, social -cultural and religious factors:

POLITICAL FACTORS

1. The unrealistic Vienna Settlement/Nationalism

The Vienna Settlement of 1815 was primarily responsible for the outbreak of the Belgian revolution. The settlement forced Belgium to combine with Holland to form the kingdom of Netherlands as a bull – work against further French aggression. The Dutch were made to dominate the government because the peacemakers were suspicious that Belgium was an ally of Napoleon. This forceful union was unworkable because of historical, social, cultural, linguistic and economic differences between the Belgians and their Dutch masters. It was protested by Belgian liberals and nationalists, which explains why they mobilized the Belgians to revolt by 1830. To this extent one can argue that the Belgian revolt was a nationalistic protest aimed at restoring the lost glory and independence of the Belgians. •

2. Unfair parliamentary system

Unfair parliamentary representation was an issue that was responsible for the outbreak of the revolution.

The Belgians who were 3.5 million were made to have equal representatives with the Dutch who were only 2 million. This was undemocratic and unfair to the Belgians who deserved more seats in the parliament on account of their population. The Parliament itself met in Hague (Holland) than Brussels (Belgian). Worst of all the Belgian MPs were government officials who could not oppose King William's unfair policies against the Dutch. This made the parliament to pass and sustain anti- Belgian policies, which made the Belgians to resort to a revolution as the only solution to their grievances.

It should be noted that unfair parliamentary system is the reason why the Netherlands constitution favoured the Dutch at the expense of the Belgians. The Belgians enjoyed lesser rights and had more duties towards the state than their Dutch counterparts (according to the constitution). For instance, the Belgians were unfairly treated at the courts of law compared to the Dutch.

3. Domination of Administrative positions

The monopolization of public offices by the Dutch was a source of concern that made the Belgians to revolt. King William, the president of the Kingdom was himself a Dutch, At one time 6 out of 7 cabinet ministers were Dutch, 30 out of 39 ambassadors were Dutch, 1,800 out of 2,000 army officers were Dutch and all the 9 Generals were Dutch. This political marginalization and prejudice against the Belgians made the Belgians to revolt in a bid-to set up an independent state and manage their own affairs.

4. Press censorship

Press censorship was another cause of the Belgian revolution of 1830. The Belgian newspapers, articles, journals etc were severely censored while those of the Dutch were being published without any restriction.

It was feared that the Belgians would use their press to criticize the Dutch discriminative policies against the Belgians. This irritated Belgian Liberals, journalists, writers and editors who spearheaded the revolution in 1830.

5. The influence of French Revolutionary Ideas and the support of the French men

The spread of French revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty, fraternity and nationalism also contributed to the outbreak of the Belgian revolt. These ideas made the Belgians whose problems were to some extent similar to those of the Frenchmen (before 1789) to rebel against their Dutch oppressors. Moreover, the Frenchmen supported the Belgians to regain their independence, which would weaken the barrier created to the N.E. and provide opportunity for annexing Belgium to France. This is why Tallyrand, other French radicals and Louis Philippe gave indirect assistance to the Belgians. All these encouraged the Belgians to start the revolution with hopes of foreign assistance from France.

6. The success of the French Revolution of 1830 and influence of external Events

The success of the French Revolution of 1830 against the Bourbon monarchy under the leadership of Charles X inspired the Belgians to revolt. Although the Belgians were opposed to Dutch domination, they could not rise up against the Dutch. This was due to the fear of Troppau protocol through which Austria, Russia and Prussia had vowed to suppress revolutions throughout Europe and maintain the Vienna settlement. However, when the French revolted successfully in 1830 and there was no intervention from neither the Vienna powers nor the Troppau powers, the Belgians were moral boosted to demonstrate against Dutch domination at opera house which climaxed into the revolution. This is because the French success was a practical example of how the Vienna settlement had outlived its usefulness and exposed its vulnerability.

On the other hand, the Belgians were moral boosted by other external events in the Austrian Empire and

America. In these areas oppressed nationalities like Italians, Germans and Brazilians were violently struggling to regain their freedom and independence. This encouraged the oppressed Belgians to wage a similar struggle, which led to the revolt.

7. The Downfall of the congress system.

The collapse of the congress system by 1830 also inspired the Belgians into the revolution. It should be noted that the congress system was to maintain the Vienna settlement, which had forced the amalgamation of Belgium with Holland. The Belgians were thus threatened by the congress powers who were bound to intervene to crush any movement against the Vienna settlement. However, the congress system collapsed by 1830 and there was no spirit of togetherness in defending the settlement. The Belgians used this as a golden opportunity to revolt and regain their freedom and independence.

8. The Role of Polignao

The rise and role of Belgian revolutionary leader Polignao was influential in the outbreak of the revolution. Polignao condemned the discriminative, exploitative and oppressive policies of the Dutch against the Belgians, which inspired the Belgians with revolutionary emotions. Polignao's role in criticizing Dutch administration, planning for the revolt and mobilizing support from foreign agitators most especially the French, made the outbreak of the revolt inevitable.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

9. Free trade policy / laissez faire Economy

The Belgians were disappointed by Leopold's economic policy, which favoured the Dutch economy at the expense of their economy. Belgium was an industrialized state and Holland was basically an agricultural and sea faring state. The Belgians therefore wanted a protectionist policy to safeguard their infant industries from foreign competition. The Dutch under Leopold's leadership preferred and pursued a free trade policy, which was intended to avail the Dutch cheap manufactured goods and food stuff. It should be stressed that this Laissez faire policy led to the influx of superior and cheap foreign goods that out competed the Belgian products. This was resented by Belgian middle class, businessmen and traders who were experiencing serious losses and closed factories. It caused inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation, which forced the Belgians to rebel for their freedom in 1830.

10. Unfair taxation system

Unfair taxation system also prompted the Belgian revolution of 1830. The Belgians revolted due to heavy and unnecessary taxes that were imposed on them. They were angered by the imposition of new taxes on flour and meat in 1821 whose benefits they never saw. The most annoying was that bread, which was their staple food, was over taxed and yet potatoes, which was the Dutch staple food was never taxed. This made bread very expensive, increased the cost of living, reduced the standard of living and disposable income of the Belgians in favour of the Dutch. It was these deplorable conditions due to indiscriminate tax policy that made the Belgians to rebel against their Dutch oppressors and exploiters.

11. Payment of National Debt

The Belgians were irritated by an arrangement, which subjected them to pay half of the total debt of the kingdom, some of which were incurred before the union. This was unfortunate because Holland had a heavier debt burden than Belgium. The imposition of a uniform tax to meet this debt burden was resisted by the Belgians. They considered foreign domination as a root cause to unfair exploitative policies and revolted in 1830.

SOCIAL - CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS FACTORS

12. Language Difference

King William's introduction of Dutch as a national and official language in 1822 also caused the revolution. This was against the Belgians who wanted French (which they spoke) to be used as an alternative language. It should be emphasized that employment in public offices and official communications were to be in Dutch. This frustrated the Belgians who regarded this as an abuse and caused the 1830 revolution.

13. Religious Differences

Religious difference between the Belgians and the Dutch was a long-term factor that contributed to the revolt. The Belgians were Catholics while the Dutch were Protestants. But because the leadership of the kingdom was dominated by the Dutch, Protestant religion was made the state religion. Protestants were favoured in appointments, recruitment and promotion in public offices against Catholics. This forced the Belgian Catholic religious leaders to criticize the union government and influence the outbreak of the revolution. The fact that the revolution was started when conservative

Belgian Catholics allied with the liberals is a clear testimony that religion was one cause of the rebellion.

14. Education control

Conflict between the Dutch and Belgians over control of Education also precipitated the outbreak of the 1830 Belgian revolution. Before the union, Education in Belgium was controlled by the church, which the Belgian Catholics wanted to maintain. However, after the union, the Dutch dictated and education was put under state control, which means that Catholic schools were indirectly given to Protestant administrators.

These administrators made Dutch language to be compulsory in schools and allocated more resources for the development of Protestant schools to the annoyance of Belgian Catholics. All these injustices were unacceptable to the Belgian Catholics and the clergy. It made them to think of their own state where they would manage their schools, which made them to spear head the revolution.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

IMPACT/SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BELGIAN REVOLUTION

The Belgian revolution had positive and negative impacts on the political, social and economic structures of Belgium as well as Europe.

Positive impact

1. The Belgians succeeded in regaining their independence. The Belgians fought and repelled Dutch invasion several times. This made King William to bow to pressure from Britain and France to recognize Belgian independence by 1839. It led to the emergence of a new Belgium that was independent on the map of Europe. On the other hand, this practically ended Dutch exploitative, oppressive and discriminative rule over the Belgians.

2. Belgium was declared neutral in the London conference of 1839 by the big powers. This was because France and Russia had hidden ambitions to dominate Belgium. Besides, the Vienna powers were afraid of war amongst themselves over Belgium, which was bound to cause a major war in Europe.

This is why Belgium was declared independent and neutral. This stayed in force until it was violated by Germany in 1914, which forced Britain to declare war on Germany.

3. Belgium was declared a constitutional monarchy with Leopold Saxe-Coburg as its first King. The new constitution had 18 articles, which was non-discriminative and emphasized equality of all by nature. The constitution established an independent constitutional monarchy with an executive, elected parliament and an independent judiciary. This made Belgium to be accepted and recognized within the ranks of the big powers of Europe.

4. It promoted the development and industrialization of Belgium. The declaration of Belgian independence and neutrality freed her from Dutch exploitation and oppression, which favoured economic development.

Belgium became free to adopt a protectionist policy and safeguarded her infant industries from foreign competition. This turned Belgium into the second most industrialized nation in Europe before the unification of Germany.

5. The Belgian independence was a triumph for the forces of liberalism and nationalism over reactionary and conservative forces in Europe. The new forces of liberalism and nationalism were ushered in by the French revolution of 1789. From then onwards there was a struggle between the new forces and the old forces of conservatism led by Metternich. The success of the revolution undermined the role of conservative aristocrats like Metternich and contributed to their downfall.

6. The revolt promoted European diplomacy at the time when it was on the verge of total collapse. The revolution created a crisis that necessitated European powers to come together and settle it. It led to the calling of the London conference of 1839, which was to find a final settlement to the revolution in Belgium. This led to the revival of European diplomacy and created a spirit that partly led to the calling of the 1840 and 1841 London conferences.

7. The success of the revolution increased British involvement and influence in European and Belgian affairs. British influence in Belgian affairs increased because Leopold Saxe-Coburg was a relative to the queen of Britain, Britain used the revolt as an opportunity to change the balance of power from Vienna to London. This was one of the issues that made Britain to call the London conference and champion Belgian independence and neutrality.

8. The Greek war of independence was facilitated by the outbreak of the Belgium revolution. The Greek revolt started way back in 1821 and by 1830, the Greeks were still fighting for their freedom. However, the outbreak of the Belgian revolt apart from creating more instabilities in Europe, diverted the attention of European powers. This favoured the success of the Greek war of independence by 1832.

9. The Belgian revolution contributed to the outbreak of subsequent revolutions in Europe. It discredited the Vienna settlement and provided a practical example of how freedom and independence could be attained. This inspired the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in Poland and Italy, 1848 Revolutions in Europe and the Russian Revolution of 1917. These revolutionary movements took the challenge and example from the Belgian revolution of 1830. Such revolutions directly and indirectly led to political, social, economic and religious reforms in different parts of Europe.

Negative impact

10. There was massive loss of life and destruction of property. The Belgian revolutionaries became rowdy and destroyed important places like opera house. On the other hand, King William II sent Dutch forces that frequently attacked and fought Belgian revolutionaries. These led to loss of lives and destruction of property.

11. The revolution had negative consequences on the growth and development of Holland. Before the evolution, Holland exploited the Belgians and depended on her industrial products for her prosperity, however, the revolution terminated her exploitation and dependence on Belgian industries, which impacted negatively on her economy. Besides, Dutch invasions and wars on Belgium had short run effect of contributing to economic decline.

12. The protectionist policy adopted in the aftermath of the revolution had negative impact on economies of Europe in the short run. It undermined international trade between Belgium and other European powers.

Nevertheless, in the long run Belgium industrialized and her Economy improved. European countries benefited by buying superior quality and cheap manufactured products from Belgium.

13. The revolution led to antagonism amongst European powers. It created a strong enmity between Belgium, Britain and France on one hand against Holland, Austria, Prussia and Russia on the other hand.

This was because Britain and France supported the revolution which was opposed by Austria, Prussia and Russia.

14. The revolt violated the Vienna settlement and led to the total collapse of the congress system. It denounced and discredited the Vienna settlement showing that it was unrealistic in an attempt to create a lasting peace in Europe. This was shown in 1831 when France and Britain who were the signatories of the settlement supported the revolution, which was opposed by other powers. Besides, this undermined the concert of Europe and led to the total collapse of the congress system.

15. The revolt undermined the popularity of Louis Philippe and contributed to his downfall by 1848. The Frenchmen wanted Louis Philippe to assist the Belgians who had offered the throne to Louis Philippe's son. However, Philippe declined to support the Belgians because of the fear of reactions from the great powers. This disappointed the glory seekers, Liberals, Catholics and Bonapartists who criticized and undermined his government. Even when Louis Philippe allied with Britain and Belgium against Holland in 1831, they still criticized him for being a stooge of Palmerstone and Britain. All these created circumstances that contributed to the downfall of Louis Philippe in 1848.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE BELGIAN REVOLUTION

The Belgian Revolution was a significant victory of Belgian liberalism and nationalism against Dutch domination and conservative forces in Europe. The Belgians succeeded in establishing an independent and neutral state that was guaranteed by the London conference of 1839. The Belgian success was due to social, political and economic factors within and outside Belgium.

1. The Downfall of the congress system was a blessing in disguise that contributed to the success of the Belgian revolution. It should be noted that the revolution was a violation of the Vienna settlement, which was to be defended by the congress system. However, the collapse of the congress system by 1830 left the powers divided and destroyed the spirit of

togetherness in preserving the Vienna settlement. This is partly why there was no intervention against the revolution, which made it to succeed.

2. The role of France and Louis Philippe was significant in the success of the revolution. A number of French agitators supported the revolution with the hope of weakening the barrier created against France and annexing Belgium to France. This made Palmer stone who never wanted French annexation and influence in Belgium to caution and frustrate Louis Philippe from suppressing the revolution. It made Louis Philippe to withdraw his son's choice over Belgian throne in favour of Leopold Saxe-Coburg. This reduced tension between Britain and France to the advantage of Belgian revolutionaries.

Besides, Louis Philippe's non interventionist foreign policy frustrated his opponent's (opposition in France) attempt to annex Belgium, which favoured quick mobilization of the Belgians against the Dutch. It should be stressed that the French troops played a crucial role in repulsing the Dutch invasion of 1831, which determined the success of the revolution.

3. Britain played the most significant role in the success of the Belgian revolution. The Whig government in Britain was sympathetic to the Belgian cause and never wanted any intervention, which was bound to jeopardize British commercial and strategic interests in Belgium. This is why Palmer stone pressurized Louis Philippe not to suppress the revolution. It indirectly explains why Britain authorized Louis Philippe in 1831 to intervene and protect the Belgian revolution against Dutch invasion. It should be noted that Louis Philippe would not have done so if it was not for Palmer stone's will and authority. It was the same Palmer stone of Britain who called the London conference in 1839 that finally guaranteed Belgian independence and neutrality.

4. The success of the revolution was also due to unity and strength of Belgian nationalism. It was a mass movement that included the middle class, traders, peasants, clergy, intellectuals, civil servants and soldiers. There were no collaborators or betrayers and everyone was ready to fight for freedom and independence. This was partly why the great powers especially Britain and France instead of suppressing the movement, helped the Belgians to succeed in setting an independent and neutral state.

5. Genuine grievances also account for the success of the Belgian revolution. The Belgians were struggling against the Vienna settlement, which had unrealistically imposed Dutch control over them. This was worsened by Dutch exploitative rule. Even after 1830, the Dutch displayed

ruthlessness when they invaded Belgium in 1831, where they caused unjustifiable destruction and killings of the Belgians. This brutal act installed a lot of fear and doubts to the great powers as to what the Dutch were prepared to do should they regain Belgium. This partly made Britain and France to assist the Belgians in their struggle for freedom.

6. The defeat of Dutch invasion in 1831 determined the success of the Belgian revolutionaries. King William refused to accept the Belgian independence that was declared in 1830 and sent Dutch troops to suppress the movements, with hopes of regaining control. However, his efforts were rendered fruitless when French troops and the British navy allied with Belgian troops and defeated the Dutch troops. Had Holland succeeded in this war; she would have regained control of Belgium and the Belgian independence would have been delayed.

7. the strength of Belgian economy was also responsible for the success of the revolution. Belgium was an industrialized nation with a strong economy while Holland was a poor agricultural and sea faring nation.

Belgian's strong economy made her able to train, arm, maintain and motivate a big army that defeated Dutch forces and defended the revolution. It should be noted that Belgian's strong economy is what made her to sustain the struggle until 1839 when she was declared free and neutral.

8. The size of Belgian population was one reason that contributed to the success of the revolution. The Belgians were 3.5 million while the Dutch were only 2million. This means that the Belgians were able to mobilize more resources and men than their Dutch masters. This more resources and men explains why the Belgians succeeded against the Dutch.

9. The success of the Belgian revolution was also due to Belgian's military superiority over their Dutch masters. The Belgians had a bigger army, well motivated, better armed and more determined than the Dutch troops. This explains why the Belgians (although assisted by French troops and British navy in 1831) were able to repulse Dutch invasion and remain free.

10. The declaration of Belgian as an independent constitutional monarchy rather than a republic facilitated the success of the revolution. This was a wise decision that made European powers not to oppose the revolution. Otherwise, had the revolutionaries declared a republican government, European powers would have intervened and crushed it. This is because

European powers knew republican governments in Europe as a source of instability.

11. The 1831 constitution excluded King William from the throne. It embraced the principle of equality and was all inclusive, non partisan and non discriminative. The constitution provided for a government with an elected parliament, an executive and an independent judiciary. Generally, the constitution was better than the French and similar to those of Britain and U.S.A. This is part of the reason why Belgians and western powers accepted and recognized the revolutionary government.

12. The outbreak and success of previous revolutions in Europe also account for the success of the Belgian revolution. For instance, the French success in 1789 and 1830 morale boosted the Belgians, even those who were initially reluctant to join the revolt. One must emphasis that the 1830 revolution in France, Poland, Italy and the Greek war of independence diverted the attention of European powers that would have assisted the Dutch. For instance, Austria and Russia were tied to suppressing the revolts in Italy and Poland respectively. These were events that favoured the success of the Belgian revolution.

13. Lastly, the London conference of 1839 was a Land mark for the success of the Belgian revolution. The London treaty guaranteed the independence and neutrality of Belgium, which was recognized by the great powers as well as Holland. Besides, the treaty clearly defined the boundaries of Belgium and her neighbours like Holland. For instance, she retained Antwerp and the western part of Luxemburg. All these made the Belgian revolution an international issue and put her on the map of Europe as an independent and neutral state.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background

The 1830 July Revolution was skillfully and successfully manufactured in Paris from which the Orleans monarchy under Louis Philippe rose to power. The revolutionaries (especially Lafayette and Tallyrand) planned to, establish a

constitutional monarchy of the British type with Louis Philippe as a constitutional King.

Louis Philippe was born in 1773 to Philippe who was a cousin of Louis XVI. He had a revolutionary background. His father (Philippe Egalite) had voted for the death of his own cousin Louis XVI in 1793. Philippe was a member of the Orleans monarchy that supported the French revolution of 1789. He was also a member of the Jacobins club and had fought in the revolutionary wars up to 1793.

However, he was suspected to be a traitor and so he fled from France and visited various parts of Europe and America including southern Europe, Sicily, the United States, England and later Switzerland where he worked as a tutor.

After the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in 1815, Louis Philippe came back to France. He regained his hereditary estate, stayed in the village for some time and entered the chamber of peers. Although he was a noble, Philippe did not identify himself with the Bourbons as he was opposed to their unrealistic policies. Instead, he associated himself with the middle class and workers of Paris whom he correctly judged to be politically very useful. He made them aware of his liberal, democratic and republican principles.

When the 30th July 1830 revolution succeeded, there was a political vacuum and Philippe was the only person seen as capable of handling French affairs without tampering with the interest of the common man.

He had declared his support for the new government. He was duly elected by the chamber of deputies in July 1830 and was declared king of France on 7th August 1830. Louis Philippe was the first elected king in the history of France with a democratic and high sounding title, King of the people with the grace of God, which was later supplemented with the words and by the will of the people, Philippe was to rule as a constitutional monarch with the help of a parliament. He accepted to rule as a constitutional King without reservations.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

General observations of the 1830 charter

The charter had some loopholes that partly undermined the powers of the king. It did not give him the powers to issue special decrees nor dissolve the parliament according to his will. The chambers of peers and deputies were to be voted for and could introduce laws and even debate that budget. Another important term of the charter' was that it gave the Frenchmen freedom of worship that they had been longing for. The state also took over supervision and control of education policies from the church. It also abolished press censorship and other forms of media restrictions. The Franchise was increased by lowering age qualification from 30 to 25 years. Tax qualification was reduced from 300 to 200 francs and candidates for the chamber of deputies were eligible at the age of 30 years other than 40years. However this enfranchised only the middle class than the majority peasants. Nevertheless, this was an advantage that Philippe utilized to survive for 18 years in power.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

FACTORS FOR THE RISE TO POWER OF LOUIS PHILIPPE

1. Revolutionary Background

Louis Philippe had a revolutionary background that became a political asset for his rise to power in 1830. His father had supported the French revolution of 1789 and had even voted for the death of his own cousin, Louis XVI in 1793. In 1789, Louis Philippe at a tender age of 16 was already a member of the Jacobin club. He participated in the French revolution and physically fought in the revolutionary wars up to 1793. For instance, he fought against Austria and the Royalists at the battle of Jemappes in 1792. This made him the only hope for the middle class, peasants and workers whose interest was jeopardized by the restored Bourbon monarchy hence they voted him to power.

2. Weaknesses of the restored Bourbons

The Bourbon monarchy had outlived its usefulness as early as 1789. From 1815 when it was restored, it was too unpopular and survived on the support of external powers. Louis XVIII and Charles X pursued very unrealistic policies

and tried to resurrect the pre -1789 socio-political and economic order that the Frenchmen never wished to see. The Frenchmen wanted a democratically elected King who would be answerable to the people, hence the title "King of the French by the grace of God and the will of the people". This made the restored Bourbon monarchy very unpopular, triggered the outbreak of the 1830 revolution and paved way for the rise to power of Louis Philippe.

3. The success of the 1830 revolution in France

The success of the 1830 revolution in France was a landmark in the rise of Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy to power. The 1830 revolutionaries (Louis Philippe inclusive), staged a massive demonstration that climaxed in the overthrow of the Bourbon monarchy. The success of the revolution created a political vacuum that led to Louis Philippe's rise to power in 1830. If the revolution had failed, Louis Philippe would either be imprisoned, executed or exiled having supported the revolution. Thus, the success of the revolution gave him an open chance to rise to power in 1830.

4. His personality

Louis Philippe had a unique and humble character that won him the support of the common man.

Philippe had a simple life style, for example he lived principally on soup, walked on streets with no bodyguards, carried his own umbrella, went shopping himself and saved his beards himself. Such personality made him to be very popular amongst the workers and peasants who were fed up with the luxurious lifestyles of the previous kings. Consequently, they overwhelmingly voted him to the chamber of deputies from which he was finally voted to power.

NB. It was the long period of exile and poverty that taught Philippe to be economical and lead a simple lifestyle.

5. Personal relations with revolutionary leaders

Besides, Louis Philippe had a strong solidarity with the leaders of the 1830 July revolutions. He had a good personal relationship with Lafayette, Adolph Thiers, Lamar tine and Tallyrand who were the brains behind the success of the 1830 revolution. It's on record that Philippe openly embraced and kissed Lafayette on 3th July 1830 when the success of the revolution was very clear. This increased his popularity most especially amongst the republicans under the leadership of Lafayette. Adolph cheirs, a reputable

journalist and politician was a very serious mobiliser and campaign agent of Louis Philippe. On 30th July 1830, he flooded Paris with placards of Louis Philippe, which popularized him and paved way for his rise to power.

6. His Association with the middle class

By 1830, France had the largest middle class in Europe that comprised of about 29% of the total population. Philippe was not slow at exploiting this to his advantage. He associated with the middle class, mixed freely amongst them and identified himself with middle class interests as early as 1815 (when he returned from exile). This made him to be a favourite and familiar candidate to the middle class and the peasants who are always influenced by the middle class. This also explains why he won the election that brought him to power in the chamber of deputies because it was dominated by the middle class. Had it not been for the votes of the middle class who were the majority in the chamber of deputies, the story of Louis Philippe's rise to power would have been different.

7. Effects of industrial revolution and support of workers

The negative effects of industrial revolution gained Louis Philippe the support of workers. The industrial revolution had by 1830 encroached into France. It came with socio-economic evils like unemployment, exploitation of workers by capitalists in form of low payments for long hours of work, poor sanitation and child labour. The working class in France was living a very horrible life compared to their colleagues in Britain where conditions were far better. Louis Philippe promised to improve their housing and working conditions, which made the workers to solidly rally behind (support) him, hence his rise to power.

8. Unpopularity of Republicanism

Unpopularity of Republicanism in France and Europe contributed to the rise of Louis Philippe to power. After the success of the 1830 revolution, republicans tried to establish a republican government in France. They set up a provisional government under the leadership of Lafayette at Hotel de Ville.

However, republicanism was only popular in Paris and did not have a nationwide popularity (outside Paris). It faced opposition from moderate royalists, liberals and monarchical powers like Russia and Austria. Moderate royalists and liberals argued that, the establishment of a republic in France would provoke the hostility of monarchical powers of Europe and gave their support to Louis Philippe as a constitutional monarch. The fear of great

powers' reaction also made republican leaders like Lafayette and Adolph Thiers to give up and support Louis Philippe who was presented and accepted as a citizen King.

9. Influence of constitutionalism

By 1830, France was fed up with absolutism (despotism) and had great admiration for constitutionalism. Charles X had declared the 1814 constitutional charter null and void and ruled autocratically. The Frenchmen therefore wanted a constitutional monarchy of the British type.

Fortunately, Louis Philippe's exile in England had widened his knowledge of constitutional monarchy that the Frenchmen badly needed. When he promised to rule France as a constitutional state just like Britain, no one could doubt him on account of his experience hence paving way for his election as a constitutional King in France.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

DOMESTIC POLICY OF LOUIS PHILIPPE (ORLEANS MONARCHY), 1830 - 1848

Louis Philippe's government was very unstable from 1830 - 1840. It was characterized by revolts, strikes and demonstrations. These were master minded by republicans who felt cheated in 1830 since they had played a leading role in the revolution of 1830. They had wanted a republican government but had failed because of the fear of the possibility of war with other monarchical governments in Europe. From 1830-1840, ten different chief ministers (prime ministers) held office. Adolph Thiers was the last who resigned in 1840 because of dissatisfaction over Mehemet All's affairs. From 1840 - 1848, Guizot's cabinet held power. His policies greatly contributed to the downfall of Louis Philippe in 1848. The following were the achievements, failures and weaknesses of Louis Philippe's domestic policies.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Achievements and positive impact of Louis Philippe (Orleans monarchy) in France

1. Industrialization

Louis Philippe made commendable progress in the industrialization of France. His pro-middle class and peaceful foreign policy attracted massive investment in the industrial sector from the middle class.

Consequently, new machines were imported from England and new industries like wine, steel and cotton ginning were established. Transport and communication networks were improved to complement industrial progress. Many railway lines including the one from Paris to St. German were also constructed to facilitate transportation of raw materials and finished products. By 1940, France was the third most industrialized state in Europe. Industrialization created more employment opportunities, improved the standard of living and promoted other sectors like agriculture, trade and transport.

2. Trade

Louis Philippe undertook special measures for the progress of trade. A network of roads, canals, railways and harbours for docking of ships were constructed to promote export trade. He also encouraged a free market economy and free trade with the rest of Europe. However, free trade policy was dropped when it was realized that the French infant industries could not manage to compete with superior British manufactured products. This forced Louis Philippe to resort to the policy of protectionism that safeguarded infant industries in France and promoted economic prosperity.

3. Education

In 1830, a law was passed to regulate education. Primary education was entrusted to the church.

However, government control over secondary and higher institutions was maintained. It was compulsory to educate children about spiritual and social responsibilities. Louis Philippe also encouraged free education and children were forbidden from any form of employment to avoid child labour. His education policy produced useful citizens who steered the socio-economic and political developments of France.

4. Religion

In the field of religion, Louis Philippe's government followed a policy of neutrality. He allowed freedom of worship, which Charles x had undermined by making Catholicism a state religion. The Concordat that Napoleon had signed with the pope was maintained and the government continued to nominate Bishops and pay salaries of the clergy. In 1831, Judaism was put on an equal footing with Christianity. The government began to pay the salaries of Jewish rabbis just as it paid the protestant reverends and catholic priests. This promoted freedom of worship as opposed to religious intolerance that was being propped up by the restored Bourbons.

5. Constitutionalism

Louis Philippe tried to rule as a constitutional monarch, which Charles x had discarded. He rose to power in 1830 through the revised constitution of 1830. From 1830 up to 1840, Louis Philippe ruled according to the provisions of the constitution. This includes fundamental human rights and freedoms like freedom of speech, press, worship and association. He was assisted by a two chambered parliament i.e. the chambers of peers and deputies. These transformed France from absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy by 1840.

6. Restoration of the National Guard and the tri colour flag

Louis Philippe is credited for the restoration of the National Guard and the tri colour flag. The National Guard that had been disbanded by Charles x in 1827 was reinstated and reorganized into a disciplined national army. It was used to maintain internal stability and protect the territorial integrity of France. The revolutionary tri colour flag that Charles x had discarded was restored as the national flag. This was recognition of the French revolutionary changes, which 'harvested' Louis Philippe support from the patriotic Frenchmen.

7. Political freedom

From 1830-1840, Louis Philippe granted political freedom. Many political groups surrounded him with varied interests. Such were the Bonapartists, republicans, liberals, legitimists and socialists. He allowed them to operate and granted political liberties like freedom of association, speech, assembly, press etc. He also adopted the policy of Golden Mean in which he tried to follow a middle path policy and satisfy all the parties. This promoted democracy, fundamental human rights and freedoms like freedom of association and press.

8. Financial management

Louis Philippe is on record as the only King in the history of France who was most economical with resources. His days in exile and the many years of poverty taught him a lesson to avoid extravagancy and luxuries. He pursued a non-interventionist foreign policy partly to avoid wasting human and financial resources. Similarly, he lived a simple life style like walking in the street with no bodyguards and living principally on soup to avoid unnecessary expenses. Some historians have argued that Louis Philippe's life style was an economic asset to France because it saved French resources and enhanced economic progress.

NB: Louis Philippe's simple lifestyle became a political liability to him as it reduced his popularity amongst the nobles and clergy who underrated him as not worthy to be a king.

9. Consolidation of power

Louis Philippe used repression to consolidate his power against internal opposition. There were uprisings, demonstrations and coup attempts engineered by internal opposition i.e. the Bonapartists, republicans, liberals, Catholics, royalists and socialists. However Louis Philippe consistently used the National Guard and the police to suppress any oppositeion activities against his government. For instance, from 1830-1835 he quelled down six uprisings in Paris, Lyon, Lavandee and Marsailles. Louis Napoleon III's assassination attempt against Louis Philippe and the coup attempts of 1836 and 1840 were foiled for which Louis Napoleon was imprisoned. These helped to create internal stability that fostered economic development

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Weaknesses, Failures and negative impact of Louis Philippe (Orleans monarchy) in France

1) Side effects of Industrialization

Industrialization had negative effects on the welfare of peasant, workers and craft men. Machines displaced many artisans and craft men rendering them jobless. The working class suffered low payments or long of work, poor

accommodation and sanitary conditions amongst others. There was child labour where a kid of 5 years old could work for 16 hours a day. This led to the growth of socialism under the leadership of Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollin. The socialists demanded for immediate solution to unemployment and poor working condition. Louis Philippe kept a deaf ear and a blind eye to the appalling conditions of the workers and the jobless craft men. It was therefore not a surprise that the socialists mobilized the unemployed and the disgruntled workers through reform banquets that climaxed into the 1848 revolution, which terminated Louis Philippe's reign.

2) The low Franchise (The right to vote)

Louis Philippe failed to democratize and liberalize French politics. Many French citizens were disenfranchised because of the high tax and age qualification. When there was a massive demand for reduction of taxes, Guizot his chief minister insisted that those who wanted to vote or be voted should work hard, save money and qualify to vote. Consequently, the chamber of deputies was dominated by the propertied middle class members whose wealth made them eligible to contest i.e. they could afford the high, tax fee. This was undemocratic as it disenfranchised majority French peasants and the poor from political representation.

3) Political repression and dictatorship

By 1840, Louis Philippe had drifted from his good intentions because of the growing opposition and threats unleashed against him by the different political factions e.g. Bonapartists, liberals, republicans etc. These factions had intensified criminal activities like strikes, demonstrations, attempted coups and assassination attempt on the life of King Louis Philippe. Eventually, Louis Philippe dropped the policy of Golden Mean and resorted to conservative, radical and reactionary policies. For instance, in April 1834 he passed the law of association, which restricted the freedom of association. He also imposed the law of discussion and banned the press in 1835. Those who defied these laws suffered arrest, imprisonment, death and exile. Although these measures checked the subversive activities of the opposition, it nevertheless brewed more political dissatisfaction that led to the downfall of Louis Philippe in 1848.

4) Internal instability

Louis Philippe's repressive measures led to violent opposition and internal instability. The laws; of association, discussion, ban on the press, arrest and imprisonment of the opposition provoked uprisings, demonstrations and

coup attempts from the Bonapartists, republicans, liberals and socialists. For instance, from 1830-1835 there were six uprisings in Paris, Lyon, Lavandee and Marsailles. In 1836 and 1840, there were assassination and coup attempts against Louis Philippe's life and his regime. Although violence was contained from 1840 onwards, they had nevertheless led to lawlessness, death and loss of property.

5) The return of Napoleon's body

Louis Philippe's return of Napoleon's body in 1846 was a boomerang that contributed to his downfall. To satisfy the revolutionaries and the Bonapartists, Louis Philippe requested to be given Napoleon's body from St. Hellena, brought it to France and laid him in the most magnificent of resting places at the Invalids. Some roads and streets were named after Napoleon. He further decorated Versailles with pictures of revolutionary events and periods. However, this rekindled the memories of Napoleon I's achievements and when the Frenchmen tried to compare it to Louis Philippe's, they realized as Lamar time put it that "France was bored". It aroused Napoleonic nostalgia and strengthened Bonapartism under the leadership of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte III, a nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte III. Thus, the event boomeranged by reducing Louis Philippe's popularity and conditioning his downfall by 1848.

6) Middle class/Bourgeoisie oriented policy

Louis Philippe pursued middle class oriented policies and programs at the expense of the Frenchmen.

They monopolized key government positions and the National Guard. They also dominated the chamber of deputies since they could afford the property qualification and were the only ones that enjoyed freedom of discussion. The middle class were also aided with soft loans to boost their investments and trade. All these were done against the conditions of workers and peasants that deteriorated with industrial revolution.

Actually, Louis Philippe set up a government of the middle class, by the middle class and for the middle class. His pre-occupation was the interest of the middle class and capitalists who were the basis of his power and hence survival. His popularity was eventually confined to the middle class and no wonder that he fell in 1848 following desertion by the middle class after the Spanish marriage in 1846.

7) Unrealistic Economic policy

Louis Philippe's labour policy was unfair to the working class. The government did not restrain the middle class's exploitation and oppression in form of low payments, long working hours, poor sanitation and accommodation. These led to poverty, famine, low standard of living and unemployment. Poor sanitation and accommodation led to the outbreak of calamitous diseases like cholera, typhoid, dysentery and death of some workers. Trade unions that the workers had formed to voice their grievances were banned. Louis Philippe's labour policy accelerated exploitation and oppression of workers by middle class industrialists.

The overall consequence was high income gap between the rich and the poor in France.

8) Corruption and embezzlement of funds

Corruption, bribery and embezzlement of funds characterized Louis Philippe's 18 years reign. The middle class who dominated key government positions and the chamber of deputies made corruption and bribery part of their lifestyle. Guizot, chief minister (1840-1848) rigged elections and maintained a strong hold over the chamber of deputies through bribery and corruption in awarding tenders. According to Karl Marx; Louis Philippe's government was like a joint stock company which was using up national wealth and whose profit was distributed between ministers, members of the national assembly and limited voters.

The overall impact was lack of integrity in leadership, high income inequality and inadequate socio economic developments i.e. education, health and transport.

9) Personality and character

Louis Philippe's humble personality and character was a personal weakness that reduced his popularity.

The long years of poverty and hard life in exile made Louis Philippe to be too economical with resources.

Consequently, he lived a very simple life style e.g. he walked freely on streets unguarded holding a green umbrella, lit his own study fire and lived principally on soup. This made some sections of the Frenchmen particularly the royalists and Bonapartists who were used to seeing their kings living luxuriously to disown him as unworthy to be a king.

10) Inglorious foreign policy

Louis Philippe's inglorious foreign policy was a disappointment to the glory seekers, Bonapartists, liberals, Catholics and revolutionaries. He pursued a non interventionist foreign policy in order to avoid wastage of resources and conflicts with other powers like Britain. For example, he refused to be moved by pressure from the liberals, Bonapartists and glory seekers to intervene in the 1830 revolutions in Belgium, Italian states and Poland not excluding the Syrian war of 1831 -184 1. This made him to be regarded as a person who was incompetent of reactivating and consolidating France's high status in Europe that had been established by Napoleon 1.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

FOREIGN POLICY OF LOUIS PHILIPPE

After his rise to power, Louis Philippe was immediately faced with a series of complicated problems across the borders of France. There were political unrest and disturbances in some parts of Europe right from 1830. The different political factions i.e. Bonapartists, republicans, liberals, legitimists and Catholics expected and pressurized Philippe to intervene in such affairs and bring glory for France. They wanted Louis Philippe to revive French military glory that was achieved by Napoleon I but disappeared during the reign of the restored Bourbons.

Unfortunately, Louis Philippe was not bellicose (warlike), he was a man of peace who did not wish to find himself in a hostile relationship with any of his neighbours. He therefore, pursued a peaceful, cautious, unadventurous and often inglorious foreign policy. This was dictated by some considerations; First he wanted to avoid war with the great powers of Europe who had fought and defeated Napoleon I. This is because they were still suspicious of France as a distabiliser of peace. Secondly, Philippe accurately realized that France had a different political ideology with despotic Russia, Prussia and Austria except constitutional and liberal Britain. He therefore, forged a cordial Franco-Anglo alliance where he took extra-care not to antagonize the interest of Britain. This also helped him not to antagonize the interest of the middle class who could not do without Britain (as the workshop of Europe). Lastly, he was aware that although public

opinion favoured war, France was not yet militarily strong enough to engage in war.

It should be emphasized that Louis Philippe's inglorious foreign policy was a great disappointment to the Frenchmen. This intensified internal opposition against his rule and by 1848 he was very unpopular even to his legislators. For example, in an assembly session of 1847 one member rose up and shouted **what have they done for the past 17 years?** Lamartine shouted back. **Nothings Nothing, Nothing, France is bored.** This combined with his failure in domestic policy to cause the 1848 revolutions that sent him to exile.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ASPECTS OF LOUIS PHILIPPE'S FOREIGN POLICY

1. The Belgium Revolution (1830)

The Belgium revolution of 1830 was an event that put Louis Philippe in a precarious position. The various political groups wanted Philippe to assist the Belgians for various reasons. The Bonapartists wanted Philippe to revive French military glory in Belgium that had once been under Napoleon Bonaparte I. The republicans wished to establish a republican's government in Belgium. The liberals were bent on destroying the 1815 Vienna settlement that had forced the Belgians under Dutch administration. The Catholics hated the Dutch Protestants and preferred Catholic control of education, press and state amongst others.

However, Louis Philippe knew very well that any assistance to the Belgians would be a violation of the Vienna settlement to which France was a signatory. His intervention would provoke the other four powers to declare war on him in accordance with the quadruple alliance that had pledged to maintain by force for 20 years the territorial arrangements of Vienna. He therefore decided not to assist the Belgians. This made him to be in good terms with other powers. In Dec 1830, the big powers met in London over the Belgian question. After realizing the strength of Belgian nationalism and the extent of Dutch mal-administration, they accepted the Belgium independence but under some conditions and one was that Belgium

should choose a king acceptable to the great powers. The Belgians promptly offered the throne to Duke of

Nemours who was Louis Philippe's second son.

Britain openly opposed the choice and Louis Philippe turned down the offer in favour of Leopold Soxe Coburg (a British choice) who was accepted by the Belgians out of their desire for freedom. This was a diplomatic victory for Britain and a loss for France. He was criticized for bending too low and promoting British supremacy over France. This offered a rallying ground for opposition against him. However, Louis Philippe regained some prestige when other powers gave him freedom to repel Dutch invasion, which he successfully accomplished in 1831. Nevertheless, he was still accused of cowardice only to act when told to do so.

2. The 1830 revolution in Italy

Napoleon I's conquest and re-organization of Italy had instilled the spirit of nationalism amongst the Italians. The Vienna settlement of 1815 ignored this and instead gave Austria direct and indirect influence over the Italian states. The Italians therefore rose in a revolt in 1830 against Metternich's unfortunate policies. Austria began using force to suppress the revolutions and restore the ousted kings. Italians and the liberals in France wanted Louis Philippe to give military assistance. However, Louis Philippe as usual followed a cautious policy. He was not slow to declare that he had no desire to clash with Austria over the situation in Italy.... my government is opposed to all foreign intervention in the peninsula. This was a great disappointment to the liberals and Bonapartists who viewed the revolution as a heaven sent opportunity to rekindle (revive) French influence in Italy. They accused him of being too weak to revive French military glory in Europe.

3. The 1830 Revolution in Poland

The 1830 revolution in Poland was yet another event that put Louis Philippe in an awkward situation. Like the Italians, Polish nationalism had been strengthened by Napoleon's conquest and reorganization of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw from 1807. This was tampered with at the Vienna settlement of 1815 by the Great powers. Poland was shared as a wedding cake between Austria, Prussia and Russia (greatest share).

Their desire for independence took them to the revolution in 1830. The liberals in France argued Louis Philippe to support the Poles in their struggle. Aware of a possibility of fighting Austria, Prussia and Russia, Louis Philippe

refused to assist the Poles. So as early as 1830, the revolt died down. Although he avoided war with the great powers, his popularity at home was undermined.

4. The Syrian question (1840)

Louis Philippe's peaceful foreign policy received a diplomatic blow over the Syrian question. In the Greek war of independence, Mehemet Ali of Egypt had helped the Sultan of Turkey after being promised territorial rewards amongst which was Syria. However, the Sultan did not keep his promise and Mehemet Ali occupied Syria forcefully. The war was sparked off between Egypt and Turkey over Syria. The French glory seekers led by Adolph Thiers argued Louis Philippe to extend military support to Egypt.

They wanted to revive the Napoleonic tradition in Egypt and gain a valuable ally in the East for commercial prosperity. Louis Philippe welcomed the ideas and sent French troops to fight alongside Egypt against Turkey. It threatened other powers particularly Britain and Russia who pledged to fight Mehemet Ali and his ally (France). This forced Louis Philippe to resort to his usual policy of "do nothing" and withdrew the French soldiers. The 1840 London conference in which France was not invited gave Egypt part of Syria. This intensified opposition against Louis Philippe to the extent that his chief minister Adolph Thiers resigned his post. Even Louis Philippe became so furious that he threatened Palmerstone with war. However, when Palmerstone took the challenge and started to prepare for war, Philippe got so scared and backed down. This act injured the national pride of France.

5. French imperialistic designs over Tahiti Island

In 1840, Louis Philippe conquered Tahiti one of the islands in the south pacific. This satisfied the glory seekers and militants in France. However, Tahiti was so close to S. America where Britain had built a commercial empire, so she threatened France to withdraw. As usual, Louis Philippe withdrew the French troops from the island in 1843 in favour of Britain. This frustrated a large section of the Frenchmen especially glory seekers who accused him of cowardice,

6. Control of Algeria

Algeria was colonized by France in 1830 under Charles X. When Louis Philippe came to power, the liberals urged him to withdraw but Louis Philippe ignored them and consolidated French rule in Algeria.

Charles X had occupied only the coastal areas with only 20.000 settlers. But Louis gradually penetrated into the interior. However, Abdel Kader declared a jihad against the French. Philippe sent General Bugeaud with about 100.000 troops who captured Abdel Kader in 1847 and consequently the whole of Algeria. By 1848, the number of settlers had risen to about 100.000. This was the beginning of the French colonial empire.

7.The 1846 Swiss Civil War

1846, a civil war erupted between Catholics and Protestants in Switzerland over the form of government to be adopted. The Protestants were secretly assisted by Britain and the Catholics appealed for French resistance. The British foreign secretary Palmerston outmaneuvered Philippe by blindfolding him that was organizing a conference to settle the Swiss crisis. Indeed before the conference sat, the Swiss Protestants had defeated the Catholics. The French Catholics felt betrayed. They expected Philippe to resist Co-religionists/brothers in faith. However, Philippe was conscious to note that it would antagonize Britain and the liberals at home. It made him to refuse to support the Swiss Catholics. This disappointed the Catholics and glory seekers who accused him of pursuing a boring foreign policy.

8. The Spanish marriage 1846

In 1846, Louis Philippe took a bold stand and registered some degree of success over Palmerston.

Princess Isabella and her sister Infanta of Spain were still not yet married. Royalists were sought from Europe to marry them. Britain and France were the most interested powers in providing candidates to marry the two sisters. This was because of the possibility of providing a heir to the Spanish throne since Spain was strategically located. So France and Britain agreed that Isabella was to be married to Francisco Duke de Cadiz, a German Prince (favoured by Britain) and her sister Infanta Maria was to get married to Duke de Montpensier, a French prince. However, it was rumoured that the German prince was impotent and yet Infanta was not to marry the French prince until Isabella was married and had children with the German prince.

Following the above discovery, Philippe and Guizot organised and celebrated the marriage of Infanta on the same day (October 10th 1846) when Isabella got married to the German prince. This was a triumph for Philippe, which so ably and so completely satisfied the glory seekers. However, Palmerston protested bitterly against the 'indirect influence' and the 'illegitimate methods' of Louis Philippe. This was a blow to the Anglo-

French diplomatic relationship. It deprived him of the only ally and undermined his support from the middle class. This made Britain to just watch Louis Philippe pack up for exile without raising any accusing finger in 1848.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS/FACTORS FOR THE DOWNFALL OF THE ORLEANS MONARCHY AND LOUIS PHILIPPE

Right from 1830 when he was elected, Louis Philippe was surrounded by internal and external problems.

This weaknesses in settling internal and external problems made his downfall inevitable by 1848. It was largely his inglorious and non adventurous foreign policy that made his fall a foregone conclusion .The reasons as to why Philippe fell from power are hereby discussed below:-

1. He was the first elected king in the history of France with the title by the grace of God and will of the election. This meant that the Frenchmen could use their votes to unseat him if he went contrary to their expectations. The revised 1830 constitution greatly reduced his powers. Amongst others, he could not like special decrees, dissolve the parliament and the parliament was composed of voted members who could even debate the budget. These made him a weak king with no proper control over the social, political and economic affairs of France hence contributing to his downfall.

2. Louis Philippe was not the most popular politician at that time. He won election by a mere majority of 219 votes out of 430 members in the chamber of deputies. This meant that right from the start he had a majority of 211 opposition members in the chamber of deputies. Even his election was largely due to misconception rather than any concrete support for him. The liberals thought that he would be a liberal king. The workers thought that the long years of poverty had taught him a lesson of the need to alleviate poverty. The Bonapartists thought that he would revive Napoleon's glory over Europe. Unfortunately, Louis Philippe had none of such in his political programs. Apart from the middle class who were appeased up to 1846, the

rest were disappointed and their disappointment was displayed in the 1848 revolutions that sent Louis Philippe to exile.

3. Louis Philippe made a fatal mistake by over relying on the middle class who had elected him. He pursued middle class oriented policies and programs at the expense of the Frenchmen. The middle class dominated key government positions, the chamber of deputies, trade and were granted soft loans for investment. The conditions of the workers and peasants that deteriorated with industrial revolutions were ignored. His popularity was eventually confined to the middle class. Unfortunately, the very middle class deserted him after the Spanish marriage in 1846. This left him with almost no support and made him vulnerable to the revolution of 1848.

4. The rise and growth of socialism became a stumbling block to Louis Philippe's reign. The worsening conditions of peasants and workers due to industrial revolution led to the rise of socialism. The socialists condemned the bourgeoisie government of Louis Philippe and his insensitivity to the plight of the workers.

Louis Blank demanded that the state must guarantee a living wage to all workers. He said; to the able bodied citizens the state owes work, to the aged and infirm, it owes aid and Protection. The socialist propaganda did a lot to add on the discontentment of the people. Socialist Propaganda was more instrumental in the reform Banquet of 1848 through which Louis Philippe lost his power.

5. The return of Napoleon I's remains from St. Hellena to France was a boomerang that led to the downfall of Louis Philippe. In 1846, Louis Philippe returned Napoleon's body and reburied it at a place called Invalids. It provoked Napoleonic nostalgia as the Frenchmen remembered all that Napoleon did for them.

Consequently, Napoleonic legend became very popular with the writings of Louis Napoleon who was the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte. The result of Napoleonic legend was that Louis Philippe became more unpopular with the Frenchmen who compared his achievements with those of Napoleon Bonaparte and practically found nothing. This made him to be rejected by the Frenchmen.

6. Louis Philippe's personality also undermined his popularity. Having experienced poverty and hard life in exile, Philippe became obsessed with how to economize resources. He lived a very simple life style, for instance

he walked freely on streets unguarded, lit his own study fire and lived principally on soup. This made some sections of the Frenchmen particularly the nobles and clergy to disown him as not worthy to be a king. They were used to seeing their kings living luxuriously. They therefore criticized his simple lifestyle and undermined his popularity.

NB His personality and character won him the admiration of the common people who viewed him as a citizen king.

7. Louis Philippe's dictatorial tendencies strengthened his opponents and led to his downfall. By 1848, he had censored the press and restricted people's liberty through the laws of discussion and association. All kinds of people were thrown in prison for leading strikes, demonstrations and revolts. However, prison life became one of the main breeding grounds for republican propaganda and socialist ideas that blew Louis Philippe out of power in 1848. It should be stressed that Louis Philippe's dictatorship was a violation of the revised 1830 constitution, which was a disappointment to the Frenchmen who had trusted him as a leader who would revive constitutionalism in France.

8. Internal political instability also contributed to the downfall of Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy.

Louis Philippe's unrealistic policies e.g. dictatorship, favouritism of the bourgeoisie and inglorious foreign policy were used by the opposition to mobilize the masses in a series of uprisings, demonstrations and coup attempts. For instance, from 1830-1835 there were six uprisings in Paris, Lyon, Lavandee and Marsailles. In 1836 and 1840, there were assassination and coup attempts against Louis Philippe's life and his regime. These undermined the credibility of the Orleans Monarchy and denied it internal support. It should be emphasized that Louis Philippe's suppression of violence by 1841 backfired as it strengthened the opposition and left them more united. This explains why opposition e.g. the liberals, republicans, socialists etc coordinated and mobilized the masses to over throw the Orleans monarchy of Louis

Philippe through the 1848 revolutions.

9. Corruption, bribery and embezzlement of funds also contributed to the downfall of Louis Philippe. The middle class who dominated political, social and economic affairs of France were very corrupt and took bribes shamelessly. Guizot, the chief minister (1840-1848) was too corrupt to the extent that corruption became official government policy e.g. in awarding

tenders and bribing opposition members of the chamber of deputies. Corruption and embezzlement made the government inefficient in provision of social services and incapable of addressing the challenges of unemployment and poor working conditions. The opposition most especially the liberals, republicans and socialists capitalized on these problems to decampaign the Orleans monarchy under Louis Philippe's leadership. This caused the 1848 revolution that led to the downfall of Louis Philippe and Orlean monarchy.

10. The economic crisis that befell France prior to 1848 fomented troubles for Louis Philippe. The bad harvest of 1846 gave way to a serious famine. Besides, epidemic diseases like Typhoid and gonorrhea had psychological and physical effects on the masses. Louis Philippe was unbothered about the conditions of the people. This forced people to move to a few large towns and became desperate mobs who greatly participated in the revolution that ousted Louis Philippe from power in 1848.

11. Louis Philippe's insensitivity to public outcry for parliamentary reforms became a turning point in his political career. Property qualifications made the chamber of deputies to be flooded with middle class members who were not concerned with the welfare of other classes especially peasants and workers. The Frenchmen wanted an expanded Franchise by lowering property qualification but Louis kept a deaf ear.

When Guizot his chief minister was questioned, he insisted that those who wished to vote or be voted should work hard, save money and qualify to vote. This prompted the socialists and republicans to organize reform banquets with barricades that forced Louis Philippe to exile in 1848.

12. it's in foreign policy that Louis Philippe clashed head long with all the political groupings in France. He pursued a submissive and non-adventurous foreign policy, contrary to the expectations of the Frenchmen except the middle class. This made him very unpopular to be ousted out of power in 1848.

The first event was the Belgium revolt of 1830. The Belgians expected assistance from Philippe and the Frenchmen even wanted Louis to intervene and gain glory. But Louis declined to assist the Belgians for fear of antagonizing other powers. Even when the Belgians offered the throne to Louis Philippe's son, he backed down after a stern warning from Palmer stone. This disappointed the liberals, Bonapartists, republicans, legitimists and glory seekers who viewed him as a stooge of Palmer stone. It reduced his popularity and made his fall inevitable by 1848.

13. Similarly, the Poles and the Italians revolted in 1830. Both of them had keen eyes on French assistance. But Louis declined to assist them for fear of the hostility of other powers. He refused to assist the Poles because he feared war with Austria, Prussia and Russia who had Polish subjects. In a similar manner, he declined to aid the Italians for the fear of Austria. This frustrated the liberals, Bonapartists and glory seekers who wanted him to utilize such opportunities to revive French influence in Europe. By 1848, they were fed up with his boring foreign policy and decided to participate in the revolution that sent him on his feet to exile.

14. Louis Philippe also met his political fate through the Mehmet Ali's affairs in the Syrian question.

Mehemet Ali had declared war on the Sultan of Turkey for failing to give him the territories he had promised after assisting him (the Sultan) in the Greek war of independence. Frenchmen wanted Philippe to assist Mehmet Ali and revive the Napoleonic tradition in Egypt. He sent troops but withdrew after being threatened by Britain and Russia. To crown up the humiliation, Palmerston called the 1840 London conference to settle the issue and did not invite France. This provoked a wave of protests from the liberals, Bonapartists and glory seekers. His liberal chief ministers Adolphe Thiers urged him to organize war against the powers that had excluded France from the London conference but Louis declined to do so.

This made Thiers to resign his seat and join the opposition. This was a blow to Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy. Thiers was the most influential leader whose resignation weakened the government and strengthened the opposition. His successor Guizot was very unpopular and his policy made the fall of Louis Philippe inevitable.

15. By colonizing Tahiti Island, Louis had lived to the expectations of the glory seekers and bellicose (war like) French citizens. However, his withdrawal due to protest from Palmerston destroyed the little popularity he might have gained and made him more unpopular. They accused him of being too weak to uphold France's high status and humiliating her in Europe and consequently rejected him.

16. The 1846 Swiss crisis was yet another diplomatic setback for Philippe. He refused to assist the Catholics who were battling with the Protestants about the form of government to adopt. This led to the defeat of Catholics by the Protestants. It made the Catholics in France to be very bitter for they felt he was morally bound to support their fellow brothers in faith. The glory seekers

equally denounced him for not rendering the assistance. These undermined his power and contributed to his eventual downfall in 1848.

17. Louis Philippe's fall can be explained from the Spanish marriage campaign. Although he succeeded over Britain by breaching the agreement and arranging the marriage of Infanta on the same day with that of Isabella, nevertheless, he lost the friendship of Britain, the only ally at the time. Britain cut off diplomatic ties and trade with France. This touched the pockets of the middle class whose trade suffered since Britain was the workshop of Europe. They therefore denounced him and henceforth he was left with no support in France. The middle class joined the workers and peasants in the February 1848 revolution through which Louis Philippe was unceremoniously seen off the French throne. Britain just watched him pack without raising any accusing finger.

18. Lastly, the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe (France inclusive) prompted the downfall of Louis Philippe. The revolution started from Palermo in Italy on 12th Jan 1848, spread to other Italian states and reached France in Feb 1848, The outbreak of the revolution in Italian states inspired the Frenchmen who were already dissatisfied with Louis Philippe's policies to revolt. The various opposition groups most especially the socialists mobilized the French men through reform banquets to start the revolution that swept Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy from power.

Note: - Louis Philippe lost control of French political affairs largely because of his over reliance on the propertied middle class. They were very small in number and had no moral or historical right to control a government that was hated by the aristocracy and the masses. If he had made reforms in the social, political and economic fields, he would have won over people's support. However, he closed his eyes and ears to the problems that faced the masses and no wonder that he was dethroned. He would have perhaps escaped the fate that befell him if he had pursued an adventurous foreign policy that would have cooled down most domestic factions who yearned for glory. All the same, we should not over condemn Louis

Philippe for if he pursued a vigorous foreign policy, he would have entered war with the big powers and risked to be defeated in the very way Napoleon I was defeated in 1815.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

EVENTS FOR THE DOWNFALL OF LOUIS PHILIPPE (1848 REVOLUTIONS)

As Louis Philippe increasingly became adamant to parliamentary reforms and the issue of franchise the republicans and socialists organised reform banquets in Paris and other centers. At these Banquets, a great number of people turned up to listen to reformist political propagators. The reform Banquets gained popularity throughout France and people were fully mobilized for reforms.

The largest of these reform Banquets was scheduled to take place in February 1848 in Paris. The principle

Guests were to be 87 sympathizers from the chamber of deputies. Sensing danger, Guizot banned it and the organizers called it off. Although it was cancelled, all the same people turned up in big numbers. They assembled and shouted for reforms. On the night of 22nd, barricades were put up throughout Paris. The next day, Louis ordered the National Guards to restore order but demoralized as they were, they just joined the people; the crowd shouted down with Guizot and Louis Philippe asked him (Guizot) to resign.

The situation went out of control when the soldiers guarding Guizot's residence fired on the demonstrators killing 23 and injuring 30. The demonstrators put the dead bodies on a wagon and displayed the same to the people of Paris in the glaring daylight. This resulted into a revolution. More Barricades were erected in Paris and Placards with the following contents were displayed in all parts of the city; Louis Philippe massacres us as did Charles X let him go to join Charles X. Hopeless as he was, Louis Philippe abdicated the throne in favour of his grandson Count of Paris. On 24th February 1848, the revolutionaries plundered his palace and set it ablaze. This was the end of the road for the Orleans monarchy and monarchical rule in the history of France. Thus, the 1848 revolution in France was successful and socialist leader Lamarque proclaimed the Second French Republic in Hotel de Ville on 24th February 1848.

Attachments

No attachments



ORLEANS MONARCHY'S CONSOLIDATION OF POWER/SURVIVAL FOR EIGHTEEN YEARS, 1830-1848

Louis Philippe's government was constantly challenged right from 1830 when he rose to power.

Internally, there were revolts, strikes, demonstrations, assassination attempts on his life and conspiracies as he observed, "It is only in hunting me that there is no close season". Opposition parties like Republicans, Bonapartists, legitimists, liberals had varied and divergent interests that made life hard for Louis Philippe.

External events like the 1830 revolutions in Europe, 1840 Syrian question, 1846 Swiss crisis and the way he responded to them intensified domestic opposition against him. In spite of all these, Louis Philippe managed to sit on the throne for 18 years and this can be attributed to the following:-

1) Louis Philippe's peaceful foreign policy was the basis for his survival up to 1848. It made him to legitimize his power amongst European powers who were scared of revolutionary France. Although he was opposed as a coward, his failure to interfere in events outside France like Belgium, Italy and Poland won him the friendship of the 1815 Vienna signatories who would have fought and overthrown him the way they did to Napoleon I.

More so, his peaceful foreign policy pleased the middle class who were the basis of his rise and hence survival up to 1848. This is because all that the middle class needed was a peaceful atmosphere to conduct their business and Britain's friendship that was won by Philippe. This explains why when the middle class abandoned him in 1846 following the Spanish marriage, Philippe became too vulnerable only to be ejected out in 1848.

2) Similarly, Philippe's peaceful reign won him the confidence of a large section of the Frenchmen who were fed up with the vicious circle of violence and bloodshed since 1789. The peasants and workers had suffered enough in 1789, 1792 -94, 1815 - 1817 and 1830. All they wanted was a stable and peaceful era for economic development. Indeed, under Philippe's administration, there was economic progress and France was second to none other than Britain in Europe. Although this was monopolized by the middle class, it nevertheless helped to cool down criticism against him with the exception of the socialists.

3) Philippe's survival can also be gauged from the Anglo-Franco alliance that he forged. He realized that France under a constitutional monarchy was bound to be isolated from conservative and despotic powers like Russia, Austria and Prussia. This made him to dance to the times of Britain and became Palmer stone's rubberstamp in Europe. Although this was opposed by a large section of Frenchmen, it earned him of official and diplomatic co-operation which the despotic powers could not give him.

NB: 1 it was only in 1846 when Britain broke this diplomatic alliance that Philippe's popularity was seriously eroded

2: The fact that France was not declared a republic in 1830 saved Philippe from the hostility of divine monarchs who would have fought him right from the beginning of his reign.

4) Louis Philippe's humble personality and simple lifestyle and helped him to consolidate his reign in France. Having suffered poverty and hard life in exile, Louis Philippe developed a simple lifestyle that helped him to gain and retain power, e.g. he walked freely on streets unguarded holding a green umbrella, shave his own beards and sent his children to the common man's school. This saved French resources that were used for socio-economic development. His simple lifestyle earned him the support

Of the common man who used to suffer excessive taxation to supplement extravagancy of the royalists.

5) Louis Philippe's policy of neutrality on religious affairs also enabled his survival for 18 years. He granted freedom of worship, which Charles x had undermined by making Catholicism the state religion. The concordat that Napoleon had signed with the Pope was maintained and the government continued to nominate Bishops and pay salaries of the clergy. In 1831, Judaism was put on an equal footing with Christianity. The government began to pay salaries of Jewish rabbis just as it paid the protestant reverends and catholic priests. These gained Louis Philippe support from different religious groups, hence consolidation of power up to 1848.

6) The absence of revolutions in Europe that would have inspired Frenchmen against Louis Philippe also made him safe for 18 years. Metternich system was very effective in suppressing revolutionary movements from 1830-1847. Thus, there was relative peace and stability that favoured some degree of economic growth in many states. Absence of a revolution in Europe by 1848 denied the opposition of an event that they could have utilized to convince the Frenchmen to revolt against Louis

Philippe. The fact that the Frenchmen were the first to revolt (Feb 1848) following the Italians (Jan 1848) is a clear testimony that absence of such a revolution prior to 1848 helped Louis Philippe to survive for the 18 years.

7) Ideological difference amongst the opposition also accounts for the survival of Louis Philippe up to 1848. The liberals wanted a more democratic and liberal system of government, republicans demanded an expanded franchise, legitimists desired consolidation of their privileges, socialists aspired for nationalization of property and establishment of state workshops and Bonapartists were nostalgic about the revival of Napoleonic influence in Europe. By 1843, these factions could not sacrifice their ideological interest for the purpose of defeating Philippe who was their common enemy. Apart from leaning towards the middle class, Philippe played the opposition well. He was not an ultra-royalist as the Bourbons; neither was he a republican, a Bonapartist nor an extreme liberal. Thus, ideological difference amongst the opposition and Philippe's neutrality helped him to survive for 18 years.

8) Although Philippe was surrounded by a cocktail of pressure groups since 1830, he managed to survive for 18 years because it was not until 1840's that they intensified their criticism of him, Louis Blanc (a socialist) gained prominence from 1840's when the conditions of workers reached frightening levels.

Bonapartism regained grounds after the return of Napoleon's body and the writings of Napoleon

Bonaparte. It was even not until 1843 that the socialists, republicans and liberals forged a united front through reform Banquets. Thus, Louis Philippe managed to rule up to 1848 because his opponents were too disorganized to put a formidable challenge to him. Secondly, by the time his opponents got organized and united, he had effectively consolidated his power and that is why they could not overthrow him before 1848.

9) The 1830 constitutional charter was an instrument that also helped Louis Philippe to survive from 1830-1848. The charter provided for a two chambered parliament i.e. the chambers of peers and deputies, which transformed France from absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy by 1840. The constitution acted as checks and balances to any despotic tendency of the king, which could have earned Louis Philippe a revolution. For example, he could no longer issue special decrees as Charles X did in 1830 to dissolve the parliament. This could have incited a revolution against Louis Philippe.

Secondly, it was not the king but the parliament to introduce laws. This also checked Philippe's despotism, which would have provoked a revolution earlier than 1848. Thirdly, the charter limited the franchise (voting power) to the rich middle class. Although this was too undemocratic because it disenfranchised majority peasants, it nevertheless offered Philippe majority support in the parliament. In other words, he lacked opposition to force him to resign in times of a national crisis.

10) Louis Philippe's throne was protected by the restored, transformed and re-equipped National Guard.

The loyalty of the army to him was indisputable. Had it been the army other than the different pressure groups who were disappointed by Louis Philippe's cautious non-adventurous foreign policy, he would not have survived up to 1848. Philippe used the National Guard to suppress internal strikes, revolutions and demonstrations such as the republican rising of 1830 and the Lavandee Legitimist uprising.

NB. It was not until 1848 when the National Guard fraternized with the socialists and republicans that Louis lost his power.

11) On top of that, Philippe had a secret spying network against his opponents in state organs. They were very effective in unearthing subversive elements and conspirators against his government. For example, assassination attempts against his life and Louis Bonaparte's attempts to overthrow him in 1836 and 1840 were exposed by state intelligence that promptly arrested such "bad" elements like Louis Bonaparte.

12) Louis Philippe's violation of the 1830 charter also aided his survival on the French throne for 18 years.

When opposition intensified their activities from 1840, Louis Philippe resorted to severe laws that drove opposition against him underground. He banned the press and this reduced open criticism against him. He also passed the laws of discussion and association that prohibited any obedience to past governments. These undermined Bonapartism and Bourbons and left the Orleans monarchy unchallenged up to 1848.

13) Socio-economic reforms were also used by Louis Philippe to consolidate his power up to 1848. His pro-middle class and peaceful foreign policy attracted massive investment that led to commendable progress in industrialization, agriculture, education and trade. Transport and communication networks were improved to enhance socio-economic development. Many railway lines including the one from Paris to St German

were also constructed to facilitate transportation of raw materials and finished products. These created more employment opportunities, improved the income level and standard of living. All these earned Louis Philippe support that he used to survive amidst hostile opposition up to 1848.

14) Lastly, Philippe's long reign can also be attributed to his chief ministers. His government was managed by statesmen of talents, integrity and force of brain like Thiers and Guizot whose patriotism and ability were great. Thiers (1836 -1840) commanded a strong domestic loyalty and the great powers' respect in favour of France. He effectively controlled liberal attacks in the chamber of deputies that was against Louis Philippe. His successor, Guizot (1840 —1848) supported his peaceful foreign policy to the advantage of the middle class that earned him support in the chamber of deputies. He also maintained a strong hold over the chamber of deputies through bribery, corruption in tenders and was highly inclined to Britain's interest. Although this was a weakness in government, it nevertheless enabled Philippe to survive attacks in the chamber of deputies.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

By 1814, the Austrian Empire had up to 13 different nationalities under Austria's control. It was composed of people who were culturally, historically, religiously and politically different. The Austrian authorities were therefore tied by the challenge of maintaining close unity and administrative control over the different races. The greatest challenge to the empire were the new forces of nationalism and liberalism that were sweeping across Europe and challenging the old order. The survival of the Empire required a ruthless and efficient administration to keep liberalism and nationalism at bay. Therefore, the manner in which the Empire was administered was determined by the level of nationalism and liberalism.

Since the French revolution of 1789, the Austrian administration had struggled to safeguard Austria from the revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity. This explains why Austria supported the Émigrés - and fought against France in the revolutionary wars. She also struggled against Napoleon until his final defeat at the battle of Waterloo in 1815.

By 1804, the Austrian Habsburg (ruling dynasty) had brought their scattered territories into a unit under the common name "the empire of the house of Austria". The Vienna settlement of 1815 formally established the regions comprising the empire.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

METTERNICH

He was born on 15 May 1773 at Coblenz in the Rhine lands in Prussia. His full name was Klemens Wensel Nepomuk Lothas Von Metternich. In 1792, the invading French army forced him to flee to Austria from where he married the granddaughter of Austrian chancellor, Princess Kaunitz of Marie Theresa. This increased his prestige, respect, rights and influence in Austria and aided his rise to power. Indeed, it was the then Austrian chancellor who gave him the high sounding title Prince Von Metternich in 1813.

In 1809, Metternich was made the minister of foreign affairs of Austria and in 1821, he became the chancellor of the Austrian empire following his achievements at the Vienna settlement and the congress system. Using these positions, he dominated European politics to such an extent that the period 1815 - 1848 has been referred to as the Metternich period and himself as the coachman of European affairs.

Metternich graduated at Strasbourg University in France and later Mainz between 1790 - 1792. He specialized in diplomacy although he was equally interested in linguistics, history, science and astronomy.

By birth, Metternich was from aristocratic family where the new forces of nationalism, liberalism and democracy were bitterly resented. This together with his experience of the reign of terror in France made him to believe that revolutions of the French type were the greatest enemy of the aristocracy and indeed the people. He described the French revolution and all that it stood for as; **The disease which must be cured by the volcano which must be extinguished, the gangrene which must be burnt out with a hot iron, the hydra with Jaws open to swallow up the social order**". To him, democracy could "change day light into darkest night

He initiated the Metternich system in an attempt to maintain the Vienna settlement where the European aristocrats were to hang together in order to keep under key and lock the forces of nationalism, liberalism and democracy. The system hinged on the principle of peace and no change. The major objectives of the Metternich system were;

- i) Preservation of European peace
- ii) Preservation of the Austrian empire from the forces of nationalism and liberalism.
- iii) Maintaining for the European aristocrats their privileges against the new forces of change. Generally the Metternich system aimed at protecting the old socio-economic and political order against the threats of revolutionary disruptions.

However, Metternich's dominance of European affairs was superficial and temporary. The forces of nationalism and liberalism had come to stay. He could only buy time by suppressing and yet not altering the momentum. No wonder that the very forces that he had devoted his lifetime to suppress forced him to abdicate and flee to exile in 1848 i.e. through the 1848 revolutions. His downfall strengthened Italian and German nationalism, which greatly weakened the Austrian empire.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

METHODS USED BY METTERNICH TO CONTROL EUROPEAN AFFAIRS OR HOW METTERNICH CONSOLIDATED HIS POWER/ SUPREMACY IN EUROPE FROM 1815 -1848

Metternich was the most famous statesman produced by Austria in the 19th century. He was the prince of diplomacy and was thoroughly at ease with the diplomatic affairs of Europe between 1815 - 1848. He used both force and diplomacy to influence European affairs and consolidate his power.

- i) Metternich posted foreign officers to administer different areas to check on nationalistic movements.

For instance, Croats were sent to Slovenia, Poles to Austria, Austrians to Hungary, Italians to Germany and vice versa. Being foreign, these officers monitored and suppressed nationalistic movements such as the Carbonary and Young Italian Movements very effectively. This explains why Austria herself survived the 1830 revolutions in Europe. Revolutions within the empire were easily suppressed by the very foreign officials e.g. in Italian and German states.

ii) Metternich also used censorship of the press and control of communication in a bid to seal off the empire from liberal and nationalistic ideas. A censor official was appointed at Vienna to approve all books, newspapers and publications. A special office was set at Vienna for opening, recording and resealing all foreign informations. Through such a network, Metternich was able to know liberal sympathizers, their agents, strategies or targets.

iii) In the German states, Metternich secured for Austria the post of the president of the German diet/parliament. This was a vital post since the president decided on the issues to be discussed and the protocol to be followed. Using this power, he was able to block most of the reforms that would have strengthened German states. Metternich persuaded all the German states to limit the subjects to be discussed in parliament which also limited liberalism and liberal issues in the diet (parliament).

iv) Metternich enacted the Carlsbad decree as a counter offensive against German nationalism that had climaxed into the murder of Kotzebue. By its provisions, student's associations were abolished and all German universities were to have government inspectors, a spy network to monitor activities of lecturers and students, the press was censored and measures were enacted by which the diet could use the army to suppress revolutions in any German state. The effectiveness of these measures explains why the Germans hardly organised any movement contrary to the Italians before 1848.

v) In Italy, Metternich's position was secured by direct and indirect control. Austria under him gained direct control in Lombardy and Venetia and indirectly over Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Romagna by supplying Austrian officers there. In the Italian as well as German states, he was able to use the policy of divide and rule up to his downfall in 1848. These measures ensured that Italians and Germans were firmly under Metternich's and Austrian control.

vi) Metternich further suppressed public opinion by prohibiting the publication of parliamentary debates for public consumption. This was intended and directed at keeping the discontented public too ignorant and conservative, thereby concealing the government's weakness and avoiding or checking open criticism against his inefficiency and dictatorship.

vii) Metternich kept himself on the forefront of European politics by the use of force against rebellions whenever diplomacy and negotiations could not work. The Carbonari and the young Italy movements were all crushed militarily. The 1821 - 1822 revolutions in Naples and Spain and even those of 1830 in Parma, Modena and Tuscany all collapsed under Metternich's iron hand and the ousted kings were restored by Metternich's reserve force.

viii) Metternich further crippled opposition to his system by using fiscal policy. He over taxed his subjects to finance the activities of the intelligence network but primarily to check on their ability to finance liberal and nationalistic movements against his dictatorship. This reduced the ability of his subjects to resist his rule.

ix) Metternich forged an alliance of European monarchs against the new forces of nationalism and liberalism. At the Vienna settlement, he advocated for the restoration of legitimate rulers who became the best agents in suppressing the new forces in Europe. He thus had the support of Emperor Francis I who surrendered all powers in the empire to him. Other European leaders like Tsar Alexander I of Russia, Fredrick William III and IV of Prussia and Charles X of France were all on his side. These became his allies in their respective states.

x) Metternich also consolidated his power by maintaining close relationships between the state and the Church. He won the support of Bishops, priests and the Catholics by recognizing the Catholic Church as a state religion. In other words, he encouraged religious intolerance (except in Prussia) that gained him support from all Catholics within the empire. This was easy because most of the clergy were anti liberal and they became bulwarks against the new forces of change.

xi) Metternich ranks high in European diplomacy for the use of spying network throughout the empire (that was controlled from Vienna). His spying system was entrenched in the army, police, civil service, public places and in strategic or sensitive places like hotels, lodges, cinema halls and schools.

These unearthed all liberal and nationalistic movements against his administration. It was this espionage or spy system that uprooted the German liberal movements that would have overthrown Metternich. From 1815 - 1848, Metternich's spying system was so efficient that an Italian woman lamented that;

My daughter cannot sneeze hut Prince Metternich will know of it It's for the same reason that, one historian referred to the Austrian empire under Metternich as "a classical example of a police state".

xii) Metternich controlled education system within the empire. All professors, lecturers, principals and teachers were made to take an oath of allegiance to the Metternich system. At all levels, the education syllabus disregarded liberal subjects especially history, philosophy, psychology and literature. He went further to prohibit liberal discussions, academic associations, seminars even on subject levels.

Emperor Francis I supported his education policy and remarked that; **I want not scholars hut good citizens, whoever teaches must do so according to my will and whoever keeps liberal ideas going must go or I will let him go.**

xiii) Lastly, Metternich exploited the congress system to influence European affairs up to 1848. He was the chairman of the Vienna congress that mapped out strategies to suppress nationalism and liberalism in 'Europe. He later became was very active in the congress system between 1818 - 1825. Through the congress system, Metternich was able to bring all the major European powers into one thinking cup.

This made it very easy for Europe to adopt his ideas and principles as "the coachman of Europe".

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ACHIEVEMENTS AND POSITIVE IMPACT OF METTERNICH IN EUROPE, 1815 - 1848 (ROLE OF METTERNICH IN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS)

Between 1815 - 1848, Metternich was so successful in European affairs that this period has been described as the Metternich era and he himself as "the

coachman of Europe". Metternich himself felt that the world was resting on his shoulders. To quote him;

My position has this peculiarity that all eyes, all expectations are directed to precisely that point where I happen to be; Again,

Why amongst so many million men must I be the one to think when others do not think, to act when others do not act, to write when others know not how?

After the downfall of Napoleon, the destiny of Europe passed into the hands of Metternich. He was able to achieve much in the socio, political and economic reconstruction of Europe after Napoleon I.

1. Defeat of Napoleon

Metternich made great contributions to the downfall of Napoleon I who had disorganized the whole continent of Europe. He influenced the formation of the fourth coalition with other countries like Britain, Russia and Prussia that led to the defeat of Napoleon at the battle of Leipzig and exiled him to the Island of Elba. Later when Napoleon escaped from Elba and sneaked back to Paris for 100 days, Metternich argued the Vienna congress powers to forget their differences and they mobilized a force of 800,000 men that delivered the final defeat to Napoleon at Waterloo. They finally exiled Napoleon to the rocky Island of St. Hellena where he died in 1821. This brought relative peace and stability in Europe.

2) Disintegration of Napoleonic Empire and redrawing the map of Europe

Metternich contributed to the disintegration of Napoleonic Empire and redrawing the map of Europe.

After the final defeat of Napoleon I, Metternich influenced the Vienna congressmen to reduce the boarder of France to those of 1790 and enforce permanent boarder restrictions. The huge French Empire created by Napoleon I was dismantled and nationalities like Italians and Germans were subjected to imperial rule of other powers. He influenced the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France to guard against the rise of any body from Napoleon's ruling line in France. These measures dismantled Napoleonic Empire and kept a Bonapatist out of the French throne up to 1848.

3) Restoration of the balance of power

Restoration of the balance of power in Europe was achieved by Metternich. The French revolutionary and Napoleonic activities had destroyed the balance of power in Europe. Metternich through the Vienna Settlement ensured that disputed territories were partitioned in a way that no one power emerged as the most dominant. Austria gained direct and indirect control over Italian and German states, Prussia got parts of Saxony and Poland. Russia acquired the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, parts of Saxony and Poland. France lost the control over Italians and Germans to reduce her power since she was the most dominant in Europe.

All these restored the balance of power in Europe, which maintained relative peace and stability in Europe.

4) Reconciliation with France

Metternich realized that it would be a political asset to treat France fairly after the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte I. He persuaded the allies to believe that the threat to Europe was Napoleon and not the French people. This made France to be treated fairly to the extent that she was admitted in the congress system in 1818 at Aix-Lachapalle. It made France to reconcile and forget of revenging against the allies, which consolidated peace, stability and unity in Europe.

5) The Vienna Congress of 1814-1815

Metternich called and successfully chaired the Vienna congress of 1814-1815. In Sept 1814, Metternich called the Vienna congress to settle the problems caused by revolutionary France and Napoleonic activities in Europe. This created a spirit of diplomacy and cooperation in resolving issues of common concern.

Metternich manipulated the terms of the Vienna settlement of 1815 to pass stringent measures against revolutions and revolutionary movements. This created peace and stability in Europe after the downfall of Napoleon I.

6) Congress system

Metternich's ideas of European monarchs hanging together against the new forces of change led to the formation of the congress system in Europe. The congress system through congresses such as the Aix-Lachapelle of 1818 managed to settle outstanding issues amongst the major powers of Europe. Although the congress system finally collapsed by 1830, it was a good gesture at forming an international organization which

provided a background for future organizations like the League of Nations and U.N.O (UN) that have maintained world peace.

7) Peace

Between 1815 - 1848, Metternich was pre-occupied with the restoration of peace in Europe. He was the chairman and pilot of the Vienna peace settlement of 1815 and a champion of the congress system that became an instrument of peace in Europe. That the post war settlement took place in Vienna, the capital of Austria portrays Metternich's seriousness with peace after Napoleon. It should be noted that although Metternich has been accused of dictatorship and oppression, it nevertheless checked the spread of assassinations, revolutionary movements and political demonstrations resulting from liberalism and nationalism. This enabled him to maintain the ramshackle Austrian empire that would have disintegrated the slightest touch of nationalism.

8) Preservation of Heterogeneous Austrian empire from disintegration

Metternich was successful in maintaining unity in the heterogeneous Austrian empire that had Germans, aliens, Slavs, Magyars, Orthodox, Catholics, Protestants, Moslems and Atheists. Through his policy of expression, espionage, divide and rule, censorship of the press and force, Metternich was able to insulate the empire from the forces of nationalism and liberalism which would have broken the ramshackle empire into pieces as emperor Francis I lamented; My realm is like a warm eaten house, if one part is removed one cannot tell how much will remain. The failure of Italians and Germans by 1848 to break away and form united independent states illustrates the effectiveness of Metternich in the preservation of the heterogeneous Austrian empire from disintegration

9) Austrian imperialism in Europe

Metternich consolidated Austrian imperialism and Empire in Europe". He used the Vienna Congress particularly the principle of balance of power to expand and formalize the Austrian Empire in Europe. The empire had different nationalities like Italians, Germans, Croatians, Slovenes, Poles and Hungarians.

Although these nationalities had different historical, economic, political, social, linguistic and religious differences, Metternich was able to utilize their differences and effectively rule them through the policy of divide and rule. Thus, Metternich is credited for the creation and consolidation of Austrian Empire in Europe.

10) Alliance of European monarchs

Metternich enhanced unity and diplomatic cooperation amongst European monarchs of the time. He exaggerated the threats of liberal and nationalistic movements against conservative monarchies to bring European monarchs under his control. Consequently, Tsar Alexander I of Russia, Louis XVIII and Charles X in France, Frederick William III of Prussia, Ferdinand II and Ferdinand VII of Naples and Spain, Charles Albert of Piedmont and the many Habsburg rulers in Germany and Italy came together under Metternich's umbrella'. Such rulers joined Metternich in the struggle to fight the threatening forces of liberalism and nationalism, thus forging alliance of European monarchs.

11) Restoration and protection of legitimate rulers.

Metternich is credited for the restoration and protection of legitimate rulers in Europe in an attempt to restore the privileges of the aristocracy. He succeeded in restoring Louis XVIII in France, Ferdinand II in Naples and Ferdinand VII in Spain. They were also restored in Italian states like Parma, Modena, Tuscany, Piedmont and Papal states. Metternich was able to use his reserve force to protect the restored kings whenever and wherever they were threatened by revolutions. This maintained the stability of political systems in Europe. Besides, the restored kings became his best agents against the forces of nationalism and liberalism.

12) Spread of revolutions and revolutionary ideas

Metternich is on record for his success against the spread of revolutions and revolutionary ideas from France to the rest of Europe. He once described the French revolution as a hydra with jaws open to swallow up the social order and a volcano which must be extinguished and so he embarked on suppressive measures that checked the spread of revolutions and revolutionary ideas. This explains why Austria survived the 1820's and 1830 revolutions that rocked Europe. Even where revolutions occurred,

Metternich was able to suppress them. Such was the case with Spain, Naples, Carbonari and Young Italy Movements that collapsed due to his repressive measures.

13) French Aggression

Metternich's policies in Europe checked on French aggression that had destroyed peace and tranquilly on the continent. He once remarked at the Vienna congress that; whenever France sneezes, Europe catches cold So,

he influenced the Vienna peace makers to create strong barrier states all round France which were too strong to be invaded. The Austrian empire that he ruled was the strongest. He was so successful that France instead of becoming an aggressor became a victim of aggression from other powers like Prussia.

14) Revival of European economy

Remarkable improvement of European economy was witnessed during the Metternich's era. Before Metternich's era, European economy was in shambles due to the continental system and Napoleonic wars.

However, Metternich mobilized European powers to defeat Napoleon and uproot his influence in Europe.

Thereafter, he influenced the Vienna settlement to design measures that ensured peace and economic stability in Europe. For instance, he ensured that there was free navigation on important waters like the Black Sea and Mediterranean Sea. These measures ended the continental system, promoted the spread of industrial revolution and revived European economy.

15) Unifications of Germany and Italy.

Metternich succeeded in keeping the Germans and the Italians disunited as the "rock to the new order (during his period)". The German and Italian patriots started serious struggles for unifications as early as 1820's. For instance, in Italy the Carbonari and the young Italy movements were very active in the 1820's and 1830's. The German intellectuals started as early as 1817. However, using both force and diplomacy these movements were crushed for example the Carlsbad decree of 1820's crippled German nationalism once and for all. It was not until his downfall in 1848 that German and Italian unifications started experiencing some positive developments.

However, Metternich indirectly laid foundation for the unification of Germany. He reduced the 280 German states into only 39 and created a single diet (parliament) for all the 39 states. This brought in a large measure of unity amongst the Germans and the diet became the hatching ground, for unification ideas. Nevertheless, although Metternich made some positive contributions to the unification of Germany, it was accidental since his policies were against German nationalism and unification.

NB. The Carlsbad decrees that suffocated German nationalism led to a period of political dormancy that favoured the growth of industrialization and trade in the German states. This economic prosperity led to the growth of the middle class who later spearheaded the struggle for German unification.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WEAKNESSES, FAILURES AND NEGATIVE IMPACT OF METTERNICH

Although Metternich was triumphant in controlling European affairs from 1815 - 1848, he has been criticized by Ketelbey on the grounds that he was an intriguer and an opportunist. Tsar Alexander I called him a liar, while liberals and democrats then and since have accused him of obscurantism, reactionariness and hostility to the desires and aspirations of the people. His weaknesses, failures and negative influence were as follows:-

1. Restoration and maintenance of legitimate rulers

Failure to restore all the legitimate rulers who were overthrown by the French revolutionary changes and Napoleon was a fundamental weakness of Metternich. For example, those of Belgium, Finland and Denmark never regained their thrones. Those who were restored were the worst rulers Europe ever had. The revolts and political instability provoked by these rulers notably in Spain and France that disorganized Europe can therefore be blamed on Metternich's principle of legitimacy.

2. Promotion of Austrian imperialism, conservatism and autocracy

Promotion of Austrian imperialism, conservatism and autocracy was a negative impact of Metternich in Europe. Metternich consolidated Austrian imperialism and conservatism in Europe through repressive measures against nationalism. He remarked; That which I wished in 1831, I wished in 1813 and in all the period between. Nationalities within the Austrian Empire suffered lack of political liberties, oppression, imprisonment, exile and press censorship amongst others. The brutal suppression of revolts like those of 1830 in Italian states and Poland led to death of people in thousands. Indeed, Metternich ranks high as one of the worst dictators that Europe has ever hosted. There is a general agreement that Metternich surpassed

Napoleon I in dictatorship. He over dwelt on rigidly static conservative policies that suffocated liberalism and nationalism in Europe.

3. Exploitation and oppression

Economically, Metternich over exploited subjects within the Austrian Empire. He used forced

conscription into the army to raise a big force to consolidate his exploitative and oppressive rule in Europe. He also embarked on excessive taxation to raise money to meet the cost of administration and deny his subjects excess resources that could be used to resist his rule. Such measures led to financial crisis, poverty, misery, famine, starvation and poor standard of living. These deplorable economic conditions contributed to the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions that prompted the downfall of Metternich.

4. Failure of press censorship

Within Austria itself, strict censorship of the press was not strict in the strictest sense. Liberal books, journals and newspapers reached university professors, students and lectures in great numbers. These were tactfully coordinated from other countries and universities without interception by the censor official. Metternich acknowledged this failure when he said; although I have ruled Europe, I have never governed Austria,' justifying that his achievement in Europe was a sharp contrast to his failure in Austria.

5. Suffocation of German and Italian unifications

Historians have blamed Metternich for blocking the unification's of Italy and Germany during his reign. He arrested tortured, imprisoned and exiled Italian and German nationalists. The Carlsbad decree destroyed German nationalism and it could not triumph until after Metternich's downfall in 1848. One must note that although Metternich laid foundations for Italian and German unifications, it was accidental since they were the reverse of his policy. Thus Metternich is hereby blamed for blocking and frustrating German unification during his era.

6. The spread of revolutions and revolutionary ideas in Europe.

Metternich made a fruitless attempt to prevent the spread of revolutions and revolutionary ideas in Europe. Although Metternich knew the empire's illness through his spy network, he is accused of treating the effects than the causes of the disease. No wonder that Europe experienced periodic revolutions in 1820's, 1830's and 1848. Metternich himself knew that he was fighting a losing battle.

He once confessed;

I have come into the world either too early or too late. Earlier I should have enjoyed the age, later I should have helped to reconstruct it. Today I have to give my life to propping up mouldering institutions.

Metternich himself was ejected out of European politics by a revolution in Vienna on 15th March 1848 that sent him to exile in England.

7. Education and academic freedom

Metternich's Education system was an insult to people's intelligence and made him very unpopular amongst intellectuals. He promoted illiteracy in the Habsburg Empire through strict control of Education. Metternich forced all teachers, lecturers and professors to swear an oath of allegiance to him, banned the teaching of revolution subjects and students, organizations and instituted a spy network that interfered with academic freedom. These provoked resistance and no wonder that the revolution that finally sealed off his career was organized by Austrian university professors, lectures and students in 1848.

8. Religious intolerance

In spite of the cry for religious freedom, Metternich re-imposed religious intolerance in the fashion of the ancient regime. He restored the privileges of the clergy and made Catholicism a state religion and yet the Austrian empire was multi-religious with other religions like Protestantism, Orthodoxy and Islam. All his appointments in public offices favoured the Catholics at the expense of other religious denominations.

9. Weak administrative system

Metternich failed to influence Emperor Francis I to execute administrative reforms. There was absence of a properly centralized administrative system to hold the different races within the empire together.

The different nationalities were therefore semi autonomous, which made it impossible to stop the spread of revolutions and revolutionary ideas. Above all, Metternich over dwelt on European politics at the expense of socio-economic conditions of the masses. This explains why by 1848 the empire was in acute financial crisis and was referred to as a laughing stock of Europe.

10. Weakness and collapse of the congress system.

Although Metternich is credited as the father of the congress system, he is blamed for killing his own 'child'. His selfish interests and conservative policies alienated liberal monarchies like i.e. Britain, France, Belgium and Greece from the congress system. These powers were against Metternich's manipulation of the congress system to restore and protect the old order of conservatism. Above all, there was no written agreement and protocol that could have bonded the congress powers together and no wonder that the system collapsed by 1830.

11. Failure to influence the post 1820 events and leadership

Metternich's idea of putting Europe into the same thinking cup was a failure from 1820's. He failed to prevent Russian imperialism in the Balkans, as was the case with the Greek war of revolt 1821 - 1831.

He even failed to restrain Britain from assisting liberal movement like the Belgium revolution of 1830 and the Greek revolt. He also lost control over Prussia after Frederick William IV's rise to power in 1840. Unlike his predecessor (William III), William IV was an enlightened despot whom Metternich could not easily influence. Therefore, Metternich was not all that a "coachman of Europe." Successive developments and leadership proved a challenge beyond his skills.

12. Shift of European balance of power from Vienna to London

Lastly, Metternich's attempt in maintaining the balance of power in favour of Austria and making

Vienna the nucleus (center) of European diplomacy failed in the long run from 1830, European diplomacy shifted from Vienna to London. For instance, the Greek war of revolt was settled by the London treaty of 1830, the Belgium independence was settled by the 1830 and 1839 London treaties. It was even the 1840 and 1841 London conferences that settled the Syrian question. The fact that European diplomacy shifted from Vienna to London is a clear testimony by Metternich's failure in directing or controlling European affairs.

NB. Metternich has been accused of obscurantism conservatism and hostility to the desires and aspirations of the people but this to some extent is a misjudgment. This is because he had correctly studied the political barometer of the time and had accurately seen how liberalism and nationalism could destabilize mankind. It was the aggressive German nationalism, which Metternich had imprisoned that led to the 1864 war between Denmark and Prussia, 1866 Austro-Prussian war and the Franco

Prussian war of 1870 - 1871 that destroyed the European balance of power. It was even the same aggressive German nationalism that led not only Europe but the whole world into the first and second world wars. It's against such a background that one should assess Metternich's achievements and failures in Europe.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS WHY METTERNICH DOMNATED EUROPEAN POLITICS FROM 1815 - 1848

Metternich was the most famous statesman produced by Austria in the 19th century. He was so successful in influencing European affairs that this period is often referred to as the "Metternich's age." A number of reasons explain why Metternich was successful in re-organizing Europe after the downfall of Napoleon I.

He was blessed with rare qualities that enabled him to survive on the forefront of European politics up to 1848. On one hand, he had a cool head and was humane yet on the other hand he was ruthless, vigilant and remorseless. These explain why he relied more on diplomacy other than force in dealing with the new forces of change. For instance the carbonari, young Italy movement and German intellectual movements were suppressed more due to Metternich's diplomatic skills than force.

However, where diplomacy could not work he was not slow at using force e.g. Naples in 1821.

2. Metternich was thoroughly educated, had traveled widely and was therefore a cosmopolitan aristocrat of the 19th century. He was educated at the universities of Strasbourg and Mainz. He studied diplomacy and administration but was equally interested in history, Astronomy, science and linguistics. It is this diplomatic skill which he attained through his education that became the most useful weapon in fighting the forces of liberalism and Nationalism hence an insight as to why he succeeded.

3. Metternich's linguistic ability made him to be more knowledgeable than anyone else about European affairs. He spoke and wrote in nearly all-European languages. He boasted; It's my habit to write to Paris in French,

to London in English, to St. Petersburg in Russian and to Berlin in German. Indeed throughout European congresses, Metternich became an interpreter for European statesmen and effected decisions without interpretation. This was a fundamental factor that helped him to be aware of events in Europe and consolidate his influence in Europe up to-1848.

4. Metternich traveled widely and had diplomatic experiences that enabled him to be the coachman of European affairs. He was an Austrian Ambassador to Dresden, Paris and Berlin. These made him to be more acquainted with the diplomatic cobwebs of Europe. Although Austria was in alliance with Napoleon through marriage (Napoleon married the Austrian princess Marie Louise in 1810 after divorcing Josephine), his diplomatic insight helped him to withdraw Austria, from Napoleon and consequently Austria joined the allied powers. This gave Austria a high position in the Vienna settlement for which she was given the leadership under Metternich's chairmanship.

5. Metternich's conservative views and policies greatly tallied with those of European aristocrats who gave him overwhelming support. Tsar Alexander I of Russia openly confessed before Metternich that; deplore all that I said and did between 1815 - 1818. I regret the time lost ...you have correctly judged the conditions of things. Tell me what you want and what you want of me and I will do it.

Others like the Bourbons in France, Fredrick William of Prussia, Ferdinand II and Ferdinand VII of Naples and Spain, Charles Albert of Piedmont and the many Habsburg rulers in Germany and Italy were all behind Metternich and his system in Europe. These rulers became Metternich's agents in the struggle against liberalism and Nationalism and that is why he succeeded.

6. Metternich also had strong official support from his emperor Francis I of Austria who was equally conservative and despotic. It's Emperor Francis I who promoted him and supported his politics and programs. He gave him freedom to "govern and change nothing". Since most civil servants, army commanders and government officials were appointed or were approved by the emperor, it was not a surprise that they were dedicated (loyal) anti-liberal officers who implemented Metternich's orders.

7. Metternich was also supported by the clergy and the nobles because he was the champion of aristocratic privileges and also because of his policy of "peace and no change". This gained him the support of the pope and a great majority of the conservative Catholics and nobles all over Europe.

Consequently, the Catholic Church was instrumental in censoring the press, implementing conservative policies in schools and influencing state officials and their subjects in favour of Metternich.

8. Besides, the few liberal countries such as France and Britain that could have opposed Metternich's conservative policies were trapped by internal problems. In France, Louis Philippe was faced by internal opposition from various political factions and his concern was a peaceful foreign policy.

Britain was occupied with problems brought by industrial revolution and Russia was tied by Polish rebels. Metternich therefore had no one to restrain him in the struggle to restore the old order of Europe hence a reason for his success.

9. The liberal and Nationalistic movements that were the greatest threat to Metternich lacked co operation and were disorganized. In Italy, the Carbonari Movement was dominated by charcoal burners whose activities were mostly confined to the bush where they burnt charcoal. The young Italy movement that succeeded it under Mazzini ignored the role of kings in the struggle against

Metternich. This earned the movement opposition from those who thought the Italian kings had a great role to play. In Germany, the opposition to Metternich was confined to a few large towns and intellectuals in universities who wrongly thought that Metternich could be ousted using parliamentary debates and resolutions. These weaknesses made it very easy for Metternich to suppress the anti Austrian movements in Italy and Germany up to 1848.

10. The nature and composition of the Austrian Empire favoured Metternich's policies. It was a hybrid of nationalities each with different interest, culture, religion and aspirations. Consequently, they lacked unity and were badly fragmented. This favoured Metternich's policy of divide and rule. For instance, the south German states were Catholics and liberal while the North German states were Protestants and conservative. Yet Prussia that was the most powerful of the German states was too jealous to sacrifice her relative prosperity for the sake of a united Germany (without Metternich). Metternich was therefore able to successfully maneuver and intervene in the internal affairs of the various states within the empire and very often some of them allied with him against their strong enemies. This boosted Metternich's ability to control European affairs up to 1848.

11. Metternich's system also survived in Europe due to lack of common language and easy mobility between his subjects. For example, the Italians in Lombardy, Venetia, Parma, Modena, Poles in Galicia, Czechs in Slovenia remained dissatisfied in their respective areas due to language barrier yet Metternich himself was a linguist. Metternich therefore divided and ruled them according to their different languages up to his downfall in 1848.

12. Metternich was able to maintain his system because the ramshackle empire lacked a highly inspired nationalistic middle class to oppose him. The population was mainly peasants who were tied to the land that was not theirs (feudalism) and so they were controlled by their landlords. The landlords hated and feared revolutions. To quote Raynor; Resistance to tyranny generally comes from people who are just well off enough to realize that it is within their power to win for themselves further prosperity and happiness.

Within the empire this class was limited to those whose interest Metternich was defending. Thus, the peasants maintained a lukewarm position in spite of their burdens since the middle class who could have led them against Metternich were in his pockets.

13. Metternich exploited events in Europe after 1815 to rally support for his system. The demonstrations, revolts and assassinations between 1817 and 1820 helped him to convert many European rulers to his side. His real chance was in 1819 and 1820. In 1819, a German university student called Karl sand assassinated professor Kotzbue, a Russian journalist employed by Metternich. In 1820, Duke de-Berry the son of Charles x was murdered in France by a Bonapartist although some sources stress a republican. In the same year (1820), Tsar Alexander I of Russia discovered an assassination plot on his life. These liberal acts helped Metternich to get the Bourbons on his side and to convert Tsar Alexander from his liberal tendencies to his despotism. At the congress of Troppau, he confessed to Metternich that;

Today I deplore all that I said and did between 1815 and 1818 ...you have correctly judged the

conditions of things. Tell me what you want and what you want of me, and I will do it.

He used such threats to convince the kings of Europe to support him against liberalism and nationalism. Therefore, Metternich's success in European politics was determined by circumstances in Europe of his time.

14. The existence of the Vienna settlement and the congress system made great contributions to the success of Metternich in European affairs. The Vienna settlement formalized the area composing the Austrian empire and legalized Metternich and Austrian intervention in the internal affairs of such states. The Vienna settlement and the congress system were manipulated by Metternich to implement his policies and programs. The congress system also brought unity amongst the great powers of Europe which was an added advantage to Metternich. For example, the Troppau congress of 1820 bonded Austria, Russia and Prussia to intervene and suppress revolutions in any part of Europe. It was such endorsed policy that empowered Metternich to suppress the Italian revolts of 1820, 1821 and 1830 respectively.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE DOWNFALL OF METTERNICH AND COLLAPSE OF THE METTERNICH SYSTEM

Undoubtedly, Metternich dominated European politics between 1815 - 1848 but failed to save Austria and his political career from the revolution of 1848. He misjudged the circumstances of the time and failed to realize that the 1840's were quite different from 1815. As professor Alison puts it;

For a tired and timid generation, he was a necessary man, and it was his misfortune that he survived his usefulness and failed to recognize that while he himself was growing old and feeble, the world was renewing its youth.

These youths were of a new generation who did not understand why Metternich wanted to maintain the status quo and remain a rock to changes. They did not know (since they did not experience) the dangers of the French revolution and Napoleon. All they wanted was freedom and self-determination and that is why they rose against Metternich.

Historians have accused Metternich for being rigidly static and too insensitive to the demands of the age.

He is guilty of treating the effects or ends than the causes of the problem. Consequently, he failed to adjust to the growing demands of the time i.e. nationalism and liberalism. He was even conscious that he was playing a losing game when he regretted that he was either born too late or too early

and that he had to spend his life propping up rotten institutions. Indeed, the very forces that Metternich was suppressing uprooted him from Vienna to exile. Before leaving Vienna, he said that he was an old physician and he knew very well the difference between a curable and non-curable disease and that his disease was fatal (deadly).

Metternich's failure/downfall is attributed to a number of factors.

1. The series of successful revolutions in France prior to 1848 encouraged the Austrians to rise against Metternich leading to his downfall. The French revolution of 1789 destroyed the Bourbon monarchy and instituted a republican government. Again in 1830, there were successful revolutions in France and Belgium and in 1848 against Louis Philippe. These successes signaled to the Italians, Germans and Austrians that the old order of despotism could be defeated which gave them morale to fight and overthrow Metternich.

2. The death and downfall of close political associates and the rise of new political figures was a heavy blow to Metternich. Emperor Francis I who co-operated with Metternich was replaced in 1835 by Ferdinand who never followed Metternich's advice. Tsar Alexander I of Russia was replaced by Nicholas I in 1825 who was too aggressive and uncompromising. Frederick William III of Prussia died in 1840 and was succeeded by Frederick William IV who was humane, religious and anxious to avoid unnecessary persecutions. George Canning who replaced Castlereagh in 1821 followed the policy of each nation for its self and God for everybody. Other new figures that were against the old order included Von Bismarck in Prussia, Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II in Piedmont. These encouraged the growth of liberalism, which forced Metternich out of European politics in 1848.

3. In Italy, the emergence of a liberal Pope Pius IX encouraged liberalism throughout the Catholic states.

More importantly although the carbonari and young Italy movements failed, they nevertheless inspired the spirit of nationalism through their philosophy of unity and independence. This is what made the Italians to be the first to rise against Metternich in January 1848 that spread to other states leading to the downfall of Metternich.

The Austrian Empire and Metternich were brainchildren of the Vienna settlement. When the congress system collapsed by 1830, there was no force to maintain the Vienna settlement. There was therefore no European alliance to suppress the rights of the smaller states. When the 1848

revolutions broke out, European countries were left without a concerted effort that could have saved Metternich from the revolution of 1848.

5. Within Austria, Metternich failed to effectively censor the press. Liberal books, publications, journals and newspapers reached students and lecturers in great numbers. Indeed the revolution that ousted him from Vienna was started by university students, lecturers and professors who were partly inspired by external influence through such newspapers, journals and liberal books.

6. 1840's were marked by economic progress in most states. There was rapid growth of industrialization and trade which led to the growth of a strong middle class. In Germany, the formation of the Zollverein or customs union led by Prussia increased industrial and economic developments. The new middle class was ready to challenge Metternich's conservative policies. Moreover, the Zollverein had strengthened nationalism amongst the Germans by bringing the German states together.

7. The Austrian empire was too extensive (large) to be administered effectively by Metternich from a central place. It had up to 13 different races, which explains why he failed to establish a properly centralized administration. Different nationalities managed their own affairs and it became difficult to check the spread of liberalism and nationalism. This climaxed into the revolution of 1848 through which Metternich disappeared from the political landscape of Europe.

8. The role of foreign powers and mercenaries were influential in the downfall of Metternich. Britain hated Austria's domination of the Germans and Italians. Napoleon was a former Carbonari who assisted Italians and Germans against Metternich. Several Carbonari fighters were given asylum in France, Britain and America. This helped the various subject within the empire to rebel against Metternich leading to his downfall.

9. Metternich was a fanatical dictator worst than Napoleon Bonaparte. He is accused of being a reactionary and ruthless ruler. His army was too strict and terrorized his subjects. Both him and his spies also became instruments of violence and plunder (loot). This caused a lot of protests in Italy, Germany and Austria climaxing in the 1848 revolutions which destroyed his political career.

10. Metternich over dwelt on politics at the expense of the other sectors of the economy. This made the Austrian empire economically and industrially backward in Europe. No wonder that by 1848, it had run bankrupt with

acute problems like unemployment, poor standard of living, famine etc. These provoked the Masses to rise against him and his system.

11. The immediate cause of Metternich's downfall was natural calamities. In 1847, the empire was hit by winter that destroyed potatoes and grains. Consequently, there was large-scale famine and epidemic diseases like cholera and dysentery. This forced the masses to move from the countryside to Vienna where they became revolutionary gangsters like that of Paris in 1789. These provided ready manpower for the revolution of 1848, which led to the downfall of Metternich.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The year 1848 is regarded by historians as that of revolutions. It is a turning point in time when the struggle between the new forces of change (Nationalism & Liberalism), and conservative forces in Europe climaxed into demonstrations and wars. The Vienna settlement of 1815 undermined the new forces, which created tension that flared up into the 1848 Revolutions in Europe.

These revolutions were confined to central and Eastern Europe and pronounced in France and the Austrian Empire. Revolts started from the Sicilian capital of Palermo in Italy on 12th Jan. 1848, spread to other Italian states, crossed to France on Feb 1848, and Austria, Hungary, Prussia plus other German states in March. In all, there were 17 revolutions in different parts of Europe. It should be noted that, although states like Belgium, Britain, Poland and Russia survived, they never-the less experienced some revolutionary shocks and disturbances.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

GENERAL CAUSES OF THE 1848 REVOLUTIONS IN EUROPE:

1. The Vienna settlement /Nationalism

The Vienna settlement laid foundation for the outbreak of the 1848 Revolutions, most especially in the Austrian Empire. The settlement undermined the principle of nationalism and imposed foreign control over smaller states. For example, Austrian control and influence was imposed on the Germans, Italians and Hungarians. The unifications of Italy and Germany that climaxed into the 1848 revolutions in these states were aimed at destroying Austria's control, which was imposed by the Vienna settlement.

The Hungarian revolution led by Louis Kossuth was also provoked by the need to eliminate Austria's influence, which was also consolidated by the Vienna settlement. To this extent, one can assert that nationalism was responsible for the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe.

2. Liberalism

Liberalism was a force to reckon with that caused the 1848 revolutions in Europe. In Austria, Hungary, France, German and Italian states, the King's were conservative, rigid and inflexible to liberal desires of the people. There was a popular demand for political liberties like freedom of speech, association and universal suffrage. There was also a popular agitation for a liberal constitution that would guarantee equality, expanded franchise, fair taxation system, fair wage policy etc. The inability of conservative kings to provide the above liberal demands explains why the liberals mobilized the masses for the revolution.

3. Metternich system

Metternich system was influential in causing the revolutions in Austria, Hungary, Germany and Italian states. In these states, Metternich consolidated his influence through unpopular policy of divide and rule, force, spy net work system, imprisonment and exile of political opponents. By 1848, these policies had made Metternich very unpopular in Europe. This is why when the Italians rose against the system in Jan 1848; it inspired the Austrians, Hungarians and Germans to take the challenge and revolt as well.

4. The Downfall of Metternich

The downfall of Metternich weakened his system and provided a line of weakness for the explosion of the 1848 Revolutions in Europe. Metternich

had maintained tight control over the Italians, Germans, Austrians and Hungarians through force and diplomacy. These measures effectively suppressed the forces of liberalism and nationalism. However, his downfall and exile in March 1848 became a source of hope and encouragement to the masses who were scared of revolting against him. It should be emphasized that the news of Metternich's downfall is what inspired the Hungarians, Germans, Slavs and Magyar's to rise up and demand for their freedom.

5. The downfall of the congress system

The collapse of the congress system left a vacuum for the explosion of the 1848 revolutions. The system had provided a spirit of togetherness in defending the Vienna settlement, which was against liberalism and nationalism. However, the collapse of the congress system by 1830 left a divided Europe that could not collectively defend the Vienna settlement. This inspired the liberals and nationalists to start challenging the Vienna settlement, which climaxed into the revolutions in Hungary, German and Italian states.

6. French revolutionary ideas and the success of previous revolutions in Europe

The spread of French revolutionary ideas and the success of previous revolutions in Europe also account for the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. The success of the Belgian revolution of 1830 against the Vienna settlement provided a practical example of how unity and determination could overturn the arrangements of Vienna. The success of the 1848 revolution in France provided yet another example of how freedom could be attained. All these provided a chain reaction for the outbreak of several other revolutions such as in Austria, Hungary and German states. This explains why some historians have asserted that whenever France sneezes, Europe catches cold and others have affirmed that whenever France coughs, Europe catches fire.

7. Effects of Bad weather and Economic hardship

The devastating impact of the 1847 - 1848 bad weather hit the agricultural states of east and central Europe, which made the outbreak of the revolutions inevitable. There were heavy rains, storms, frost and freezing of land to the extent that exchange of goods and services were brought to a standstill.

Besides, there were corruption and embezzlement of funds, which were unchecked by the existing governments. All these led to inflation, unemployment, poverty, famine, starvation and rural urban migration. It was these desperate conditions which the existing governments failed to handle that led to hostile groupings of jobless and hungry mobs on major streets. The jobless, hungry and frustrated mobs escalated lawlessness and violence, which degenerated in to the 1848 Revolutions.

NB: The impact of bad weather was more devastating to agrarian / agricultural economies like

Austrian empire and France. This partly explains why industrialized nations like Britain and Belgium survived the waves of the revolution.

8. Impact of epidemic diseases

The outbreak and spread of epidemic diseases in east and central Europe was also responsible for the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions. Diseases like cholera, typhoid, tuberculosis and influenza were more pronounced in the urban centers where there was a lot of congestion. Crop and animal diseases were also very active in the rural areas. These diseases led to high death rate, poor harvest, famine, psychological and physical effects on the people. People blamed their kings for failing to provide practical solutions to these problems and consequently revolted.

9. Population Explosion (Demographic Aspect)

The 1848 revolutions were also caused by population explosion. For instance, from 1840 to 1848, the population of Europe increased from 187 million to 266 million. These excess populations put a great strain on resources and means of survival especially food. Consequently, there were serious problems of famine, poverty, starvation, unemployment, congestion and inflation, which became fertile grounds for the explosion and spread of revolutions. The government's failure to address these problems dragged the masses to take a revolutionary stand. It should be noted that population pressure led to rural - urban migration and congestion in the urban centers, for example, the population of Berlin increased from about 170.000 in 1800 to over 440.000 by 1848. These provided the revolutionary mobs that made the outbreak of the revolutions inevitable.

10. Negative impact of industrial revolution

The negative consequences of industrial revolution played its role in the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. Industrial revolution started from

Britain in 1760's and by 1848 it had spread to East and Central Europe. Industries displaced human labour and rendered many people jobless. The few who were employed suffered long hours of work (14-16 hours a day), congestion and severe punishments. Accommodation, sanitation and working conditions were all poor. Indeed, conditions of industrial workers were so grim (very serious / deplorable) that they were expected to die sooner than agricultural workers. Governments went ahead and labeled ground for capitalists to continue exploiting workers. All these made the workers and the unemployed to engage in constant strikes and demonstrations, which climaxed into the 1848 Revolutions.

11. Influence of socialism

The 1848 revolutions were also caused by the growing influence of socialism. The disciples i.e. followers of Karl Marx and his socialist ideas, took advantage of socio-economic problems like unemployment, exploitation of workers and peasants to undermine capitalism and strengthen socialism. Socialists like Lamartine and Louis Blanc in France decampaigned their governments using such problems and demanded for a change of government. This created more awareness and a revolutionary mood in the minds of the people. It should be noted that the socialists played a leading role in mobilizing the workers and the unemployed to participate in the 1848 revolutions.

12. Segregative social class system

The segregative social class system cannot be underrated in the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. Apart from France, the social, political and economic system in the Austrian empire was dominated by the clergy and nobles against the peasants and the middle class. The clergy and nobles monopolized key positions in the civil service, church and the army. Besides, these aristocrats (clergy and nobles) were very arrogant when dealing with the peasants and the middle class. The peasants and the middle class joined the revolutions as the only way to end aristocratic arrogance and segregation.

13. The Role of Revolutionary leaders/Intellectuals

The rise and role of revolutionary leaders was influential in the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions.

Patriotic and nationalistic leaders like Louis Kossuth of Hungary, Lamartine and Louis Blanc of

France, Mazzini and Cavour of Italy and Stephan Baron of Prussia played a leading role in the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in their states. They undermined their governments by criticizing their weaknesses which ploughed ground for the revolutions. It should be stressed that these leaders played a crucial role in mobilizing and leading the masses in the 1848 revolutions

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES / SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 1848 REVOLUTIONS ON EUROPE

The 1848 Revolutions had positive and negative impacts on the social, political and economic structures of Europe.

Positive impact

1. Unifications of Italy and Germany

The 1848 revolutions contributed to the final unifications of Italy and Germany by 1871. In the first place, the revolutions led to the downfall of Metternich and collapse of his system that had been obstacles to the unification of both states. Secondly, the failures of the revolutions in Italian and German states exposed the real obstacles and enemies in the unification process of both nations.

Thirdly, these revolutions led to the rise of new men like Victor Emmanuel II, Cavour and Bismarck who corrected the weaknesses of the 1848 revolutionaries and successfully accomplished the unifications of Italy and Germany by 1871.

2. Partial Achievements

Temporary and partial successes were realized out of the 1848 revolutions. In Italy, Mazzini and Garibaldi succeeded in establishing a Roman Republic under Dr. Manin by 1849. However, Napoleon III sent French troops under General Oudinot who destroyed the republican government and the revolution in Rome. In Hungary, Kossuth succeeded in establishing the Hungarian Republic in March 1849 with himself as the president. However, like the Roman Republic, the Hungarian Republic was demolished by Russian troops who were sent by Tsar Nicholas I. The revolutionaries in the

German states succeeded in establishing the Frankfurt assembly of May 1848 that revived parliamentary democracy. This was also achieved temporarily in Hungary where Kossuth established a parliament at Budapest. Nevertheless, the achievement of parliamentary democracy did not radically change European society because class division persisted.

3. Destruction of Feudalism and serfdom

The 1848 revolutions gave a blow to Feudalism and serfdom that had characterized Metternich's rule in Europe. In Austria, Emperor Francis I passed the emancipation act of Sept. 1848 in which peasants were allowed to own and inherit land without compensation to their landlords. Serfdom was also abolished in Hungary. All these increased the productivity of peasants, led to increased output and reduced the problems of famine and starvation in Europe.

4. Effect of the revolutions in Denmark, Holland and Switzerland

The wave of the 1848 revolutions had fundamental effects on Denmark, Holland and Switzerland. In Denmark, the king was influenced by the revolutions in other countries to grant a liberal constitution and parliamentary democracy. This was a strategy that the king used to pre-empt the outbreak of a revolution in Denmark. In Holland, the revolutions influenced the election of the middle class in parliament contrary to the pre- 1848 era where the nobles and clergy dominated the parliament. In Switzerland, the revolutions accelerated the success of the liberals in the Swiss civil war and the promulgation of a new constitution. This was inspired by the success of liberalism in France and Austria during the course of the 1848 revolutions. One can therefore argue that the 1848 revolutions planted seeds of parliamentary democracy and constitutionalism in countries that survived.

5. Rise of New men

The rise to prominence of new men was one of the consequences of the 1848 revolutions in Europe.

The revolutions provided favourable opportunity for the rise of formerly insignificant men of low status to positions of significance. For instance, Stephan Born and Bismarck emerged from the revolution in Prussia, Louis Blanc and Cavainag from France, Schwazenburg from Austria and Victor Emmanuel II from Piedmont. These were new and prominent men who played a great role in shaping the destiny of their respective states.

Negative impact

6. Loss of Lives

The revolutions led to massive loss of lives in Europe. It is estimated that 3-5 thousand people were killed in Austria by Windischgratz (after proclaiming martial law). In Hungary, Haynau (who was nicknamed Hyena for butchering people), butchered Bethany (the Prime Minister of the short lived Hungarian republic), 13 Generals and over 1,000 politicians. It is also-estimated that 300 people were butchered in Berlin, 3^0 in Milan and over 500 in Trance. These, significantly reduced the populations of Europe as many people were forced to flee abroad.

7. Destruction of property

Besides, there was wanton destruction of property. In many areas, the revolutionaries recklessly dismantled administrative offices, recreational centers, health centers, educational facilities, bridges, etc. These left a burden of reconstruction in the post revolutionary era, which reduced the phase of economic recovery and development.

8. Displacement and Exile

There was displacement and exile of people and key figures in Europe. In Austria, Metternich was forced by pressure of events to flee to London. The failure of the revolutions in different parts of Europe and the quest of revenge by anti - revolutionary leaders forced prominent revolutionary leaders like Kossuth, Charles Albert, Mazzini and Garibaldi to flee to exile.

9. The Downfall of Metternich and collapse of Metternich system

The 1848 Revolutions led to the downfall of Metternich and the collapse of his system. From 1815 -1848, Metternich was the most dominant political figure in Europe. However, the massive demonstrations against him by the 1848 revolutionaries forced him to resign and flee to London.

Metternich was replaced by Schwarzenburg (as the new chancellor). It should be noted that

Metternich's downfall weakened his system and left it ineffective. Although, Metternich came back from exile in 1851, he was fatigued and died in 1852 as a common man.

10. Downfall of Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy

In France, the 1848 revolution led to the downfall of Louis Philippe and Orleans monarchy. It forced Louis Philippe to abdicate and flee to exile on

24th Feb. 1848. This ended the era of monarchism in the history of France and opened a political vacuum for the rise of Napoleon III and the second French republic.

11. Economic Decline

The 1848 revolutions led to economic decline in Europe. There was a lot of destruction and disorganization, which hindered industrial and agricultural progress. These accelerated the prerevolutionary economic hardship such as poverty, famine, starvation, diseases, unemployment and inflation.

12. Effect of the revolutions on Britain

The 1848 revolutions had some effects on countries that survived. It caused political disturbances in Britain due to spillover effects. Before the revolution, the chartist movement in Britain was unable to achieve much success. But, the news of the success of the revolution in France inspired the chartists to organize a mass demonstration which was foiled by the government counter measures using the army and spy network. Although this demonstration was suppressed, the chartists succeeded in presenting a charter to the government.

13. Influence of socialism

The 1848 revolutions consolidated the influence of socialism in Europe. The socialists had mobilized the workers and peasants to revolt against capitalists and the governments of Europe. However, the revolutions were suppressed and the problems of workers and peasants did not receive immediate attention. It left the workers and peasants 'cursing' capitalism and governments of the day. This strengthened the spread and consolidation of socialism in Europe. It should be emphasized that this set in an ideological struggle between communism *vis-à-vis* capitalism that was responsible for the cold war in the post world war II era.

14. Success of new order against old order

Lastly, the 1848 revolutions were a triumph for the old order of conservatism against the new order of liberalism and nationalism. Although the revolutions started with much vigour and prospects, by 1850 almost all with the exception of France had failed. The anti revolutionary forces had succeeded in re establishing Austrian control in Vienna, Hungary, Italian and German states. Nevertheless, these revolutions shook the Austrian authorities and forced them to embark on reforms such as constitutional rule and parliamentary democracy.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

COMMON FEATURES / CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 1848 REVOLUTIONS

The 1848 Revolutions in Europe had common features. The similar characteristics of these revolutions are found in the causes, course and consequences.

1. The origin of the 1848 Revolutions in Europe can be traced back to the French Revolution of 1789.

The revolution came with the ideas of equality, liberty, fraternity and nationalism that spread and contributed to the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. It should be noted that the 1848

Revolutionaries used similar strategies and tactics that was adopted from the French revolutionaries.

2. Apart from France, the 1848 revolutions in other countries was a protest against the Vienna Settlement of 1815. The settlement imposed foreign rule and influence over smaller states. For instance, Austrian and Metternichian influence were imposed on the Hungarians, Italian and German states. Thus, the revolutions in these states were primarily to undo the Vienna settlement and the Metternich system.

3. The revolutions were either liberal or nationalistic in nature. The revolutionaries aimed at achieving liberal or nationalistic goals. The revolutions in France and Austria were liberal because people had achieved political independence but were denied political liberties. However, the revolutions in Hungary, German and Italian states were both liberal and nationalistic. This is because the masses were struggling for political liberty as well as independence.

It should be noted that the outcome of these revolutions strengthened the forces of nationalism and liberalism, which led to the unifications of Italy and Germany by 1871. This is because the revolutions led to the rise of Bismarck, Cavour and Victor Emmanuel who learnt lessons from the revolutions and championed the unification of both nations.

4. The immediate events that sparked off the 1848 revolutions were the effects of natural disasters and epidemic diseases. Bad weather and epidemic diseases led to famine and psychological problems in the agrarian economies of France and the Austrian Empire, which conditioned the outbreak of the revolutions in those states.

5. The 1848 revolutions were more pronounced in less industrialized states and those who depended on agriculture (agrarian economies). It was because agricultural states are more vulnerable to the devastating impact of natural calamities and diseases. This explains why the agrarian economies of France and the Austrian empire experienced the revolutions while the industrialized states of Britain and Belgium survived.

6. The timing and spread of the revolutions provides yet another common feature. All these revolutions broke out in the same year, i.e. 1848 from January to June. The spread of the revolutions were contagious and sequential i.e. it started from Sicily and spread like a bush fire to other Italian states, France, German states, Austria and Hungary.

7. The 1848 revolutions were also characterized by lack of foreign assistance and foreign intervention.

The revolutions broke out in the same year and countries who were busy suppressing the revolutions could not give foreign assistance to revolutions in other countries. Those who survived the revolutions were also tied by political disturbances and shocks that they could not also support revolutions outside their boundaries. On the contrary, there was foreign intervention, which led to the failure of the revolutions in different states. France suppressed the revolution in Rome and frustrated the success of the revolution in Italy, Russia suppressed the revolution in Hungary and Austria did the same in Italian and German states.

8. Military weakness and lack of support from domestic army (except France) are other characteristics of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. The revolutionary armies were poorly armed, coordinated, trained and disorganized. They lacked support from domestic armies, which explains why the ruling kings used the army to suppress the revolutions.

9. The 1848 revolutions were urban based. There was poor mobilization that left the revolutions confined to a few cities and towns like Paris and Versailles in France, Vienna in Austria, Budapest and Press burg in Hungary, Milan in Piedmont and Berlin in Prussia. This is because urban centers were administrative areas, which made it the target of the middle class and

intellectuals who were also residents in such cities and towns. The other reason is that urban centers had the greatest impact of side effects of industrial revolution. Besides, workers were also resident in such urban centers, which explain why they massively participated in the revolutions.

10. The Revolutions were led by intellectuals and financed by the middle class. These included university students, lectures, professors, journalists, lawyers and other professionals. For example, Mazzini in Italy, Stephan Bora in Prussia, Louis Blanc and Lamartine in France and Kossuth in Hungary. This explains why the rural peasants did not participate in the revolutions. It's for this reason that some historians have described the 1848 Revolutions as Intellectual movements of 1848-1850.

11. The 1848 revolutionaries were divided along ideological, racial, religious and social lines. The Italians were divided between the supporters of the Pope, Mazzini and Charles Albert. The Germans were divided into North German states, which supported Prussia and South German states, which supported Austria. Besides, there were betrayers and cowards like Charles Albert of piedmont, Pope Pius ix of the Papal states, Fredrick William IV of Prussia and Kossuth (betrayed Croats and Slovenes) of Hungary. All these, explain the failure of the revolutions in such states. This was precisely because the existing kings who could have supported the revolutions declined to do so.

12. The failure of the revolutions by 1850 is yet another similar characteristic of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. Due to military weakness, disunity, economic backwardness, foreign intervention etc, the revolutions in Austria, Hungary, Italian and German states were completely suppressed by 1850. The earlier concessions such as parliamentary democracy and constitutional rule were also withdrawn. In France, the second French republic, which was a great success of the 1848 revolutionaries, was dissolved by Napoleon III who replaced it with an empire in 1851. However, there were permanent achievements like destruction of feudalism and serfdom, constitutional rule and parliamentary democracy.

13. Lastly, the revolutions were characterized by heavy bloodshed, destruction of property and exile to thousands of people. The counter revolutionary measures by the existing governments led to the loss of thousands of lives and self-exile of key suspects. There were also key revolutionary targets like Metternich who fled to exile. Besides, there was destruction of infrastructure and other valuable assets during the revolutions.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

GENERAL REASONS FOR THE FAILURE OF THE 1848 REVOLUTIONS IN EUROPE / AUSTRIAN EMPIRE:

1. Military weakness vis-a-vis- strength of anti revolutionary forces

The failure of the 1848 revolutions was due to military weakness. The revolutionaries were poorly armed, hurriedly trained and disorganized yet without support from their domestic army (except France). On the other hand, the anti - revolutionary forces were properly armed, well trained, disciplined and loyal to their kings. They were commanded by skillful and experienced commanders like General Windischgratz who quelled the revolution in Vienna and Prague, Haynau and Jellic who crushed the Hungarian Revolt and Radetsky who defeated the Italians at the battle of Custoza.

2. Economic problems vis-a- vis strength of the Austrian empire

The success of the 1848 revolutions was hindered by economic problems such as inflation, unemployment, poverty and famine. These explain why the revolutionaries failed to mobilize, finance and arm a big army, which could have earned them success against Austrian forces. On the contrary, the Austrian empire had sufficient resources, which was due to taxes collected from the different races within the empire. The Austrian empire was the biggest in Europe with a high population and hence a big army. The army was motivated by resources exploited from the very Italians, Germans, Austrians and Hungarians who were revolting. This tilted the military balance of power against the 1848 revolutionaries, hence their failure.

3. Metternich system

Metternich system was a stumbling block that led to the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Europe.

Metternich had used a complex policy like diplomacy, spy net work, divide and rule and force to frustrate any united opposition to his dominance of European politics. This explains why the 1848 revolutionaries in Austria,

Hungary, Italian and German states failed to stage a properly co ordinate and united resistance, which made them to fail. It should be noted that although Metternich fled to exile, his system was successfully used by his successor, prince Schwarzenburg against the revolutions in Vienna, Prague, Budapest, Milan and Berlin.

4. Disunity

a) Racial Difference

The 1848 revolutions also failed due to divisions within the revolutionaries. In Hungary, the revolution failed because of racial difference between the Croats and Slovenes against the dominant Magyars.

This is why the Croats led by Jellacic allied with the Austrian king and suppressed the revolution in Hungary. In Italian and German states, when the workers and peasants started advocating for communism, it threatened the property of the middle class and made them to support their kings to suppress the revolutions. Thus, divisionism provided a line of weakness for the triumph of anti revolutionary forces and failure of the 1848 revolutions.

(b) Ideological difference and lack of common strategy

Lack of a common strategy due to ideological difference was also responsible for the failure of the 1848 revolutions. The Italians were divided between supporters of a republican government. Federal government and a unitary system of government. The republicans, led by Mazzini disregarded foreign assistance and the role of kings which was rejected by federalists. In Germany, the North German states led by Bismarck wanted a "little Germany" led by Prussia, which was rejected by the South German states who wanted a "big united Germany" led by Austria. Other Germans opposed them and wanted a republican government. All these explain why the revolutionaries failed to stage a coordinated and limited movement that could have succeeded against Austria.

c) Religious difference

Religion was a social factor that divided the revolutionaries and made them to fail. In the German states, religious consideration made the northern Protestants to support Prussia and the Southern Catholics to support Austria (being a fellow Catholic state). In Italy, Charles Albert hesitated to attack Austria because he was a Catholic and the Pope defected for the same reason. Religious consideration also explains why

Napoleon III and Tsar Nicholas II intervened against Italian and Hungarian revolutions respectively.

5. Lack of capable and reliable leadership

The 1848 revolutions also failed due to incapable and unreliable leaders. The revolutionaries had hopes in leaders who were driven by self interest and ended up betraying the revolutionary cause. In Italy, Charles Albert was a coward, who was only interested in expanding his kingdom and that was why he delayed to attack Austria. The pope betrayed the Italians when he defected, sought for support from Catholic states and was restored to Rome by Napoleon III. Kossuth became a dictator after establishing the Hungarian republic and denied the Slovenes and Croats their independence (which he had promised before the revolution). Frederick William IV of Prussia was also a coward and too fearful of Austria, which partly made him to refuse to lead the revolution. The role of these incompetent and unreliable leaders favoured the success of anti-revolutionary forces and made the failure of the revolutions inevitable.

6. Role of intellectuals

The poor and theoretical approach of the intellectuals also contributed to the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Europe. Intellectuals who led the revolutions over concentrated on theoretical issues like debates, conferences and seminars, which became useless against the mighty anti-revolutionary forces. They neglected the role of the army, kings, foreign assistance and distanced themselves from the peasants and rural areas. These left the 1848 revolutions confined to cities and few towns, which were easily suppressed by kings and foreign powers.

7. Poor mobilization

The 1848 revolutions failed due to poor mobilization. The revolutions were urban based in a few large towns and cities. The rural dwellers and peasants were not politicized and made little contributions to the revolution. For example, out of 586 members of the Frankfurt assembly, only one person was a peasant and the rest were other professionals. This means that there was no mass support, which led to the failure of the revolutions.

8. The Failure of the Austrian revolution

The failure of the 1848 revolutions in Austria also contributed to the failure of the revolutions in other parts of Europe. On 31st Oct 1848, the Austrian forces recaptured Vienna, which brought the revolution to an end. This gave

Fredrick William IV of Prussia confidence to use force against the Frankfurt assembly and the revolution in Prussia. It also reduced pressure on Austrian authorities and made it possible to release troops to suppress the revolutions in Hungary, Prussia and Piedmont.

9. Foreign intervention/ monarchical solidarity

Lastly, the 1848 revolutions failed due to foreign intervention. The Italians had succeeded in setting the Roman republic but were demolished by French troops who restored the pope in Rome. Similarly, the Hungarians were suppressed by the intervention of Croatians and 200 Russian troops. The Prussian and Italian revolutions were all brought down by the intervention of Austrian troops. One can say that the intervention of foreign powers against the 1848 revolutions in Europe was a disaster that made the failure of the 1848 revolutions inevitable.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

REASONS FOR THE FAILURE OF THE 1848 REVOLUTION IN PRUSSIA

1. Lack of a strong revolutionary army rendered the 1848 Prussian revolution a failure. The revolutionaries were poorly armed, trained and co-ordinate yet they had no support from the Prussian army. On the other hand, the Prussian and Austrian armies were properly armed, well trained, disciplined and loyal to their kings. This is why the revolution was easily suppressed by Prussian and Austrian troops.

2. The political and economic strength of the Austrian empire also contributed to the failure of the Prussian revolution. The Austrian empire was the biggest in Europe and the most influential in European politics. She had dominated and exploited the Germans, Italians, Hungarians, and Bohemians etc. She also had a big population and hence a big army that was maintained by the exploited resources. This rendered the Prussian revolution a failure. It should be noted that Austrian strength is what bullied King Fredrick William IV and made him to reject the offer to lead the revolution and appeal for Austrian intervention against the revolution.

3. The impact of the Metternich system made valuable contribution to the failure of the 1848 Prussian revolution. By 1848, Metternich had disorganized

the Germans through his policy of spy network, Carlsbad decree, divide and rule and force. He created a confederation parliament, which was led by an Austrian. He also imposed different rulers to lead the various 39 German states. These undermined nationalism and explains why the Prussians were not united in the revolution. It should be stressed that although Metternich was overthrown, his system was effectively used by his successor Schwarzenburg against the revolution in Berlin.

4. Racial difference was another setback to the 1848 Prussian revolution. This was responsible for the failure of the Frankfurt parliament, which was to decide on the future of Prussia, it was dominated by intellectuals and middle class with very limited peasants and workers representatives. This is why the workers and peasants in Berlin started agitating for communism, which in turn forced the middle class to support King Fredrick to suppress the revolution.

5. The Prussian revolution also failed because of ideological conflict. This was revealed in the Frankfurt parliament. The delegates conflicted over whether Austria should be part of a united Germany or not.

There were also other groups who were advocating for federal and republican governments. This explains why the Frankfurt parliament wasted a lot of time and failed to embark on crucial issues like raising an army. This disagreement and confusion provided a line of weakness for King William IV to use force and dissolve the parliament, leading to the failure of the revolution.

6. The influence of religion in politics was also responsible for the failure of the revolution in Prussia. It made the Catholics in Prussia to sympathize and support King William and Austria against the revolution. This is why the revolution in the German states was more concentrated in Prussia, which was a stronghold of the Protestant religion.

7. Lack of capable and reliable leadership also contributed to the failure of the Prussian revolution.

The revolutionaries had hopes in King William IV who unfortunately was a coward and afraid of fighting Austria. He refused the Frankfurt assembly's proposal to lead a united Germany saying that he was not ready to be serf of the revolution" "nor pick a crown of mud and wood from the gutter".

He turned against the assembly remarking that, "The assembly wished to take from me my divine right. No power on earth is strong enough to do

that. I shall hold it as I have inherited it from my ancestors (Years of Nationalism by L.W. Cowie and R. Wolfson, P 173)

Eventually, William IV withdrew Prussian delegates from the parliament, which was followed by other delegates. This marked the end of the Frankfurt assembly, which was a devastating blow to the revolution.

8. The political miscalculation of the liberals and intellectuals was yet another contributory factor to the failure of the revolution. The liberals and intellectuals who dominated the Frankfurt parliament blundered by falsely hoping that they could succeed through speeches and parliamentary resolutions yet the complexity of the Prussian problem needed a field where bullets not views would fly.

Consequently, they vetoed important and crucial issues like raising an army, foreign assistance and using kings against Austria. The liberals wasted time on non issues instead of taking advantage of the downfall of Metternich and the weakened Austrian empire to unite the Germans. This was opposed by Prussian representatives led by Bismarck, which paved way for the success of Fredrick William and Austria against the revolutionaries.

9. The failure of the 1848 revolutions in other parts of Europe also contributed to the failure of the revolution in Prussia. By November 1848, revolutions had failed in other states. In Austria, the Austrian troops recaptured Vienna on 31st Oct, 1848 and ended the revolution. In Italy, the Italians were also failing to succeed. All these gave the Prussian king, William IV confidence to use force against the Frankfurt Assembly and the revolution in Prussia. The failure of the revolution in Austria also reduced Pressure on Austrian authorities and made it possible to release troops who suppressed the revolution in Prussia.

10. Poor mobilization also account for the failure of the 1848 revolution in Prussia. The revolution was urban based and confined to a few large towns and cities like Berlin and Frankfurt. The rural peasants were not mobilized and that is why there was only one peasant out of 586 members in the Frankfurt assembly. This denied the revolutionaries mass support leaving them confined to urban centers e.g. Berlin, which were easily suppressed.

11. The Austrian intervention against the revolution was also significant in the failure of the revolution in Prussia. The revolution was against Austrian influence in German states, which provoked Austria and Prince Windischgratz to send troops that brought the revolution to an end.

12. Opposition by conservative Prussian Junkers led by Bismarck also rendered the 1848 revolution a failure. The Junkers opposed the revolutionary aim of integrating Prussia in Germany and wanted Prussia to absorb other German states. They had dominated key government positions in Prussia and encouraged King William IV to use force against the revolution. It should be noted that Prussia was the strongest of all the German states and her moves against the revolution made its failure inevitable by 1849.

13. The nature and composition of the constituent assembly (of May in Berlin) also contributed to the failure the Prussian revolution of 1848. There were 400 members but the representatives of peasants and workers were only about 100 while the rest were representatives of the conservative middle class and Junkers. The middle class and Junkers who dominated the constituent assembly were against the revolution and influenced the king to suppress it.

14. The influence and interest of foreign powers in German states made the failure of the 1848 revolution a foregone conclusion. The big powers of Europe had selfish interests to defend or pursue in the German states, which made them to oppose the revolution in Prussia. Russia had the ambition to expand to central Europe and Prussia's leadership of a united Germany would frustrate her ambitions.

Denmark was in control of Schleswig and Holstein, Holland was in possession of Luxemburg, Britain had political influence in Hanover and Austria's influence in German states was legalized by the Vienna settlement of 1815. All these powers were opposed to the revolution partly because they were signatories of the Vienna settlement of 1815 and partly because of the need to protect their influence in the German states. This explains why the Prussians did not get foreign assistance but intervention from Austria, which made the revolution to fail.

15. The dismissal of liberal ministers by king William IV also contributed to the failure of the Prussian revolution. The king had appointed liberal minded men to ministerial positions in the initial stage of the revolution. However, he dismissed them in Sept 1848 and replaced them with conservative anti liberal and anti revolutionary men. It was these new set of ministers who pressurized King William IV to use force to recover his authority and suppress the revolution.

16. The outbreak of epidemic diseases also contributed to the failure of the 1848 revolution in Prussia. The success of the revolution was hindered by the

outbreak of epidemics such as cholera, potato and animal diseases. These led to famine, which weakened the revolutionaries and made it easy for Austria to suppress the revolution. It should be emphasized that the desperate conditions provided by epidemic diseases is what partly made king William IV to cowardice and support Austria against the revolution in Prussia.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE FAILURE OF THE 1848 REVOLUTIONS IN ITALIAN STATES

1. The Italians were militarily weak and were not supported by the various state armies. On the other hand, Austria was a military power with a mighty army, which was commanded by experienced commanders like Radetsky. Radetsky was a great mobiliser and a battle hardened soldier, who had fought Napoleon on several occasions. This is why he defeated Italians at Custozza and Novara, which brought the revolution to a bitter end.

2. Economic backwardness compared to Austria's strength also made the Italians to fail. The Italians did not have sufficient resources to mobilize, finance and arm a strong army that could have defeated Austria.

On the other hand, Austria had exploited her subjects (Italians inclusive) and had sufficient resources, which she successfully used to suppress the revolutions.

3. Mettenich system had undermined Italian nationalism in favour of Austrian dominance. His policy of spy network, divide and rule and force explains why the Italians were not united and organized during the revolution. Although Metternich fled to exile, his system was effectively used against Italians by his successor, Schwazenburg.

4. Racial and Ideological differences were also responsible for the failure of the revolutions in Italian states. The middle class supported Austria to suppress the revolutions because they were afraid of communism, which was being advocated by workers and peasants. There were also divisions and conflicts between agitators of republican, federal and military governments. The republicans led by Mazzini disregarded foreign assistance and kings, which made kings to turn against the revolutions. All

these provided a line of weakness for the success of Austrians troops against Italians.

5. Religion also divided the Italians and contributed to the failure of the revolutions. It made some Catholics in Italian states not to join the revolution because of Austria being a strong Catholic state. This is what partly made Charles Albert to hesitate to attack Austria and was also responsible for the Pope's defection. It should not be taken for granted that Napoleon's restoration and protection of the pope in

Rome against the revolution was also due to religious consideration.

6. The selfish interest of Charles Albert and his hesitation to attack Austria was a total blunder that led to the failure of the Italian revolution. Charles Albert had a hidden agenda to use the revolution to expand his kingdom of Piedmont at the expense of Italians. He did not have a united Italy in his heart and had profound hatred for republicanism, which frustrated some Italians from joining the revolution. Charles Albert's hesitation to attack Austria made him to lose a crucial moment of defeating Austrian troops. It gave Austria enough time to re-organize and reinforce Radetsky's troops who defeated his troops at Custoza.

7. The Italians also failed due to inadequate politicization and poor mobilization. Mazzini's politicization had failed to fully sensitize the peasants because of the high level of illiteracy. This left the revolutions confined to intellectuals in a few towns and cities, which were easily suppressed by Austrian forces.

8. The failure of the revolution in Austria was bad news that contributed to the failure of Italians as well.

The Austrian troops invaded and recaptured Vienna on Oct 1848 from the revolutionaries. This reduced pressure on Austrian troops and made it easy to release troops who reinforced Radetsky and led to the defeat of Italians at Custoza.

9. Lack of foreign assistance was also responsible for the failure of the 1848 revolution in Italian states.

European powers that could have assisted the Italians were busy either with their own internal problems or suppressing revolutions. This left the Italians isolated without any military assistance. It should be noted that the Italians expected assistance from France but were disappointed when Napoleon

refused, which demoralized the Italians and contributed to the failure of the revolution.

10. The sudden defection of the Pope made the Italians to lose faith in his leadership and the revolution as well. As the revolution was progressing, the Pope suddenly denounced the war and withdrew his forces with a justification that he was not ready to wage war on Austria who was a staunch Catholic state. This demoralized the soldiers and Italian Catholics who had joined the revolution due to the Pope's liberal attitudes.

11. The French intervention was a landmark that contributed to the failure of the Italian revolution.

Garibaldi and Mazzini had overthrown the pope and established Roman republic in Rome. However, the French soldiers successfully restored the pope in Rome and destroyed the republic. The French intervention also denied the Italians the chance to use Rome for mobilization and left them vulnerable to further defeats. This explains why Austrian forces easily re-conquered other Italian states such as Venice and Nice.

12. The role of the Vienna settlement of 1815 should not be underrated in the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Italy. The settlement gave Austria direct and indirect control over Italian states. It also legalized Metternich and Austrian intervention against any revolutionary movement in Italian states. This made Austrian Authorities to crush the revolution without fear of foreign intervention. It's partly for this reason that Napoleon III who had wished to assist the Italians turned round and instead used his troops against the revolution.

13. Lastly, the revolution in Italian states also failed due to the outbreak of epidemic diseases. The Italian city of Venice presented the strongest resistance to Austrian forces. However, by August 1849, the city was hit by cholera epidemic and famine. These reduced people's ability to resist Austrian bombardment and forced the revolutionaries to surrender to Austrian forces.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The Unification of Italy refers to the amalgamation (union) of various Italian States to form a single one in 1870. The various states that formed a united Italy includes; Piedmont (Sardinia), Lombardy, Venetia, the Central Italian Duchies of Parma, Modena and Tuscany, Papal States, Naples and Sicily.

Politically, there was no single leader and diplomatic co-operation between these states. From economic point of view, there was even no unity. This was due to poor transport network between the south and northern Italian states. Consequently, one had to pay custom duty while transporting commodities from one area to another. Besides, there was no cultural unity amongst the Italians. The Italians were of different races, historical and ethnic background and worst of all spoke different languages. All these explain why Metternich sarcastically referred to Italy in 1815 as, "A mere geographical expression".

Before 1796, the Italians were under Austria's control. However, Napoleon I forced Austria out of Italy in the famous Italian campaign. Napoleon preached and instilled in the Italians, the French revolutionary ideologies of equality, liberty and nationalism. He also preached against foreign domination and reminded the Italians that they had the same goals and historical background.

Napoleon I later merged the different Italian states into three divisions. These were The Kingdom of Italy in the north and northeast, Kingdom of Naples in the south and the Central Italian states. This made Italians to interact more closely, develop solidarity and started thinking as one people hence developing the idea of unification.

Nevertheless, although Napoleon I was welcomed as a liberator against Austrian imperialism and oppression, the Italians did not take long to discover his "true colours". He merely destroyed Austria's imperialism and super imposed his oppressive and exploitative rule over the Italians. This made the Italians to use the same nationalism that he had earlier preached to them to resist his domination.

Consequently, they formed the Carbonari in 1809 to resist the French rule, which later continued after 1815 against Austria.

After the defeat and downfall of Napoleon I in 1815, the Italians had high hopes for regaining their freedom and independence. However, the Vienna peace makers of 1815 multiplied the 3 states forged by Napoleon I into 12 smaller ones that were instead given back to Austria's control. Austria

was given direct control in Lombardy and Venetia (the richest states) and indirect control over Parma, Modena, Tuscany etc by imposing her rulers there. Austria and her rulers used unrealistic policies to frustrate Italian unification process and that was why the Carbonari that was formed against France continued struggling for the unification of Italy.

However, the Italian unification process between 1796-1848 was a failure without any territorial Achievement. The unification process was delayed and was finally completed in 1870. This was due to so many problems/obstacles (internal and external factors) that hindered the course of the unification

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE DELAY OF ITALY UN UNIFICATION/OBSTACLES TO ITALIAN UNIFICATION:

1) THE METTERNICH SYSTEM:

Metternich and his system were stumbling blocks to the Italian unification by 1848. Metternich used the policy of divide and rule to keep the Italians divided and disunited. He also instituted one of the most efficient spy networks that exposed the activities of Italian nationalists. Above all, Metternich used force to suppress Italian freedom fighters. All these explain why the unification attempts of 1821, 1830 and 1848 failed to win any success in the unification process. The fact that the Italians succeeded after the downfall of Metternich is a clear testimony that he had been a formidable obstacle in the unification of Italy.

2) THE VIENNA SETTLEMENT

The 1815 Vienna Settlement and the Congress System that followed were serious setbacks to the Italian unification process. They hindered the unification in 3 ways; In the first place, the peacemakers re-partitioned Italy into 12 smaller states out of the 3 forged by Napoleon I. This made it more difficult to unify the states than it would have been with only 3 states. Secondly, the settlement gave Austria direct control over Lombardy and Venetia and indirect control over the rest of the Italian states. This made it illegal for any other power to assist the Italians in the unification process. On

the other hand, it also legalized Austria's intervention against Italian unification process and that was why she suppressed all unification movements without fear.

3) THE CONGRESS SYSTEM:

Besides, the Congress System that was to maintain the Vienna Settlement brought a spirit of togetherness against any revolutionary and unification movement. The Troppau Protocol of 1820 bonded Austria, Prussia, Russia and France to suppress liberal and nationalistic movements in

Europe. It's this spirit that Austria used to crush the carbonari movements of 1820-1822 in Naples, Sicily and Piedmont. It's the same spirit that was used by France to suppress the pro-unification movements of 1821 in Spain and 1848 in Rome. These disorganized and paralyzed the activities of the Carbonari and Young Italy Movement, hence accounting for the delay in the unification of Italy by 1850.

4) LACK OF A STRONG MIDDLE CLASS

Lack of a strong and revolutionary middleclass also hindered Italian unification struggle by 1850.

The middle class that existed in Italy were supporters of Austria and Metternich system of conservatism. This was because Metternich was defending their privileges against revolutionary movements by the Carbonari and later Young Italy Movement. They were the landlords who controlled the peasants through the practice of feudalism. This denied Italians of a strong pro unification leaders and mass support that could have achieved a successful unification by 1850.

5) ILLITERACY

The high rate of illiteracy and ignorance amongst the Italians also contributed to the failure of unification movement by 1850. Most Italians especially in the rural areas were unable to read and write. For instance over 90% of Italians in the rural areas were illiterate. They could not properly understand the advantages of an independent and united Italy in comparison to a divided Italy under Austrian rule. Illiteracy also hindered effective mobilisation and circulation of unification ideas across the various Italian states, hence delaying the unification process.

6) WEAKNESSES OF ITALIAN NATIONALISTIC MOVEMENTS

The weaknesses of Italian pro-unification movements were also responsible for the failure of the struggle by 1850. The Carbonari movement was dominated by charcoal burners whose political influence was confined to the bush where they burnt charcoal. The Young Italy Movement that succeeded the Carbonari (from 1833) was monopolized by a few intellectuals and idealists who did not have a comprehensive political program to achieve Italian unity. They ignored the role of Italian Kings and earned opposition from those who believed that not all kings were against the unification. They also over concentrated on theoretical approach in form of debates and discussions at the expense of raising a strong army to fight Austria out of Italian states. These weaknesses favoured Austrian dominance and enabled her to easily suppress pro-unification movements like those of 1830 and 1848.

7) LACK OF A LEADING STATE

Lack of a model state to lead the rest of Italian states also failed the struggle by 1850. None of the Italian states emerged to rally others behind her to achieve national unity. Each of the states and their kings believed in their own struggle for independence from Austria rather than fighting for a united Italy. This explains why Italian unification struggle was led from foreign countries like France, Britain and Switzerland after the exile of nationalists like Garibaldi and Mazzini. Thus, lack of a model state denied Italian nationalists of an internal base to mobilize Italians for effective unification by 1850. The fact that Italian unification easily succeeded with the emergence of Piedmont as a leading state from 1850's is a testimony that absence of a leading state was a serious problem that had hindered the struggle.

8) DISUNITY AND IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES:

Ideological difference was a great hindrance to Italian unification. The Italians were divided over the strategy to achieve a united Italy. Mazzini was against foreign assistance and Italian Kings and wanted a republican government led by an elected King; Abbey Ghiberty wanted a Federal

Government led by the Pope from Rome and Mazzimo-de-Azeglio wanted a united Italy led by Charles Albert of Piedmont (Sardinia). This division amongst the Italians explains why the Italians failed to organize a co-ordinated movement but isolated risings, which were crushed by Austria one at a time.

NB: Mazzini's negative attitude towards foreign assistance explains why no foreign power considered granting foreign assistance to Italians against Austria yet from another angle,

Mazzini's republican spirit bullied the Italian Kings from supporting the unification. It's because republicanism was a big threat to their power. This is why Charles Albert hesitated and gave half-hearted support to the unification, which doomed it to failure in 1848.

9) ECONOMIC BACKWARDNESS:

Economic backwardness of the Italian states impeded the unification progress. There was no properly developed transport and communication network for effective mobilisation and the flow of unification ideas. The richest states of Lombardy and Venetia were under Austria and this left the unification to the economically poorer states of the south. Unfortunately, these poor states could not finance a protracted unification program that needed a modernized army and well developed transport and communication network. This explains why there was poor mobilisation, co-ordination and infrastructure that frustrated Italian unification.

10) THE STRENGTH OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE:

By 1848, the Austrian empire was the strongest in Europe. It was an amalgam (combination) of races like the Italians, Germans, Magyars, Austrians and Hungarians. Austria therefore had a very high population and that is why she had a big army that was deployed against Italian nationalists.

From economic point of view, the empire had enough resources that was due to the taxes collected from the different races within the empire. These resources were useful in financing intelligence network, training the army and morale boosting the army that made them to easily suppress all unification movements by 1850. The strength of the Austrian empire can be manifested by the fact that even after the fall of Metternich in 1848, it still took about 10years for the Italian nationalists to make practical achievements.

11) MILITARY WEAKNESS:

Military weakness was a serious obstacle to Italian unification. For the Italians to succeed, they needed a strong, well equipped, trained and armed army. Unfortunately, the Italian freedom fighters resorted to secret movements (Carbonari) that were ill equipped and ill trained. This couldn't

therefore challenge the Austrian army that was well organized, highly trained, equipped led by mighty and experienced commanders like General Windischgratz, Haynau, Jellacio and Radetsky. This is why Italian struggles of 1820-21, 1830 and 1848 failed because they were violently quelled down by mighty anti-revolutionary forces (Austrian soldiers).

12) LACK OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE:

Lack of foreign assistance was a cardinal factor that delayed the unification of Italy. By 1850,

European powers (most of them monarchs) were not ready to assist Italians against the Austrian monarchy. France under Louis Philippe had a non-interventionist foreign policy; Russia and

Prussia had a strong solidarity and alliance with Austria; Britain maintained her isolationist policy in Europe. All these left the Italians isolated without any military or moral assistance. This was exploited by Austria to suppress the Italian unification movements and dominate her up to 1858.

That the unification of Italy succeeded only after acquisition of foreign assistance from 1859 is clear evidence that lack of it was indeed not a minor obstacle by 1858.

13 FRENCH INTERVENTIONS, 1849:

Napoleon's III's intervention in Rome in 1849 was a final blockade in the unification of Italy.

Garibaldi and Mazzini had overthrown the Pope and established a Roman Republic in Rome.

However, Napoleon III sent French soldiers led by General Oudinot and restored the Pope in

Rome. This denied the Italians of a base to mobilize themselves and made them vulnerable to further defeats. This is why the Austrian troops easily re-occupied Venice and Nice. Worst of all,

French soldiers remained in Rome guarding the Pope up to 1870. This is what made Garibaldi's attempt to liberate Rome a failure not until 1870 when the Franco-Prussian war conditioned Napoleon III to withdraw the French troops.

14) INADEQUATE POLITICISATION AND POOR MOBILISATION OF THE MASSES:

By 1850, the majority of Italians were still ignorant about the advantages of a united Italy.

Mazzini's politicization program had failed to significantly politicize the peasants because they were not able to read and write (illiterate). This also made the unification struggle to be confined to urban areas and the rural dwellers played a "passive role". Hence, by 1850 the unification of Italy was confined to a few urban centers and intellectuals who were easily defeated by Austria.

15) LACK OF CAPABLE AND RELIABLE LEADERSHIP

The unification of Italy was also delayed by lack of capable and reliable leadership up to 1850.

The Carbonari was merely a group of disorganized charcoal burners without a political agenda and organized leadership. They operated in isolated groups without proper co-ordination and became a victim of Metternich's policy of divide and rule. Mazzini, the leader of the Young Italy Movement operated from exile and was against foreign assistance plus the Italian Kings. Charles Albert of Piedmont was anti-unification and merely wanted to expand his Kingdom and this is why he hesitated to attack Austria in 1848. Pope Gregory XVI was conservative and a self confessed supporter of Metternich and Austria. Q Although the Italians had hopes in the liberal Pope Pius IX (who replaced Pope Gregory in 1846), he nevertheless betrayed them in 1848, when he defected and was restored to Rome by Napoleon III. These acts of betrayal and unnecessary activities of the Italian leaders made it impossible to achieve a successful unification by 1850.

16) RELIGION:

The role of religion was yet another hindrance that delayed Italian unification. Most Italians were

Catholics and the Papal States were ruled by the Pope who was a political as well as a spiritual leader. Unfortunately most Popes were conservative, anti-liberal and strong allies of Austria as a mother catholic state. The Popes therefore helped to strengthen Austria's control over Italians and frustrated all attempts towards unification. In fact, the Italian unification was taken as a move against the Pope and was condemned by the Catholics in Italy and Europe. It also attracted the intervention of catholic powers like France that forcefully restored the Pope in 1849 and marked the failure of the 1848 unification attempt. It has to be re-emphasized that the Pope's defection

in the 1848-49 revolutions was due to religious consideration. This was because the revolution was against Austria that was a strong Catholic power and hence his ally.

17) LACK OF A COMMON LANGUAGE:

The absence of a national language also delayed the unification of Italy. Italian as a language was for the intellectuals. Latin was a medium of communication in schools, universities and churches.

In states like Piedmont, Naples and Sicily, the Italian language was unknown. They instead used French or local languages. The absence of a national language made it extremely difficult for Italian nationalists to politicize and mobilize the Italians for a successful unification by 1850.

18) GEOGRAPHICAL NATURE OF THE ITALIAN STATES:

Topography became yet another geographical hindrance to Italian unification. The Italian states were scattered with a rugged landscape that became an obstacle to mobilization. Most parts of Italy were mountainous with a long coastline. For instance, the Alps complicated movement across the rivers. This therefore became a serious problem in preaching the gospel of the unification to the Italians. It also presented difficulty in securing foreign assistances not until 1850's when Cavour constructed the Moncenis tunnel railway line.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

FACTORS THAT FAVOURED THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY AFTER 1850 OR
FACTORS THAT LED TO THE FINAL UNIFICATION OF ITALY BY 1870

The Italian Unification that was frustrated by so many obstacles was able to succeed between 1850s and

1870. This was because problems that had hindered successful unification were addressed from 1850- 1870. The efforts of patriotic Italians and the changes in the international situation favoured the unification process and that is why it succeeded, in other words, the factors that favoured the unification of Italy can be attributed to internal and external factors. These were;

1. The role of the Carbonari and Mazzini's Young Italian, Movement laid a foundation for the unification of Italy. Although the Carbonari and the Young Italian Movement collapsed, they nevertheless strengthened the spirit of nationalism amongst the Italians through their political philosophy of unity and independence. They also de-campaigned Austria's domination of the Italians and inspired the Italians with a revolutionary spirit against Austria. Mazzini through the Young Italian Movement politicized the Italians about the benefits of a united Italy and the disadvantages of a divided Italy under Austria. This reduced the past ignorance and negative attitude that had hindered the struggle for unification. All these made it easier to mobilize the Italians for total unification by 1870.

2. The collapse of the congress system was a blessing in disguise for the success of the Italian Unification.

It left Europe divided without a concerted effort (spirit of togetherness) to suppress the Italian revolutionaries who were challenging the Vienna Settlement of 1815. This is partly the reason why no foreign power assisted Austria in suppressing Italian unification after 1850. Otherwise if the congress system existed after 1850, the Congress Powers would have helped Austria to suppress the Italian unification movement that was a challenge to the Vienna Settlement, which the congress system was to protect.

3. The downfall of Metternich in 1848 also favoured the unification of Italy. Metternich had used a complex policy of diplomacy and force to frustrate any unification attempt by the Italians. However, he was forced to exile by the pressure of events due to the 1848 revolutions. Although he returned in 1851, he did so as a common man and never held any public office. Metternich's downfall weakened Austria's control and influence in Italy and provided a line of weakness for the triumph of Italian nationalism and thus unification.

4. The failure of the 1848 revolutions (in Italy) was yet another blessing in disguise for the Italian unification process. It made the Italians to learn lessons and exposed their traitors. Their failure in 1848 taught them of the need to have a strong army and economy plus foreign assistance that were addressed later 1850. The failure of the revolution also discredited Mazzini and his republican ideas.

The Pope was exposed as a traitor and his supporters lost trust in him. These made the supporters of Mazzini and the Pope to shift their loyalty and support to Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont. This solved the problem of disunity that had belated/ delayed the unification process by 1848.

5. The role of capable and reliable leaders was of paramount importance in the Italian unification after 1850. By 1850, the Italians were frustrated by unreliable leaders like Charles Albert and Pope Gregory XVI. However, the emergence and role played by Victor Emmanuel II and Cavour after 1850 settled the leadership problem once and for all. Cavour embarked on socio-economic reforms that strengthened Piedmont economically and made her able to shoulder the burdens of Italian unification. He also re-organized, re-armed and trained the Piedmont's army that was used to fight Austria out of Italy. Above all, Cavour sought for foreign assistance by involving Piedmontese's soldiers to help the allied powers against Russia in the Crimean war. This made the Italians to gain French assistance in 1859. Victor Emmanuel unlike his father Charles Albert was a liberal, constitutional and a pro-unification King. He is the one who led the unification of Italy after the untimely death of Cavour in 1861. His role led to the liberation of Venetia and Rome that completed the unification process

6. The strengthening of Piedmont's economy by Cavour was of great assistance to Italian unification. By 1850, the unification of Italy had failed due to economic backwardness and lack of a leadership state.

However, by 1855, Cavour had built roads, railways and promoted trade and industrialization of Piedmont.

Piedmont therefore had enough resources and that is why it was possible for her to successfully lead the other poorer Italian states in the unification.

7. The unification of Italy was also favoured by Piedmont's military strength. Military weakness had been great obstacle to Italian unification but this was addressed by Cavour's military reforms. He enlarged Piedmont's army, equipped, trained and modernized them. It is this reformed and modernized Piedmont's soldiers that defeated Austria in 1859 and 1866 and hence favouring the unification of Italy. It would be unfair to disregard Garibaldi's effort in this respect. He proved more than anybody else as the most successful commander who commanded all the battles, through which Austria was defeated and forced out of Italy.

8. The role of foreign powers after the Crimean war was influential in the Italian unification. France helped Italy in the liberation of Lombardy in 1859, Britain's neutrality helped Garibaldi to successfully land at port Marsalla to liberate Naples and Sicily; Prussia assisted in the liberation of Venetia in 1866 and indirectly Rome in 1871. The positive attitude and role of foreign powers unlike before 1850 was therefore great boost to Italian unification.

The revival of the past glory (Risorgimento) also facilitated the course of Italian unification. The Italians had a common culture and historical background. They were once part of the Holy Roman Empire where they had led the world in Art and Literature. They also remembered that their past ancient glory was due to unity under one leader. This inspired them with a superiority complex against foreigners hence this gave them courage and morale to fight for their freedom and unity.

10. The election of a liberal Pope Pius IX in 1846 encouraged liberalism and nationalism throughout the Italian peninsula. This shook Metternich right from 1846 and this is why he confessed that, We were prepared for anything but a liberal Pope, now that we have got one, there is no answering for anything.

Unlike other conservative Popes before 1846, Pius IX was kind hearted and sympathetic to the idea of Italian unification. He even granted a general amnesty to all political prisoners. This explains why Gioberti preached for a united Italy under the Pope, which attracted more followers especially from the Catholics although the Pope himself defected in 1849, nonetheless, his earlier liberal ideas had stuck in the minds of the Christians who later participated in the unification process.

11. The role of the writers, philosophers and lecturers strengthened the unification spirit amongst the Italians.

They condemned the Austrian domination of Italy and wrote patriotic poems, novels and books against Austria. For instance, Giacomo Leopardi's book, "My Prisons" exposed how Austrians tortured the Italians in prisons; Alessandro Manzoni wrote in "The Betrothed", in which he showed Europe how Austria had reduced the Italians to the lowest and most degrading position in the world. These ideas increased and strengthened anti-Austrian sentiments (feelings) amongst the Italians. This prompted many Italians to fight for unification.

12. The change of leadership in France and Britain favoured the unification of Italy. In France, Louis Philippe who pursued a non-interventionist foreign policy was replaced by Napoleon III in 1848.

Napoleon III supported the unification of Italy from 1859. In Britain, the new Prime Minister, Gladstone and his foreign secretary John Russell greatly supported the unification from 1860. Both Napoleon III and Gladstone designed the 1860 Referendum through which the central Italian states were amalgamated with Sardinia to form the Kingdom of Italy in

1861. Had it been the conservative Louis Philippe (for France) and Salisbury (for Britain), the Italians would not have made such achievement in the unification of their country.

13. The rise of Bismarck in Prussia and his role in the unification of Germany helped to complete the unification of Italy by 1870. In 1862, Bismarck was appointed the prime minister of Prussia by the new king, William I. This promotion gave Bismarck a flat form to systematically and successfully isolate and defeat Austria plus France that were enemies in the unification of both Germany and Italy. In 1866, Italian troops joined Prussians to fight Austria in the Austro-Prussian war in which Bismarck isolated Austria from European powers. It should be noted that although Italian troops were defeated by Austria in the war, Prussia's overwhelming defeat of Austria at the battle of Sadowa ended the battle: out of which Bismarck rewarded Italy with Venetia. It should also be traced that Bismarck's isolation and the consequent defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 -1871 is what helped the Italians to easily occupy Rome. The war forced Napoleon III to withdraw the French troops from Rome (that had blocked the liberation of Rome since 1849); made it possible for Italian troops to invade Rome and make Rome part of a united Italy, hence completing the unification in 1870.

14. The role of Felice Orsini also favoured the unification of Italy. In 1859, Orsini an Italian exile in France attempted unsuccessfully to assassinate Napoleon III (and his wife) for his reluctance to assist Italians against Austria following the 1859 pact of Plombieres. Although Orsini was arrested and martyred, his action and last words of "Vivie Italie" (long live Italy) bullied Napoleon III, made him to change his attitude and assist Italians with troops in the liberation of Lombardy in 1859. This only came because the plot made Napoleon III and his family members to live under constant fear of being assassinated for his failure to honour the 1859 pact of plombieres in which he had promised to help Italians in the liberation of Lombardy and Venetia.

15. The role of Italian National Society was instrumental in the unification of Italy. In 1857, Cavour, Dr Manin, Lafarina and Pallvicino formed Italian National Society that was used for mobilisation of Italians for unification.. It became a forum for Italian patriots and nationalists to popularise the advantages of a united Italy as opposed to the disadvantages of a disunited Italy under Austria. Thus, Italian National

Society was used to politicise Italians negatively against Austria, which helped to reduce past ignorance that had hindered the unification.

16. The overwhelming patriotism of Italians themselves also facilitated the unification process by 1870.

The unification was massively supported by middle class in the urban centers, peasants, nobles and members of Italian national society. This support made it very easy for Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II to mobilize Italians against Austria i.e. in 1859 and 1866. It was also because of patriotism that in 1860 Italians in central Duchies of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Romagna revolted on their own and voted for a union with Piedmont in the referendum that was held to determine their fate

17. The Crimean war of 1854-1856 was a significant event that favoured the unification of Italy (from 1856 onwards). In the war, Cavour tactfully sent the Piedmont's troops to fight alongside Britain and France to show solidarity and get support against Austria since Austria declined to participate in the war.

At the Paris peace conference that concluded the war, Cavour raised the issue of Italian unification to allied powers. This changed the British and French attitude that had hitherto been negative to favour the unification of Italy. Consequently, Britain promised to give moral support while France pledged to give military assistance that was done in 1859. Thus, the Crimean war tilted the balance of power in favour of

Britain and France and left Austria isolated without allies against Piedmont. The war also gave Piedmont's troops military experience that was used to fight Austria in 1859 and 1866.

NB) When the Piedmont's troops complained of mud in Crimea during the war, Cavour wrote back that Out of this mud! Italy will be made! This was because Cavour was well aware of the military and diplomatic significance of the Crimean war in the unification of Italy.

18. The Franco-Prussian war of 1870 was the final event that favoured the Italian unification. It forced Napoleon III to withdraw the French soldiers from Rome. The French troops were stationed in Rome to protect the Pope against the Italian revolutionaries of 1848-49, They had blocked the liberation of Rome but as soon as they were withdrawn from Rome. in 1870, the Italian nationalists occupied it and declared a united Italy at St. Florence in Rome.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITIES IN THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

In the course of Italian unification, there are a number of personalities who played a distinguished role.

These personalities were patriotic Italian nationalists like Mazzini, Cavour, Victor Emmanuel II etc and non Italian statesmen like Napoleon I, Napoleon III, Bismarck and Pope Pius IX, The roles played by these personalities were both positive and negative in the process of Italian unification.

1. GUISEPPE MAZZINI (1805-1872)

Mazzini was born on 22th June 1805 to a Doctor and a Professor of anatomy in Genoa. Mazzini's father was a great scholar who was well versed with the French revolution of 1789. His father lectured to him the story of the French revolution to which he (Mazzini) paid keen interest. This made him knowledgeable about the French revolutionary ideas, changes and the campaigns of Napoleon Bonaparte as well. His father also told him about the disunity and disorganization of the various Italian states and the glories of the ancient Roman Empire. These stories influenced Mazzini's sentiments and he became a known republican right from childhood up to his death. He preached for a free, united and republican (democratic) Italy. This strengthened the spirit of liberty and nationalism amongst the Italians for the unification. This is why he is code-named. The prophet of the Italian Unification.

Mazzini became a full time revolutionary right from childhood. In 1815, the Vienna Peacemakers added his hometown of Genoa to the Kingdom of Piedmont. This provoked a wave of protest from the Genoa which himself participated. Thus, Mazzini became a radical revolutionary at an early age of 10 years old.

In around 1820, Mazzini joined the Carbonari secret movement to fight for Italian freedom and independence from Austria. He was very active in the Carbonari's uprisings at Naples, Sicily and Piedmont in the 1820's and 1830. Although the Carbonari failed, it nevertheless laid a foundation for Italian

unification that Cavour and Victor Emmanuel utilized in the 1850's and 1860's.

The numerous weaknesses and failures of the Carbonari inspired Mazzini to form the Young Italy Movement in 1831. Its motto was, "God and the people" This movement attracted a big number of the youth whom he used to appeal to the other sections of Italians like the peasants, businessmen, Civil servants, army and other intellectuals. The Young Italy Movement became broad based with over 600,000 members by 1833.

In 1833, Mazzini attempted an unsuccessful revolt against Charles Albert of Piedmont, in which he was sentenced to death. However, he escaped to Switzerland through France and thereafter to England. He opened a pro-unification school for the children of Italian exiles at the Tottenham Road Court district (in London). In France, he had established several branches of the Young Italy Movement in different states.

He wrote several pamphlets, letters and books through these branches that circulated to the Italians. This kept the fire of unification burning and politicized the Italians about the unification. It reduced the past ignorance about the unification and made it easier to mobilize the Italians for unification.

In 1848, Mazzini together with Garibaldi overthrew the conservative Pope Pius IX who had objected his ambition of establishing a democratic and constitutional Parliament. They successfully instituted the Roman republic under Daniel Manin in Rome. They also introduced a number of reforms in the Papal States. Unfortunately, France under Napoleon III intervened by crashing (destroying) the republic and restored the Pope to power. The French troops remained in Rome and protected the Pope up to 1870 when they were withdrawn. This is why Mazzini hated any dealing with France in the struggle to unify Italy. That was also why he protested the 1859 alliance which even led to the annexation of Nice and Savoy (his own home town) to France.

However, Mazzini is criticized for his negative attitude against foreign assistance. His view was that Italians needed self-sacrificing patriots not foreign assistance that was bound to be strings attached. He therefore decampaigned foreign assistance and that is partly why no foreign power bothered to assist the Italians by 1850. This delayed the struggle because prior to 1850, Italians were militarily, politically and economically inferior to Austria and thus needed foreign support if they were to succeed.

Mazzini was also a radical republican who failed to co-operate with Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II.

He protested and hated a united republic under King Victor Emmanuel II until his death in 1872. He regretted this when he wrote; I shall have no more joy in Italy, that country with its contempt for all ideas, has killed the soul within me. Mazzini's attitude and policy against Italian Kings has also been criticized amongst historians. He used a propaganda campaign against Italian Kings (since 1830) and traitors in the unification struggle. He even used the Young Italy Movement to stage revolts against Italian rulers after branding them agents of Austria. Although a number of these rulers were real traitors and supporters of Austria, it's argued that Mazzini did not do enough dialogue with them i.e. to convince them to fight Austria. All the same his negative attitude and policy against Italian

Kings made them to cooperate with Austria against the unification by 1850.

Mazzini's other weakness was that his Young Italy Movement was more of a political pressure group with a limited military skill. This is why it was impossible for them to organize a well co-ordinate, led, trained and armed uprising against Austria.

Nevertheless, inspite of his weaknesses and failures, Mazzini was the first well-known Italian nationalist in the unification struggle. He politicized the Italians and inspired them with the spirit of dedication, patriotism and self-sacrifice for the unification. This is what future nationalists like Cavour utilized to unify Italy by 1870.

2. GARIBALDI 1807-1882:

Garibaldi was born in Nice in 1807 to a peasant family. His peasantry family background made him to develop a negative attitude to Kingship. This is what made him to become a radical republican like Mazzini. Although Garibaldi was not educated, he nevertheless had strong nationalistic sentiments (feelings) for a united Italy. He was inspired by Italian patriots and exiles to fight for Italian freedom. He believed in Italy just like Christians who believe in God. Garibaldi excelled as the most daring military commander in the battles through which Italian states were liberated from Austria. In other words, he was a military hero and that is why he is referred to as a sword of Italian unification.

Garibaldi's parents wanted him to be a priest but he was more interested in tourism and adventurism right from his childhood. At the age of 15 years,

he left his parents and took up a career on the sea. He became an efficient sailor and businessman in the Roman Sea.

Garibaldi's revolutionary spirit made him join the Young Italy Movement of Mazzini. He became a devoted and active member of the movement. He was very active in the 1830-1831 uprisings that failed.

He later joined the Piedmont's navy with a hidden agenda of organizing a mutiny (coup) in 1834 as Mazzini was to mobilize the civilians. However, this plan aborted and Garibaldi was sentenced to death by Charles Albert I of Piedmont.

Fortunately, Garibaldi fled to exile in France, and later to South America where he spent 12 years. While in exile Garibaldi fought for Uruguay against Brazil and Argentina's dictatorships. It is from here that he learnt guerrilla war tactics and skills that he used in the Italian unification from 1848. He adopted the red-shirt uniforms from the Argentineans. The Argentineans used the red-shirt uniforms to reduce the notability of bloodstains from those who were slaughtered. When he returned from exile, he formed an army of about 1000 red-shirts that he used to liberate the islands of Sicily and Naples from Austria.

Garibaldi's zeal for Italy's unity and liberation was displayed in the 1848 revolution in Italy. He returned from exile in 1848 and offered his military services to Charles Albert of Piedmont - Sardinia. However, he suffered defeat at the battle of Custoza. Even if this attempt was a failure, it left a number of lessons which future nationalists like Cavour used to programme for a successful unification by 1870.

In 1848 still, Garibaldi and Mazzini overthrew the Pope and set up a short-lived Roman republic led by Daniel Manin. However, they were thrown out of Rome by French troops led by General Oudinot. The French troops demolished the Republic and reinstated the Pope in the Papal States.

After the failures of 1848, Garibaldi became a wanted man by the armies of France, Austria and the Pope. Worst of all, he had even lost his dear wife, Anita in the course of fighting the French armies.

Garibaldi again fled to South America and later New York. He accumulated enough money and came back to live a peaceful life for sometime on the island he had bought near Italy. Cavour met him and convinced him to join the unification movement under the leadership of King Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont in 1856. Garibaldi accepted and

dropped his republican ideology and this singled him out as a true Italian patriot unlike Mazzinni who had discarded any dealings with Kings.

In 1859, Garibaldi liberated Lombardy from Austria. This became the first successful military campaign in the practical unification of Italy. He commanded the Piedmont's troops and together with the French Troops defeated Austrian forces at the battles of Magenta and Salfarino. After the war, Austria was forced to quit Lombardy which was added to Piedmont. This success weakened Austria's control in Italy and stimulated Nationalistic uprisings in the Central Italian states to join Piedmont in 1860. They eventually did so through the 1860 referendum.

However, Garibaldi was very disappointed when Napoleon III of France signed the truce of Villa Franca in 1859 with Austria and withdrew from the war. This left Venetia out and yet Napoleon III had earlier agreed (in the pact of Plombieres 1858) to liberate both Lombardy and Venetia from Austria's domination.

Garibaldi was also greatly disappointed by Cavour's pact of Plombieres with Napoleon. This was because Cavour agreed to give Napoleon III Nice and Savoy to compensate for his military assistance against Austria in 1859. This was Garibaldi's worst experience for Nice was his own birth place. He lamented that; they have made me a foreigner in a land of my birth.

In 1861, Garibaldi successfully liberated the two islands of Sicily and Naples with a thousand red-shirt soldiers. He sailed from Caprere (in Piedmont) and landed at Port Marsala from where he advanced and liberated Sicily. He later crossed the Straits of Massina and conquered Naples. He then surrendered both islands to Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont. After this, the Kingdom*of Italy was officially declared in 1861 and this signifies Garibaldi's contributions to the course of Italian unification.

NB: After his success in Sicily and Naples, Garibaldi returned to Caprere with a few seeds of corn after rejecting all compensations including becoming the Duke of Sicily. While at Caprere, he lived a simple lifestyle as an ordinary farmer, fisherman and a candle maker at last!!!

Garibaldi made three unsuccessful attempts in 1862, 1865, and 1867 to liberate Rome and annex it to the Kingdom of Italy. His attempt was foiled by Cavour who feared intervention from Catholic states and a stiff resistance from the French and Papal troops. Nevertheless, his attacks reminded the Italians that Rome must be part of a united Italy, which was finally done in 1870.

On the other hand, Cavour's untimely death in 1861 greatly affected Garibaldi's role in the unification of Italy. His successors failed to appreciate his role in the unification process. They never regarded him faithful in a united Italy under Victor Emmanuel II. On the other hand, his earlier solidarity with Cavour and legitimists reaped him hatred from fanatical liberals and republicans. Mazzini, amongst others remarked that he had a heart of gold and brain of an ox - implying that he was faithful to Cavour's ideals of liberal and constitutional legitimacy in Italian unification while betraying or abandoning his original republicanism.

In the 1866 Austro- Prussian war. Garibaldi led the Italian soldiers to assist Prussia against Austria, This was in accordance to an alliance between Italy and Prussia in which Italy was to be given Venetia. This alliance led to the defeat of Austria. After the war, Italy was given Venetia in the treaty of Prague in 1867 and the greatest tribute goes to Garibaldi.

Garibaldi died in 1882 but he played a memorable role as a veteran soldier during the unification of Italy. He was one of the greatest architects of Italian unification. He greatly complemented the roles of Mazzini, Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II in the unification of Italy. He has remained in the eyes of history to the extent that stories of his selfless service and patriotism are read profoundly in Italy.

3. COUNT CAMILLO DE CAVOUR (1810-1861):

Cavour was a Piedmontese born in Turin (capital of Piedmont) in 1810 to a noble family. Although Cavour was an aristocrat by birth, he was not conservative. Instead he was liberal minded and an admirer of British liberalism -plus its constitutional system of governance. He joined the army but resigned in 1830 after quarrelling with his conservative Piedmontese senior officers due to his support for the 1830 French revolution against the Bourbons. After this, he settled down for farming and became an opinion leader amongst the farmers.

Consequently, he was elected to Piedmont's first Parliament in 1848. In 1850, he was appointed the minister for agriculture, industry and commerce. He also held the post of a finance minister and in 1852; he became the prime minister of Piedmont. It was in these sensitive and successive posts that Cavour laid a firm and sound foundation for Piedmont's social, political, economic and military developments that became the backbone for the unification of Italy. This is why Cavour is regarded as the Soul of Italian unification. In other words, Cavour was the greatest architect (maker) of

Italian unification due to the various roles he played in the course of Italian unification.

1. In 1847, Cavour founded a revolutionary newspaper called *Il Risorgimento* (or Italian resurrection). It advocated for a free, constitutional and united Italy. The paper helped to politicize the Italians and strengthened the spirit of unification at a time when Mazzini's Young Italy Movement had collapsed.

This is what amongst others made Charles Albert to take up arms against Austria in 1848. The *Il Risorgimento* also sensitized the European powers to change their hitherto negative attitude and support the Italian unification after 1850.

2. Cavour made favourable reforms in Piedmont and that is why Piedmont was able to champion the course of Italian unification. He advised King Victor Emmanuel II to abandon his fathers' anti unification policies and take the Italian unification as a priority. He worked closely with the King to implement the 1848 Constitution which gave the Italians more political freedom. This made the Italians to enjoy some degree of freedom and it made them enthusiastic for total independence from Austria.

This is what enabled Piedmont to rally behind her all other Italian states in the unification.

3. Cavour successfully reduced the influence of the church and Pope in Italian affairs. In 1849, the Pope betrayed the Italians and remained a serious obstacle to the unification of Italy. Cavour together with Victor Emmanuel II enacted laws that paralyzed the influence of the Catholic Church in state affairs. In

1850, he passed the Saccardi laws which scrapped the church privileges, asserted freedom of worship, state control of education, land, finance and marriage. These reforms checked the negative role of the Pope and speeded the success of the unification. Such reforms also earned Cavour support from the liberals and republicans, which facilitated the unification of Italy after 1850.

4. Cavour's educational reforms also aided the course of Italian unification. He abolished church influence in education and liberalized education. He built schools and Institutions of higher learning.

These reduced illiteracy and past ignorance that used, hinder the Italian unification. It should be

emphasized that the products of such schools and institutions became radical critics of Austrian influence in Italian affairs and helped in championing the process of Italian unification.

5. Cavour championed and sponsored the formation of the Italian national society (1857) under the leadership of Doctor Manin, Lafarina and Pallavicino. The society provided a forum for sensitization and mobilization of Italians against Austria. It also helped to politicize the Italians and reduce ignorance that had made it difficult to mobilize the Italians for unification.

6. Cavour advocated for unity and harmony amongst the conflicting political groups like the monarchists, republicans and federalists who used to hinder the unification before 1850. He also mobilized all able-bodied Italians to rally behind Piedmont to fight Austria. This made the Italians to raise a big force that succeeded in eliminating Austria out of Italian political affairs.

7. Aware that the unification of Italy had failed due to military weakness, Cavour decided to strengthen the Piedmontese army that was used to fight Austria. He expanded, re-organized, re-trained and reequipped the Piedmontese army with modern arms and skills. It is this army that was used to liberate Lombardy in 1859, Venetia in 1866 and Rome in 1870.

8. Cavour re-organized the Piedmontese economy that was used to finance the unification. He developed agriculture, industry and eliminated corruption, which increased Piedmont's revenue. It is this increased revenue that helped in modernizing the army to fight Austria. Besides, Cavour constructed roads and railways that eased the process of mobilizing the Italians for unification. It also helped in transporting foreign troops against Austria. For instance, the Monscenis railway Tunnel that linked Piedmont to France is what was used to transport 20,000 French troops for the liberation of Lombardy in 1859. Had it not been due to the tunnel, it would have been difficult if not impossible for the French troops to pass through the Alps and the Italians would not have succeeded against Austria at the battles of Magenta and Salfarino.

9. Externally, Cavour as a Minister for Finance borrowed loans especially from Britain. He also signed free commercial treaties with Britain, France and Belgium. Apart from bringing prosperity, these commercial treaties paved way for a possible alliance with France and Britain when the unification of Italy gained momentum. It also isolated Austria and that is why, Britain and France who were Austria's allies in 1815 turned against her and supported the unification.

10. Unlike Mazzini and Garibaldi, Cavour realized the need for foreign assistance as a crucial fact in Italian unification. He tactfully sent the Piedmontese troops to assist the allied powers in the Crimean War (against Russia) in order to isolate Austria and get a platform to advocate for Italian unification. The Crimean war gave the Italians mastery experience that was crucial in the unification war against Austria.

It also gave Cavour a seat in the 1856 Paris Peace Treaty, which he used to convince France and Britain to support the Italian unification. This left Austria isolated since she did not participate in the war and was thus a great diplomatic victory for Piedmont (against Austria).

n. In 1858, Cavour signed the pact of Plombières with Napoleon III in which Napoleon III agreed to help the Italians to liberate Lombardy and Venetia from Austria. Consequently in 1859, Napoleon III sent 20,000 French troops that assisted the Piedmontese army and defeated Austria at Magenta and Solferino leading to the liberation of Lombardy. However, Napoleon III unexpectedly signed the truce of Villa-Franca with Austria and withdrew from the war before liberating Venetia. This left Cavour frustrated and made him to resign his Premiership. It remained an ulcer in his heart and a snag in the unification of Italy.

12. Cavour provided a justifiable cause for the French Intervention in the 1859 war against Austria.

Napoleon III had promised to assist the Italians on condition that Austria was the aggressor. This left Cavour with the task of provoking Austria to declare war. He achieved this when Austrian authorities ordered conscription in Lombardy and Venetia which forced the Venetians and Lombards to take refuge in Piedmont. Cavour mobilized the Piedmontese troops and deployed them on the border with Lombardy. This forced Austria to declare war on Piedmont and provided a justification for French intervention.

It should be noted that Napoleon III had changed his mind and was contemplating a peaceful settlement with British officials. Had this been the case, Austria was not bound to relinquish control over Lombardy and Venetia. Thus, credit goes to Cavour's political shrewdness that made Austria to declare war and appeared the aggressor.

13. Apart from the acquisition of Lombardy, the 1859 war also helped the unification of Italy in another way. This was because it weakened Austria's control of Italy and stimulated Italian nationalism throughout the Peninsula. It convinced the Italians that Piedmont had the capacity to challenge

Austria and spearhead the unification process. This provoked popular uprisings in the Central Italian states of Modena, Parma, Tuscany and Romagna in 1859 (who later joined Piedmont through a referendum in 1860). Although the credit for this goes to patriotism of Italians in those states, it should be realized that it was Cavour's effort that gave them the opportunity to do so. This is because he created a favourable international atmosphere that prevented either France or Austria from intervening against the unification of those states with Piedmont.

14. Cavour's diplomatic maneuvers and tricks assisted Garibaldi in the liberation of Sicily and Naples.

He realized that Garibaldi's careless attacks were bound to attract the intervention of Austria, France and even Britain. Thus, he gave Garibaldi a diplomatic cover by officially ordering for his arrest while at the same time clandestinely (secretly) assisted him with arms and other logistics to invade the two islands with his a thousand red-shirt army. This gave a false impression that Cavour was checking Garibaldi's moves yet he was instead aiding his conquest of the islands.

15. Cavour's role was very instrumental in the annexation of the Papal States to Piedmont. After

Garibaldi's success in Sicily and Naples, he had an ambition to invade Rome. This was bound to be catastrophic as it was likely to attract the intervention of catholic states (especially France and Austria) against the Italians. To avoid this, Cavour frustrated Garibaldi's invasion of Rome by occupying the Papal States and made them bulwarks against Garibaldi's provocation. Eventually, the Papal States joined Piedmont through a referendum in the same year i.e. 1860,

16. Cavour's efforts led to the declaration of a united Italy in 1861 at Turin (without Venetia and Rome).

This composed of the liberated states of Lombardy, Naples, Sicily, Papal States and Piedmont. This is why he is regarded as the greatest statesman and architect of Italian unification.

17. Although Cavour ranks highest in the history of Italian unification, his over reliance on foreign assistance costed him a lot of popularity from some sections of Italians. This is because it led to the loss of Savoy and Nice that were given to Napoleon III as a reward for the French military assistance of 1859. This was criticized by Mazzini and Garibaldi because those two towns were their hometowns.

18. Cavour was also accused for his initial biasness in liberating the southern Italian states to form part of a united Italy. He had regarded the southern states as poorer states that would jeopardize the prosperity of the northern states. It was only when Garibaldi pushed so hard for the liberation of those states that Cavour changed his attitude and supported the struggle. However, inspite of such criticism, one should keep in mind that Cavour played the greatest role in the practical unification of Italy than any of his contemporaries.

4. VICTOR EMMANUEL U OF PIEDMONT:

Victor Emmanuel II was the son of Charles Albert who fled to exile due to the 1848 revolutions in Italy.

He was born in 1820 to King Charles Albert who was exiled after being defeated by the Austrian troops.

He inherited the throne following the abdication of his father and accepted to lead the struggle for the unification of Italy. Consequently, he was given the title of the "honest King" because of championing the unification struggle. It should be noted that Victor Emmanuel's acceptance to lead the struggle, settled the problem of leadership and provided unity for Italian nationalists who had been divided before his rise to power.

Unlike his father, who was a conservative Austrian stooge, Victor Emmanuel II was bellicose (war like), liberal minded, patriotic and anti-Austrian. When he rose to power in 1848, Austria was ready to make peace with him on condition that he nullified the liberal constitution of 1848, which his father had given to the Piedmontese. Austria also assured him of full support in case of war with any of his neighbours.

However, Victor Emmanuel II refused to accept all such terms and conditions. The constitution did not only guarantee the rights and liberties of Italians but became a significant document upon which Italy was unified. It was adopted as a working document (constitution) for a united Italy in 1870.

Victor Emmanuel II granted a general amnesty to Italian exiles. Before 1848, a number of Italian patriots had fled to exile because of Metternich's oppressive and exploitative system. This also includes pro unification activists who were forced to exile by Metternich. However, when Victor Emmanuel II rose to power, he gave them unconditional amnesty to return home and join the struggle for unification. This boosted the Italian drive to unification by 1870.

Although Cavour played the most important role in the unification of Italy, it should be noted that it was Victor Emmanuel II who promoted him up to post of Prime Minister in 1852. It is this position that gave Cavour the flat form to create internal reforms and embark on foreign policies that led to the unification of Italy. Above all, it was Victor Emmanuel II who supported Cavour's socio-economic and political reforms that were intended to unify Italy. It was even him who supported Garibaldi's military adventures in 1859. Otherwise, if Victor Emmanuel had declined or refused to support Cavour and Garibaldi, their efforts would have ended nowhere.

Besides, Victor Emanuel II granted liberal and constitutional reforms in Piedmont that contributed to the unification of Italy. Apart from supporting Cavour's pro-unification reforms, Victor Emmanuel If embarked on other similar pro-unification reforms as part of his own initiative. For instance, he granted freedom of association, press and educational reforms. Other than creating more hope in him and Piedmont as a fulcrum/center of Italian unification, these reforms transformed Italy into a constitutional and liberal nation by 1870.

The conquest and annexation of the Papal States in 1860 was the effort of Victor Emmanuel II. It was his troops that over ran the Papal States at Castelfidardo, which were later amalgamated with Piedmont as part of a united Italy. He also encouraged the central states of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Romagna to join Piedmont Sardinia in 1860. This is partly why these states voted for a union with Piedmont in the referendum of 1860.

Important still, it was Victor Emmanuel II who forced Cavour to resume his post of Premiership after his resignation following Napoleon III's disappointment in 1860. Most important is that, it was Victor Emmanuel II who steered the unification of Italy after the death of Cavour in 1861. He did this by accepting to lead the Kingdom of Northern Italy from 1861 when it was declared by Cavour. It was even him who entered an alliance with Bismarck, which led to the defeat of Austria at Sadowa in 1866. This earned Italy Venetia and completed the unification of the northern Italian states.

Victor Emmanuel restrained Cavour from fighting Austria after the withdrawal of France in 1860. In the 1859 pact of Plombieres, Napoleon III of France had pledged to assist Italians to fight Austria for the liberation of Lombardy and Venetia. However, after the liberation of Lombardy, Napoleon III signed the truce of Villafranca with Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria in which he stopped the war against Austria; Cavour insisted that Piedmont should continue to fight alone for the liberation of Venetia.

However, this was bound to be disastrous and could have led to the loss of Lombardy that had already been liberated.

Thus, Victor Emmanuel should be credited for being a shrewd diplomat with a powerful foresight.

Victor Emmanuel II's foreign policy gave Piedmont a diplomatic advantage over Austria, which boosted the Italian unification struggle. In 1854, Victor Emmanuel II together with Cavour sent Piedmontese troops to help allied powers against Russia in the Crimean war. He undertook this venture to show solidarity and get allies to fight Austria since she had remained neutral in the war. This is part of the

reason why France and Britain supported the unification of Italy after the war. Besides, Victor

Emmanuel sacrificed his family interest for the sake of Italian unification when he consented to give his 16 year old daughter Clotilde to marry Napoleon III's matured cousin, Prince Victor Jerome Napoleon.

This cemented diplomatic ties between Piedmont and France that helped to isolate Austria and facilitate the process of Italian unification.

Finally, the role of Victor Emmanuel II led to the occupation of Rome in 1870, which completed the unification of Italy. He took advantage of the withdrawal of the French troops to attack and occupy

Rome on 20th September 1870. He even organized a referendum on 2nd June 1871 through which the people of Rome voted to be part of a united Italy. After this, he transferred his family and Parliament from Turin (in Piedmont) to Rome and this is how Rome became the capital of Italy.

NB: However, although the occupation and annexation of Rome is said to have completed the unification of Italy, it should be noted that this was at the expense of some Italian states like Tyrol, Trieste, Trentino, Fiume, Savoy and Nice that were not liberated from foreign control. These states were finally superimposed (included) in the united state of Italy in 1919.

5. POPE PIUS IX

The role of Pope Pius IX inspired the Italian unification movement since the Pope doubled as a spiritual and political leader. In 1846, a liberal Pope Pius IX was elected to replace Pope Gregory XVIII. Pope Gregory and other previous Popes were conservative, anti nationalism with strong attachment to Austria as a great Catholic state. However, Pope Pius IX was kind-

hearted, liberal minded and sympathetic to Italian unification struggle. He granted a general amnesty to all political prisoners who were imprisoned during the reign of his predecessors. He also embarked on reforms in administration, law, education and declared press freedom in 1847 i.e. in the Papal States. These reforms were also adopted in other states like Piedmont, Lombardy, Parma etc. It should be emphasized that Pope Pius ix's liberal attitude made his followers under the leadership of Father, Abbey Gioberty to advocate for a united Italy under his leadership. This popularized the Italian unification movement most especially amongst the Catholics and contributed to the outbreak of the 1848 revolutionary movements against Austria in the Italian states.

However, Pope Pius ix betrayed Italians when the revolution broke out in 1848. The religious feelings in him over powered his revolutionary feelings and made him to denounce war against Austria, a catholic state. Consequently, he withdrew and sought for protection from Napoleon III of France. Napoleon III sent French forces that protected him in Rome up to when he was forced to withdraw due to pressure from the Franco- Prussian war. Nevertheless, Pope Pius ix's reforms were firmly rooted through out

Italy and could not simply be undone by his change of mind.

6. WRITERS, PHILOSOPHERS AND OTHER INTELLECTUALS

The role of writers, Philosophers and other intellectuals also added momentum to Italian unification movement. Abbey Gioberty, Mazzimo De-Azeglio, Giacomo Leoparch, and Alessandro etc condemned Metternich's and Austrian domination and oppression of Italians. They wrote poems, novels and books that were critical of Metternich and Austria. For instance, Giacomo Leoparch wrote a book "My prisons" in which he exposed how Austrian authorities tortured Italians in prisons and Alessandro wrote

"The betrothed" in which he described how Austria had degraded Italians in Europe, through oppression and exploitation. All these writings inspired Italians with revolutionary emotions that made it easy to mobilize them for unification by 1870.

7. THE ROLE OFFELICE ORSINI, AS AMARTYR AND PATRIOT

The role of Orsini, an Italian exile (in France), a patriot and a martyr was also influential in the unification of Italy. He is the one who pressurized and forced Napoleon III to assist Italy against Austria in 1859. It should be noted that Napoleon III wanted Italian independence from Austria and not a united Italy since he feared a powerful state across his border. Such attitude

made him reluctant to assist the Italians even after signing the 1858 Pact of Plombieres with Cavour. This made Orsini to plot an assassination against him and his wife Eugène on January 1858. However, Napoleon survived the assassination and Orsini was guillotined. When he was being guillotined (hanged), Orsini's last words were, "Vive Italie" (Long Live Italy). This moved Napoleon III with passion that he changed his attitude and sent French troops to assist the Italians in 1859. This is because the plot had made him to realize that as long as Austria remained dominant in Italian affairs, there would be no peace and security for him, his wife, France and the whole of Europe.

8. ROLE OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE I (Ref: Role of France part (a) in the unification of Italy.)

9. ROLE OF NAPOLEON III (Ref: Role of France from part (d))

10. ROLE OF BISMARCK AND KING WILLIAM I (Ref: Role of Prussia)

11. ROLE OF GLADSTONE, the new British Prime Minister (from 1859) and his Foreign Secretary,

JOHN RUSSELL (Ref Role of Britain)

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

THE ROLE OF GREAT POWERS IN THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

The role of great powers in the unification of Italy was double folded i.e. both negative and positive. The European powers who played a significant role in a unification of Italy were France, Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia. These powers hindered the unification process in the initial stages from 1796 to 1850 but accelerated or favoured it between 1850 to 1870. Their roles both positive and negative are as discussed below.

FRANCE

a) France is credited for laying foundation for the unification of Italy. Napoleon I conquered and inspired the Italians with revolutionary doctrines of equality, liberty and nationalism. He also reduced the number of Italian states from 13 to 3, which made the Italians to be closer to each other and

hence developed the idea of unification. However, Napoleon III's exploitation and oppressions of the Italians was a contradiction of his prophesied policies and made the Italians to form the Carbonari movement to throw him out of their territory. The Carbonari continued resisting foreign influence and advocating for Italian freedom and unity even after the overthrow of Napoleon.

b). After the overthrow of Napoleon, the restored Bourbon monarchs i.e. Louis XVIII and Charles X continued supporting Austria's domination and oppression of the Italians. For example, in 1821, the Carbonari succeeded in overthrowing Ferdinand VII of Naples but Louis XVIII suppressed the revolution and restored Ferdinand to his throne. This partly explains why the Carbonari Movement failed to unify Italy.

c). In 1830, Louis Philippe failed to assist the Italians against Austria and this partly contributed to the failure of the 1830 revolution in Italy. He had initially promised to assist the Italians but the fear of losing support from Catholics in France and Europe forced him to refuse to assist the Italians. This greatly frustrated the Italians in their unification movement.

d.) Napoleon III's military intervention in Italy in 1848 destroyed the last attempt in the unification of Italy before 1850. He sent French troops under General Oudinot who destroyed the Roman Republic that had been established by Garibaldi and Mazzinni. They occupied Rome, restored the Pope and protected the

Pope up to 1870, This denied the Italians the opportunity of using Rome as a base for mobilization and led to the vulnerability of other states like Venice and Sicily that were re-occupied by Austrian troops It has to be re-emphasized that the presence of the French troops in Rome made it impossible for the Italians to conquer and make it part of a united Italy. They repulsed all attempts by Garibaldi to conquer Rome.

e). However, France from 1859 played a positive role in the unification of Italy. Napoleon III of France signed the Pact of Plombieres with Cavour in 1858 and promised to assist Piedmont in liberating Lombardy and Venetia from Austria. This was partly achieved in 1859 when Napoleon III sent 20,000 French troops that helped Piedmont to liberate Lombardy. After the liberation of Lombardy, Napoleon mentored Milan and urged the Italians to unite for their freedom, he told them to; Use the good fortune that presents itself to you, your dream of independence will be realized if you show yourself worthy of it Unite yourself for the liberation of the country.

This speech raised Italian nationalism to the maximum and provoked the Central Duchies of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and the Southern states to revolt and expel Austrian rulers. This was also because the defeat of Austria had left them more confident in Piedmont as a centre of unification. In 1860, Napoleon III supported and programmed the referendum through which the states of Parma, Modena and Tuscany were annexed to Piedmont. This created more morale and determination in the Italians to the extent that Cavour who had resigned resumed his post of Premiership. Later when Victor

Emmanuel II sought Napoleon III's attitude about the annexation of Umbria and Marches, his reply was simply, "Do it quickly". This encouraged Victor Emmanuel to attack and occupy the Papal States in September 1860.

Napoleon III of France guaranteed Russia's neutrality and hence frustrated Austro-Russian Alliance against Italian unification movement. He signed an agreement with Tsar Alexander II in March 1859 in which he promised to assist him to violate the 1856 Paris Peace Treaty in return for Russia's neutrality in the 1859 war. This is partly the reason why Russia refused to assist Austria in the battles of Magenta and Salfarino.

However, France is accused for the annexation of Nice and Savoy in 1860 as a compensation for her assistance in the liberation of Lombardy. This was very unrealistic because he had left Venetia, yet the Plombieres agreement included Venetia.

The greatest accusation against Napoleon III is that although he wanted Italy free from Austria, he never wanted a united Italy. This according to him would alter the military balance of power against him. This is why he changed his mind and signed the Truce of Villafranca with Austria in which he stopped the war and refused to assist Piedmont in the fight for Venetia. This is partly why the liberation of Venetia was delayed up to 1866.

2. BRITAIN:

Britain was a big force behind the Vienna Settlement of 1815 that legalized Austria's domination of Italian affairs. The Settlement also re-divided Italian states into 12 out of the 3 that were forged by Napoleon Bonaparte. This strengthened Austria's interest of maintaining a divided Italy for her selfish imperialistic ambitions.

Although Britain was a liberal, democratic and a constitutionally guided nation, she was against Italian unification for it would destroy the balance of power and affect her trade in the Italian Peninsula besides Britain had

anon-interventionist foreign policy. This explains why she declined to assist the Italians in 1820, 1821, 1830 and 1848 revolution. The British attitude and policies left Austria with a free hand to crush all revolutionary movements for the unification of Italy by 1850.

Nevertheless, the British attitude after the 1856 Paris Peace Conference changed in favour of Italian unification. Her sympathy and moral support to the Italians in the 1856 Paris Peace Conference is what motivated Napoleon III to give military assistance in the liberation of Lombardy. Had Britain not sympathized with the Italians at the conference, probably Napoleon III, who had always been keen not to fight a war against the British will, would not have rendered such assistance.

In 1860, when the Central Duchies of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Romagna revolted, Britain assisted them to join Piedmont. She went beyond being neutral and Russell (Foreign Secretary) proposed a referendum that made those states to join Piedmont.

In 1860 still, Britain allowed Garibaldi and his 1,000 red-shirt army to land at Port Marsala and liberate two islands of Sicily and Naples. The powerful detachment of British troops declined to open fire at Garibaldi which made him to land safely and liberate Sicily. After Sicily, Garibaldi was granted a free passage by the British Naval troops who were guarding the Port of Massina that connected the two islands.

Otherwise, if Britain had decided to block him (being the world's naval power), he would not have liberated Naples.

It must be recapitulated that the neutrality of the British in the liberation of Sicily and Naples frustrated the efforts of Austria and France who were bent on blocking Garibaldi and his 1,000 soldiers from conquering the two islands. Britain even went ahead to threaten France and Austria with war and this made them to back down. From yet another point of view, the attitude of Britain affected Napoleon III and made him to renounce (violate) the truce of Villafranca and started supporting the Italians once again. This is why he supported the referendum through which the Central Duchies joined Piedmont.

The neutrality of the British was very important in the liberation of Venetia and Rome. If Britain had sided with Austria in 1866 the Italians would have failed to liberate Venetia. Similarly, if Britain had assisted France in 1870, Napoleon III would not have withdrawn the French troops from Rome and

the liberation of Rome that completed the unification of Italy would perhaps not have been in 1870.

3. PRUSSIA

Prussia was a major signatory to the Vienna Settlement of 1815 that became a death warrant to the Italian unification by 1850. The reactionary, conservative and anti-liberal

Prussian Junkers were Austria's allies from 1815 to 1850's. this strengthened Austria's domination of the Italian states, which delayed the unification.

However after 1860 Prussia played a positive role in the unification of Italy. She assisted in the liberation of Venetia in 1866. Prussia that was fighting for the unification of Germany allied with Italy against Austria. Prussia promised to force Austria out of Venetia for the Italians. Although Italian troops were defeated, the Prussian troops were able to finally defeat Austria at Sadowa. According to the terms of the alliance, Italy was given Venetia at the Treaty of Prague in 1867.

In 1870, Prussia indirectly helped Italy to acquire Rome. This was through the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. It forced Napoleon III to withdraw the French troops from Rome. This gave Victor Emmanuel II an open chance to annex Rome and transfer his capital from Turin in Piedmont to Rome. Thus, the role of Prussia was the most important in the final unification of Italy. Without this, as Usher Chopra argues,

...The purpose of Italian unification would be incomplete ... like that of body without a heart".

4. RUSSIA:

Russia was led by a despotic, conservative and anti-liberal Kings called Tsars. Tsar Alexander I and others after him were in total support of Austria's acquisition, domination and oppression through the Vienna Settlement of 1815.

Tsar Nicholas I who succeeded Alexander I indirectly helped Austria to suppress the 1848 revolution in Italy. He suppressed the 1848 revolution in Hungary and left the Austrian troops free to deal with Italian revolutionaries. Had Tsar Nicholas I not done so, the Austrian forces would have been divided and possibly the Italians could have succeeded in their movement.

Russia declined to support the Italian unification because of Piedmont's participation in the Crimean War against her. Even if she had wanted to

frustrate or accelerate the process of Italian unification, she could not intervene because of the Black Sea Clause that restricted her within almost only her boundaries. By the time the Black Sea Clause ceased to exist in 1871, it was already too late for her to intervene whether positively or negatively in the Italian unification.

5. AUSTRIA

Austria's role in the unification of Italy was purely negative. In the first place, she hosted the Vienna Settlement and later used the Congress System to maintain a divided Italy. Austria had direct control over Lombardy and Venetia. Indirectly, Austria used conservative and anti-unification Hapsburg rulers in states like, Parma, Modena and Tuscany. These rulers were very effective in frustrating Italian unification from 1820's up to 1850.

Austria was very successful in suppressing all unification movements by 1850. Metternich used a combination of diplomacy and force to block the unification of Italy. For instance, the Carbonari risings of 1820, 1821 and 1831 were crushed by Metternich's regular and reserve soldiers. In 1848, it was the Austrian troops that defeated the Italians at the battles of Custoza and Novara and dashed away Italian hopes for unification.

Austria was also influential in protecting the Pope after 1849. The Austrian troops assisted the French to safeguard the Pope in Rome up to 1870. This is what among others delayed the liberation of Rome up to from 1850-1866, Austria resisted all attempts to unify Italy. In 1859, she resisted the liberation of Lombardy and only gave up after the Magenta and Salfarino defeats. She clung on Venetia until 1866 when she was ejected out by the Italians and Prussian troops.

Generally, Austria excelled in dominating Italian states, France in laying a foundation and partially unifying Italy and Prussia succeeded where the French had failed. Britain amongst other powers offered moral support while Russia often acted as expected i.e. hindering Italian unification in favour of Austria's domination.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The unification of Germany is a very interesting and significant event in the history of Europe. By 1789, the present Germany was the most fragmented (divided) nation in Europe, consisting of over 300 states.

These states were under the Roman Empire but with remarkable differences in terms of politics, economic power, social life and military might. Austria and Prussia were the strongest states that were rivaling for political influence over the rest of the other German states.

In 1807, Napoleon I conquered the Roman Empire and merged the over 300 states into 39 under French rule. Generally, these states can practically be divided into three major groups i.e. the northern state which included Prussia, Saxony, Hanover and Frankfurt, The central states with the Rhine lands as the main state and the Southern state that included Wurttemberg, Bavaria, Baden, Hesse-skesse and Palatinate. The merging of these German states plus the reforms Napoleon introduced, stimulated nationalistic feelings amongst the German states for unification.

However, after the down fall of Napoleon in 1815, the Vienna peace makers frustrated the German quest for unity by putting the 39 states under the Confederation Parliament at Frankfurt headed by Prince Metternich of Austria. Metternich used a combination of force and diplomacy to disorganize and keep the Germans disunited. That is why the intellectual movements of 1817-1819, 1830 and the 1848 revolution failed to succeed in bringing about German unification.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

OBSTACLES / FACTORS THAT DELAYED THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

1. Religious Difference

Religious difference divided the Germans and made it difficult to achieve unity by 1860. The northern German States e.g. Prussia, Saxony, Holstein, Brunswick and Hanover were Protestants while the Southern German States e.g. Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Baden were Catholics. The predominantly protestant northern States were conservative and more affiliated to Prussia while the Catholics in the South had closer ties with France and Austria. The

Pope and the German Catholics greatly opposed war against Austria that was intended to expel her out of the German confederation. This was because of Austria being a strong Catholic State and such a war was bound to weaken the Catholic Church in favour of the Protestants. Thus, religious difference divided the Germans and made them incapable of forming a strong nationalistic movement by 1860.

2). Ideological difference

Difference in political ideology amongst the Germans also delayed the unification by 1860. German nationalists and liberals disagreed on the strategy of achieving unity. The conservatives in the North led by Bismarck wanted a "little Germany" under the leadership of Prussia without Austria while the liberals in the south wanted a "big United Germany" with Austria as the leader. Radical liberals who dominated the parliament opposed and blocked crucial reforms that were intended to "Push" the unification of Germany ahead. The moderates in Germany dismissed these extreme political ideologies and wanted a republican government with an elected president. This difference in ideology divided the Germans and made them unable to forge a common plan that could have brought unity by 1860.

3. Opposition from the Liberals and Conservatives

Besides, the German unification was opposed by the liberals and conservative Junkers. The 1848 revolutions failed because the liberals wasted a lot of time discussing useless issues and opposed crucial issues such as raising a strong army at the Frankfurt Assembly of May 1848. Even after 1850, the liberals still obstructed crucial reforms such as increasing taxation, raising and maintaining a big army which would have smoothened the path towards German unification. Worst of all, the conservative Prussian Junkers who dominated key Government positions opposed any unification in which Prussia would be submerged into a "big Germany". They were not very serious with unification because it would make the economically prosperous Prussia responsible for the general poverty of the southern German states. These problems persisted until it was radically addressed by Bismarck's policy of blood and iron.

4. Weakness of the Frankfurt Parliament Le. German Diet

The German confederation parliament, created in 1815 had serious weaknesses that contributed to the failure of German unification. The parliament was used by Metternich to give the 39 German states a false sense of unity. This was because Metternich appointed an Austrian as the

president /Speaker of the diet which he used to manipulate the parliament to block pro-unification reforms. The diet was used by Metternich to support anti-unification policies such as the Carlsbad decrees of 1819 that crippled German quest for unity. The constitution adopted by the diet stressed the independence of individual states and that no member state was to wage war against another. This promoted disunity and consolidated Austria's dominance of German affairs since she was one of the German States. Above all, the parliament was dominated by the liberals, middle class and Junkers who wasted time discussing unserious issues and blocked pro-unification reforms. They were also the ones who influenced King William IV to use the army to suppress the 1848 revolution in Prussia.

NB It should be noted that Bismarck's role in the Frankfurt Parliament before 1848 was negative about the total unification of Germany. He opposed the inclusion of non Germans and Southern German States as part of a united Germany. He wanted a smaller Germany under the leadership of Prussia.

Bismarck's anti liberal and anti Catholic views in Parliament created unnecessary arguments and antagonism amongst the parliamentarians that made the parliament unable to effect Pro-unification reforms.

5. Lack of foreign Assistance

Lack of foreign support also contributed to the failure of the unification of Germany. The Germans fought without foreign assistance and yet Austria was too strong that she could not be defeated by revolutionaries without foreign backing. Governments are always removed by revolutionaries supported by other governments and only in very special cases by revolutionaries alone. As the Germans fought alone in 1848, Austria was backed by Russia who suppressed the revolution in Hungary and reduced pressure on Austria, setting her free to release troops and suppress the Germans.

6. Failure of the 1848 revolutions

The failure of the 1848 revolutions in the German States was a serious setback that frustrated the unification of Germany. In 1848, German nationalist mobilized the various German states to revolt against Austrian and Metternich's oppressions. This was intended to eliminate Austria from the German confederation and unify the different German States. However, the revolution was crashed by Austrian troops and by 1849 had collapsed. This frustrated and demoralized German nationalists whose hope was to over throw Austria and proceed to unite the German States.

7. Austrian imperialism /Domination of German States Austria's opposition also delayed the unification of Germany. The Austrian empire comprised of Germans and non Germans, which made Austria, determined to maintain a divided Germany because a united Germany would disintegrate her empire. Although she was the leader of German confederation, she still opposed the unification because it would weaken her and lead to her exclusion from the German confederation. It should be noted that Austria successfully used her economic, political and military power to block all efforts to unify Germany before 1860.

8. Military weakness

Lack of a strong liberation army was a serious setback in the unification of Germany by 1850. The poor and quarrelsome German states could not raise and maintain a strong army that could challenge Austria's military might. That is why the movements of 1817-1819, 1830 and 1848 were silenced with a lot of ease by Austria. Thus, Austria took advantage of the Germans being "defenseless" and dominated her for long.

9. Unreliable leadership

Lack of reliable leadership in terms of a person and a state was yet another obstacle in the unification of Germany. The German nationalists had in principle agreed to the idea of the unification. The question of all questions was which state and person should spearhead the unification as a base and coordinator respectively? Neither William III nor his successor F. William IV could provide an appropriate leadership to offset Metternich and Austria's opposition. Fredrick William IV was a strong Austrian ally and that is why he said, "Germany without Austria would be worse than a face without a nose". Although he accepted to lead the revolution in 1848, he was nevertheless threatened by Austrian forces that he changed his mind and used his troops to suppress the movement. On the other hand, German leaders in other states felt secured and independent within their territory. They opposed unification because it threatened their power.

10. Economic backwardness

Economic backwardness of the German states hindered the unification. The German states were poor and could not finance a long and protracted war for unification. Most states apart from Prussia had no industries and depended on weak and disorganized agriculture. Roads and railway networks were not developed and this made it difficult to mobilise the

Germans for unification. It also became impossible to train, equip and modernize the army that could have challenged Austria successfully.

11. Inadequate politicization and poor mobilization

Inadequate politicization and poor mobilization was also responsible for the delay of the German unification. The Germans were not fully sensitized about the advantages of a united Germany as opposed to a divided Germany dominated by Austria. This was why the 39 states had strong beliefs in the Confederation Parliament as the best uniting organ yet it only strengthened Austria's dominance over German affairs. This is also why the unification was dominated by a few middle class plus intellectuals and opposed by the peasants.

12. Metternich System

Metternich and his system were serious obstacles to the unification of Germany. Metternich used a combination of force and diplomacy to keep the Germans divided and dominated by Austria. He headed the Confederation Parliament for the 39 states, which he used to pass anti-unification policies. He also influenced the German Princes to pass the 1819 Carlsbad Decree that made it impossible to organize a serious movement for unification up to 1848. The fact that German nationalism triumphed after his downfall was a clear testimony that his presence was not a small problem to the Germans.

13. Imperialism and foreign interference

The interference and interest of foreign powers was an issue that delayed the unification of Germany.

France oppressed and exploited the Germans between 1807-1815 leaving them too weak to organise an effective unification by 1850. France also had claims over the southern German states up to 1871.

Denmark was in control of Schleswig and Holstein, Holland was in possession of Luxembourg and Britain had political influence in Hanover since the Royal family of Hanover originated from Britain. Russia had imperialistic desires to conquer her neighbours and the rise of a powerful Germany would frustrate her imperialism. These foreign powers therefore opposed the unification of Germany because it would distort the Balance of Power against them. States like France, Denmark and Holland were not ready to peacefully surrender the German states and this delayed the unification up to 1871.

14. The Vienna Settlement of 1815

The Vienna Settlement of 1815 became a big problem in the unification of Germany. In an attempt to re-organise Europe and create peace, the "Vienna tyrants" made the German states part of the Austrian empire, which was ruled from Vienna. An Austrian representative also became the President of the German confederation parliament that was used to frustrate the German unification. It is upon this background of subjecting the Germans to Austria's control that Austria became a problem in the unification of Germany.

By legalising Austria's control over German affairs, the Vienna Settlement also made it impossible for foreign powers to support the unification (by 1848) since such support would be destroying the international setting i.e. Vienna Settlement.

15 .Social conflicts and tension

Lastly, the unification of Germany was delayed by social conflicts and tension. The industrial revolution had created two distinctive social classes in the German states. These were the wealthy middle class industrialists and the poor proletariat (workers). There was a serious tension and conflict between the two classes. This made the middle class to ally with Austria against the workers who were agitating for unification and a communist revolution. This also explains why the members of the Frankfurt Parliament were dispersed on 5th Dec 1848 by the loyal Austrian forces supported by the middle class.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

STAGES IN THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

I) NAPOLEONIC ERA 1807-1815:

In 1807, Napoleon conquered the German states from the Austrian Habsburg rulers. He re-organised the states and merged them in what is called the Confederation of the Rhine. He introduced some reforms such as Universal Education and Constitutional Parliament. As a true son of the French revolution, Napoleon preached and strengthened the French

revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and nationalism. It's these reforms and revolutionary ideas that the Germans adopted and started agitating for the unification of their motherland.

2) THEREVOLUTIONARY ERA 1817-1848

After the downfall of Napoleon, the Vienna powers created some positive changes that favoured the unification of Germany. The Settlement imposed Austria's control over the German affairs and the diet itself was under the Presidency of an Austrian Representative. Metternich and Austria's rule were very oppressive and exploitative to the Germans. These provoked a series of revolutionary movements that were intended to end Austria's control and unify the German states. For example, the intellectual movements of 1817-1819, which was suppressed using force and the Carlsbad Decree. There were also the 1830 uprisings and the 1848 revolutions, which were brutally suppressed by Austria as the earlier ones.

These taught the German nationalists some lessons and they adopted better strategies for the unification after 1850.

However, the practical unification of Germany was achieved between 1864-1871 by Prince Otto Von Bismarck. Bismarck was a Prussian Junker (landlord) born in 1815, in an aristocratic family at Brudenburg. By birth and orientation, Bismarck was a conservative anti-liberal and not a friend to democracy. By nature, Bismarck was passionate and volcanic. He was a man of indomitable will power with a quick and sensitive mind. He prophesied about the unification when he told the British Prime Minister, Disraeli that he, "... would attack Denmark in order to get possession of Schleswig and Holstein, put Austria out of the German Confederation and finally attack France".

This is exactly the stages and manner in which Bismarck planned and achieved the unification of Germany between 1864-1870.

Bismarck graduated at the Universities of Gottens and Berlin and joined the Prussian army in 1835 after his education. However, he returned to farming in his vast land estates in 1840. Although Bismarck studied Law, he was equally interested in History and novels that made him a cosmopolitan academician.

In 1847, Bismarck was elected a member of the Prussian Provincial Parliament. While in Parliament, his tongue was so bitter against the liberals and Austria's domination. This threatened King William IV who referred to Bismarck as "a man,... only to be employed when the Bayonet reigns".

In 1851, Bismarck was again elected a Prussian representative to the German Confederation Parliament at Frankfurt. Again, Bismarck's views were that the unification of Germany would start from the north under Prussian leadership. However, King Fredrick William IV who was afraid of Austrian intervention deliberately appointed Bismarck an Ambassador to St. Petersburg in Russia (1859) and transferred him to France in 1862.

However, King Fredrick William IV died in 1861 and was replaced by William I. Like Bismarck, the new King William I was reactionary, despotic, a firm believer in divine rule and not afraid of Austria unlike his predecessor King William IV. The new King William I appointed Von-Roon as Minister of War and Von Moltek as Chief of Staff. They decided to embark on army reforms. Accordingly, in 1862, William I called the Prussian Parliament to vote for money to increase taxation, expand the army and introduce military Laws. All these were vetoed (rejected) by the liberals. It is at this point that Von-Roon sent Bismarck a telegram that

"COME, THE PEER IS RIPE, DANGER INDELAY"

Bismarck immediately left France for Prussia where he was made the Minister President. It is this position that Bismarck used to plan and achieve the unification of German in three (3) quick wars.

STAGES THROUGH WHICH BISMARCK UNITED GERMANY / ROLE OF BISMARCK IN THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

3) Bismarck started by addressing the past internal problems in Prussia that had hindered the unification of Germany by 1850. Bismarck's plan was to strengthen Prussia politically, economically and militarily so that she spearheads the unification of Germany. He held a passionate (strong feelings) view that,"

Germany has its eyes not on Prussian liberalism but on its might. The great questions of the day shall not be decided by speeches and resolutions of the majority but by blood and iron". These made Bismarck to start with his home province of Prussia as a base for the unification of Germany.

a. He started by counseling the King not to resign inspite of liberal opposition to his administrative and military reforms. The liberals had obstructed important and sensitive reforms like expanding the army from 500.000 - 750.000 soldiers and increasing taxation to maintain and strengthen the army. They had also vetoed the appointments of Von Roon and Von Moltek as Chief of staff and Minister of War respectively. But when Bismarck was made the Minster President, he encouraged the King not to resign his

reforms. These reforms made Prussia the hope and centre for the Germany unification.

b. Bismarck suppressed the liberals from the Prussian Provincial Parliament who were blocking reforms that were intended for the unification. He systematically dismissed and eliminated liberals who dominated key positions in the army, civil service and censored the press to contain liberal opposition. He also dissolved the Parliament and organized fresh election that saw a small number of liberals resume their seat in the Parliament. These measures gradually and systematically destroyed the influence of the liberals in the Prussian as well as German politics. This also helped Bismarck and King William I to consolidate their power over Prussia and implement pro-unification reforms like increasing taxation and expanding the army, which was used to challenge Denmark in 1864 and Austria in 1866.

c. Bismarck improved the military capacity of Prussia. He was aware that Germany had its eyes not on Prussian liberalism but on its might and that the great question of the day shall not be resolved by mere speeches and resolutions of the majorities but by blood and iron. When the liberals objected King William I's army reforms, Bismarck and the King ignored and went ahead with the reforms. They increased and collected taxes and expanded the army from 500,000 to 750,000 troops. The army was well motivated, trained, armed and modernized under the effective command of Von Moltke and Von Roon. By 1870, the Prussian army was only second to Britain. The army was used to suppress internal oppositions and fight external enemies. It is this army that was used to defeat Denmark in 1864 for the liberation of Schleswig; Austria in 1866 for the liberation of Holstein and France in 1871 for the liberation of the southern German states.

d. Bismarck reorganized the Prussian economy. He constructed roads, telegraphic and railway networks, most of which were extended towards Austria. These were later used to mobilize and transport troops during the 1866 war with Austria. Bismarck also promoted trade and industrialization. He signed free commercial treaties with industrialized countries like Britain, Belgium and France. The strong economy created by Bismarck helped in financing and sustaining the three quick wars through which Germany unified.

After successfully re-organising Prussia to lead the unification, Bismarck turned his attention to foreign policy. His great enemies were Denmark that was holding Schleswig and Holstein; Austria that had political influence in German affairs; and France who besides having claims over the southern

German states never wanted a powerful and united Germany across her borders.

4). However, before Bismarck embarked on putting into practice his policy of blood and iron, he secured friendship and diplomatic co-operation from other foreign powers. In 1861, he signed an agreement with Disraeli of Britain. In 1863, he got Russian friendship by handing the Polish rebels who had fled to Prussia back to the Russian Tsar Alexander II. These isolated Britain and Russia from Bismarck's enemies and made Prussia diplomatically strong to begin the actual unification using his policy of blood and iron.

Besides, Italy was still disorganised with enough internal problems that she could not intervene; France could also not intervene because Napoleon III had signed the Truce of Villafranca with Austria in 1860.

5). Between 1863-1864, Bismarck handled the Schleswig-Holstein question. It was so complex which Palmerstone maintained that only three people knew about it. To him, the first person was Prince Consort who was dead; the second person was a German Professor who was in a lunatic asylum, the third person was Palmerstone himself who had even forgotten about it. However, inspite of its intricacy and complexity, Bismarck succeeded in solving the question in the interest of German unification.

Historically, the two provinces were governed by Denmark as semi-independent states. Schleswig was dominated by Danes but had some Germans in the northern part. The Germans and Slavs mainly inhabited Holstein. There was a period of armed and diplomatic rivalry between the Danes and the German nationalists to incorporate both territories in their respective state boundaries. This crisis was settled by the London Treaty of 1850 in which the big powers of Europe agreed that the King of Denmark should continue to rule the two provinces separately.

However in 1863, the new King of Denmark Prince Christian violated the London Treaty of 1852. He enacted a constitution in which he incorporated Schleswig as part of Denmark. This provoked opposition from the Germans in northern Schleswig, Holstein and other German states and Austria. Bismarck took advantage of this to gain full support from the German nationalists and ally with Austria against Denmark.

In 1864, a joint of Austro-Prussian troops invaded, defeated and expelled Denmark from the two provinces.

In the treaty of Vienna 1864, Denmark gave up all claims over Schleswig and Holstein. Later in the Gastein Convention of 1865, Schleswig was

annexed to Prussia and this was the first territorial achievement in the unification of Germany. Bismarck tactfully gave Austria Holstein, which was dominated by Germans to make it easy to scheme a war and finally eliminate Austria out of German affairs.

Nevertheless, although Bismarck succeeded against Denmark in 1864, his efforts were complemented by other factors. The alliance with Austria who was a signatory of the 1852 London treaty greatly boosted his military and diplomatic position against Denmark. Besides, Denmark was militarily very weak and could have even been defeated by Prussian troops alone without Austria. He was also favoured by the disunity between the 1852 London powers and the absence of a capable international organisation to maintain peace.

6. In 1866, Bismarck defeated Austria and annexed Holstein in the famous Austro-Prussian war. The war was to eliminate Austria out of Holstein and German affairs. As usual, he decided to isolate Austria in order to deny her foreign assistance from those powers likely to assist her. He gave a verbal promise to Napoleon III of France at the Biarritz meeting of October 1865 that he (Bismarck) would reward him with the south German states in return for his neutrality in the war. He was assured of British support based on the 1861 agreement and Russia's support because of his actions against the Polish rebels in 1863. In April 1866, Bismarck signed an agreement with Italy in which he promised to help the Italians to liberate Venetia from Austria.

With all the above safeguards, Bismarck was left with the task of provoking Austria in order to make her appear the aggressor. He incited the Germans in Schleswig to rebel against Austria's authority. Austria violently quelled down the rebellion and imprisoned the participants with a heavy death toll. Bismarck then appealed to the Confederation Parliament to expel Austria out of German affairs. This appeal prompted Austria to declare war against Prussia on June 14th 1866. Italy joined Prussia and Austria was finally defeated within only seven weeks (hence seven week's war) at the battle of Sadowa.

Bismarck finally concluded the war by signing the Treaty of Prague with Austria on 23rd August 1866. By the treaty, Austria was forced to surrender all her claims in the German Confederation. She handed Holstein to Prussia. Prussia also annexed the smaller northern German states (that had supported Austria) of Hanover, Nassau, Hesse-Cassel and the free city of Frankfurt. This brought more morale and hope in the Germans for the unification.

It should be noted that Bismarck was so lenient to Austria in the Treaty of Prague. He did not annex any of her territory and even stopped the Prussian soldiers from over running the whole of Austria during the war.

This is because he did not wish to make Austria irreconcilable to Prussia. His fears were the big powers of Europe especially France that could ally with Austria against Prussia. His other fear was the smaller states that had their roots in Austria and who had even supported Austria during the war.

7). In 1867, Bismarck completed the unification of the northern German states. He abolished the

Confederation Parliament and formed a Confederation of Northern German states with a new Constitution.

Its President was King William I of Prussia and Bismarck was the Chancellor of the Confederation. This eliminated Austria out of German affairs forever, it also inspired the southern states of Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Saxony with nationalistic feelings to join the north and be part of a united Germany.

This therefore made it easy to mobilise them for war against France in 1870.

Although Bismarck and Prussia shares the responsibility for the victory against Austria in the 1866 war, they were somehow favoured by other factors. Austria by 1866 had not yet fully recovered from the humiliating defeat of 1859 at the battles of Magenta and Salfarino. She was also weakened by nationalistic uprisings within her empire. Besides, she fought alongside small and weak coalition members who frustrated her efforts. For example, Hanover soldiers surrendered to Prussian troops on 28th June 1866 and this disintegrated Austria's coalition.

8). The last event that completed the unification of Germany was the Franco- Prussian war of 1870-1871.

Bismarck's main occupation (task) after 1867 was the incorporation of the southern German states of Bavaria, Wurttemberg, Baden, Saxony etc into a united Germany. But the problem was France that had claims over these states based on the 1865 Biarritz promise and historical connection. France was also openly opposed to the unification of Germany for the fear that it would alter the balance of power against her. This is why Thiers confessed that, The unification of Germany must not go further. This made Bismarck, who had once remarked that, War with France lay in the logic of history to prepare for war.

Napoleon III fell into Bismarck's trap when he demanded for the Biarritz promise of 1865. Bismarck again duped him to make his claims in writing. He then published Napoleon III's claims of the southern German states to cause anti-French enmity and detach them from France. This made it easy for Bismarck to mobilise the south German states to fight France in 1870. He also published Napoleon III's claims to other

European powers, which made them to hate him. They started seeing in him the aggression of Napoleon I especially that he was claiming the southern German states, Luxemburg and the "neutral" Belgium.

Bismarck moved ahead and secured Russia's neutrality by promising to support her in violating the Black Sea Clause. He was assured of Austria's non-intervention following the lenient treaty of Prague of 1866.

The Italians and the Germans were birds of the same feather because the French troops in Rome were the last obstacle to the unification of Italy. Thus, there was no problem with Italy.

However, the immediate cause of the war was the Spanish succession dispute. In 1869, there was a revolution in Spain, which led to the overthrow of the King and the Queen. The throne was offered to Leopold Sigmund of the Hohenzollem family who was a relative of King Leopold of Prussia. France protested and rejected this arrangement for the fear that it would leave her encircled by the Hohenzollem family in Prussia and Spain and generally encircled by the Germans. Napoleon's protest forced William I to withdraw from the Spanish throne, which was Napoleon's victory over Prussia.

Astonishingly, (very surprisingly) Napoleon III sent the French Ambassador, Bernadette to King William to demand for a written apology and a promise that Leopold's candidature would never again be renewed in future. Bernadette requested to meet William I over the issue, but the King (William) declined to meet him since he regarded the matter as already settled (closed). King William sent an EMS telegram to Bismarck informing him of what had transpired (happened). Bismarck who was disgusted with the withdrawal of Leopold's candidature deliberately altered the telegram to appear that King William I had insulted the French Ambassador by deliberately refusing to meet him as he had requested. The telegram raised war hysteria and tension in both countries. It made France to declare war on Prussia on 14th July

1870. However, on 3rd September 1870, the French troops were defeated at the battle of Sedan. The Prussian troops besieged Paris up to January 1871.

The war was concluded by the Frankfurt treaty of 1871 in which all the southern German states plus the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine were annexed to the northern German states to form a united German empire. The empire was proclaimed at Versailles in France.

Although Bismarck played the most significant role in the unification of Germany, it is important to note that other factors also played a role in the unification of Germany. Bismarck was favoured by special opportunities, which he utilized. For instance, the liberal opposition to the army reforms is what made him to be recalled from France and promoted to the post of Minister President. Had it not been because of the liberal opposition, probably Bismarck would have remained a Prussian Ambassador or retired to his estate and consequently died a reactionary bigot with all his rare diplomatic talents untapped.

King William's insanity and death was a blessing in disguise for Bismarck. He was fortunate that King William I who replaced Frederick IV was more authoritative, decisive, tolerant, not afraid of Austria and loyal to his ministers. It was the new King William I who appointed Bismarck Minister President which post he used to unify Germany. It was even the same King who supported Bismarck's domestic reforms and foreign policies that led to the unification of Germany. All these made Bismarck's efforts in the unification of Germany successful by 1871.

Bismarck's three quick wars were successful partly because Von Roon and Von Moltke had helped in the re-organization of the army. If they had not done so, Prussia would have remained militarily weak and probably have not been successful in the three wars. Similarly, if the Schleswig-Holstein Question had not arisen, Bismarck would have found it impossible to quarrel with Austria and expel her from the German Confederation.

Napoleon III's ignorance also favoured Bismarck's success. He was duped by Bismarck in the 1865 Biarritz verbal agreement and he could not even realize the risk of verbal promises. He was even fooled to put his claims in writing, which gave Bismarck an opportunity to publish his demands and isolate him.

Napoleon III's insistence on a written apology made it very easy for Bismarck to fight him. Even if both Napoleon and Bismarck were prepared for war by

1870, the excuse of the war came through the Spanish succession dispute. Thus, the Spanish succession dispute became yet another event that complimented Bismarck's role in the unification of Germany.

Internally, Bismarck has been criticized for his tough measures against Prussian liberals. He dismissed them from the civil service, imprisoned some of them and forced many to exile. This made the liberals to be a problem in a united Germany after 1871.

Lastly, Bismarck united Germany on Prussian terms at the expense of other states. This made Prussia dominant in the united Germany, which other states protested. It also made the Prussian Protestant religion dominant in the united German empire. This was equally protested by the Catholics, which led to a crisis known as the Kulturkampf after 1871.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

FACTORS THAT FAVOURED THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY OR REASONS WHY BISMARCK AND PRUSSIA SUCCEEDED IN THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

The unification of Germany was delayed due to a number of obstacles by 1860. However, within less than 10 years (between 1864-1870), the unification of Germany witnessed rapid successes and was finally completed in 1871. Prussia and Bismarck were the most influential in bringing about the unification of Germany in this period. They were able to achieve what had been impossible before 1860 due to favourable factors within and outside Prussia.

I. The downfall of Metternich in 1848 and the weakness of his successors greatly favoured the unification of Germany. Metternich was the greatest hindrance to German unification and his downfall in 1848 gave Prussia and Bismarck the chance to mobilise the Germans almost freely. This was because his successors i.e. Schwazenburg (1848-1852) and later Count Boul (from 1852) proved to be less repressive and intelligent like Metternich himself. Had Metternich maintained his seat as Austria's Chancellor and Foreign Minister in Vienna, it is possible that Bismarck or Prussia could have found it extremely difficult to succeed the way they did from 1864-1870.

2. The re-organized and strong Prussian economy of the 1860's greatly helped to address the problem of economic backwardness that had hindered the unification. Bismarck had constructed roads, railways and embarked on agricultural and industrial development. This gave Prussia an economic lead in the German states to the extent that the Germans turned to Prussia rather than Austria for textiles, iron, chemicals, wheat and trade. It should be stressed that Prussia's technological advancement gave her modernized Weapons against Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866 and France in 1870-71.

3. The unification of Germany was also favoured by Prussia's military reforms of the 1860's. The Prussian army was raised from about 500.000 to 750.000 soldiers under effective commands of Von Roon and Von Moltke. They were strong, loyal and armed to the teeth and that is why Bismarck proudly stated that, Germany has its eyes not on Prussian liberalism but on its might, the great questions of the day shall not be decided by mere speeches and resolutions of the masses, but by blood and iron. It is these reformed and loyal Prussian troops that were used against external enemies like Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866, and France in 1870-71.

4. The rise and role of King William I was a favourable turning point in the unification of Germany.

William I replaced Frederick William IV as a regent in 1858 and became the King in 1861. In contrast to Frederick, William I was liberal and anti-Austrian domination in German affairs. He favoured modernizing the Prussian economy and the army. He is the one who expanded the Prussian army from 500.000 to 750.000 and appointed Von Roon and Field Marshall Von Moltke to lead them. It is even William I who recalled and appointed Bismarck as the Minister President in 1862 thereby giving Bismarck the position and opportunity to create a united Germany by 1871. Otherwise, if it was not due to the change of leadership, Bismarck who had been "discarded" from Prussia by Frederick William IV would not have been recalled and the unification of Germany would not have been what it became by 1871.

5. The role of Bismarck was of great favour to the unification of Germany. He diplomatically and aggressively addressed the obstacles that had hindered the unification of Germany. He strengthened Prussia politically, economically and militarily, which made her able to lead the rest of the German states in the unification. It was through Bismarck's policy of blood and iron that Prussia became successful against Denmark in 1864, Austria in

1866 and France by 1871. It is yet another tribute to Bismarck that he skillfully schemed and planned for the three wars. This, he achieved by diplomatically isolating German enemies, tricks and propaganda. All these explain why some historians have argued that the unification of Germany would not have been achieved without the role of Bismarck.

6. The military weakness and strategic mistakes of Prussia's enemies i.e. Denmark, Austria and France greatly favoured the unification of Germany. Denmark made a diplomatic blunder when she violated the 1852 London treaty and annexed Schleswig. This single act isolated her from the big powers and made it easier for Bismarck to defeat her in 1864. Besides, Denmark was also militarily very weak compared to the reformed Prussian army of the 1860's. Austria had a heterogeneous empire, which was giving her enough political headache (problems). Militarily, she was weakened and exhausted by the constant revolutions from 1820's to 1848. Most importantly, Austria was frustrated and exhausted by the battles of Magenta and Salfarino of 1859. Similarly, France was exhausted by the Mexican adventure of the 1860's.

Besides, France's Napoleon III was not politically shrewd and that is why he was duped and isolated by Bismarck. This explains why Prussia became successful over France in 1871. Thus, the political, economic, military and strategic mistakes of anti-unification opponents were a great boost to the course of German unification.

7. The collapse of the Congress System was a blessing in disguise for the unification of Germany. Its downfall by 1830 left Europe without a concerted effort / spirit of togetherness to suppress movements like the unification of Germany. The fact that the unification of Germany was a violation of the Vienna

Settlement meant the Congress Powers were bound to suppress it if the system existed up to the 1860's.

8. Although the Vienna Settlement suffocated the unification of Germany, it accidentally facilitated the struggle. The Settlement created the German Confederation with a single Parliament at Frankfurt. Much as this was to promote Austrian interest, it nevertheless brought the Germans together as one people and strengthened the quest for unification. It is from this Parliament that the unification ideas spread to the rest of the Germans.

9. The role of the Zollverein movement was also influential in the unification of Germany. It was an economic union that was started by Prussia and

covered the rest of the German states by 1860. This brought economic corporation amongst the German states which developed into political corporation in the name of unification in 1871. The fact that it was started by Prussia showed that she had the necessary drive and initiative to lead the rest of the German states into unification. This is why it was easier for Prussia to rally the other German states behind her in the unification process by 1870.

10. The role of Napoleon I was yet another inspiring factor in the unification of Germany. He conquered the German states and reduced their number from over 300 to 39 states. This became known as the German confederation of the Rhine, which reminded the Germans that their glories and achievements of the past could still be revived. This strengthened the spirit of unity amongst the Confederated 39 states.

Napoleon also abolished feudalism, which paved way for economic and eventual political union of the German states by 1871.

11. The unification of Germany was also favoured by the role of foreign powers in the 1860's. Austria assisted Prussia in the liberation of Schleswig from Denmark in 1864. The Italian unification struggle weakened Austrian troops to the advantage of Prussia. They also helped the Prussian troops against Austria in 1866. This led to the liberation of Holstein and the unification of the northern German states with Prussia in 1867. Although Bismarck secured the neutrality of powers like Britain, France and Russia, still their co-operation and goodwill was commendable and made Prussia to successfully triumph over her enemies.

12. The work of German scholars was also significant in the unification of Germany. They politicized the Germans and made them aware of their identity as a superior race, Hegel wrote "The Concept of the state and the historic role of the Teutonic race"; Steuben founded Monumental Germanieau for the study of German history. By recapitulating on the Germans' past glory, the scholars made the Germans "a proud people", strengthened their spirit of resistance against oppressive and exploitative influence by foreign powers. This partly explains why it was easy to mobilize the Germans against foreign powers in the unification.

13. Although the 1848 revolutions failed to give Germany her unity, it nevertheless became a turning point that favoured the unification. It clearly exposed the real obstacles and enemies in the path of the unification. Bismarck learnt these bitter lessons, worked on them and successfully accomplished the unification of Germany by 1871.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE UNIFICATIONS OF ITALY AND GERMANY (COMPARING AND CONTRASTING THE UNIFICATIONS OF ITALY AND GERMANY).

By 1850, the unification of Italy and Germany were faced with internal and external obstacles that rendered the unifications of the two nations a failure. However, after 1850, there were changes internally and externally that favoured the unification of both nations. The two unifications were stimulated by the French revolution and completed by the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871. The main architects of Italian unification were Mazzini, Garibaldi, Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II while the German unification was achieved through the efforts of Bismarck, Von roon, Von Moltek and King William I. A critical analysis of the origin, course and consequences presents us with striking similarities (comparison) amidst some differences (contrasts) as the foregoing analysis reveals.

SIMILARITIES:

1. The greatest obstacles to the two unifications by 1848 were Austria and Prince Metternich. Metternich used a combination of diplomacy and force to block all attempts to unify Italian and German states up to 1848. It was only after his downfall in 1848 that the two unifications progressed. Even after the downfall of Metternich, Austria continued to have direct and indirect control over Italian affairs. In the German affairs, Austria dominated the Confederation Parliament, which she manipulated to oppress and exploit the Germans. Thus, Metternich and Austria were the greatest bottlenecks in the unifications of both Italy and Germany.

2. Foreign assistance was another key element in both unifications. The unifications of both states were hindered by lack of foreign assistance before 1848 and favoured by the role of it after 1850. The Italians were assisted in the liberation of Lombardy and Venetia by France and Prussia respectively. On the other hand, the Germans were assisted in the liberation of Schleswig and Holstein by Austria and Italy respectively.

3. The unification of both states were championed by the most dominant states. The Italian unification was led by Piedmont (Sardinia) which was the strongest of all the Italian states while Prussia on her own terms united the rest of the German states. These leading states (Piedmont and Prussia) were first strengthened politically, economically and militarily as a firm foundation for a successful unification. This is why the unification of Italy and Germany were sustained by Piedmont and Prussia's military and economic strengths respectively.

4. In both unifications, force and violence were used. The Italians used force against Austria in 1859 in the liberation of Lombardy and 1861 in the liberation of Sicily and Naples. On the other hand, Bismarck used the policy of blood and iron in the three quick wars against Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866 and France in 1870-71. All these were possible .because of the leading states.

5. Diplomacy was also employed in the Italian as well as German unifications. Cavour won international sympathy and support by sending the Piedmontese troops to help the allied powers. In the Crimean War, she also allied with France in 1859 and Prussia in 1866 against Austria. While in the German case, Bismarck diplomatically isolated Denmark, Austria and France as a step towards hosting them from German territories. These diplomatic moves and schemes quickened the process of German and Italian unifications after 1850.

6. The foundation of the two unifications was laid by the French revolutionary ideas and Napoleon's conquest and re-organization of the Italian and German states. Napoleon I reduced the number of both states and preached the revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity. These made the Italians and Germans to start thinking and acting as one people hence developing the idea of unification. Napoleon's exploitation and oppression of the Italians and Germans made them to use the same revolutionary principles to start fighting for freedom, independence and later unity. It should be noted that the success of the French revolutions of 1830 and 1848 had yet another morale boosting effect on the Italian and German unifications. Apart from giving them morale, the French success also taught the Italians and German nationalists some lessons, which they learnt. This was why Cavour and Bismarck embarked on domestic reforms as a preparatory measure for a successful unification after 1850.

7 -The unifications of both Italy and Germany were largely brought about by the roles of the Chief Ministers of the dominant states. These were Cavour

of Piedmont and Otto Von Bismarck of Prussia. Cavour and Bismarck were men of noble birth and had military and diplomatic experiences that they used in the course of the unification. They embarked on political, socio-economic and military reforms as a stepping-stone towards a sustainable unification struggle. Their foreign policy created a favourable international environment that explains why countries like Britain and France developed a positive attitude towards Italian and German unifications.

8. The Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 was the final event that completed the unifications of both Italy and Germany. The war forced Napoleon III to withdraw the French troops from Rome and this gave an open chance for Rome to be annexed to the Kingdom of Italy. For the Germans, the war eliminated France that was the last obstacle in the liberation of the southern German states. The defeat of France made it easy to incorporate the south German states plus French states of Lorraine and Alsace as a final stage in the unification of Germany. Thus, the Franco-Prussian war was the last event in the unification of both Italy and Germany.

9. Although the unifications of both nations were completed in 1870 and 1871, many Italians and Germans were left outside the orbit of a united Italy and Germany. For instance, the Italians in the states of Nice, Savoy, Trieste and Trentino were left under French and Austrian domination only to be incorporated in 1919. In the German unification, Bismarck united Germany on Prussian terms and left out the Germans in Austria and parts of Bohemia.

10. In both cases, the earlier struggles were frustrated by negative attitudes and roles of Kings in the leading states and were favoured when there were changes. The Italians were frustrated by the negative attitude of Charles Albert of Piedmont and that is why the earlier struggle flopped. However, they were favoured by the positive attitude and support of Victor Emmanuel II who replaced Charles Albert in 1848.

For the Germans, King Frederick William IV who was too fearful of Austria failed them. However, the Germans were blessed by the active role of King William I from 1858 who supported Bismarck's ideas, policies and programs for the unification of Germany.

DIFFERENCES / CONTRAST

1. The unification of Germany was relatively easier than that of Italy. Unlike the Italians, the Germans had a Confederation Parliament and a Custom Union (Zollverein) which brought some form of political and economic unity.

For the Italians, there was no form of such unity but were instead directly and indirectly dominated by Austria.

2. The actual unification of Italy took a longer period compared to that of the Germans. The first territorial achievement in the Italian unification was in 1859 and it dragged on until 1870 when the Franco-Prussian war broke out. For the Germans, they were only actively involved in three quick wars between 1864 to 1871.

3. Although Cavour and Bismarck played the greatest roles in the two unifications, Bismarck played a much greater role than Cavour. Cavour was assisted by Mazzini who politicized the Italians about the benefits of a united Italy, Garibaldi who liberated Sicily and Naples and the central states who voted in favour of Piedmont through a referendum. After Cavour's death, Victor Emmanuel II and Garibaldi were the ones who completed the unifications. Much as Von Roon; Moltke and William I assisted Bismarck, the degree of assistance was less than that of Cavour. In fact, it was through Bismarck's diplomacy, blood and iron policy that Prussia became successful in ousting Denmark, Austria and France from German territories.

4. There was more foreign assistance in the unification of Italy than that of Germany. The liberation of Italian states was directly or indirectly due to the role of foreign powers. More importantly, the liberation of Venetia and Rome would not have been realized if it was not due to Prussia's role. As far as the Germans were concerned, there was less foreign assistance compared to Italy. The German unification was spearheaded by Bismarck who manipulated international politics and united Germany on Prussian terms. In other words, he relied more on Prussia's military might in the successive wars through which the unification of Germany was achieved.

5. The unification of Italy was achieved at the expense of Nice and Savoy that were given to France as a compensation for her assistance in the liberation of Lombardy (in 1859). However, no single state was battered in the German unification. Although Bismarck had promised Napoleon III at the Biarritz Agreement of 1865 some territories along the Rhine, he violated the agreement and refused to cede any German state to France after the war. He instead propagandized and annexed those states to complete the unification of Germany in 1871.

6. The unification of Germany was on Prussian terms and Berlin the capital city of Prussia became the city of a united Germany. But in the unification of Italy, Piedmont with her capital Turin were not considered to be the

capital city of a united Italy in 1870. Instead the city of a united Italy was shifted from Turin where it had been declared in 1861 to Rome in 1871.

7. The consequences of the two unifications also differed. The final unification of Italy was relatively peaceful without much bloodshed in 1870. In other words, the liberation of Rome was relatively peaceful because of the favourable circumstances provided by the Franco-Prussian war. Contradictorily, the unification of Germany was achieved by humiliating France in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871.

This destroyed the balance of power that hitherto favoured Britain and France. This created a hostile relationship between France and Germany that led to arms race and alliance system which disorganized Europe and led to the outbreak of the First World War.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The Franco-Prussian war was the last event that completed the unifications of Italy and Germany. It was a military confrontation between France and Prussia, which led to the downfall the second French Republic| and changed the European balance of power in favour of Germany. This caused a lot of tension in Europe, which climaxed into the outbreak of the First World War. This catastrophic war was caused by a combination of long term and immediate factors as portrayed by the following analysis.

i) Historical problem between France and Prussia was responsible for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. From 1792, Prussia openly opposed French revolutionary ideas and changes that it caused in France and Europe. She allied with other powers and fought in all the coalitions against France under the revolutionary government and later Napoleon Bonaparte up to the downfall of Napoleon. In 1815, the

Vienna Settlement disappointed France by giving Prussia the Rhine lands, parts of Poland and Saxony

Prussia also remained threatened by the success of further French revolutions of 1830 and 1848 that consolidated the seeds of liberalism and

nationalism. Bismarck dismissed the French revolutionary successes and ideas when he said German has its eyes not on Prussian liberalism but on her might..."

In a similar manner he remarked that "Prussia does not look to her liberty but to her glory!

These comments disappointed the liberals in France who pressurized Napoleon III to declare war against Prussia

The violation of the 1865 Biarritz verbal agreement to Napoleon III by Bismarck conditioned this war.

Bismarck had promised to compensate Napoleon III with the southern German states for his neutrality in the then looming 1866 Austro-Prussian war. However, after Prussians victory at Sodowa, Bismarck changed his mind and reinforced the German public outcry against France that, "A land that is essentially German must not fall into the clutches of our hereditary enemies". This was a total embarrassment to Napoleon III and France, which made the Frenchmen to concur that it was France not Austria that was defeated at Sodowa. This became a long-term cause of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871.

3) Bismarck's policy of isolating France in European politics made Napoleon III to resort to war to save his reputation. Bismarck had isolated Napoleon III from the south German states by publishing his claims over the south German states. He also isolated France in Europe by publishing such claims including those of Luxembourg and Belgium to Russia, Britain and Austria. The need to punish Bismarck for the unfriendly acts partly forced France under Napoleon III to declare war on Prussia hence the Franco- Prussian war.

4) The struggle for power superiority between France and Prussia was also responsible for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. By 1870, the balance of power in Europe was in favour of France who was regarded as a land power and Britain who was considered a sea power. But France's position was threatened by Prussia's military growth and superiority in German as well as European affairs. Prussia's strength and ambitions would change the balance of power, lead to the loss of French prestige and glory which Napoleon III could not tolerate. This was even the reason why Napoleon III did not want the unification of Italy and Germany to be completed since it would create strong and powerful states across the French borders. Napoleon III therefore resorted to war against Prussia to

destroy her before it was too late and maintain the balance of power in favour of France.

5) Bismarck's efforts to unify the German states was an issue that led to the outbreak of the Franco Prussian war. He had earlier prophesied to Disraeli that, "I will attack Denmark to get possession of Schleswig and Holstein, I will put Austria out of the German Confederation and attack France". By 1867, Bismarck had attacked Denmark, gained Schleswig and Holstein and eliminated Austria out of the

German affairs and formed the north German Confederation. His next task was the annexation of the south German states in order to complete the unification of Germany. But the greatest obstacle was France that had claims over the south German states due to the 1865 Biarritz agreement and historical connection.

Bismarck had according to his prophecy foreseen that war with France should be the last event in the inclusion of the south German states to a united Germany. This is why Bismarck manipulated every opportunity like the EMS telegram to provoke France into war.

6) Napoleon III's failures in France and Europe forced him to declare war on Prussia to save his reputation.

He had liberalized the empire from 1860, which opened gates for opposition against his failures in foreign policy. The Mexican Campaign of 1864-1866 and the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 were total disasters that destroyed his prestige internally and continentally (in Europe). Napoleon III therefore fought in a desperate attempt to revive his prestige and popularity in France and Europe.

7) Italian support and influence was also responsible for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. By 1870, Italy was hostile to France and in good terms (friendly) with Prussia. Italy was angered by Napoleon III's refusal to assist her in 1859 to liberate Venetia from Austria. It was only Prussia that helped her to Liberate Venetia by force in 1866. Above all the presence of the French troops in Rome since 1849 had made it impossible to complete the unification of Italy. However, this could be reversed if France is engaged in a war where military pressure would force her to withdraw her troops from Rome.

This made Italy to give moral support to Prussia against France which encouraged Bismarck to lure France into the battle field.

On the other hand, Napoleon III had lost the support of the Catholics in Austria because of his initial assistance that helped Italians to liberate Lombardy. He therefore expected to gain their support by fighting Prussia for Prussia had fought and defeated Austria at the battle of Sadowa in 1866. This situation inspired Napoleon III to declare war against Prussia in 1870.

8) Bismarck's desire to suffocate Catholicism in Germany and Europe also played a role in the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. The Catholics in Germany opposed Bismarck's pro-Prussian and protestant policies. They were supported by the Pope who issued the dogma of Papal infallibility, which Bismarck rejected. The Catholic Centre Party was also busy de-campaigning Bismarck in Germany. The Catholics in Germany appealed to fellow Catholics in France to assist them against Bismarck. This reinforced Bismarck's fears that a hostile Catholic power like France would use the pretext of assisting Catholics to fight Germany. It's this fear that prompted Bismarck to drag France into war by altering the EMS telegram.

9) The influence of Eugenie Marie (Napoleon III's wife) and warmongers in France made the Franco- Prussian war inevitable. Napoleon III was bed ridden (sick) by chronic urinary tract infection and this gave chance to Eugenie and her friends to pressurize him to declare war against Prussia. It should be emphasized that Napoleon III was against war with Prussia but was forced against his will by Eugenie and the military patriots because of his ill health. This is why Eugenie proudly remarked that, **this is my war.**

10).Prussian economic and military reforms created circumstances that led to the Franco-Prussian war.

The custom union that was started by Prussia had by 1870 brought economic unity and prosperity between the northern and southern German states. Bismarck had expanded rearmed and modernized Prussian army under battle hardened commanders like Von roon and Von Moltek. It was this reforms that earned Prussia successive military victories over Denmark in 1864 and Austria in 1866. These events gave Bismarck confidence of a successful military victory against France, the last enemy of Prussia. It was this confidence that made Bismarck to alter the EMS telegram, which forced Napoleon III into war.

11) The role of Bismarck was very influential in the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. Bismarck, the prime minister of Prussia was by nature an ambitious, militaristic and volcanic man. He had observed that the great questions of the day shall not be decided by speeches and resolutions of

the majority but by blood and iron. This means that Bismarck was a man who preferred war to diplomacy in resolving conflicts. Bismarck had long term plans to fight France because France was an obstacle in the unification of Germany. He is blamed for his dishonesty in the 1865 Biarritz agreement and manipulation of the EMS telegram that caused the war. It was these that caused war fever in both countries and forced France to declare war on Prussia.

12) The immediate event that sparked of the Franco-Prussian war was provided by the Spanish succession dispute and Bismarck's manipulation of the EMS telegram. After withdrawing Leopold's candidature to the Spanish throne, King William I sent an EMS telegram to Bismarck informing him of the incidence.

However, Bismarck deliberately provoked France into war by editing the telegram to appear that the French ambassador was insulted by King William I of Prussia. He knew what he was doing and that is why he remarked that this would be like a red rug to the French bull. The edited version of the EMS telegram became a red rug to Napoleon III and forced him to declare war on Prussia hence the Franco-Prussian war.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES/SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WAR

Positive consequences

1. The war was a great success for Bismarck and a proof that he was the "master political tactician of the 19th century". Bismarck had argued that Germany would be unified on Prussian terms using the policy of blood and iron. He had also assured Disraeli that he would "attack Denmark to gain possession of Schleswig and Holstein, put Austria out of the German confederation and attack France". This is exactly the manner and stages throughout which Bismarck achieved the unification of Germany. The success of Prussia over France in the Franco-Prussian war boosted Bismarck's popularity and influence in German as well as European politics. He became the chancellor of United Germany and played a major role in directing German and European affairs from 1871-1890.

2. The war is significant because it led to the final and total unification of Germany. It eliminated

Napoleon III's claims over the southern German states and made them to join the north for total unification by 1871. After the war, a united German empire was declared at Versailles in France including the two French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine.

3. Similarly, the war favoured and completed the unification of Italy. It forced Napoleon III to withdraw the French troops from Rome. The Italians seized this opportunity to occupy Rome and declare a united Italy in 1870.

4. The war inspired the rise of nationalism in Europe after 1871. A number of nationalities who were disunited and dominated by foreign powers were inspired by Bismarck's policy of blood and iron to fight for their freedom and unity. Nationalistic movements like Pan Slavism, Pan Germanism, Young Turk Movements and the Greater Serbian Movement took lessons from the German nationalism that had crushed France at Sedan.

Negative consequences

5. There was massive loss of lives and destruction of property. The French army of about 200,000 was encircled by the Prussian troops in the city of Metz in the western part of Lorraine. Napoleon III surrendered at Sedan close to the border with Belgium. He was arrested together with 100,000 troops and sent to exile from where he died. A number of German troops also perished either within the German states or in Paris where they were besieged for a long time.

6. The Franco- Prussian war ended with the defeat of France by Prussia at the battle of Sedan. This humiliation was crowned by the 1871 Frankfurt treaty, in which France lost the two mineral rich provinces of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany. This became great assets in the industrialization of Germany on top of 5 billion francs (200 million pounds) war indemnity. France was to have a German army of occupation stationed in Paris until all the reparations was paid. This weakened France economically and militarily to the advantage of Bismarck and Germany.

7. The war changed the balance of power in Europe. The war led to the downfall of France as a land power and the rise of Germany as a new land power. This created a struggle by France to regain her former glory by planning a war of revenge against Germany. The determination of Bismarck to avoid this war and maintain Germany's supremacy is what made him to start the alliance system and arms race that became the root

causes of the First World War. In other words, European powers like France, Russia and Britain hated and feared a powerful Germany and this caused tension between Germany and them, which was forcefully resolved in the 1914-1918 war.

8. The war also contributed to the scramble and partition of Africa. The loss of Alsace and Lorraine forced France to look for compensation in Africa by acquiring some colonies. France also wanted to raise enough manpower for a successful war of revenge against Germany. Bismarck who had regarded colonies as not worth the bones of a single German soldier changed and started conquering colonies to encourage France in her compensation drive. Germany also supported France to divert her attention from recovering Alsace and Lorraine through the 1878 and 1884-85 Berlin conferences. All these moves and counter moves accelerated the scramble and partition of Africa, which ended in the colonisation of some parts of Africa.

9. The war led to the destruction of the second French empire and the declaration of the third French Republic later in 1875. Napoleon III was abducted and exiled which ended the second French empire that he had forged in 1852. This opened way for the establishment of the third French Republic under Macmahon.

10. Russia exploited the war situation to repudiate the 1856 Paris treaty on the neutrality of the Black Sea.

Bismarck encouraged Russia to do so in order to guarantee Russia's neutrality during the war. This however, revived Russia's imperialism (especially in the Turkish Empire) with all its threats to European peace.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

REASONS FOR THE DEFEAT OF FRANCE:

1. Prussia's military reforms compared to Napoleon III's military weakness could not make Napoleon to win the war. He had reduced his army by 10,000 yet the Prussian army had swollen from 0.5 million to 0.75 million. The French troops were rag tag, ill-trained, ill-equipped and armed with single loaded rifles yet the Prussians were armed with automatic machine guns.

The French troops had more maps of Germany, which they were supposed to invade than France, which they forced to defend. Thus, the defeat and surrender of the French troops in 1871 was a foregone conclusion.

2. Poor mobilization on the side of Napoleon III was also responsible for the defeat of the French. Bismarck on the other hand ordered for a full scale general mobilization for the final unification of Germany. This was contrary to the French men and the French troops who were demoralized by the Mexican adventures and other foreign blunders coupled with a low degree of mobilization.

3. Prussia's technological advancement put her at an advantage over the French. The Prussian scientists succeeded in producing needle gun, which was too advanced compared to the French chassepot that was still being tested. This is what enabled them to make rapid advancement against the French troops and encircled Napoleon III plus his 200.000 troops.

4. Prussia was blessed by a number of battle hardened combatants and officers who had high quest for Military victory. This was provided by Prussia's successive victories against Denmark in 1864 and Austria in 1866. On the other side, the top French military officers were either too old or dead from disastrous foreign wars and adventures like the Mexican case. This is why the Prussian soldiers had more determination and morale unlike the French soldiers, which ended in the defeat of France.

5. Bismarck's isolation of France completely ruined Napoleon III and made him vulnerable to defeat. He alienated Russia from Napoleon III by promising to support Russia's violation of the 1856 Paris Peace treaty. He had assisted Italy in the acquisition of Venetia and the Franco-Prussian war would favour Italian conquest of Rome and thus Italy could not support France. Austria was less bitter to Prussia following the 1866 treaty of Prague in which Bismarck was very lenient to Austria i.e. he did not annex any Austrian territory nor impose a war indemnity on her. Bismarck isolated France from Britain by publishing Napoleon III's claims over Luxemburg and Belgium. Most importantly, he exposed Napoleon's claims over the South-German states and mobilized them to support the Prussian troops, which made Prussia's success inevitable.

6. Napoleon III's unrealistic policies in France and over Europe also accounts for his defeat. He had liberalized the empire and the press had turned public opinion against him towards 1870 making it hard to mobilize the French men for war. The free trade policy had led to industrial breakdown and a general economic decline. The right to strike generated

unnecessary violence throughout France. These plus his adventurer's foreign policy led to economic depression which affected the morale and performance of the French troops against Prussia that had a sound economy.

7. Napoleon III's poor health was also responsible for the defeat of France in the war. By 1870, the chief in command of the French troops who was Napoleon III himself was suffering from chronic urinary tract infection that was sapping his energy. This affected his intelligence, morale and mobility, which led to the defeat of his troops by a relatively younger and healthier Prussian commander's i.e. Von Roon and Von Moltke.

8. Nevertheless, the defeat of France cannot be attributed to Napoleon III alone. His wife Eugenie and war mongers in France were also responsible for the failure of France to defeat Prussia. Napoleon III on his own never wanted to declare war on Prussia because he was aware that his weaknesses and that of the

French troops could never make him successful. However, he was forced to declare war by Eugenie and her other warmongers in France. Besides, Eugenie and the warmongers messed up the administration of France since Napoleon III was sick which demoralised the French troops. Even in the battlefield, there was insufficient supply of food, arms and reinforcement which made the French troops to suffer a crushing defeat at the battle of Sedan in 1871.

9. Lastly, the population of the Germans compared to the French also account for the success of Prussia against France in the war. In the 19th Century, the population of the Germans increased from 23 million to 36 million while those of the French rose from 27 to only 39 million. This put Prussia in a better position than France to mobilize resources and manpower to fight. It was this that made Prussia to shoot down France at the battle of Sedan in 1871.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

Bismarck is one of the most fascinating personalities in the history of modern Europe. He took the credit for being the master political tactician of the 19th century. Between 1871- 1890, Bismarck was the most dominant in German as well as international politics. He played the most significant role in the unification of Germany and became its chancellor in 1871. His greatest task was to consolidate German unity against disruptive forces like liberalism, socialism and Catholicism. This he blatantly declared that;

My aim from the first moment of public activity has been the creation and consolidation of Germany and if you can show a single moment when I deviated from that magnetic needle, you may perhaps prove that I went Wrong that I lost sight of the national aim for a moment,

Bismarck therefore came prepared and determined to deal with his opponents. He adapted a policy of little or no compromise with his opponents. This was dictated by the following considerations;

i). the newly created empire was heterogeneous with non-Germans who were forcefully annexed against their will. This included the French in Alsace and Lorraine, the Danes in Schleswig and Holstein and the poles in East Germany. These races would break the-empire if they start struggling for their independence.

ii. Germany was united on Prussian terms, which did not please the rest of the German states who were amalgamated to Prussia. Besides, Austria was out of the German confederation yet she was a very powerful German state. Bismarck's task was how to Prussianise the Germans and maintain close relationship with Austria.

iii). The unification of Germany had destroyed the balance of power which was bound to graduate to a balance of terror (war). This was because Germany was united by humiliating Austria in 1866 and France in 1871. Even other powers like Britain and Russia were hostile to the newly created state of Germany. This is what forced Bismarck to be a man of peace between 1871 - 1890. He struggled to avoid any war because such a war could endanger his newly created Germany that was becoming the most industrialized nation in the world. It would also give France an heaven sent opportunity to get allies and fight a war of revenge against Germany.

The newly created empire was to be ruled by a new constitution that favoured Prussian interest in Germany.

The government lasted from 1871 - 1918 under three different kings i.e. Emperor William I, 1871 -1888 with Bismarck as the chancellor before he resigned in 1890. Fredrick William III who rose and died in the same year (1888) and Emperor William II popularly known as Kaiser William II (1888 - 1918) who was exiled after the First World War. Bismarck was guided by the following aims and objectives in his internal policy i.e. how to;

- i) Germanize (harmonise) the Germans and non-Germans within the empire i.e. the consolidation of unity.
- ii). Check and if possible eliminate the disruptive forces of the society i.e. liberalism, socialism and Catholicism.
- ij). Maintain internal and external peace in order to consolidate the German empire.
- iv). Create a powerful Germany that would control and influence European politics.
- v). Strengthen international trade to create a powerful German economy.
- vi). Control the parliament and public opinion in Prussia's favour.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ELEMENTS OF BISMARCK'S DOMESTIC POLICIES (ACHEIVEMENTS AND FAILURES)

ACHEIVEMENTS

1) Constitutionalism

Bismarck successfully manipulated the new constitution of 1871 to his own advantage and that of Prussia.

The constitution provided for a parliamentary democracy with two assemblies (houses) i.e. the Bundesrat and the Reichstag. The Bundesrat was the legislative assembly (law making body). It was constituted by 58 members from the different German states. Out of the 58 representatives, Prussia alone had 17 who were Bismarck's own men. The decision of the Bundasrat could be vetoed by 14 Prussian representatives. This gave Prussia

and Bismarck an upper hand to influence German Politics and undermine the opposition.

Besides, Emperor William I and Bismarck who had influence over German policies were themselves Prussians.

The Reichstag was to debate and suggest amendments to the laws proposed by the Bundesrat. It had about 400 members and more than a half of its members were Prussians. The power of the Reichstag was limited to passing and amending laws against opposition in favour of Bismarck's or Prussian interest. Above all, the Reichstag could be dissolved by the Emperor with the approval of the Bundesrat. This still gave the Emperor and Bismarck full control over the government and hence German affairs. The constitution guaranteed the German's political freedom and hailed to check dictatorial tendencies within the Empire.

2) Federal system of administration

Bismarck set up a federal government in order to ensure effective administration of the huge heterogeneous empire. All states elected representatives to the two houses of the federal parliament i.e. the Bundesrat and Reichstag. The federal system allowed different states to manage their own affairs as long as they were obedient to the central government at Berlin i.e. they had the power to handle local issues like education, civil and criminal cases. The central government was in-charge of national issues like the army, taxation, foreign affairs, transport and communication. All these departments were dominated by Prussians at the expense of other states. Bismarck used the army to consolidate his iron-rule through intimidation, imprisonment and deportation of suspected opponents. This ensured Prussia's dominance and promoted Bismarck's interest as a sign of success.

3) The Kulturkampf i.e. the struggle for civilization

The Kulturkampf was a struggle between Bismarck supported by his fellow protestant Prussians and the Catholics. The conflict arose because the German Catholics and Pope Pius IX considered the German Empire dominated by Protestants as a serious threat that should be fought. This made the Catholic Prussian representatives in the Bundesrat and Reichstag to form the Catholic center party and advocate for recognition of Catholic religion as the most dominant in Germany. In 1870, the Vatican Council passed the "The Dogma of papal infallibility", which proclaimed that the Pope was infallible (cannot make mistakes) and that his decisions

were not to be questioned or rejected by Catholics worldwide. However, some German Catholics especially lecturers, academicians and scientists rejected it. The Pope reacted by excommunicating the rebellious Catholics from the church and demanded that they should be excommunicated from state offices as well.

Bismarck instead reinstated all priests and school officials who were dismissed for non-compliance with the infallibility of the Pope. The Catholic Church went ahead and prohibited catholic students from attending lectures or getting services from such lecturers and priests. The Catholic Center Party started massive campaigns against Bismarck. The Catholics also appealed to follow Catholics in France to assist them against

Bismarck. Bismarck through the minister of Church affairs, Falk in May 1873, 1874 and 1875 passed the

May laws in which the Church was forbidden from excommunicating opponents of the Papal infallibility.

Those who opposed the May laws were exiled, imprisoned and executed. He was so successful that by 1876, all Prussian Bishops were either in Prison, exile or dead and 14,000 parishes were without a priest in-charge.

In short, Bismarck effectively suppressed Catholicism and the negative influence of the Pope in German affairs.

This helped to safeguard the interest of his Prussian Protestants.

However, as a shrewd politician, Bismarck realised that suppression of Catholicism would be dangerous in the long run and signed a concordat in which he reconciled with the new Pope Leo III 1879. Bismarck suspended the May laws, the church recovered its former powers except inspection of schools and holding of civil marriage and the Dogma of papal Infallibility was abandoned. This is because he made a tactical sacrifice to gain support of the Catholic Center Party against the social Democrats in the Reichstag who had become very popular.

NB The above extreme measures made Bismarck very unpopular amongst the Catholics in Germany and all over Europe. By 1878, a number of issues made Bismarck to reconcile with the Catholics. First, the social democrats had become a more threatening force than the Catholics and he needed the support of the Catholics.

Secondly, the Kulturkampf would have jeopardized his achievements in the 1878 Berlin congress and the Austro-German alliance of 1879. Thirdly, the

German liberal Protestants most especially the Lutherans were alarmed and thus opposed Bismarck's persecution of the Catholics. Fourthly, a new Pope Leo XIII who was more moderate and compromising rose to power in 1878. These factors forced Bismarck to bend down and compromise with the Vatican and the new Pope. Nevertheless one should note that the reconciliation portrays Bismarck as a man of peace.

4) The struggle against Socialism /Social Democratic Party

By 1878, the socialists and the social democratic party were the greatest threat to the existence of the German Empire. They took advantage of unemployment, poor working conditions and exploitation of workers to de-campaign Bismarck's industrial policies and gain more parliamentary seats. For instance in 1871, the socialists had won only 3 seats in the Reichstag but in 1877 it increased to 12 seats with about 5 million supporters. This alarmed Bismarck who reacted by implicating them in an assassination attempt on Emperor William I in 1878. He secured the support of the Catholic Center Party and the National Liberal Party and caused the parliament to pass the exceptional/enabling law of 1878, by which the Socialist Democratic Party and its newspaper were banned and some socialist supporters were imprisoned, killed or deported to exile. To address the roots of socialism, Bismarck introduced insurance schemes against sickness in 1883 and pension for retired workers or those incapacitated in 1884. Thus, -the exceptional law and welfare schemes helped control the strength of socialism in Germany.

5) Promotion of trade

Bismarck promoted internal and external trade in favour of Germany. He worked tirelessly to maintain European peace which created a favourable atmosphere that promoted trade in Europe. From 1871-1879, he pursued a free trade policy, which won for him the support of National Liberal Party most of whom were traders. However, from 1880, Bismarck realised that the free trade policy was detrimental to the industrialization of Germany and adopted a protectionist policy. The policy protected internal markets for grains which appeased his fellow Prussian Junkers (land lords) who were great corn producers. For instance, the East Prussian Junkers were relieved because cheaper grains from other countries had greatly lowered the price of their grains. Protectionist policy also safeguarded other small scale industries like iron and steel industries from foreign competitions and earned Bismarck more support from the industrialists.

6) The struggle with the National Liberal party (His protectionist trade policy)

Bismarck silenced opposition from the National Liberal Party against the policy of protectionism that he adopted from 1879. The Jewish traders allied with the National Liberal Party and started a fierce campaign against Bismarck in the parliament and throughout Germany. Bismarck reacted by influencing his supporters

in the parliament to undermine their influence. He also used anti-Semitic propaganda in the media in which he emphasized that the Jews were non-Germans and could not determine the destiny of Germany in any way.

The propaganda also accused the leaders of the National Liberal Party to be Jews whose ambition was to cause the downfall of the German Empire. Thus, Bismarck successfully used the media and anti-Semitic propaganda to suppress opposition from the liberals and the Jews to make the policy of protectionism successful. The success of the policy promoted industrial development in Germany and brought economic prosperity that was second only to Britain in Europe.

7) Germanisation policy

Germanisation of non Germans within the Empire was a remarkable achievement by Bismarck. The German Empire that was proclaimed in 1871 was multi racial in that it forcefully incorporated the French in Alsace and Lorraine, the Danes in Schleswig and the Poles in Eastern Germany. These nationalities desired to break away and join their respective mother states. Bismarck encouraged Germans from other states to settle amongst them in order to outnumber and overpower them in decision making. The non Germans were forced to abandon their mother tongue and speak the German language. Bismarck used divide and rule policy, intimidation, spy network and imprisonment to frustrate any attempt to break away from the Empire. These nationalities were also few and disunited which favoured the success of divide and rule policy. Bismarck also used Prussian domination of the Bundesrat and Reichstag to pass anti nationalistic and anti secessionist laws that consolidated Germanisation policy.

8) Colonial policy

Initially, Bismarck pursued an anti colonial policy. His extreme view was that colonies are not worth the bones of a single German soldier. However, the protectionist policy made German industrialists and traders to start advocating for territorial acquisition during the, scramble and partition of colonies. They demanded colonies for raw materials, investments and resettlement of excess population. Although Bismarck was opposed to

colonies, he was influenced by public opinion to change his negative colonial attitude and allow the establishment of German colonisation society led by Karl Peters to acquire colonies in Africa. The need to maintain European peace made Bismarck to call the Berlin conference of 1884 -85 through which

Germany acquired Togo land, Cameroon and Namibia. These became areas for exploitation, which benefited the German industrialists, businessmen and the common man.

9) Military reforms

Bismarck's military reforms from 1871-1890 consolidated the military strength of Germany that was achieved during the unification process. He continued with the policy of retraining, rearming and modernizing the German army. The same measures were taken to improve the naval strength of Germany.

Compulsory military service was introduced to mobilize a big force against internal opposition and external invasion. Domestically, the army was used to suppress internal opposition groups like the socialists and Catholics. However, Bismarck followed a cautious naval policy to avoid destabilizing the balance of power and conflicts with Britain. In other words, Bismarck deliberately kept the German naval strength below that of Britain to maintain the balance of power in favour of Britain as a naval power and Germany as a land power.

10) Socio-economic development.

Bismarck also implemented significant socio-economic reforms in the history of Germany. In 1873, he constructed an imperial railway line to facilitate transport and communication across the German states. In 1876, he established an imperial bank and introduced a uniform/common currency in the German Empire. He also improved and modernized roads, communication, agricultural and industrial sectors. These reforms helped to consolidate the spirit of unity, germanisation and patriotism within the German empire. Such reforms also transformed Germany into a powerful state with a powerful economy that became most dominant in European and world affairs during the Bismarckian era.

A critical assessment of Bismarck's domestic policy reveals that it was a state man's clever game of playing one party or opponents against others. He used the Protestant conservative Junkers and the National Liberal Party against the Catholic Center Party. Later, he utilized the Catholic Center

Party, the National Liberal Party and conservative Junkers against the socialists and Social Democratic Party. Lastly, he used the industrialists, Junkers and agriculturists that he pleased through a protectionist policy against the National Liberal Party. Above all, he used Prussian dominance in the parliament to destroy his opponents.

Nevertheless, Bismarck failed to completely destroy Catholicism and socialism to the extent that he officially withdrew his policies against the Catholics and socialists. He over promulgated Prussian interest and failed to perfectly Germanize the diversities within the empire. This is why some historians have argued that Bismarck short sightedness and insensitivity in domestic policy was a sharp contrast with his sure hand in foreign policy.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WEAKNESSES AND FAILURES

i) The unrealistic constitution

The 1871 constitution was unfair as it favoured Prussians to the disadvantage of other Germans. For instance, the constitution made Prussians dominant in the Bundesrat and Reichstag through which policies that favoured Prussian dominance in German affairs were made. This was denounced by other German states like Bavaria and Wurttemberg who had strong economies. Consequently, they neglected policies from the central government and threatened to secede (break away) from the German empire. Non Prussians therefore remained discontented throughout the Bismarckian era.

ii) Failure of the Kulturkampf i.e. against the Catholic Church

Bismarck's anti catholic policies was unsustainable and consequently he dropped it in 1879 when he reconciled with the Pope. Bismarck had coerced the Catholic Church through the May laws, intimidation, imprisonment, exile and death of Priests, Bishops and Catechists. However, these suppressive measures made Bismarck very unpopular amongst the Catholics in Germany and all over Europe. Even German liberal Protestants were alarmed and criticized Bismarck for his persecution of the Catholic Church. The Kulturkampf threatened his achievements In the Berlin

congress of 1878 and the Dual alliance of 1879 (Austro-German alliance) since

Austria is a staunch catholic state. Worst of all, the German Catholics appealed for assistance from France and she was bound to use it as an opportunity to revenge against Germany. This factors forced the 'iron chancellor' to "bend down", negotiate with Pope Leo XIII and reconciled in 1879. He signed an agreement in which he suspended the May laws and gave back the catholic church its former powers except inspection of schools and holding of civil marriage. To this extent one can justifiably regard the Kulturkampf as a struggle that became impossible to sustain.

iii) Failure to destroy Socialism and the Social Democratic Party

Bismarck failed to contain the growth of socialism and the influence of Social Democratic Party in Germany.

In spite of the exceptional law of 1878 and welfare schemes of 1883 and 1884, socialism and the Social Democratic Party became stronger. For instance, the number of Socialist representative in the Reichstag increased from 3 in 1871 up to 44 by 1890. Internally, the 44 representatives in the Reichstag utilized their parliamentary immunity to condemn Bismarck's anti-socialist campaigns and popularize socialism.

Externally, the socialist exiles co-coordinated their movement from exile and sent more socialist pamphlets into Germany, which kept the spirit of socialism alive.

Bismarck realized that force was not a solution to socialist influence. He cowardiced and adopted the "positive approach to socialism" or "State socialism" in which he granted insurance and pension schemes in 1883 and 1884 respectively. Nevertheless, Bismarck's concessions and generosity still failed to turn the workers and socialists on his side. This is because the key targets of high wages, low working hours, paid leave and minimum wages were not addressed. Consequently, the socialists continued opposing him and by 1890 when Bismarck resigned, the number of the socialist supporters had increased to 1.5 million. This shows that Bismarck's struggle against the socialists was a failure and a boomerang that finally led to his downfall. This is because his struggle against the socialists was one of the issues that brought him into loggerheads with Kaiser William II and caused his downfall.

iv) Germanisation policy

Bismarck forcefully Germanized the minority races within the German Empire. The policy of Germanisation forced the minority French, Danes and Poles to become part of the united Germany against their will. They were forced to abandon their mother language and use the German language. The policy denied such minority nationalities their right to self rule and subjected them to German domination which is against the principles of liberalism and nationalism. This explains why there was intensive opposition most especially from the French in Alsace and Lorraine right from 1871 up to 1890 when Bismarck resigned.

vi) Inconsistency over trade policy

Initially, Bismarck pursued a free trade policy, which won for him the support of National Liberal Party most of whom were traders.-However, from 1880, Bismarck realised that the free trade policy was detrimental to the industrialization of Germany and changed to a protectionist policy,.However, the policy undermined the business of the German National Liberal Party business men merchants and the Jews. It's-because cheaper goods especially from the more industrialized Britain from which they used to get bigger profit margins were restricted. The policy made the liberals through the National Liberal Party and Jewish traders ally and wage serious campaign against Bismarck in the parliament and throughout Germany. Thus, although the change from a free trade policy to a protectionist policy safeguarded infant industries, it nevertheless attracted resistance from the National Liberal Party traders and the Jews.

v) Inconsistent colonial policy

Bismarck failed to sustain his anti colonial policy in the long run. He had a pre conceived negative attitude towards colonies that he sarcastically remarked that colonies are not worth the bones of a single German soldier. However, during the scramble and partition of colonies, German industrialists and traders pressurized Bismarck to abandon his anti colonial policy and acquire colonies primarily for economic motives. There was therefore a public outcry for colonies that forced Bismarck to allow the establishment of German colonisation society led by Karl Peters to acquire colonies in Africa. Eventually Germany acquired colonies like Togo land and Namibia in Africa by 1890. The shift from anti colonial policy to colonisation is inconsistency in policy which one can consider a failure.

Attachments

No attachments



BISMARCK'S FOREIGN POLICIES (1871 -1890)

The peace, unity and consolidation of German Empire necessitated a shrewd foreign policy for which Bismarck was a master political tactician of his time. He was aware that France was humiliated and was longing for a war of revenge. He had also realised that Austria was expelled from the German confederation and was therefore not in good moods. At the same time Bismarck was conscious of the need to secure the friendship of Britain and Russia who were likely to join France in case of any war of revenge. Bismarck's concern i.e. aims and objectives in foreign policy were to: -

i. Continue isolating and weakening France so that she does not organize a war of revenge against Germany.

ii. Maintain German friendship with Russia and Austria who were the two powers likely to ally with France.

However, if it becomes impossible and one of the two had to be chosen, then priority would be given to Austria.

iii. Prevent any war in Europe while maintaining the balance of power under Germany and himself as the focus of European diplomacy and settlements.

iv. Maintain the 1871 Frankfurt treaty and settlement.

v. Maintain good relationship with Britain who was a super power and enemy of France.

vi. Not to participate in the Eastern question but to utilize any opportunity that arises to consolidate German supremacy. At the same time he wanted to reconcile Russia and Austria who were separated by rival interest in the Balkans.

Vii. Consolidate the Italian friendship that was cultivated during the unification and Germany was to be a buffer state between Italy and Austria.

viii. Maintain the territorial integrity and independence of the German empire that was created in

Attachments

No attachments



1) The 1871 Frankfurt treaty

By the Frankfurt treaty OF 1871, Bismarck gave the two mineral rich French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany. The newly created Germany benefited from the coal and iron deposits which fostered the industrialization of Germany at the expense of France. This weakened France economically and made her incapable-of financing a war of revenge against Germany.

The treaty also imposed a heavy war indemnity of 5 billion Francs (200 million pounds) and sent a German army of occupation to France, to ensure that the money was paid. The war indemnity was to weaken France economically and bolster Germany while the army of occupation was to ensure that France does not re-organise for a war of revenge against Germany. Although the war indemnity was cleared and the army of occupation withdrawn by 1875, there was a slow improvement in the French military might which still left France unable to fight Germany. This was a success because France remained weakened and unable to fight Germany. This policy was completely against France in favour of Germany.

It should be noted that by weakening France economically and militarily and disabling her from revenging, Bismarck proved to be a man of peace. This is because a Franco-German war was bound to attract the intervention of other powers, which would jeopardize peace in Europe after 1871.

2) The establishment of a republic in France

From 1871 - 1875, Bismarck supported the establishment of a republican government in France. This, he calculated would be isolated from the despotic monarchical governments of Austria and Russia. It would also not be acceptable to Britain who although was a constitutional and parliamentary government had a very poor relations with the earlier republican governments of France. Bismarck knew what he was doing and that is why he remarked; ... a republic, would find it difficult to obtain allies than a monarchy,..."

This was a success because it isolated France from the three continental powers of Austria, Russia and Britain. This also maintained peace because

if any of the three had joined France, it would have given her opportunity to revenge and cause war. It should be noted that Bismarck clandestinely/secretly supported opposition party against the republic, which destabilized it and frustrated all hopes of revenge against Germany.

3) The Dreikaiserbund or the three Emperors league of 1872

In 1872, Bismarck successfully formed the Dreikaiserbund or the-three Emperors-league of Austria, Germany and Russia to attract Austria and Russia to Germany and isolate France. He exaggerated the threats of Republican France to the monarchical governments of Austria and Russia and this forced them to ally with Germany. The three emperors promised to assist one another against socialist revolts and to consult each other on matters of mutual interest.

This alliance threatened and suppressed socialism and consolidated conservative governments in Austria, Germany and Russia. It left France isolated, unable to wage a war of revenge and hence maintained peace in Europe. The coming together of the three emperors brought diplomatic co-operation which proved of Bismarck as a man of peace for it prohibited war between the three powers. It was of great significance because it proved that Austria had reconciled with Germany and forgotten the humiliations of the 1866 battle of Sadowa.

NB: The Dreikaiserbund was originally in favour of Germany and against France but to another extent it was for the general peace of the three powers and the whole Europe.

4) The war of nerves

In 1875, Bismarck embarked on what he called the "war of nerves" with France. France had recovered so fast that the idea of recovering Alsace and Lorraine was not lacking amongst the patriotic Frenchmen. She had paid the war indemnity and the German army of occupation was withdrawn and had expanded her army to the tune of 200.000 soldiers by 1875. Worst of all, France supported the German Catholics against Bismarck in the famous Kulturkampf. These developments scared Bismarck and made him to resort to the war of nerves in which he bullied France by mobilizing German troops towards the French borders. He also manipulated articles, newspapers and made speeches in Germany to indicate a possibility of another war with France. However, when Britain and Russia threatened to assist France, Bismarck abandoned the war threats against France as a man of peace. Although Bismarck stopped threatening France, he

nevertheless succeeded in intimidating/bulling France and more so Britain and Russia did not ally with France and hence France remained isolated, as Bismarck wanted.

5) The Balkan crisis of 1875-1878

Between 1875- 1878, Bismarck successfully resolved the Balkan crisis in the Berlin congress of 1878.

The Balkan states of Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro revolted against unfair political, social, economic and religious policies of Turkey. Russia assisted them and Turkey was defeated. Russia then forced Turkey to sign the Sanstefeno treaty of March 1878 in which the big Bulgaria was created and independence was given to the Balkan states of Romania, Bessarabia, Bosnia, Herzegovina etc under, Russians' patronage. This threatened Britain and Austria's political and economic interests in the Balkans.

They condemned Russian's illegal action in the Balkans but Bismarck kept Germany out of the conflict as a man of peace. By remaining neutral, Bismarck avoided conflicts with the contending parties i.e. Britain, Austria and Russia.

However, when Britain and Austria reached a decision to fight Russia, Bismarck turned round and involved Germany in the conflict. His fears were that it would undermine Germany's external trade and give France chance to secure alliance against Germany. That was why he called the Berlin congress of 1878 for a diplomatic settlement. He succeeded because the conflicting powers i.e. Britain, Austria and Russia attended and the Balkan crisis was settled under his chairmanship. Thus, Russian's Imperialism in the Balkans that was a threat to European peace was successfully contained. The congress was a diplomatic victory that maintained the European balance of power in favour of Germany and Bismarck.

By calling the conference and settling the Balkan problems diplomatically, Bismarck avoided war in Europe as a true man of peace.

Bismarck also used the conference to isolate France and divert her attention from recovering Alsace and Lorraine. He supported the French occupation of Tunisia in order to make her compensate for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and refrain from fighting Germany. He did this with yet another aim of conflicting and hence isolating France from Italy since they were rivals over Tunisia. Bismarck succeeded and that is why Italy joined the dual alliance, which became triple alliance in 1882.

6) The Dual alliance of 1879

In 1879, Bismarck formed the Dual alliance to consolidate the Austro-German friendship as a result of the collapse of the Dreikaiserbund at the Berlin congress of 1878. Bismarck's biasness against Russia at Berlin moved Russia closer to France and there was a possibility of a Franco-Russian alliance against Germany. Bismarck therefore hoped to use the alliance as a tool to block a Franco-Russian alliance.

According to the terms of the Dual alliance, Austria promised to assist Germany if France and Russia or Russia and any other power jointly attack Germany but to remain neutral in case France alone attacks Germany. On the other hand, Germany promised to assist Austria in case Russia or France plus any other power attacks Austria but to remain neutral if Russia alone attacks Austria. These terms and conditions scared Russia from joining France to fight either Germany or Austria as an achievement for Bismarck.

The alliance was constantly renewed up to 1914 as a sign of success.

To some extent, the Dual alliance was for the Austro-German interests against France and Russia. But to another extent, it was for the general welfare, peace and prosperity of Europe. This was because a Franco-Russian alliance that Bismarck blocked was bound to cause war to Germany, Britain or both of them. This is because France had bitter relations with Germany to which she (France) would have used Russia to fight Germany while Russia had bad relations with Britain over the Balkans to which she would have used France in a war against Britain. Thus, Bismarck remains a man of peace and consolidated Germany's supremacy.

7) The triple alliance of 1882

In 1882, Bismarck admitted Italy in the Dual alliance which became the triple alliance. He wanted to bring Italy to his camp, frustrate any possibility of France-Italian alliance and convince Italy to leave Tunisia for France in order to divert France's attention from Alsace and Lorraine. Bismarck was successful because the three powers, i.e. Italy, Germany and Austria signed the agreement. They pledged to support one another if attacked by a non-member especially France or Russia. By this agreement,

France remained isolated and there was peace because the members promised to co-operate with one another and block an alliance between France and Russia. Bismarck therefore, takes the credit for his skills and shrewdness in managing a complicated network of alliance as a way of isolating France, maintaining European's peace and consolidating

Germany's supremacy. This is why Denis Richards remarked of Bismarck as a clever juggler who could keep five very costly plates, Austria- Hungary, Italy, France, Russia and Britain spinning through the air. The plates were always in danger of being smashed and injuring the juggler in the process but Bismarck's skills was such that the disaster never occurred.

The fact that Bismarck's downfall was majorly due to internal differences with Kaiser William and not through the net-work of alliances is a proof of the worth of this statement.

NB The triple alliance was to be kept secret and was to be renewed after every five years. However Italy made it clear that her position in the alliance was not to fight Britain i.e. for the fear of jeopardizing (endangering) her cordial relationship with Britain. This is part of the reason why Italy quitted the alliance and fought on the side of the Triple entente in the First World War. All the same, Bismarck is credited for bringing a diplomatic union of European powers (Germany, Austria and Italy) that stretched from the Baltic Sea in the North to the Adriatic Sea in the south hence maintaining European peace.

It should be acknowledged that Bismarck renewed the triple alliance in 1887. The alliance was extended to include Rumania that had signed separate defensive agreements with all the triple alliance powers between 1883-1887. In the agreement, Germany was to support Italy in Tripoli against France which Italy offered to assist Germany against France in Europe and Austria agreed to recognize Italian interest in the Balkans all these left France increasingly isolated, unable to trouble Germany maintained the balance of power and consolidated German supremacy in European politics.

NB) One has to note that Bismarck had successfully used the alliance to isolate France and maintain peace in Europe. It was Kaiser William II misused the alliance system that enabled France to ally with Britain and Russia, which contributed to the outbreak of World War I.

8) The renewed Dreikaiserbund (three emperors League) October 1881.

In spite of the triple alliance, Bismarck was not yet convinced that the isolation of France was complete etc.

There was still a threat of a Franco-Russian alliance that would take him back to square number one. This is why he negotiated with the new Tsar Alexander III and renewed the Dreikaiserbund (three emperors League) in October 1881. It was to be a secret and military alliance for three years. The

three emperors of Austria, Germany and Russia promised to remain neutral in a war involving any of them and a fourth power. They also agreed that one of the members was to mediate in a dispute or war involving the other two members of the league. To fully consolidate the Dreikaiserbund, Bismarck duped (deceived) Tsar

Alexander II that he would support the resurrection of the big Bulgaria that was dismantled at the 1878 Berlin conference. This alliance was a success because it settled Bismarck's fears and brought Russia and Austria back to around table in spite of their differences and quarrels in the Balkans. This preserved peace in Europe because it stopped the possibility of a Franco-Russian alliance either against Germany or Austria. It also meant that Austria would not support Britain against Russia and this guarded against magnifying local tension to war.

9) The scramble and partition of Africa and the Berlin congress of 1884-1885

During the scramble and partition of Africa, Bismarck was initially adamant for territories Africa. His reaction to pressure from the German colonial pressure groups was that: -My map of Africa lies in Europe. Here is Russia and there is France and we are in the middle that is my map for Africa.

Bismarck avoided colonies because it would antagonize British imperial interests and result into an alliance between Britain and France against Germany. He preferred to remain in Europe, maintain the balance of power and consolidate German supremacy. He also fore saw that intensive colonisation would require Germany to have a large well-equipped naval force which would provoke the British hostility.

This would provide France with the strongest ally i.e. Britain. Bismarck therefore avoided conflicts and proved his worth as a man of peace.

Nevertheless, Bismarck was forced by pressure from the industrialists to become a "colonial chancellor".

The industrialists argued Bismarck to acquire colonies for raw materials, markets, investments and for resettling the excess population. Bismarck succumbed to this pressure and entered the scramble and partition of Africa. He colonized Togo, Cameroon, Namibia and Tanganyika that later benefited Germany in terms of raw materials, markets, investment and settlement of the excess population.

It should be noted that Bismarck avoided conflicts during the scramble and partition because such conflicts would offer France alliance against

Germany. He even avoided further conflicts with France and that is why he supported France in Tunisia. It's also for the same reason that he avoided territories close to France but chose the ones next to those of Britain. For instance, he colonized Cameroon next to British Niger plus Togo that were adjacent to the British Ghana and Tanganyika that was close to the British colonies of Uganda and Kenya. These are evidences of Bismarck as a man of peace and a successful states man.....

However, when the scramble and partition of Africa threatened to cause war amongst the European powers, Bismarck called the 1884 - 1885 Berlin congress to settle colonial conflicts and cause other European powers to recognize Germany's colonies. He settled colonial disputes between the major conflicting powers (Britain, France, Belgium, Germany and Portugal) that compromised. The conference designed guidelines for the partition of Africa and that was why the partition of Africa was achieved without recourse to war. This is the surest evidence that Bismarck was a man of. Peace between 1871 -

1890. Indeed, the conference raised Bismarck to the level of an international diplomat and made France to stop dreaming about securing alliance and fighting a war of revenge against Germany. This is because there was no way France could successfully fight or ally against the only person who had made the whole exercise of the partition of Africa peaceful.

10) The renewed Bulgarian crisis of 1885-1887

Bismarck successfully resolved the renewed Bulgarian crisis of 1885-1887. In 1885, the dissected Bulgaria united once more in a big state (Bulgaria united with East Rumania). The united Bulgarians elected Ferdinand Soxe Coburg as their ruler, which Tsar Alexander III did not only oppose but was prepared to throw out of the Bulgarian throne by force. Austria, Britain and Italy united to oppose Russian intensions because it was seen as an attempt to revive Russian imperial interest in Bulgaria. The threat of war between Russia on one hand against Austria, Britain and Italy on the other hand became so great that Bismarck decided to intervene. Consequently, in 1888, he published the 1879 Dual alliance that bonded Germany to assist Austria in case of war against Russia plus any other power. This forced Russia to cowardly give up her ambitions of ousting Ferdinand Soxe Coburg from the Bulgarian throne leaving Bulgaria an independent state free from Russian and Turkish influence.

11) The Mediterranean agreements

The Mediterranean agreements were very influential treaties in Bismarck's foreign policy. Aware of the diplomatic complications/problems from the succession of Ferdinand to the Bulgarian throne, Bismarck carried out a series of dialogue with the parties concerned i.e. Britain, Italy and Austria from 1886-1888.

This resulted into the first and second Mediterranean agreements of March 1886 and Dec 1887 respectively. In these agreements, Austria, Britain and Germany were to support Turkey in case of any aggression from Russia. Italy was to support British interest in Egypt and Britain was to support Italian interest in North Africa. These agreements provided the basis for co-operation in maintaining peace in the Mediterranean region, Turkish Empire and the Balkans. They helped to consolidate Germany's supremacy and isolate France in European diplomatic circles.

12) Maintenance of the balance of power

Bismarck also maintained the balance of power between Germany and Britain by avoiding building a strong navy. After 1871, Germany took over from France as a land power and Britain remained a sea power. Bismarck preserved the status quo by pursuing a cautious naval and military policy that did not challenge the British naval superiority. This helped to promote harmony between Britain and Germany, avoid arms race, maintain the balance of power and relative peace prevailed in Europe.

13) The Re-insurance treaty of 1887

By 1887, the Dreikaiserbund had completely outlived its usefulness and Russia was on the verge of making an alliance with France against Germany. The way Bismarck and Austria handled events in the Balkan to the disfavour of Russia made it impossible for Russia to accept the renewal of the Dreikaiserbund, The Russian newspapers started to advocate for an alliance with France against Germany.

While in France the radical politicians led by General Boulanger were advocating for a Franco-Russian alliance against Germany. Bismarck in a desperate move made a secret Re-insurance treaty in 1887 with Tsar Alexander III of Russia. Russia and Germany agreed to be neutral in case of war with any other power but not when Austria attacks Russia or France attacks Germany. The Re-insurance treaty blocked a Franco-Russian alliance, left France fantastically isolated and unable to wage a war of revenge because the powers that mattered i.e. Britain, Italy, Austria - Hungary, Russia etc were either hostile to France or in "Bismarck's camp". It

should be noted that by completely isolating France and avoiding her war of revenge, Bismarck maintained peace in Europe.

All in all, Bismarck had by 1890 greatly succeeded in fulfilling his aims and objectives. He had perfectly isolated France and avoided a war of revenge, maintained the 1871 Frankfurt treaty, consolidated Germany's supremacy and maintained peace in Europe. Although his policies generally favoured Germany at the expense of France and other powers, to a smaller extent, it favoured other powers either intentionally or accidentally.

Although Bismarck played the most significant role in preserving European peace between 1871 -1890, it should be noted that other factors also supplemented his role. The first is the co-operation and support of King William I. The king supported Bismarck's policies and programs in domestic and foreign affairs and this gave Bismarck an easy task to maintain European peace. The fact that Bismarck failed to work with the new king Kaiser William II signifies that king William I was a real "blessing" to Bismarck, Bismarck also took advantage of the low skills and intelligence of King William I and overshadowed him in decision making. This was because Bismarck's skills and intellectual ability was above that of the king

And that was why he other than the king dominated domestic as well as foreign affairs.

The scramble and partition for colonies also favoured Bismarck's role. It diverted attention of European powers towards Africa and the Balkans and left Bismarck who had little interest in colonies to dominate European affairs. It led to colonial conflicts between France and other powers and made it difficult for France to secure allies. For instance, France conflicted with Britain, Italy and Belgium in Africa. She also confronted Russia in the Balkans and yet these are the powers that could have allied with her. Above all, the colonial conflicts gave Bismarck an opportunity to call the Berlin conferences of 1884 - 1885 and 1878 through which he settled colonial disputes and maintained peace.

The co-operation and support of other powers also complemented Bismarck's role in Europe. By 1890, there was no international organization to maintain peace and so Bismarck survived on the good will and co-operation of Britain, Austria, Italy, and to some extent Russia. These powers supported Bismarck's policies that were geared towards peace. This was shown at the two Berlin conferences.

Lastly, Bismarck was favoured by the weakness of France. France that was Bismarck's number one enemy adopted a republication government that was hated by despotic governments of Austria, Russia and even the liberal Britain. Worst of all, the third French Republic was very unstable and was faced by great challenges like the Panama Canal scandal, Dreyfus case, the Boulangist movement just to mention but the most notables. These internal problems made it difficult for France to harmonise her foreign policy and get allies to revenge against Germany.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

FAILURES, WEAKNESSES, NEGATIVE ROLE OF BISMARCK IN EUROPE

i) The loophole of the 1871 Frankfurt treaty

The 1871 Frankfurt treaty had its own weaknesses. It was too punitive and severe to France in as far as it imposed a heavy war indemnity of £200M and an army of occupation on her. It also formalized the creation of the German Empire at the expense of two mineralized French territories i.e. Alsace and Lorraine.

It should be noted that France's desire to recover Alsace and Lorraine became a big issue and was partly responsible for the formation of the rival triple entente in 1907 that made the outbreak of World War 1 inevitable.

ii) The collapse of the Second French Empire and instability in the third French republic Bismarck was greatly responsible for the downfall of the Second French Empire and instability in the third French republic. During the Unification, Bismarck schemed a war to defeat France as the last enemy in the path of German unification. In 1871, the then Prussian troops defeated France at the battle of Sedan upon which Napoleon III of France was exiled. Thereafter, Bismarck supported the establishment of the third French republic that replaced the second French Empire. After this, he went ahead to support opposition against the third French republic in order to create internal instability that would preoccupy

France and make it difficult for her to strengthen her diplomatic relations with other powers. Thus, one can rightly blame Bismarck for contributing to

the overthrow of the Second French Empire and instability that rocked the third French republic.

iii) Anti Semitism

Bismarck promoted anti Semitic feelings and sentiments against the Jews in Europe. In 1880's, Jewish traders and National Liberal Party allied and waged a serious campaign against Bismarck's policy of protectionism in favour of a free trade policy. Bismarck used anti-Semitic propaganda in the mass media, public functions and parliament to fight and isolate the Jews. In the propaganda, he emphasized that the Jews were non-Germans and did not have any right in Germany. Consequently, the Jews were systematically isolated, over taxed, and persecuted. This was the genesis of anti-Jewish sentiments in Germany that was fully executed by Hitler and Mussolini during the Second World War.

iv) Anti catholic policies

Bismarck's anti catholic sentiments brought him into loggerheads with Catholics in Germany and Pope

Pius IX. He favoured his Protestant Prussians to the disadvantage of Catholics in the German Empire. This partly prompted the Pope in 1870 to issue the dogma of Papal Infallibility that Bismarck denounced. He

(Bismarck) thereafter enacted the falk laws of 1873, 1874 and 1875 through which he suppressed Catholicism. It was accomplished through arrest, imprisonment, exile and harassment of catholic priests, bishops, catechists and die hard Catholics. This destroyed freedom of worship and created a lot bitterness in the Catholics and the Pope that was cooled down in 1879 when a new Pope Leo III reconciled with Bismarck.

v) The war of nerves

The war of nerves created a lot of unnecessary tension and instability in Europe. It worsened the already poor relationship between France and Germany. It also attracted Britain and Russia who openly declared their support of France against Germany. The war of nerves also broke Germany's diplomatic relationship with Britain and Russia and made it hard to convince Russia to renew the Dreikaiserbund. This is a clear indication that Bismarck failed to isolate republican France from the Monarchical governments of Europe. The war demonstrates Bismarck's failure in consolidating German supremacy and maintaining European peace. In

other words, Bismarck's war of nerves against France for no genuine reason disqualifies him from being a man of peace from 1871 - 1890.

vi) The 1878 Berlin congress

The 1878 Berlin congress also had its own weaknesses and failures. It made it impossible to renew the Dreikaiserbund treaty because it left Russia very bitter since Bismarck supported Turkey, Britain and Austria against her (Russia). Thus, the Dreikaiserbund was officially ended at the Berlin congress of 1878 when Bismarck openly supported Britain and Austria against Russia. The Congress also worsened the fragile relationship between Austria and Russia and made Russia out of frustration to pursue a more aggressive policy towards the Ottoman Empire including supporting Serbia in the Balkans. It strengthened Serbian nationalism that destabilized the Balkans and climaxed in the outbreak of the First World War. It also shows Bismarck's failure given the fact that the Dreikaiserbund was to be renewed after every 4 years.

vii) Neglect of the forces of liberalism and nationalism in the Balkans

Bismarck ignored the forces of liberalism and nationalism in the Balkans which contributed to instability in Europe. The Berlin congress of 1878 neglected the forces of liberalism and nationalism by subjecting Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria's control. This paved way for Austro-Russian hostility that resulted into Russian support to Serbia and a renewed Austro-German alliance that destabilized European peace. It also triggered off militant/violent Slav nationalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina against Austrian imperialism that was responsible for the Sarajevo assassination, which began the First World War.

viii) Russian imperialism

Bismarck is also criticized for encouraging Russian imperialism, which destabilized European peace. He had earlier on promised to assist Russia to violate the 1856 black Sea clause during the unification, which intensified Russian imperialism that climaxed in the creation of the big Bulgaria with a lot of destructions.

After this, the same Bismarck turned round and promised to help Russia to revise the big Bulgaria in 1881, which still made Russia more aggressive towards the Ottoman Empire in favour of the Balkan states. This made the Balkans a historical storm center for the explosion of World War 1.

ix) Escalation of colonial conflicts

Bismarck is also blamed for promoting colonial conflicts between France and other powers as a strategy of isolating her (France) in Europe. He stirred colonial conflicts between Italy and France over Tunisia and Libya, Britain and France over Egypt. These caused unnecessary tension not only between Italy and France but also other powers that were interested in colonizing Tunisia and other parts of North Africa.

Thus, Bismarck fell short of being a perfect man of peace in Europe.

x) Isolation of France

Bismarck's foreign policy was primarily concerned with isolation of France amongst European powers. He thus created a network of complicated alliances such as the three Emperor's League of 1872, the dual alliance of 1879 and the reinsurance treaty of 1887. Even the terms of the 1878 Berlin congress were partly influenced by Bismarck's personal interest to isolate France eg the French occupation of Tunisia was meant to conflict France with Italy and keep her isolated. The isolation of France therefore led to suspicion, bitterness, secret diplomacy and dubious alliances that undermined European diplomacy.

xi) Creation of division and antagonism

Bismarck created division and antagonism in Europe through a net work of alliances. Some of the alliances he made later were dubious and contradicted earlier ones e.g. the 1879 Dual alliance consolidated Austro-German alliance against the Dreikaisebund of 1872. The 1887 Reinsurance treaty was a secret dealing with Russia that was against the renewed Draikaiserbund of 1881. Such contradicting alliances caused suspicion, fear, rivalry and panic in other European powers and hence war fever. Besides, alliances such as the Dual alliance were defensive where Bismarck was preparing for war, which undermines his status as a man of peace. All these were responsible for the formation of rival alliances, which led Europe to the First World War.

NB. Although Bismarck is highly rated for maintaining European peace using a network of alliances, he is nevertheless accused of creating a complicated and dubious foreign policy, which neither Kaiser William II nor his successors could manage. No wonder that after Bismarck's downfall, counter alliances were formed leading to suspicion, tension and antagonism that climaxed into the outbreak of World War I.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE DOWNFALL OF BISMARCK, 1890

From 1871-1890, Bismarck was significant in German as well as European affairs. He had a cordial relationship with King William I who supported his policies and programs. Bismarck took pride in the fact that he was the most faithful servant of William I. However, King William I died in 1888, which became the beginning of the end of Bismarck. He was succeeded by his son Frederick who was already sick of Cancer and died after ruling for only 3 months. Frederick was in turn replaced by his 27-year-old son, William who became known as Kaiser William II.

The young, inexperienced and ambitious William II considered Bismarck as a man who had outlived his usefulness and was therefore not prepared to work with him. On the other hand, Bismarck considered himself the maker of Germany and felt that he still had a great role to play. But right from the beginning, William II indicated that he was not going to tolerate Bismarck's influence over state affairs. He said; it's not easy to work under such a chancellor, I will first let the old man sniffle for six months. Then I will rule myself.

The root cause of conflict between Bismarck and King William was that William was not ready to tolerate Bismarck's domination of German Politics. To quote him; There is only one master in this country and I am he. I shall suffer no other besides me.

Thus, there were serious disagreements and tensions between Bismarck and King William I that made Bismarck to resign in March 1890. Bismarck called his resignation a first class funeral & said; my dismissal was not a new thing of yesterday. I had seen it coming. The Emperor wished to be his own Chancellor. Soon or later he will learn from experience. Indeed, Kaiser William II learnt from experience when he was defeated and forced into exile in 1919, which also led to the collapse of the German Empire.

CAUSES OF BISMARCK'S DOWNFALL

1. The Death of King William I and the rise of William II laid foundation for the downfall of Bismarck.

King William I died in 1888 and was replaced by Fredrick who was in turn replaced by William II in the same year. William I had great respect for Bismarck and greatly supported his policies. However, the new King William II was a young, inexperienced and ambitious man who was out rightly determined to uproot Bismarck from German politics. He said, 'I will first let the old man sniffle for six months then I will rule myself.' Bismarck's response was that the young man wants to be his own Chancellor & with these he parted company with King William and resigned. This was inevitable because William II considered Bismarck an outdated statesman & it's a natural phenomenon that a young & inexperienced leader would not be tolerant to an old and ageing politician.

2. Bismarck's internal policies also contributed to his downfall. Bismarck persecuted the Catholics, liberals and the socialists who paid him by supporting the new King William II against him. Apart from this, Bismarck's Iron hand against opposition made him to be in loggerheads with King William II.

Bismarck wanted to continue using force, intimidation, imprisonment and repression against internal opponents most especially the socialists. This was rejected by the liberal King William II who preferred dialogue other than force against the opposition. This brought a domestic wrangle between Bismarck and King William, which forced Bismarck to resign.

3. Bismarck's downfall was also due to conflict with King William II on foreign affairs. Bismarck wanted to maintain diplomatic relations with both Austria and Russia while William II preferred Austria to Russia.

William II believed that a lasting German understanding with Russia was impossible and a dangerous dilution and refused to renew the re-insurance treaty. He also wanted Germany and Austria to have strong influence in the Balkans irrespective of Russian and British interests. Bismarck opposed this because it would give France an opportunity to ally with Britain and Russia against Germany. This prompted Bismarck to resign on 29th March 1890.

4. Kaiser William II's aggressions and reckless ambitions also forced Bismarck into resignation. William II wanted to defeat Britain and make Germany both a land and sea power. He openly declared our future lies on the sea. He preferred colonialism, imperialism and the building of a powerful navy. This was expressed at his coronation when he remarked; Germany must become a great colonial power. She must show the world that her energies

and achievements are second to none great power must grow or die. Bismarck protested Kaiser's ambitions arguing that it could provoke the hostility of Britain and Russia to the advantage of France. This disagreement conditioned Bismarck's resignation and hence downfall in 1890.

5. Exhaustion, fatigue and old age also contributed to the downfall of Bismarck. Bismarck had worked so hard to unify Germany and control Europe that by 1890 he was suffering from fatigue and exhaustion which made him less effective. He withdrew from Berlin and spent most of his time at the country house where he transacted state affairs. This isolated him from Ministers, other government officials and the King, which made him unpopular leading to his downfall.

6. It should be noted that Bismarck had anointed and groomed his son, Herbert Bismarck to replace him.

He had trained Herbert in state affairs and made him to work as foreign Secretary since 1886. His withdrawal from Berlin was to give Herbert opportunity to fit in to his shoes under his close supervision and direction. Although Herbert Bismarck tried to be like his father, his manners were insufferable (too extreme to be tolerated or unbearable). The Germans were prepared to move with Bismarck and rejected the bad mannered Herbert as his successor. This intensified opposition against Bismarck, which led to his resignation and downfall.

7. King William II's violation of the German constitution by taking over the foreign affairs ministry left Bismarck in an awkward situation. Bismarck reminded him that the German constitution provided that the chancellor alone was entitled to advise the king. William II reacted by telling Bismarck to advise him to change the constitution. William was determined to see and learn everything on his own instead of getting lessons & lectures from Bismarck. He made personal visits to St. Petersburg, Vienna, London, Athens and Constantinople, which were to be done by Bismarck. These visits enabled William to think independently about Germany's foreign Policy. Bismarck resented his foreign trips and expressed his disapproval by resigning.

8. The most immediate incident that led to the downfall of Bismarck was disagreement with Kaiser William II over the 1890 general elections. In the elections, more social democrats were elected to the parliament unlike before, i.e. From 12 in 1877 to 35 in 1890. Bismarck wanted to take a more serious course to deal with the growing strength of the party. However, King William who wanted to unite all 3 Germans behind him rejected his plans in

favour of a more tolerant policy. This made Bismarck to believe that he no longer has a place in German politics and consequently resigned.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

BACKGROUND

The Eastern Question refers to the 19th Century problematic and often violent events in the Balkans that arose from the decline of Turkey, the rise of Balkan nationalism and the involvement of the great powers in the Balkan-Turkish affairs. Dr. Mill called it "the problem of filling the vacuum caused by the decline of the Turkish Empire in Europe". The Question can broadly be expressed as; who was going to take Over from Turkey, where, when, how and to what extent? The attempt to answer these questions involved the European powers in a series of quagmires, quarrels and wars that left the Eastern Question unanswered until the Versailles settlement of 1919.

From the 14th to 17th centuries, Turkey made great conquests and created a great empire. The empire stretched from the borders of Russia and Austria in the north through Asia Minor, Syria, North Africa (Maghreb), and Mediterranean Sea islands of Crete, Cyprus, Malta etc. In the Balkans, it included Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Wallacia, Moldavia, Macedonia, Transylvania etc. The Turks had built a large empire at Constantinople and the Sultans of Turkey were very influential in European affairs.

The empire surrounded areas that were of great political, social, economic, strategic and religious significance to European powers. The black and the Mediterranean seas were areas of great Economic and strategic interests. Bethlehem was a social and religious centre of the world. The smaller Balkan states were important for imperial & colonial ambitions of the great powers. This explains why there were convergent and conflicting interference by Western European powers like Britain, France, Russia, Austria, Prussia and later Germany.

It was a heterogeneous empire composed of people of different races, religion, language, culture & customs. These diverse nationalities were subjected to the Ottoman rule by force against their will. It therefore

needed an efficient military force and administrative control to maintain unity and harmony within the empire. This is because any laxity in the military and administrative control would give chance for the conquered states to fight for their independence, which would lead to the disintegration of the empire.

However in the 19th Century, Turkey "lost her energy" and drastically declined. This was due to political, economic, military and administrative weaknesses. Tsar Nicholas II based on these to describe Turkey as a sick man of Europe. Generally, Turkey's sickness or weaknesses were due to internal and external factors.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE DECLINE/ WEAKNESS OF TURKEY

1. The loss of Turkey's military power was responsible for the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. From the 14th -17th Centuries, Turkey was a world military power and had an extensive empire that included the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa. But towards the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th Century, Turkey lost her military glory. She had a cosmopolitan array that disciplining and integrating under one command became impossible. Consequently, the army lost its effectiveness and could not hold the different nationalities together as a sign of weakness. Even her former subject states like Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria and Greece became more powerful and started disobeying the sultan like the way Mohamed Ali (Egypt) and the Greeks did. In fact, Turkey became so sick (weak) that she had to be assisted in suppressing internal revolts like in the Syrian question.

2. Administrative problem was one issue that contributed to the crumbling of the Ottoman Empire.

Turkey had created a heterogeneous empire that covered the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa. These were people of different historical, cultural, and linguistic background that were difficult to hold under a centralized administration. The empire was therefore too large to be ruled led by any single power or person.

Eventually, the sultans were less effective outside Constantinople and this left the conquered states semi-independent. This made it easier for the conquered states to revolt against the Sultan, which led to the disintegration of the empire.

3. Corruption and embezzlement were diseases that characterized Turkey a sick man of the 19 Century.

The Turks Moslem administrators were "potbellied men" who made bribery, swindling and embezzlement part of their life style. These brought financial crisis, poverty and famine upon which Turkey was branded a sick man of Europe. Corruption & embezzlement also made the conquered states to lose hope in the government and that is part of the reason why the Greeks and the Moreans broke off. It also affected the army who also lost confidence on the government, which undermined the government the full loyalty of the army.

4. The rise of nationalism was a formidable challenge that tore the Turkish Empire into pieces. Due to political, Economic and military weaknesses of the Ottoman Empire, the conquered states started struggling to regain their independence and many succeeded. For example, Serbia and Egypt became independent in 1805, Algeria in 1811, Greece in 1832 and some Balkan states in 1878. The breaking away of these states one after another weakened Turkey and was the actual disintegration of the empire.

5. Economically, the Ottoman Empire was weakened by loss of trade control. Before 1760, Turkey was the leading commercial and sea-faring nation. She monopolized trade within the empire and across the Mediterranean and Baltic seas. However, industrial revolution started in Britain in the 1860s and Britain started manufacturing better ships than Turkey. Eventually, Britain destroyed Turkish dominance in trade and monopolized international trade. This left Turkey in an awkward economic situation and made her a laughing stock of Europe" to be branded the "sick man of Europe".

6. Religious tension between the Moslems and Christians within the Ottoman Empire also brought about the disintegration of the empire. The Christian majority within the empire were discriminated in Education, administration and heavily taxed with inhuman methods of collection. Above all Christians were persecuted by the Moslem rulers of the empire. This brought rebellion such as in Greece, Morea, Chios and Bulgaria which left Turkey weak. It should be noted that Turkey's persecution of Christians attracted the intervention of Christian powers like Russia, Britain, Austria and

France whose intervention complicated the issue and led to the success of revolts like in Greece and Bulgaria.

7. The spread and influence of the French revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty and fraternity also contributed to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. By the 19th Century these revolutionary ideas had spread to Europe including the Turkish Empire. It influenced the Turkish subjects to demand for Liberty and independence against the Turks' oppressive and exploitative administration. This led to revolts such as in Greece, Wallacia, Moldavia and Bulgaria which shook the empire and led to its collapse.

8. The rise and role of educated elites and intellectuals was influential in the decline of the Ottoman Empire. They were young, revolutionary and dynamic men who condemned Turkish oppressive and exploitative regime. They advocated for reforms and independence to the conquered states. These created revolutionary emotions in the minds of the oppressed and exploited Turks subjects, which prompted them to revolt and break the empire. Intellectuals such as Hypslanti and Capodistrious led the Greeks to revolt against Turkey, which made the Greeks independent by 1832. Thus, the role and inspiration of Intellectuals widened the gap between Turkey and her subjects and made the disintegration of Ottoman Empire inevitable.

9. Lastly, the Ottoman Empire was weakened by the selfish and convergent interest of European big powers. Britain rivaled Turkey in order to dominate international trade. Austria, France and Britain wanted Turkish powers and influence to be reduced and act as a bull work against Russian imperialism.

Russia wanted to conquer and dominate the Balkans and that is why she coined the idea that Turkey was a sick man that could not be cured by any quantity of drugs. She incited and supported the Greeks, Wallacians, Moldavians, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Serbians, and Bulgarians to revolt against Turkey.

These revolts weakened Turkey economically, militarily and led to the collapse of the empire.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

SIGNIFICANCE AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE WEAKNESS OF TURKEY TO EUROPE

1. Turkey's weakness affected the standard of living and welfare of her subjects. She lost her trade monopoly and there was acute financial crisis due to corruption and embezzlement by her officials.

Consequently there was poor standard of living, inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation.

2. The decline of Turkey provided opportunity for her subjects who were forcefully conquered to revolt for their independence. For instance the Greeks revolted and became independent in 1831, the Moldavians, Wallacians in 1856 & Bulgarians in 1878. This was because these states could not remain under Turkey's oppression when the very force that brought them under Turkey ceased to exist in the 19th Century.

3. The disintegration of Turkey led to the final collapse of the congress system. The Greeks exploited Turkey's weakness to revolt for independence. This divided the congress powers into two and practically ended the idea of the congress system i.e. France, Britain and Russia supported the Greeks while Austria and Prussia sympathized with Turkey.

4. The gradual disappearance of Turkey from the map of Europe made European powers to converge and conflict within 'the empire. Britain, France, Russia, Austria and Prussia had commercial, political, economic, social and strategic interests to satisfy and all wanted to safeguard their interests especially that Turkey was "dying". This made the Balkans an international storm centre for the explosion of catastrophic wars such as the Crimean war and the First World War.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

EVENTS OF THE EASTERN QUESTION

1. THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE, 1821-1832

The Greek war of independence was the first phase of the Eastern Question that started in 1821 up to 1832. The Greeks were forcefully conquered and

incorporated in the Turkish Empire during the Century. This deprived the Greeks of their former position and privileges hitherto enjoyed in Europe and the World at large. The Greeks were forced to be under Turkish Moslem administrators. In spite of the privileges the Greeks enjoyed in the empire such as freedom of education and commerce, the Greeks rose up demanding for greater freedom and independence. The rebellion was therefore a nationalistic movement by the Greeks against Turkey in which religion was used as a tool of resistance against the Moslem Turks. It was due to political, economic, social and religious factors within and outside Greece.

CAUSES

1. The growth of Greek nationalism for independence was primarily responsible for the Greek revolt. The Turks had forcefully conquered the Greeks in the 14th century and the Greeks remained discontented longing for a day when they would liberate themselves from Turkish domination. Although the Greeks had much privileges and favours compared to other subjects within the Turkish Empire, they considered such concessions (privileges) as an appeasement that was intended to frustrate their attempt to regain their independence. When peaceful means could not bring forth their independence, the Greeks resorted to violence hence the Greek war of revolt.
2. Liberalism was also responsible for the outbreak of the revolution in Greece. The Turks who conquered the Greeks in the 14th century denied them basic rights and fundamental political, economic and social freedoms. Press freedom was violated by forbidding publication of newspapers. Other basic rights like freedom of the speech, association and movement were seriously restricted. This provided a long term disgruntlement that was used by Greek liberals and nationalists like and mobilize the Greeks for a revolution against the Turks.
3. The arrogance and superiority complex of the Ottoman administrators towards the Greeks forced the Greeks into the revolution. The Greeks bated the Turks for abusing them as an inferior race because they were conquered and calling them infidels because they were Christians. This made the Greeks who believed historically that they were a superior race and the mother of civilization to rise up for their freedom.
4. Taxation was yet another burning issue amongst the Greeks that caused the revolt. The Greeks were subjected to land tax and a tax on commerce which reduced their profit margins. They were also forced to living within

the Turkish Empire. Although these taxes were not exorbitant, the Greeks rejected them because the money was swindled by corrupt Turkish officials and very little was used to provide basic services. Besides, the tax defaulters were heavily punished to the extent of death, which arose the Greek concern for independence.

5. A sick man of Europe gave the Greeks the opportunity to rebel and regain their independence. Turkey had conquered the Greeks in the 14th Century but when her military and political control weakened in the 19th Century, the Greeks saw no reason of remaining under Turkish foreign domination. Besides, the Greeks had acquired naval supremacy and dominated the Ottoman navy.

It was this naval superiority over their masters that encouraged the Greeks to face the Turks in the war of independence.

6. The success of the French revolution of 1789 and the spread of the French revolutionary ideas to Western Europe also inspired the Greeks to revolt. Revolutionary ideas of equality, liberty, fraternity and nationalism were popularized throughout Europe by radical revolutionaries during the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. These revolutionary ideas were used by Greek nationalists to mobilize the Greeks to fight for their independence.

7. Influence of the Serbian revolt also inspired the Greeks to revolt by 1821. In 1804, the Serbians started a revolt against Turkey in demand for their independence. By 1817, they had successfully regained their independence under the leadership of Milosh from the obrenovitch ruling dynasty. This weakened Turkey's control of her subjects and provided a practical example for the Greeks of how to regain their independence. The Serbian success was used by Greek patriots and nationalists to mobilize the Greeks to begin the rebellion by 1821.

8. Other rebellions and violent events within the Ottoman Empire also contributed to the outbreak of the Greek revolt. Sultans Mehemet Ali of Egypt and Ali Pasha of Jenina had by 1821 revolted against Turkey and declared their independence. Mehemet Ali had declared himself Pasha of Egypt, conquered Sudan and Arabia. Ali Pasha had created his own independent state of Albania by amalgamating several states around Adriatic Sea. The activities and successes of Sultans Mehemet Ali and Ali Pasha weakened Ottoman Empire and morale boosted the Greeks to revolt and regain their independence.

9. The role of European powers was yet another instrumental factor in the Greek quest for independence.

In the past, Britain and France had tried to restrain Russia from inciting and assisting the Greeks but they turned round and started supporting the Greeks when they realized that Russia could not stop assisting the Greeks. Russia had religious interest of protecting fellow orthodox Greek Christians who were suffering persecution from the Turks. She also had political ambitions to have a lion's share from the crumbling Ottoman Empire. Russia had employed Capodistrious as her foreign minister and H5q5slanti as her army officer and used them to form the Heterophilika (Society of Friends) that began the revolt in 1821.

10. The weakness of the congress system encouraged the Greeks to revolt against Turkey. The congress system was established to maintain peace against the threatening forces of liberalism and nationalism.

However, by 1821 disagreement between the members had made it impossible to adopt a common policy against revolutions, which greatly threatened European peace. The Greeks were thus motivated by differences amongst the congress powers to launch a nationalistic war of independence against Turkey by 1821

11. Religious difference between the Greeks and the Turks also, contributed to the revolt. The Greeks were Christians and the Turks were Muslims, most of them were radicals. The Turks apart from under looking and discriminating Christians embarked on persecutions. This is why the 1822 Morean revolt was mobilized by a Bishop. The Turks heavy massacres of Christians in Morea, Chios, the hanging of Greek Orthodox patriarch and two bishops outside their Church on Easter Sunday aggravated the revolt. It attracted the sympathy and intervention of Christian powers like Russia, France and Britain who supported the Greeks in their movement for total liberty and independence.

12. The ancient culture and glory of the Greeks made them to develop a superiority complex that inspired them to revolt against the Turks. The Greeks were a highly educated and well-known people. They were the ones "who started Olympics, Arithmetic's and Civilization. Philosophers like Koreas emphasized that the Greeks were descendants of ancient Greece and inheritors of a great civilization. This provoked the Greek concern for independence. Besides, Greek writers like Constantine, Regas and Byron emphasized the Greek history i.e. how the Greeks were mothers of world knowledge and civilization and how they were unfairly brought under

inferior Turks due to historical accident. This consolidated the Greeks desire for independence and made them to start the war in 1821.

13. The evolution of a common Greek language in the 19th century also contributed to the outbreak of the Greek revolt. By 1821, Greek language had evolved into a single dialect and was popularity used by the Greeks. The new language integrated local vocabularies and broke down differences that existed between the Greek dialects. Patriotic and nationalistic songs, poems, drama and proverbs in Greek language were very popular amongst the Greeks. These consolidated the spirit of nationalism and patriotism that helped to bind /unite the Greeks to fight for their independence. The common language that evolved was used by Greek nationalists to sensitize the Greeks against Turkey's exploitation and oppression and mobilization for the revolt by 1821.

14. The privileges and prosperity of Greeks gave a stimulus to the revolt. The Greeks accumulated a lot of wealth from trade which led to the emergence of a powerful middle class who formed and financed the Heterophilika movement. The Greeks were also educated and some of them were holding sensitive positions in the army. For instance, Capodistrious was the Russian foreign minister and Hypslanti the leader of the Heterophilika was the Russian army officer. They used their political and military experiences in Russia to champion the Greek war of rebellion against the Turks. In Greece, some Greek children who were conscripted in the army, got promotion and experiences that were used for the revolt.

For example, the governors of Walachia and Moldavia were Greeks who used their positions to trigger the rebellion.

15. The formation of Heterophilika society (Society of Friends) was also responsible for the outbreak of the Greek war of independence. In 1814, Heterophilika, a secret society was formed by nationalistic Greeks at Oddessa to mobilize the Greeks to fight the Turkish oppressive rule and regain their independence. The society was also used to spread anti Turkish propaganda that helped to provoke revolutionary emotions of the Greeks to fight for their freedom. By 1821 the society had about 20,000 volunteers who began the rebellion.

16. Lastly, the rise and role of Greek nationalistic leaders was influential in sparking the rebellion.

Alexander Hypslanti and Capodistrious provided the leadership and secretly mobilized the Greeks through Heterophika for the rebellion.

Capodistrious was the Russian foreign minister and Hypslanti had served as the Russian army officer. They were thus supported by Tsar Alexander I and even used some Russian soldiers to trigger off the revolt in Moldavia and Wallacia, which gave the Greeks an open opportunity to revolt by 1821. Hypslanti became the overall leader of Heterophilika society through which he decampaigned the Ottoman rule and mobilized the Greeks for the revolt.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

1. The Greek intellectuals and nationalists stirred the nationalistic feelings of the Greeks by reviving the past historical glory of Greece. Greek writers and nationalists like Regas, Byron, Capodistrious and Hypslanti recapitulated (re-emphasized) how the Greeks were a superior race i.e. mother of knowledge and civilization and how they were accidentally brought under the inferior Turks. This rekindled the Greek desire for freedom.
2. The Greek revolutionary leaders used revolutionary ideas from Western Europe to instigate and mobilize the Greeks for war against the Turks. They argued the Greeks to take example from the Frenchmen who revolted and overthrew the despotic and oppressive rule of the Bourbon monarchy.
3. The Greek nationalists used a new model of Greek language that developed in the 19th century. The new language integrated local vocabularies and broke down differences that existed between the Greek dialects. Apart from providing unity, the new language became a medium of communication through which western revolutionary ideas circulated throughout Greece. It was also used in mobilizing and coordinating the revolt between 1821-1832.
4. The Greeks used external support from European big powers like Russia, France and Britain.

Capodistrius and Hypslanti who were employed in Russia solicited for Russian support that led to the establishment of a revolutionary society known as Heterophilika. France and Britain joined Russia and the three powers declared Greece totally independent in 1832.

5. Greek revolutionary leaders used religion as a tool of resistance against Turkey. Persecution of

Christians by Moslems was used by Greek nationalists to mobilize and unite the Greeks for the war of independence. Religious leaders preached against the Turks and incited the Greeks to revolt. This is why the first uprising in Morea (1821) was instigated by a Bishop.

6. The Greeks used Heterophilika which was a secret movement formed in 1814 by Hypslanti. This was a revolutionary movement that was used to spread revolutionary ideas to all the Greeks and mobilize them for the revolt. By 1821, the movement had mobilized about 20,000 volunteers who became the first fighting force for the revolution.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

COURSE

In Feb. 1821, Hypslanti with the Russian support organized a revolt in Moldavia and Walachia. He had two basic aims, first to liberate the two Islands before moving to Greece. Secondly, he wanted to divert the Turks attention to the two provinces and give the Greeks chance to declare their independence. Hypslanti massacred many Turkish officials and nationals. However, he lacked proper co-ordination and support from the people of Moldavia and Wallacia who were non-Greeks. Consequently, he was defeated and fled to Austria where he was imprisoned for 7years by Metternich.

Before the Moldavian revolt ended, a Greek Bishop and local agents of the Heterophilika (Society of Friends) started another revolt in Morea and the Augean Island in which they butchered 25,000 Moslems.

When this news reached the sultan of Turkey, he decided to give a tit for tat to the Greeks. He massacred about 30.000 Greeks in the Chios City (The Great Chios massacre) and Augean Islands. He crowned up by hanging the Bishop and 20 other Bishops in Constantinople on an Easter Sunday This was a terrible shock to the Greeks and Western European Christian powers. The Greeks resorted to a fierce civil war that the Turks failed to suppress.

In 1824 the Sultan of Turkey appealed to Mohammed Ali for military assistance because of continued Greek resistance and threat of Russian intervention. Mohammed Ali sent an Egyptian army commanded by his son Ibrahim Pasha. He conquered and destroyed Crete from the Greeks in 1824.

He also conquered Navarino and advanced to Morea hurrying, devastating and slaughtering thousands of Christians in all directions. Byron was slaughtered and Missolonghi was captured. This temporarily ended revolt and was a success for Sultan Mahmud II.

It should be noted that Russia had secretly been assisting the Greeks against Turkey and the 1822 Verona Congress failed to reach any solution over the Greek war of independence. In 1825, Tsar Alexander I called the St. Petersburg congress which apart from being attended by only four powers did not also come up with a resolution and left the powers more divided.

The massacres and slaughtering of Christians by Mohammed Ali through his son Ibrahim Pasha alarmed Europe and gave Russia the opportunity to openly assist the Greeks. It also changed the negative attitudes of Britain and France who also joined Russia in assisting the Greeks. Austria and Prussia sympathized with Turkey. In spite of such protests, Britain, France and Russia signed the 1827 London treaty in which Greece was granted internal self-rule under Turkish overlordship.

However the 1827 London treaty stipulated that force would be used if Turkey fails to accept the terms. Turkey declined to accept the terms with a deception that Austria and Prussia would support her consequently, joint British, Russian and French naval forces advanced and defeated fleet at Navarino Bay. Russia disregarded the British views and invaded Moldavia and Wallachia with Constantinople at the mercy of Russia. Turkey was forced to sign the treaty of Adrianople (1829) in which the Sultan recognized the Greek independence, but the Greeks were to continue paying annual tributes to Turkey.

However, the terms of the Adrianople treaty created some fear to Britain and France. The fear was that a semi-independent Greece would be a Russia's satellite in the Balkans and more so under the aggressive and imperialistic Tsar Nicholas I. They were also worried that the condition of annual tribute to the Sultan would give Russia an excuse to intervene in the Balkans if the Greeks fail to pay tributes in future. This made Britain, France (without Austria and Prussia) to pressurize Turkey to give unconditional independence to the Greeks at the 1830 London treaty. The powers

concerned offered the throne to Leopold Saxe Coburg who declined to take it. The offer was extended to Prince Otto of Bavaria who promptly accepted it. In 1832, Britain, France and this time Russia fixed and defined her boundaries and Greece became fully independent with Prince Otto of Bavaria as the first king (from Feb 1832).

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GREEK WAR OF REVOLT

Positive Impact

The war made the Greeks to regain their independence. The Turks had conquered the Greeks in the 14th century but the Greeks revolted and freed themselves from Turkish rule. They were assisted by France, Russia and Britain to get unconditional independence in 1832 under the leadership of Prince Otto of Bavaria.

2. The map of Europe was redrawn as a consequence of the Greek war of independence. The Greeks with assistance from the Russians, French and British defeated Turkey and were granted their independence by the London treaty of 1830. In 1832, Britain, France and Russia demarcated her (Greece) boarder and that of Ottoman Empire. This led to emergence of a new independent state of Greece on the map of Europe, which changed the map of Europe.

3. The revolt revived European diplomacy much as it divided the powers leading to the collapse of the concert of Europe. It threatened European peace and forced European powers to come together to solve the problem. This led to the calling of the congresses of Laibach in 1821, Verona in 1822, St. Petersburg in 1825 and the London conference in 1830. These were diplomatic meetings that were intended to peacefully address the Greek concern for independence.

Negative Impact

4. The Greek war of independence was one of the most destructive resistances that led to massive loss of lives and destruction of property. About 25,000 Turks and 30,000 Greeks were massacred in Morea and Chios

at the beginning of the revolt in 1821. Many more were killed at the battle of Navarino bay that included the French and the British who intervened on the Greeks' side. Besides, there was destruction & devastation of towns, cities and properties that included Chios, Morea, ports, farms and warships.

5. The Greek revolt finally led to the collapse of the congress system in Europe. It divided the congress powers at the congresses of Verona (1822) and St Petersburg (1825). The powers were divided into two i.e. Russia and later France and Britain who supported the Greeks against Austria and Prussia who protested such support and sympathized with Turkey. This was practically the end of the congress system in the history of Europe.

6. The success of the Greeks contributed to the rise of nationalism in Europe. It inspired other oppressed nationalities under Turkey to rise up for their freedom and independence. For instance, it encouraged the people of Moldavia and Wallacia in 1853 to revolt against Turkey, which led to the Crimean war. It is also what partly motivated the Bulgarians, Montenegro's and Bosnians to revolt from 1877-1878. All these revolts which were inspired by the Greek success attracted the intervention of European powers that made the Balkans the foundation of tension in Europe up to 1919.

Other than the Ottoman Empire, the Greek revolution also led to the outbreak of other revolutionary movements in Europe: The Greek success was a triumph of liberalism and nationalism against conservatism and imperialism. This inspired the outbreak of the 1830 revolutions in France, Belgium, Poland and 1848 revolutions in Hungary, German and Italian States.

7. The war exposed the selfish hidden ambitions of Western European powers towards the Ottoman Empire and the Balkans. Austria was against the revolt because it would inspire nationalistic uprising within her empire. Britain and France who had earlier on advocated for non-intervention changed and supported the Greeks due to their strategic, naval and economic interests in the Balkans. These would be jeopardized by Russia in case they didn't play a positive role in the struggle.

8. The Greek war of independence was responsible for the outbreak of the Syrian question that destabilized Europe from 1830-1841. In 1824, continued Greek resistance and the threat posed by Russian assistance forced Sultan Mohamood II to request Mehemet Ali of Egypt to help him suppress the resistance. Ali was to gain some territories that included Syria as a compensation for his assistance, which the Sultan declined to fulfill. The sultan's failure to reward Mohammed Ali for his assistance against the

Greeks made Mohammed Ali to forcefully occupy Syria, which resulted into war (with Turkey). It became a protracted war that involved other powers like Russia, Britain and France. It was only resolved in the straits convention of 1841.

9. The war intensified the persecution of Christians within the Ottoman Empire. During and after the rebellion, Turkey became more aggressive in dealing with its Christian minority race. For example, she executed over 30,000 Christians at Chios in 1821, a good number were equally slaughtered by Ibrahim Pasha and other radical Moslems. After the war. Sultan Mohamood ignored his promise of fair treatment to Christians and resorted to massacres such as in Moldavia and Wallacia (1853), Bulgaria and Macedonia (1877). These were intended to suppress the Christians so that they do not rise up to break away like the Greeks. However, such Massacres isolated Turkey from Western powers which favoured the success of such Christian minority against Turkey.

10. The Greek war of independence increased Russian negative influence in European as well as Balkan affairs. The 1829 treaty of Adrianople gave Russia commercial and territorial gains within the Ottoman Empire. The 1833 Unkier Skellesi treaty in which Turkey was placed under Russian military protection still favoured Russia. Russia also found it easier to pursue her imperial ambitions in Georgia, Eastern Armenia, Moldavia and Wallacia. All these revived Russian imperialism and ambitions within the Ottoman Empire that led to the outbreak of the Crimean war and instability in Europe up to 1914.

11. The Greek war also weakened Turkey and contributed to the disintegration of Ottoman Empire. It was the first event that was a proof of Turkey as a dying man of Europe. The wars like the 'battle of Navarino Bay of 1827 weakened Turkey militarily and economically. Above all the Greeks regained complete independence in 1832 and Turkey could no longer conscript and tax them. Worst of all, the success of the Greeks inspired other nationalities within the Ottoman Empire to rise and regain their independence from Turkey.

12. The Greek revolt had negative consequences on France and Louis Philippe. Louis Philippe's policy over the Greek war of independence was very inconsistent. At first he supported Mohammed Ali of Egypt against the Sultan of Turkey, which satisfied the interest of French liberals and glory seekers.

However, he withdrew such support due to pressure from Palmer stone, the British Prime minister.

Palmer stone went ahead and called the London conference to settle the problems without inviting France. This made Louis Philippe to lose popularity in Europe and France which contributed to his downfall by 1848.

13. Metternich was challenged and left isolated by the Greek war of independence. Metternich who had vowed to destroy the forces of liberalism and nationalism lost the battle when the Greeks attained their independence by 1832 with the support of Britain, France and Russia. By opposing the attainment of Greek independence, Metternich lost the confidence and diplomatic support of Britain, France and Russia. Thereafter it became impossible for him to hold the three powers in the "same thinking cup" through the congress system. Worst of all, the revolt inspired liberal and nationalistic movements within the Austrian Empire that contributed to the downfall of Metternich by 1848.

14. The success of the Greek war of independence also undermined the Vienna Settlement of 1815. The Vienna settlement ignored the forces of nationalism and liberalism in Greece against Turkish oppressive and exploitative rule. The success of the Greeks in overthrowing Turkish rule by 1832 showed how short sighted the Vienna peace makers were in handling the problems of Europe. The revolt was therefore a triumph of liberalism and nationalism over conservative forces of Europe.

15. The revolt created instabilities that disrupted European peace up to 1841. The outbreak of the revolt in 1821 antagonized Russia, Britain and France who supported the Greeks against Austria and Russia who were against the revolt. This created antagonism that destroyed the congress system, which was the only organization whose role was to maintain peace. The success of the Greeks also increased Russian imperialism and aggression that were consolidated by the treaties of Adrianople of 1829 and Unkier Skellessi of 1833. Above all, the revolt led to the outbreak of the Syrian war that disrupted European peace up to 1841 when the second London treaty was signed.

16. Lastly, the Greek war of independence resulted into the signing of the London treaty of 1830. The treaty disappointed Russia because it forced Turkey to grant an unconditional independence to the Greeks. Russia had hoped to use the condition of paying tributes by Greeks to Turkey to intervene in the Ottoman Empire incase conflict arose over payment of the tributes. This worsened the already poor relationship between Russia and

other powers leading to the straits convention of 1841, the Crimean war of 1854-56 and the calling of the Berlin Congress of 1878.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Background

This was the second violent event that constitutes the Eastern question. It refers to confrontation between Mehemet Ali of Egypt against Sultans Mohamad II and later Abdul Majid of Turkey over the possession of Syria. It was sparked off by Sultan Mohamad II's refusal to fulfill his reward to Mehemet Ali for his assistance in the Greek war of independence that made Mehemet Ali to forcefully occupy Syria in 1831 and threaten to takeover Constantinople. This attracted the intervention of the big powers of Europe who provided wrong answers, which left the question unanswered until the 1841 Straits convention provided concrete solutions.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Causes

1. The 1821 - 1832 Greek war of independence was a significant event that made the outbreak of the Syrian question/war inevitable. Sultan Mohamad n called on Mehemet Ali of Egypt to assist him to suppress the Greek resistance with promises of Syria, Morea and Damascus. However, the Greeks succeeded in regaining their independence with the support of European big powers by 1832. This left Sultan Mohammad II so disappointed that he declined to fulfill his promises of territorial rewards to Mehemet Ali, which provoked him to use force to take over Syria. Besides, the Greek war of independence accelerated the downfall of the Congress system and left European powers so divided that they could not provide a diplomatic solution / answer to the Syrian question.

2. The refusal of Sultan Mohammad II to reward Mehemet Ali for his role against the Greek rebels triggered the Syrian war / question. In 1824, Sultan Mohamad II lured Mehemet Ali to assist him suppress the Greek revolution with promises of Syria, Morea and Damascus. Mehemet Ali sent his "no nonsense" son Ibrahim Pasha who demolished Crete, Novarino and advanced to Morea leaving behind dead bodies of slaughtered Christians in thousands. It provoked the intervention of Christian powers

(Britain, France and Russia), who helped the Greeks to attain unconditional independence by 1832.

The Sultan did not see sense in rewarding Ali for assistance in a war that he lost and consequently refused. Mehemet Ali felt betrayed and used force to occupy Syria that caused the Syrian question.

3. The collapse of the Congress system played a role in the outbreak of the Syrian question / war. By 1830, the Congress system was no more. It was a formal institution for peaceful settlement of conflicts that had united European powers. Its collapse by 1830, left European powers divided and incapable of diplomatically settling the Turko - Egyptian crisis that degenerated to the Syrian war. This partly explains the difference in opinion between France vis-a-vis Russia and Britain over Mehemet Ali's invasion of Syria that became a preamble to the Syrian question.

4. The weaknesses of Turkey as a "sick man of Europe" made the outbreak of the Syrian question inevitable. By 1831, the huge heterogeneous Ottoman Empire was characterized by famine, poverty, financial crisis and religious conflicts that were tearing it apart. Turkey had a loose administrative system where the power of the Sultan was only effective around Constantinople. It left the conquered states semi independent and able to revolt successfully against Turkey the way the Greeks and Mehemet Ali of Egypt did. Turkey's military weakness made Sultan Mohamad II unable to suppress the Greek revolt. This explains why he resorted to assistance from Mehemet Ali of Egypt (his vassal state) with false promises that led to Ali's invasion of Syria. Turkey's inability to push Egyptian forces out of Syria dragged her to seek assistance from Britain and France who let her down because they were busy with the Belgian revolution. This provided Russia with an opportunity to intervene and subject Turkey to the dubious treaty of Unkier Skellessi of 1833, which caused more suspicion and conflicts amongst

European powers perpetuating the Syrian question.

5. The 1830 Belgian revolution was yet another event that contributed to the outbreak of the Syrian question / war. It kept European powers divided, busy and unable to collectively address the Syrian question. This explains why Britain and France refused to assist Turkey to repulse Egyptian occupation of Syria. It is this situation that Russia used to assist Turkey and secure the Unkier Skellessi treaty that threatened other European powers, and hence pushing the Syrian question further.

6. The Unkier Skellessi treaty of 1833 also contributed to the Syrian question. It was a defensive as well as an offensive treaty signed between Russia and Turkey in the aftermath of Russia's assistance to Turkey against Egyptian invasion of Syria. It had a secret clause which provided that Turkey would close the entrance of the Black Sea (Dardanelles) to warships of other powers whenever Russia demanded. The secret was leaked to Britain by a Turkish official who was frustrated with Russian influence over Turkish affairs. This became the biggest threat against the security, economic and strategic interests of Britain and France. It dragged Britain and France into the conflict who forced Turkey to handover Syria, Damascus and Palestine to Mehemet Ali of Egypt. Thereafter, it became a palmer stone's policy to watch the events of the Syrian question more closely with intension of reversing the treaty which he accomplished in the straits convention of 1841.

7. Russian imperialism and the determination of other European powers to contain her influence also contributed to the outbreak of the Syrian question. Russian ambition to break up the Ottoman Empire and dominate it was opposed by other powers because it threatened their political, economic and strategic interests in the Balkans and Med-Sea. The preservation of the Ottoman Empire was essential in safeguarding their interest against Russian imperial ambitions. The fear of Russian dominance explains why Britain and France forced Sultan Mohammad II to handover Syria, Damascus and Palestine to Mehemet Ali. It left the Sultan disappointed, looking for an opportunity to regain his territories and consequently attacked Syria in 1839, thus accelerating the Syrian question.

8. France's Military support to Egypt under the leadership of Mehemet Ali played a significant role in the Syrian question / war. Louis Philippe was influenced by his bellicose (war like) Prime Minister, Adolf Thiers to send French technical army officers who helped to retrain and reform Egyptian army. In 1839, the reorganized Egyptian forces with French support crushed the Turkish forces who had invaded Syria.

It made other European powers to be very suspicious and hostile to France, which explains why

Palmerstone excluded France from the 1840 London Conference that was called to find solutions to the Syrian question. French support also gave Mehemet Ali false confidence that he rejected the generous terms of the 1840 London convention through which he was to receive Southern Syria (1/2 of Syria) amongst others. This made allied force of British, Austrians and Russians to push him out of the whole of Syria and Crete. Thus, the French support to Mehemet Ali of Egypt strengthened him, made him more stubborn hence perpetuating the Syrian question.

9. On the other hand, Prussia's military support to Turkey boosted her confidence to fight Mehemet Ali out of Syria. Sultan Mohammad II was left dissatisfied by the big power's decision that forced him to cede Syria, Palestine and Damascus to Mehemet Ali of Egypt. He consequently enlisted Prussian technicians and military advisers to retrain and re-organize his army. This gave him a false confidence of military victory that made him to invade Syria in 1839 in which he was disastrously defeated by Mehemet Ali's forces.

10. Mehemet Ali's invasion of Syria made no small contribution to the outbreak of the Syrian question / war. In 1831, Mehemet Ali sent his son Ibrahim Pasha to invade and occupy Syria after the refusal of the Sultan to give him Syria as a reward for his role in fighting the Greek rebels. Ibrahim Pasha conquered Syria and demolished Sultan's last army at the battle of Koniah. He threatened to overrun Constantinople within a year. It terrified other European powers whose fear was that he would conquer the whole empire and install himself as the next Sultan. This attracted the intervention of the great powers who failed to adequately address the problem that made the question to linger in the diplomatic circles of Europe up to 1841.

11. The oppressive, exploitative and tyrannical rule of Mehemet Ali in Syria also contributed to the Syrian question in 1833, European powers forced Sultan Mohammad II to surrender Syria amongst others to Ali. However, Egyptian rule in Syria became very unpopular due to oppression, exploitation, dictatorship, religious persecution and ruthlessness by Egyptian troops under the leadership of Ibrahim Pasha, Mehemet Ali's son. This state of affairs led to the rebellions of 1834 and 1838, against Egyptian administration. Sultan Mohammad II decided to take advantage of the situation to repossess Syria under the pretext of rescuing his subjects. He eventually invaded Syria in 1839 and expected a mass uprising that would

help his conquest of Syria. However, he was humiliatingly defeated by Egyptian forces under the leadership of the ruthless and great warrior Ibrahim Pasha. The invasion provided Britain with an opportunity to maneuver her way to destroy Russian influence and nullify the 1833 Unkier Skellessi treaty. This led to the calling of the London Conferences of 1840 and 1841 where the Unkier Skellessi treaty was reversed.

12. The desire of Sultan Mohammad II to preserve the Ottoman Empire at any cost also propelled the eastern question. The Ottoman Empire had started to disintegrate rapidly most especially with the success of the Greek war of independence. After losing Greece, the Sultan resolved not to lose any more territory even when he was clearly losing control over the empire. It explains why he decided to do anything on the principle of "the end justifies the means" to preserve the empire. This was why he resorted to Russian assistance after failing to secure the support of France and Britain against Mehemet Ali of Egypt. A Turkish Minister justified this when he commented that 'A drowning man will clutch at a serpent.' The desire to preserve the empire also explains why the Sultan invaded Syria in 1839 yet he had surrendered (though under pressure) to Mehemet Ali way back in 1833.

13. Lastly, the 1840 London Conference / Convention / Treaty pushed the Syrian question further since it failed to provide a lasting solution. France was not invited which left her so disappointed that she almost declared war on the powers concerned. It also failed to satisfactorily address the concerns of Mehemet Ali of Egypt. He was offered half of Syria (Southern Part), which he declined to accept. Ali was eventually attacked in 1841 by allied force of Britain, Russia and Austria who pushed him out of Syria, Crete, Alexandria and threatened to overrun Cairo. It is this that forced Mehemet Ali to surrender and give up his claims over Syria.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES / SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SYRIAN QUESTION / WAR

Positive consequences

1. Turkey was able to regain Syria, Arabia and Crete much as she suffered disastrous defeats in the hands of Mehemet Ali of Egypt. She was forced to surrender these territories to Mehemet Ali in 1833 and failed to recover them by force in 1839. However, the refusal of Mehemet Ali to accept Southern Syria in 1840 made European powers to give Turkey the whole of Syria plus other states like Crete and Arabia. Her territorial integrity and independence were therefore recognized and preserved with the support of European big powers.

2. However, in spite of the loss of Syria and other territories, Egypt was able to regain her independence from Turkey through the Syrian question. It was recognized by the first London convention of 1840 and confirmed by the second London convention of 1841. Her colonial control over Sudan was as well guaranteed. Mehemet Ali was also declared the hereditary Pasha (ruler) of Egypt. The big powers also prevailed upon / forced Sultan Abdul Majid to counsel the deportation of Mehemet Ali and recognize him as hereditary pasha of Egypt. This preserved the territorial independence and integrity of Egypt against external threats especially from Turkey.

3. The Syrian question / war led to the calling of the first London Conference and the signing of the London Convention of 1840. In 1840, Palmer stone of Britain called the Conference (France was excluded) to find ways of fighting Mehemet Ali out of Syria and stopping his intended invasion of Constantinople. The Conference was attended by Russia, Austria and Britain who signed the London Convention of 1840 in which Mehemet Ali was recognized as the hereditary Pasha of Egypt and offered Southern part of Syria on condition of making peace with Turkey. Turkey recovered Crete and Arabia from Egypt. However, Mehemet Ali of Egypt rejected the terms of the Convention and forced the powers concerned to fight him out of Syria and Crete leading to his surrender to allied forces.

4. The Syrian question /war also resulted into the calling of the 1841 London Conference and signing of the Straits Convention. Palmer stone called the Conference to settle pending conflicts over the Syrian question most especially the 1833 Unkier Skellessi treaty that favoured Russia against other powers.

Austria, Russia, Britain and France (she was invited) signed the 1841 Straits Convention where Turkey was to close the Dardanelles and Basphorous to warships of all nations (Russia inclusive) in times of peace. It was a great triumph for Palmer stone because it nullified the Unkier Skellessi treaty of 1833 and curtailed Russian unnecessary interference in the Balkans. It also

effectively blocked Russia or any other naval power from threatening Constantinople by sea. This erased the suspicion and hostility by other European powers against Russian threat in the Balkans. In short, the Straits Convention secured the political, economic and strategic interests of other power against Russian influence that had been consolidated by the Unkier Skellessi.

5. The Syrian question ended up as a big diplomatic victory for Palmerstone and Britain. By 1841, Palmerstone had successfully nullified the 1833 Unkier Skellessi treaty, checked Russian, Egyptian and French imperialistic ambitions in the Balkans, preserved the Ottoman Empire against disintegration and brought back Turkey to reliance on Britain and European powers in general than on Russia alone. All these helped to secure the British political, economic and strategic interests in the Middle East and the Mediterranean Sea. This also boosted Palmerstone's popularity as Britain's Foreign Minister amongst the British citizens.

Negative consequences

6. The Syrian question led to massive loss of lives and destruction of property. For instance at the battles of Kojah (1832) and Nezib (1839), Ibrahim Pasha the commander of the Egyptian troops killed almost all the "Turkey's troops that confronted him. The defeat of Sultan Mohammad 11 was followed by his death a few days later. Important towns and cities like Beirut, Crete and Syria were destroyed in the course of the war.

7. The wars fought weakened and exhausted Turkey militarily. She was disastrously defeated in several battles by Ibrahim Pasha the overall commander of Egyptian forces. For instance, she lost most of her abled and experienced soldiers at the bloody battles of Koniah and Nezib. This accelerated the condition of Turkey as a "sick man of Europe". Thus, the war contributed to the downfall of Ottoman Empire in the second half of the 19th century.

8. The Syrian question finally ended Mehemet Ali's imperialistic ambitions in the Balkans. He was finally defeated and surrendered to allied force of Britain, Austria and Russia in 1841 (after refusing to take half of Syria). He was forced to withdraw from Syria, Morea, Crete and Palestine that were handed back to Sultan Abdul Majid (the new Sultan from 1839). This effectively ended Mehemet Ali's claims and imperialistic ambitions in the Balkans.

In France, the Syrian question contributed to the down fall of Orleans monarchy and Louis Philippe.

The support that Louis Philippe gave to Egypt against Turkey disappointed the big powers and left France isolated. It explains why Palmerstone refused to invite France to the London Conference of 1840. The French Bonapartists, liberals and glory seekers argued Louis Philippe to organize war against the powers (most especially Britain) that isolated France from the conference. However, Louis Philippe cowardiced and Adolf Thiers resigned due to intensive opposition and uprising against his role in supporting Mehemet Ali of Egypt. The event therefore undermined Louis Philippe's popularity and brought about his down fall by 1848.

10. The Syrian question destabilized Europe for about a decade. It created tensions and conflicts amongst European powers from 1831 up to 1841 when it was finally resolved. Russia antagonized Britain, France and Austria when she manipulated Turkey to sign the 1833 Unkier Skellessi treaty that gave her exclusive rights to use the Dardanelles in times of war. France later conflicted with Britain, Russia and Austria when she supported Egypt against Turkey. Her exclusion in the London Conference of 1840 almost led to a declaration of war against Britain had Louis Philippe not cowardiced at the last moment.

All these led to political instability and undermined economic cooperation in Europe.

11. The Syrian question contributed to the outbreak of the Crimean war of 1854 —1856. The Straits Convention of 1841 left Russia disappointed. It nullified the Unkier Skellessi treaty of 1833 by a provision that Turkey was to close the Dardanelles and Bosporous to warships of all nations including those of Russia in times of peace. Russia's occupation of Moldavia and Wallacia that sparked off the Crimean war was a move to the Dardanelles and Bosporous because of their proximity (closeness) to the Black Sea. It explains why Britain and France hurried to send their troops to the Black Sea to block Russia from controlling the Straits of Dardanelles and Bosporous. This ended up in the Crimean war when allied troops followed Russian troops when they withdrew up to Crimea.

12. Anglo - Turkish diplomatic relationship was consolidated by the Syrian question / war. At the London Conference of 1841, Palmer stone supported Turkey to regain her lost territories of Crete and Syria from Mehemet Ali of Egypt, Sultan Abdul Majid was so grateful to Palmerstone's support that he

allowed him to turn the terms of the 1833 Unkier Skellessi treaty in the 1841 Straits Convention.

This revived British influence over Turkish affairs at the expense of Russian earlier influence, which furthered the conflict.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The Berlin congress was a European diplomatic meeting held at Berlin, the Capital of Germany from June- July 1878. It was chaired by Bismarck who played the role of an "honest broker". Britain was represented by Disraeli and Salisbury, Russia by Gortschakoff, France by Wadington, Austria by Andrassy and Corti represented Italy. The main pre-occupation of the congressmen was to settle the Eastern question especially the problem of the big Bulgaria.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS WHY THE CONGRESS WAS CALLED/AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1. To revise the San Stefano treaty that Russia had imposed on Turkey in March 1878. The big powers wanted to dismantle the big Bulgaria that was created by Russia.
2. To stop Russian imperialism that had made her dominant in the Ottoman Empire. For instance, the San Stefano treaty had given Russia control over Bessarabia and Bulgaria.
3. The congress was also to settle territorial disputes that were a source of tension amongst the European powers. Territorial conflicts were mainly between Russia, Turkey and Austria in the Balkans.

4. Commercial rivalry between Russia and Britain/was also a source of concern to the Berlin congressmen. Disraeli the British Prime Minister had threatened to declare war against Russia to protect the British trade zones in the Black and Mediterranean Seas. These trade zones were being threatened by Russian imperialism and growing influence within the Ottoman Empire.

5. To save the Ottoman Empire from disintegration Britain wanted the Ottoman Empire to survive as a check to Russian imperialism that was a threat to her trade zones in the Balkans. Austria that shared some Slav nationalities with Turkey wanted the existence of Turkey because its disintegration would trigger Slav nationalism within her Empire and break her own Empire into pieces.

6. To reform his administration and end religious persecution that had always given Russia chance to intervene and interfere in the Balkans. This was also a source of instability in the Balkans and the whole continent.

7. The congress was also called to address the fate of those nationalities who were struggling for independence. Such were the Balkan states of Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Romania etc. who wanted to free themselves from Turkish exploitative and oppressive administration.

8. Bismarck as a man of peace wanted to avoid war and maintain peace in Europe. Britain and France were on the verge of fighting Russia for her illegal action that had led to the creation of the Big Bulgaria. Bismarck feared that war would hinder the prosperity of the German Empire and give France chance to secure alliance in Europe. He also wanted to become an international broker and consolidate German supremacy. These fears and considerations is what made Bismarck to host the congress.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES/ SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BERLIN CONGRESS ON EUROPE

i) The Berlin congress saved the Ottoman Empire from disintegration. Russia had conquered the Empire, acquired Bessarabia and instituted the Big Bulgaria. She had also given independence to states like Serbia, Montenegro and Romania. However, the Berlin Congressmen revised the

Sanstafeno treaty through which Russia had consolidated her influence in the Ottoman Empire.

Turkey was given back 2 million people and 30,000 square miles of land that she had lost at the Sanstafeno treaty with Russia. Nevertheless, much as Turkey survived, her Empire was reduced by almost a half of her original size and population.

ii) The congress averted war over the question of the Big Bulgaria. The Russian-master minded Big Bulgaria was a big problem to the British and Austrian interests in the Balkans. This had made Austria and Britain to consider fighting Russia and dismantling the Big Bulgaria by force.

However, the Congress of Berlin settled the issue diplomatically although to the dissatisfaction of Russia.

iii) There were some territorial re-adjustments in the political map of Europe. Russia retained

Bessarabia but was asked to quit the Big Bulgaria. Austria was to temporarily occupy and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina pending the restoration of peace and prosperity. Britain acquired Cyprus Island in the Mediterranean Sea which Disraeli called "peace with honour". He was so impressed that when he was asked what he was thinking, he said he was merely enjoying himself. France was given Tunisia and Bismarck of Germany achieved the peace and supremacy that he wanted.

iv) The congress intensified the scramble and partition for Tunisia in Africa. Italy did not gain from Territorial adjustments but was instead advised to leave Tunisia for France. The congress statesmen recommended France to occupy Tunisia yet the Italians had more investments and there were more Italians than French in Tunisia. This intensified the Franco-Italian scramble for Tunisia that only ended in 1881 with the French conquest and occupation of Tunisia.

v) The Berlin congress was unrealistic and contributed to the rise of nationalism in Europe.

Territorial re-adjustments were made at the expense of smaller states like Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina who were denied their independence. Austrian influence was imposed over Bosnia and Herzegovina that were by then dominated by Serbia. This created conflict between Serbia and Austria that climaxed into the Sarajevo assassination and the First World War.

NB: The Austro-Serbian conflict ceased to be a localized affair and led to World War I because it attracted Russia that was a Slav state to Serbia against Austria. It also drew Germany to support Austria because of the Austro-German friendship that was consolidated at the Berlin congress.

vi) The Sultan was again forced to promise fair treatment to non-Moslems. Britain was given Cyprus to bring her closer to Turkey and remind the sultan incase he forgets to treat his Christian subjects fairly. The big powers also promised to send European consuls to ensure fair treatment of non-Moslems. These brought some period of relative calm at least in the short-run. However, in spite of all these measures, the Sultan and Moslems continued persecuting and slaughtering Christians. This brought rebellions such as in 1885 and 1906 that threatened peace in

Europe. Besides, European powers never sent consuls to ensure fair treatment of non-Moslems and Christians.

vii) The Berlin treaty nullified the Sanstefeno treaty that was forged by Russia. The big Bulgaria was dissected (divided) into three. The Northern Bulgaria or small Bulgaria that was given independence. The Central Bulgaria was given to a Christian governor who was under the direct political and military authority of the sultan and the Southern Bulgaria that was given back to the Sultan. These eliminated Russian imperialism in the Balkans and temporarily ended the eastern question.

However in 1885, the dissected Bulgaria re-united once more in a big state. This was a big blow to the Berlin congress and yet no great power intervened to defend the Berlin Settlement. This was because the re-united Bulgaria of 1885 was without Russian influence unlike the one of 1878. In 1878, the big powers almost fought Russia to reduce Bulgaria while in 1885 they all agreed to support Bulgaria because Russia had no influence. This explains the paradox of the 19th Century imperialism in the Balkans.

viii) The congress was a great diplomatic achievement for Germany and a humiliation for France that was Germany's enemy. It was hosted and chaired by Bismarck, which increased German's supremacy and Bismarck's significance in European politics. This became a source of prestige to

Germany and left France isolated although for a short time.

ix) Russian influence and imperialism in the Balkans was checked and reduced. She lost her control in the big Bulgaria and the Balkans. Bosnia and Herzegovina that initially belonged to Russia were given to Austria which made her (Russia) a permanent enemy of Austria. This also made

Russia to halt her imperialism in Europe and embark on Empire building in Asia. However, Russian imperialism bounced back in the form of Pan-Slavism that created instability in Europe between 1908-1914.

x) Bismarck's biasness against Russia made it impossible to renew the Dreikaiserbund which ended the three emperor's league. Russia went to Berlin with hopes that Bismarck would back her according to the Dreikaiserbund of 1873. Russia was also counting on German's support because she had prevented Austria from assisting France in the Franco-Prussian war. However, Russia was very disgusted when Bismarck turned round and supported Britain and Austria against her claims in the Balkans. This provided chance for a Franco - Russian alliance that ended the isolation of France and opened way for alliance system that caused the First World War.

On the other hand, Bismarck in a bid to consolidate Austria's friendship formed the dual alliance between Germany and Austria. Austria was grateful to Bismarck's support at Berlin and that is partly why she paid Bismarck back by formalizing the dual alliance.

The Berlin congress elevated German's status in Europe and created a political stigma of arrogance in the Germans and their King Kaiser William II. It also brought Germany closer to the Balkans and increased her ambitions in the Balkans. This was partly responsible for German aggression and partly explains why Germany intervened in the Austro-Serbian conflict that triggered the First World War.

xii) Lastly, the Berlin congress failed to create a lasting peace in Europe. Tension continued to exist in Europe in spite of the terms of the settlement that were geared towards peace. Besides, unrealistic terms like subjecting smaller nationalities like Serbians and Montenegrines to Austrian control triggered a wave of political instability in the Balkans that exploded into the First World War.

NB: One can argue that the Berlin congress and the 1856 Paris treaty escalated tension in the

Balkans and made it a storm centre for the explosion of World War I. The eastern question was treated as the Russian foreign minister once remarked;

....there are two ways of dealing with the Eastern Question. First, a complete

reconstruction, second, a mere re-plastering which would keep matters together for

another term of years. No one would wish for a complete settlement. Everyone must wish

to put it off as long as possible.

It's true that the European powers preferred "re-plastering" and treating the effects other than causes of Turkish sickness. This worsened Turkish sickness and made European powers to continue interfering within the Empire, which caused tension and World War I. Thus, the Berlin congress did not provide a permanent and lasting solution to the eastern question and left it as a question for a violent answer between 1914-1918.

All in all, the 1878 Berlin congress had positive and negative consequences in the social, political and economic developments of Europe. Its impact was more positive in the short run than in the long run. This is because it brewed more conflicts that climaxed into World War I.

NB: The Berlin congress was the 4th and last stage of the Eastern Question.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Introduction

World War I refers to the first most disastrous war that was fought on a global scale from 1914 - 1918. It was fought between Britain, France, Russia, USA, Italy and their allies against Germany, Austria- Hungary, Turkey, Bulgaria and their allies on the other hand. The war was fought on land, in the air, on the sea, under and above the sea by both soldiers and civilians.

The World War was the climax of international tension that had been building up in Europe after the unifications of Germany and Italy. Such tension found a line of weakness in the Balkans to explode into a global war. Bismarck prophesized it when he told a friend that; **I shall not see the World War but you Will, it will start from the near east**

History proved him a true prophet when the First World War was sparked off after the assassination of France Ferdinand, the heir to the Austrian throne

and his wife Sophia in Sarajevo by a Bosnian on 28th June 1914. Austria issued an ultimatum which Serbia was to reply within 48 hours. However, Serbia failed to meet all the conditions and Austria declared war against Serbia on 28th July 1914. Other powers joined the conflict which amplified (magnified) it into a European war and finally a World War. The war ended with the defeat and subsequent surrender of Germany in 1918.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CAUSES OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The causes of the First World War are so complex and intertwined that no single factor can be held absolutely responsible for this catastrophic event. Even the Sarajevo double murder that sparked off the war was itself a result of accumulated tension that had piled up in Europe for a long time. It is therefore logical that the causes of the war be traced from events that created such tensions and made the outbreak of the war inevitable be examined.

1. ALLIANCE SYSTEM.

After the Franco-Prussian war, Bismarck started the alliance system to isolate France and make it difficult for her to wage a successful war of revenge against Germany. During his lifetime, France was effectively isolated and the Alliance system became an instrument of peace in Europe. However, after his resignation (1890) the alliance system and European peace were left in the hands of young, inexperienced and aggressive men like Kaiser William II which drove Germany and the world to the First World War. A number of scholars have asserted that the alliance system was primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. By 1914, the alliance system had divided Europe into two hostile and antagonistic camps.

The two camps were the German centered triple alliance (1882) that had Austria - Hungary and Italy and the Triple Entente (1907), which comprised of Britain, France, Russia and Japan as the main allies. These contributed to the catastrophe of 1914 in a number of ways.

i) It grouped the major world powers into two hostile and antagonistic camps that became fighting camps.

By 1914 there was intensive hatred, jealousy, fear and rivalry between the two camps, which climaxed in the Sarajevo assassination to spark the war.

ii) Without the alliance system, the Sarajevo incident would have remained a localised conflict between Austria and Serbia. But Sarajevo was the only place where the triple alliance and triple entente collided with all their resources, emotions and hostilities. For instance, the triple alliance made Germany to declare war on Russia and France instead of Serbia. This amplified the Austro-Serbian conflict into a global war.

iii) The dual alliance of 1879 and triple alliance of 1882 tied Germany to Austria. This explains why Germany supported Austria which support made Austria to declare war on Serbia sparking off the bloody war of 1914 - 1918. It also prompted Germany to declare war on Russia and France who were members of the triple entente. If the triple alliance had not bonded Germany to Austria and antagonized Britain and France from Germany, Germany would have found it difficult to act the way she did and the First World War would have been avoided.

iv) Bismarck's biasness against Russia in the 1878 Berlin congress forced Russia to ally with France in the Franco-Russian alliance of 1894. It was a diplomatic and defensive alliance directed against Germany and to some extent Austria-Hungary and Italy. It worsened the already bad relationship between Germany and Russia. This is what forced Germany to declare war on both Russia and France. Otherwise, Russia's mobilization after the Sarajevo assassination targeted Germany more than Austria.

v) In 1904, France moved closer to Britain and formed the Dual Entente. In 1907 Russia was admitted into the entente and this gave rise to the triple entente, which ended France's isolation in Europe and offered her an opportunity and confidence to revenge against her long time foe (enemy)-Germany. It's for this that France declined to be neutral in the Austro-Serbian conflict, which forced Germany to declare war on her.

NB. Before declaring war on France, Kaiser William II demanded France to clarify whether she would be neutral in the Austro-Serbian conflict but France declined to comment, a clear indication that she was not ready to be a spectator in the Austro-Serbian conflict.

vi) The Anglo-Franco entente and triple entente certainly determined the direction of British policy up to the First World War. That Britain allied with France

in 1914 was not necessarily because of German's invasion and therefore a violation of Belgian's neutrality, British policy was shaped in 1904 and consolidated in 1907. By 1914 when Germany invaded Poland, the entente had matured to exercise enough British influence in favour of France's security.

NB. One can therefore safely argue that however peaceful Europe seemed to be, the alliance system partitioned her into two hostile, aggressive, suspicious but confidently armed camps making it impossible to localize a conflict like that of Austria and Serbia.

vii) The alliance system gave the necessary courage and strength to the small and otherwise fearful states to provoke war. This is true of Austria and Serbia. Assured of support from other camp members, Austria and Serbia became very reckless and aggressive in dealing with the Balkan affairs. Russia's backing (support) to Serbia is what made her to sponsor the Sarajevo assassination and defy Austria's ultimatum.

Otherwise, there was no way a 'tiny' state like Serbia could remain defiant to Austria in such a high profile case. On the other hand, if Austria-Hungary had not been assured of Germany's support, she would not have issued the high sounding ultimatum and risk war against Serbia because this would mean fighting Russia as well.

viii) Furthermore, the alliance system gave reinforcement to imperialism, which worsened the already dangerous situation in Europe. It bailed France out of isolation and counting on the backing of her allies, she started dreaming of re-possessing Alsace and Lorraine. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia and Britain pursued their imperialistic ambitions without fear. This created more tension in Europe that led to war

ix) To maintain the defensive terms of the various alliances, each camp had to increase her military might to the highest level. This became more urgent because the alliance system had created mutual fear, hatred and hostility between the two antagonistic camps. This led to military and naval race with a common view that none of the camps should be left behind and this drove Europe to the disastrous war of 1914- 1918.

However, although the alliance system contributed to a large extent towards the outbreak of the First World War, nevertheless, its role should not be over exaggerated. In the first place it did not accurately determine the fighting camp. For instance, Italy that was a member of the triple alliance fought on the camp of the triple entente.

Secondly, states like U.S.A, Turkey and Bulgaria that were none members of any of the alliances also participated in the war. Definitely, this was due to other factors other than alliance system.

Thirdly, the inconsistent nature of alliance system becomes clear especially that Britain concluded an alliance with Japan in 1902, in which she promised to support Japan if France and Russia declared war on her yet in 1914 the three powers fought on the same side. Italy signed treaties with almost all the continental powers. This reduced alliance system to mere Jokes.

Fourthly, the creation of alliances and counter alliances was made possible because of international misunderstanding arising from nationalism and imperialism. For instance, Bismarck was able to hook Italy into the triple alliance (1882) only because she was thrown out of Tunisia by France. The 1902 Anglo- Japanese alliance was set against Russia largely for imperial interest in the Far East. This therefore shows that other factors were instrumental in the outbreak of the war.

2. ARMS RACE

a) Naval race

Arms race was started by Kaiser William II in an attempt to challenge British naval superiority and make Germany both a land and sea power. He made this clear in 1890 when he said; our future lies on water.

This was affected by modernizing and updating weapons and tactics at sea. Sea cruisers, destroyers and sub marines. In her effort to maintain her status as a water rat/sea power, Britain built the first all-big-gun turbine driven battle ship which she called dreadnoughts. She calculated that it would take the Germans some years to use dreadnoughts effectively since they would first have to enlarge the Kiel Canal. Germany reacted faster than Britain had thought by expanding the Kiel Canal so that her forces would easily enter the Adriatic Sea in case of war. She concentrated on building dreadnoughts and by 1913; Germany had 9 dreadnoughts while Britain had 18. At the apex of 1914 Germany had 13 dreadnoughts compared to 20 for

Britain. Naval armaments were equally on a very scaring scale in France, Austria-Hungary, Italy,

Turkey etc. These were preparations for war in advance which opportunity came through the Sarajevo double murder.

That Britain entered the war under the pretext of protecting the neutrality of Belgium yet she wanted to protect her naval base against Germany's advance is a clear testimony that naval race made valuable contribution to the deadly war of 1914 - 1918.

b) Military race

By 1914, naval race had extended to military race, which increased the means as well as the spirit of violence. Huge chunks of money were spent on the production of deadly weapons for land and air raids.

These included short, medium and long-range artilleries, machine guns, tanks, poisonous gas and fighter planes. Germany in particular trained and enlarged her army to the highest degree of efficiency while France, Russia and Britain increased periods of training and conscription. The deadly weapons were not flowers for decoration but instruments of war which had to be tested and the need to test these weapons is what made the outbreak of war in 1914 a reality.

The increasing level of armaments created universal fear, suspicion and hatred amongst the two antagonistic camps. Indeed it strengthened the alliances and increased hostility between camps. What has to be emphasized is that the powers fought with arms than treaties (alliances).

Arms race increased recklessness and created more tension and conflicts as European powers pursued their national and imperialistic ambitions. This brought in colonial conflicts that worsened the already bad relations between European powers leading to the outbreak of war in 1914.

The deadly weapons created gave confidence of victory in an event of war. This made public opinion in Europe to blindly fall in love with war. For instance, the British public opinion was in favour of war with Germany to destroy her fleet and protect British naval supremacy. The Germans on the other hand wanted war in order to prove to mankind their superiority over other races. Indeed, Germany declared war on Russia and France partly because German public opinion wanted a swift action.

Arms race played a big role in the Sarajevo incident that became the immediate factor in the war. In the first instance, the sophisticated weapon Serbia had is what was utilized by Princip to murder Franz Ferdinand and his wife. The dangerous weapons Austria had in comparison to Serbia is what made Austria to declare war on Serbia. Even Germany declared war on Russia and France because she assumed that she had the best army-and Navy. Otherwise, had it not been because of the sophisticated weapons

European powers possessed, Ferdinand could have not lost his life, Austria and Germany would not have gone on rampage declaring war, Britain would not have entered war and the First World War would have been avoided.

NB. In 1899, Tsar Nicholas II called the Hague conference whose priority was to arrest arms race between the great powers. Germany took the lead in opposing such a noble idea viewing it as Nicholas II's trick to save the economically backward Russia from matching the military expenditures of Germany and Austria.

At the second Hague conference, Germany still took the lead against British naval proposal, regarding it as a plan to keep her inferior at sea. When in 1913 Sir Winston Churchill called for a naval holiday, the same Germany refused. However to Britain, a strong navy was a necessity for her and a luxury for Germany.

Britain considered Germany's building a strong navy as a move to destroy her. This partly explains why Britain declared war on Germany merely over the question of violating Belgium's neutrality.

c) Militarism

The political Landscape of Europe prior to 1914 was highly militaristic. War was seen as a divine element of the universe and a condition for progress. The role of politicians was hijacked by a powerful class of military and naval officers' whose decisions were final in foreign as well as domestic affairs. They intensified conscription to a level conducive to world peace. For example Germany and France could raise 3½ million soldiers each while Russia could raise 4 million, Britain could raise a smaller but more efficient army. All resources were diverted towards defense. These made war inevitable because the well armed huge standing armies and reserve forces could not be left bored without war. Moreover, those who advocated for war received wide reception while those who stood for peace were condemned.

However, the year 1914 was not the first time Europe was experiencing arms race. It started much earlier and if it was so important then World War I should not have waited until 1914. Even if the weapons made prior to Sarajevo incident were more sophisticated, this should have been a warning to those who wanted war not to risk. This gives room for an analysis of other factors.

3. ROLE OF THE PRESS

The role played by the mass media cannot be underrated as a cause of the 1914 - 1918 disastrous war.

Radio presenters and journalists because of the need to amass wealth over exaggerated the suspicion, fear and international tension between the big powers. For instance, the London Times poisoned the British public opinion against the Germans and radio presenters caused more fear and panic after the Sarajevo double murder which created public outcry for war. This forced European powers to strengthen alliances and mobilize for war as Russia did.

NB. Before the outbreak of World War in 1914, there was already a newspaper war which acted as a curtain raiser to World War 1. The newspapers of two different countries often took up some point of dispute, exaggerated it and made attacks and counter attacks until a regular newspaper war was created.

Bismarck had earlier foreseen this when he lamented that; every country is held at some time to account for the windows broken by its press; the bill is presented some day in the shape of hostile sentiment in the other.

4. IMPERIALISM AND COLONIAL ECONOMIC CONFLICTS

i) After 1871, European powers went on rampage to acquire territories in Africa, Europe and the Balkans.

By 1906, areas for peaceful expansion was already exhausted and further conquest could only be made by dispossessing or displacing someone from somewhere. This laid foundation for tension, mistrust and suspicion that spoilt diplomatic relations amongst the imperialists leading to the Great War. For instance, France was bitter over Germany's conquest of Togo and Cameroon. Britain was hurt by Germany's presence in South Africa and her conquest of Namibia while Germany was irked by Britain's conquest of Uganda. Poor relation between Germany and Britain was portrayed by Kaiser William II's congratulatory message to Paul Krugger of Transvaal upon his success in repulsing the Jameson raid of 1896. Germany, France, Britain and Italy also conflicted over Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt and Congo.

ii) It should be noted that Germany declared war on France partly because of tension created between her and France during the scramble and partition of Africa and Asia. Britain also declared war on Germany partly due to poor diplomatic relations cultivated in the era of European conquest in Africa and Asia.

Indeed, Britain was not prepared to give up her colonies, protectorates, spheres of influence and markets to Germany. As Germany was bent on getting them at any price, Britain had to act faster and declare war on Germany.

iii) Outside Africa, Germany's commercial rivalry and strength was a disturbing factor to Japan, Britain and Russia in the Far East and the Pacific. Russian imperialism was a formidable threat to Germany and Austrian imperialistic interests in the Balkans. This explains why Russia mobilized in support of Serbia (where she had influence) against Austria after the Sarajevo incident. Russian imperialistic designs in Serbia threatened Austrian control and forced her to declare war on Serbia to crush her nationalism.

Equally so, Germany had to declare war on Russia because Russian imperialism was equally a scaring factor to her influence in the Balkans.

iv) One can therefore safely argue that Germany's support of Austria Hungary against Serbia and Russia's backing of Serbia were imperialistically motivated. This is why Lenin argues that; the war of 1914 -1918 was imperialistic the part of both sides, it was a war for the division of the world, for the partition and repartition of colonies and spheres of influence. One has to emphasize that it was Austrian imperialism that clashed with Serbian nationalism to spark off the war in 1914. Had it not been because of the need to pursue Austria's imperialistic interest in Bosnia, Franz Ferdinand and his wife would not have traveled to Sarajevo. The assassination would not have occurred and the First World War would have not broken off at least in 1914.

v) The constant confrontations over colonies in different parts of the world made the imperialists to resort to the manufacture of sophisticated weapons for conquest and consolidation of their rule. The possibility of war amongst European powers over colonies also created more need for deadly weapons. This brought in arms race and militarism that made the outbreak of war in 1914 inevitable.

vi) To some extent, imperialism contributed to alliance system, which is a cardinal factor in World War I.

The Anglo-Japanese alliance (1902) was against Russia largely for imperial interest in the Far East.

Bismarck was able to form the triple alliance in 1882 (by admitting Italy in the Dual Alliance of Austria and Germany which became triple alliance)

only because Italy was frustrated by the French occupation of Tunisia (1881).

Nevertheless, the fact that Italy and France fought on the same side shows that colonial disputes due to imperialism counted less in causing World War I. However this should not blind up from the fact that imperialism in the Balkans is what sparked off the war in 1914.

Again if imperialism was a serious factor, then Britain and France who were first class enemies in the colonial field would not have fought on the same front in the war. Yet other powers like Romania, USA and Bulgaria never involved themselves seriously in the struggle for colonies but participated in the war.

Suffice to note is that imperialism had existed for more than half a century without causing war until 1914.

If it was a major cause of World War I, then the war would have occurred in 1880's when colonial conflicts were at their climax.

Moreover, colonial conflicts due to imperialism was most intensive in Africa not Europe. If colonial disputes counts so much then World War I would have started from Africa and not Europe.

Lastly, by 1914 most colonial disputes had already been settled through the Berlin settlement and mutual agreements between European powers e.g. the Congo crisis was settled by the Berlin conference, Britain and France had reconciled over Fashoda and this explains why they joined hands in the war.

NB i) Colonial disputes due to imperialism delayed the formation of rival alliance but strengthened it after they were formed.

ii) The role of economic factor can as well be seen from France's revengist spirit against Germany for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. Britain and France were flabbergasted by the Berlin-Bagdad railway because it was bound to jeopardize their economic interest in the region. Economic consideration was primary in the Congo crisis, Moroccan crisis and Austro-Serbian conflict that brought war.

However, one should guard against over estimating the role of economic considerations in sparking off the disastrous war of 1914-1918. Germany herself had more trade with Britain than any other power in Europe. Thus, if economic considerations mattered so much, then Britain would definitely not have fought her best customer in Europe (Germany). In 1906 a number

of German industrialists openly complained about Kaiser William's aggressive character that was frustrating their trade. David Thomson clarifies that economic consideration were kept subordinate to political and strategic considerations.

5) NATIONALISM/COMPETITIVE PATRIOTISM

By 1914, a number of ill-conceived nationalistic movements had sprung up in Europe. The Great Serbian movement, Pan-Slavism, Revanche movement and Jingoism bonded themselves in the triple alliance against pan Germanism. The Great Serbian movement had a divine mission of liberating Serbians including those in Bosnia and Herzegovina who were under Austrian's control. Pan-slavinism aimed at making Russia the custodian of all Slav speaking races irrespective of where they were living. The Revanche movement in France was bent on revenging against Germany because of the 1870 – 1871 humiliating Franco-Prussian war. Jingoism aimed at maintaining British naval technological advancement above other nations while Pan-Germanism or Pan German League was created to unite all German speaking nationalities in different countries. Nationalism strengthened patriotism (love for one's country) and hatred to other nations, which made the following contributions to the First World War.

i) The desire to pursue national interest made the big powers to clash with one another, which increased tension and hostility amongst the European nations. For instance, when Germany began to build a strong navy, Britain and France protested it as a threat to their national interests. These selfish national interests made it extremely difficult for international peace conferences to succeed leaving war as the only option.

ii) The need to pursue, defend and promote national interest created prestige and made European powers to be on rampage for colonies. The struggle to promote national interests in Africa and the Balkans created some economic conflicts leading to World War I. In short, nationalism contributed to imperialism.

ii) Nationalistic feelings made France obsessed with a revengist spirit against Germany. This forced Bismarck to venture into alliance system to isolate France and avoid a French war of revenge. It's on this account that one can argue that had it not been because of the fear of French nationalism, Bismarck would not have started alliance system and the First World War would have been avoided.

v) To defend national interest and sovereignty, the big powers hastened the manufacture of deadly weapons leading to arms race and war. Nations also engaged in cut throat competition in the number of soldiers each nation could put in the battlefield, which increased militarism in Europe. Germany was in a dying need to show off and that's why she declared war on Russia and France. On the other hand, Britain, Russia and France had to defend their national interest against German aggression, which made war unavoidable

v) It was intense nationalism in Serbia that created hostility between Serbia and Austria-Hungary. The desire by Serbia to liberate all Serbians from Austria's imperialism and the attempts by Austria to tighten her control on the Serbs led to the Sarajevo assassination which sparked off the war. Actually, Princip who assassinated Ferdinand was a member of Pan-slavinism who conducted the murder just after attending an anti-Austrian meeting. The fact that the First World War broke out in the Balkans where national interests clashed most portrays the strength of nationalism in World War I. This is because the forces of Pan- Germanism and Pan slavinism conflicted most in the Balkans leading to the outbreak of war in 1914.

Serbian nationalism clashed with Austria's imperialism to spark off war in 1914. It's therefore clear that nationalism was an important factor in World War I. However, it's real significant came when it clashed with imperialism in the Balkans.

6) THE FRANCO - PRUSSIAN WAR, 1870 -1871

i) In 1815, the Vienna Settlement gave Prussia the Rhine lands to the annoyance of France. This made Prussia to be a historical enemy of France, which climaxed into the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 - 1871.

France was defeated and forced to submit to the harshest peace treaty of the 19th century (i.e. Frankfurt Treaty of 1871). In the treaty, she lost her mineralized provinces of Alsace and Lorraine that had up to 4 million Frenchmen. She also suffered a German army of occupation and was forced to pay a huge indemnity of 200 million pounds. This spoilt diplomatic relations between France and Germany leaving France boiling for a war of revenge. France therefore got a heaven sent opportunity of redressing the wrongs of Prussia's victory with the outbreak of the First World War. This is what forced Germany to act faster by declaring war on France before France could do so.

ii) The Franco-Prussian war changed the balance of power. It completed the unifications of both Germany and Italy at the expense of Denmark, Austria and France. Before the war, the balance of power was in favour of France and Britain with France as a new land power. But after defeating France, Germany emerged as new land power and started challenging British naval supremacy. This forced Britain and France to ally against Germany leading to tension and the First World War.

The fear of a French war of revenge and the desire to protect and promote Germany's supremacy in European diplomacy while maintaining peace in Europe forced Bismarck to venture and start the alliance system. This sent France on a shopping spree for alliance since she could not successfully revenge against Germany single handedly. She found this in the triple alliance of 1907. The alliance system left Europe divided into two hostile and antagonistic camps, which made war inevitable. It's therefore safe to argue that if the Franco-Prussian war had not occurred, France would not have been eager for a war of revenge and consequently Bismarck would have not ventured into the alliance system hence the Austro-Serbian conflict would have remained a localized affair between Austria and Serbia.

iv) The threats of French revenge forced Bismarck to arm Germany in preparation for war. Other nations followed Germany and started prioritising defense expenditures. They were encouraged by Bismarck's policy of blood and iron through which Germany was unified from 1864 - 1871. This created arms race and strengthened militarism, which made Europe a walking bomb that exploded in 1914.

v) The war contributed to imperialism leading to colonial economic rivalry and the First World War in 1914. The loss of the mineralized regions of Alsace and Lorraine forced France to look for compensation elsewhere most especially in Africa. Bismarck tactfully encouraged her since she would forget of Alsace and Lorraine while clashing with other powers in the scramble for colonies in Africa. This also encouraged Austria to tighten her control in Serbia, which raised Serbian nationalism leading to the murder of Prince Archduke and war.

vi) The triumph of Italian and German nationalism in 1850's through the Franco-Prussian war inspired the oppressed nations to struggle for freedom using Bismarck's policy of blood and iron. Nationalistic movements like Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism and the Greater Serbian movement in the Balkans had a direct Xeroxing (copying) from Italian and German unification struggles from 1810 - 1871. Serbia was encouraged to challenge Austria

since it was the same Austria that was defeated by Italians and Germans leading to their freedom. This made Serbia to act recklessly against Austria leading to the Sarajevo assassination and consequently the First World War.

vii) The success of Germany in the Franco-Prussian war coupled with the earlier military victories made Kaiser William II to believe that Germany was the mightiest (strongest) world power. It created in him a political stigma of arrogance and aggression in his efforts to preserve Germany's supremacy. This is what made him to recklessly send a blank cheque to Austria, declare war on Russia and France and violate the neutrality of Belgium. These moves by Germany amplified the Austro-Serbian conflict into the First World War.

NB. The Franco-Prussian war indirectly completed the unification of Italy and made Italy more ambitious to recover Trentino and Trieste that were inhabited by Italians but were still under Austria-Hungary's control. This is what made Italy to quit Austria's camp (Triple alliance) and join the triple entente tactfully to recover Trentino and Trieste, which she got at the Versailles peace settlement of 1919.

7) KAISER WILLIAM II'S AGGRESSIVE CHARACTER /GERMAN AGGRESSION

The role played by Kaiser William II of Germany was of paramount importance in the sparking of World War I. He was a bellicose (war like), arrogant and cantankerous leader who could not hide his hangover for war. In his foreign policy, he tried to intervene in each and every activity of world politics in order to make Germany a world power. He declared; "Nothing must go on anywhere in the world in which Germany does not play apart", William was too confident and proud of himself and he proclaimed; "God has called us to civilize the world". Consequently his character and policy played a cardinal role in World War I. Germany took the greatest blame in causing World War I because of the role played by Kaiser William II. He made a number of blunders and diplomatic errors that made the outbreak of the First World War inevitable.

i) He forced Bismarck to resign leaving the world with no capable statesman who could diplomatically settle world conflicts such as the Austro-Serbian conflict, which exploded into the First World War.

ii) Kaiser William II had a very poor opinion and natural hatred towards the English people and other races. This made Britain, Russia and France to form the triple entente that ended the isolation of France.

In 1897 - 1899, Joseph Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary tried to negotiate an Anglo-German agreement but this failed on both occasions due to Kaiser William's aggressive naval policy and his unfriendly attitude to Britain in the Anglo Boer war. He sent a congratulatory message to Paul Kruger for repulsing the Jameson raid in Transvaal. It should be emphasized that British allies especially France and Russia were long time enemies to her (Britain) who would not have fought against Germany if it had not been because of Kaiser William's careless and aggressive policy. All these were because Kaiser William misused Bismarckian alliance system turning it to an instrument of war rather than peace as Bismarck had done.

iii) Kaiser William further antagonized Great Britain in a speech in Damascus when he offered German leadership to all Moslems in the world. This aroused British suspicions regarding Kaiser's intentions because a large number of Moslems lived in the British Empire. It also attracted the hostility of Christian powers like France and Italy against Germany, which created a favourable atmosphere for the explosion of world war I.

iv) The Berlin - Baghdad railway project that he embarked on was a threat to Russia, France and Britain whose interests in the east were bound to be jeopardized by Germany. This helped to consolidate the triple entente against Germany.

v) Kaiser William II is blamed for starting the naval race to challenge British naval supremacy and militarism to maintain Germany's supremacy. He reinstated conscription and prolonged the period of service not only for defense but more to fulfill his imperialistic ambitions abroad. He deliberately disagreed with other leaders at disarmament conferences, yet this would have reduced arms race. Indeed, his activities and arrogance gave other powers every excuse to fear and re-mobilize against Germany just like Russia did after the Sarajevo incident.

vi) It was Kaiser William's blank cheque to Austria that increased Austria's recklessness towards Serbian.

He openly promised Austria that; ".....rest assured that his majesty will faithfully stand by Austria- Hungary as required by the obligations of his alliance and by his ancient friendship". Surely, if Kaiser William had not given this assurance, Austria would not have taken a bold step against Serbia (to the extent of declaring war). Henceforth, World War I would have been avoided.

i) It was Germany under Kaiser William II that declared war on Russia, France, violated the London treaty of 1839, which dragged Britain into war. All these are what magnified the local Austro-Serbian conflict into a European and finally a World War.

8) WEAKNESS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION AND THE COLLAPSE OF INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY

The weakness of International organisation prior to 1914 made the outbreak of the First World War inevitable. The international court of justice at The Hague was perfectly inefficient and un able to settle major world disputes. It had neither moral authority nor force to implement its resolutions, which explains why the many resolutions of the Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 remained on paper. The weakness of International organisation let to the collapse of International diplomacy. The outbreak of the First World War became inevitable because every state considered itself free to do anything according to its will since there was no authoritative organisation to restrain or punish her.

It should be noted that Serbia's attempt for a peaceful resolution with Austria failed because of the ineffectiveness of the international court of justice. Serbia accepted Austria's first two ultimatums and referred the third one to the international court of justice for arbitration. This failed because of the weakness of the International court of Justice, which had been discarded by Kaiser William II since 1907.

9) THE SARAJEVO DOUBLE MURDER, 28TH JUNE 1914

The immediate cause of the First World War was the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, the heir to the Austrian throne and his wife Sophia at Sarajevo-the capital of Bosnia (Bosnia had been annexed to Austria-Hungary in 1808) by Gavrilo Princip, a Serbian nationalist. Austria that was already sick of Serbian nationalism decided to utilize the event to destroy Serbia. She considered the incident as a Serbian conspiracy to destroy the Austrian monarchy, by assassinating the heir at a time when the ageing Emperor Joseph Francis was 84 years and was expected to die any time. Germany gave Austria-Hungary a blank cheque i.e. the freedom to do anything she wishes to Serbia with Germany's unconditional support.

Assured of Germany's backing, Austria sent an impossible ultimatum to Belgrade, the capital of Serbia on 23th July 1914. She demanded a satisfactory reply within 48 hours. These demands were that Serbia should among others;

- i) Declare her intention of being a good neighbour through the press and by suppressing anti-Austrian propaganda.
- ii) Dismiss anti-Austrian officials in her administration and the army.
- iii) Allow Austria's officials into Serbia to investigate the inquiry of Franz Ferdinand's assassination.

Serbia accepted the first two conditions but rejected Austria's participation in the inquiry of Ferdinand's death on the ground that it was a violation of her independence and wisely referred the matter to the international court of justice at The Hague. However, the international court of justice had been discarded by Kaiser William II way back in 1907. Austria rejected Serbia's proposal and declared war on her on 28th July 1914. This determined the occurrence of the First World War. Russia mobilized in support of Serbia, Germany demanded that Russia should demobilize but when she refused, Germany declared war on her on 1st August 1914. Germany again demanded France to declare her neutrality and when she refused, Germany declared war on her on 3th August 1914. On 4th August 1914, German troops invaded Belgium in violation of the 1839 London treaty that had guaranteed Belgium's independence and neutrality, which forced Britain to enter the war against Germany on the same day. Thus, the First World War was on a high gear.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ROLE OF EUROPEAN POWERS IN THE OUTBREAK OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Each and every power that participated in the war should be held responsible although the degree of responsibility differs. In other words, the responsibility varies from country to country based on the magnitude of the blame; It should be noted that much as countries like Italy, Japan, USA, Bulgaria and Turkey participated in the First World War, they cannot be held responsible for the outbreak of the war.

This is because they joined the war later when it had already started i.e. "broken off". Thus, with or without them the First World War would still have been an important event in the history of Europe and indeed the whole world.

1. GERMANY

By article 231 of the war guilt clause in the Versailles peace treaty, Germany was solely blamed for causing World War I. It was unanimously agreed that Germany alone was responsible for the outbreak of World War I and that is why article 232 subjected her to impossible reparation of 6,600m pounds.

Although these were very unrealistic, Germany still shares the greatest responsibility in causing and sustaining World War I in as far as she;

i) Started the alliance system in an attempt to isolate France in European politics. After Bismarck, Kaiser William II misused the alliance system as a tool to raise Germany above other powers. This prompted the formation of triple entente, which became antagonistic with the triple alliance leading to World War I.

ii) It was again Germany that started the arms and naval race which was followed by other powers. This was to prepare for a French war of revenge, dominate other powers and challenge British naval supremacy. The sophisticated weapons created more suspicion, hatred, recklessness and courage leading to the First World War.

iii) In the colonial field, Germany acquired territories adjacent to Britain that was very provocative. For instance, when Britain acquired Uganda and Kenya, Germany moved to Tanganyika. When Britain declared a protectorate over Ivory Coast and Sierra Leone, Germany annexed Togo and Cameroon.

Germany also encouraged colonial conflicts between France and other powers purposely to isolate France. Kaiser William II himself irritated Britain when he congratulated Paul Kruger for his success in the Jameson raid of 1894. This worsened the already hostile relationship between Britain and Germany and partly explains why Britain declared war on Germany in 1914.

iv) In pursuit of Germany's imperialism in the near east, Germany in 1913 started building the Berlin-Baghdad railway. She continued to claim exclusive rights to train and command the Turkish army against the British claim of similar rights over the navy and foreign policy. This created more tension in the east and made it a storm centre for the explosion of World War I.

v) Germany under Kaiser William II shares a blame for militarism and chauvinism. Kaiser William II believed in the policy of "world power or downfall". The arrogance and superiority complex of the Germans

increased the hostility between Germany and other races leading to World War I.

vi) The unification of Germany in 1871 distorted the balance of power in Europe and stimulated nationalism throughout Europe. In 1871, Prussia inflicted a humiliating defeat on France and completed the unification of Germany. France was subjected to a heavy war indemnity of 5 billion Francs, an army of occupation and was forced out of her two mineral rich provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. The humiliations and the losses from the Franco-Prussian war created bitter enmity between Germany and France and led to World War I.

NB. It has been argued that if Germany had not interfered in Morocco, France might have found some material compensation for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and would have probably forgotten to revenge against Germany. However, the German interference in Morocco added the bitterness between the two countries.

vii) Germany stands in the dock of history in relation to World War I for supporting Austria's annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the annoyance of Serbia and Russia. This strengthened Austria's imperialism in Serbia and triggered off Serbian nationalism leading to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and World War I

viii) Germany shares the guilt of World War I for issuing a blank cheque to Austria, which increased Austria's recklessness towards Serbia after the Sarajevo incident. This made Austria to issue the unrealistic ultimatum and declare war on Serbia that became a prelude to World War I.

ix) Germany is blamed for issuing an unnecessary ultimatum to Russia. In the aftermath of Austria's declaration of war on Serbia, Russia started a general mobilization and Germany sent an ultimatum demanding for her demobilization, which prompted Germany to declare war on her. Germany is therefore blamed for issuing an ultimatum on her own terms rather than seeking the opinion of other powers in dealing with Russian's mobilization. The ultimatum could have possibly humbled Russia if it was a joint declaration by the big powers of Europe i.e. Germany, France, Russia and Austria. That it failed to humble Russia was because it was a German declaration that posed no serious threat to Russia.

x) After the Sarajevo assassination, it was Germany that magnified the Austro-Serbian conflict into a World War. She declared war on Russia,

France and Belgium. The attack on Belgium violated the London treaty of 1839, which forced Britain and other powers to declare war on her.

NB. After Germany stationing her troops in Belgium in readiness for attack, France and Britain demanded that the German troops should be withdrawn but the Germans did not respond, neither they send a reply. This forced Britain to join the war against Germany.

2. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

i) Austria's imperialism in the Balkans is what sparked off World War I. The Berlin conference of 1878 gave her the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina merely to administer and not to annex them.

However, Austria annexed the two provinces in 1908. This brought forth bitter protest from Serbia and Russia leading to the assassination of Ferdinand and World War I. It also explains why Russia mobilized in support of Serbia against Austria.

ii) Austria should be blamed for her recklessness towards Serbia through the unrealistic ultimatum.

Austria had long-term intention to fight Serbia but lacked an excuse. She purposely issued the ultimatum with stringent conditions knowing that the terms would be rejected by Serbia and that would justify war with Serbia. It's even on record that the Austrian cabinet debated and declared war on Serbia on 14th July 1914, before the ultimatum was dispatched.

iii) Austria is also to blame for violating the territorial and political integrity of Serbia. She declared war on Serbia even after Baron Von Wiesner the then Austria's ambassador to Belgrade (Serbia) reported that there was no conclusive evidence of Serbia's involvement in the Sarajevo assassination. Had Austria not declared war on Serbia; possibly other powers like Russia would have no reason to mobilize their troops and the timing of the war would have been different.

iv) Austria also got involved in the arms race and was one of the most militaristic nations by 1914. This increased her imperialistic ambitions in the Balkans, which clashed with Serbian nationalism to spark off World War I.

v) She had a very strong solidarity with Germany and was the closest to Germany than Italy and Russia in the triple alliance and Dreikaiserband respectively. This created more confidence in Germany and made her the most aggressive nation prior to 1914. Had Austria abandoned Germany like Italy and Russia did, Germany would not have been so reckless to declare

war on Russia and the Austro-Serbian conflict would have remained a local affair between Austria and Serbia.

vi) Austria- Hungary is blamed for organizing the visit of Franz- Ferdinand and his wife at a time when the diplomatic relations between her and Serbia was at its lowest (worst) level. On 28th June 1914, Austrian authorities organized the royal visit that boomeranged and caused war when the royal couple was assassinated by a Serbian nationalist, Princip. Austrian authorities are therefore blamed for provoking Serbia by the visit because they were fully aware of the Serbian hostility towards Austria.

The poor relations between the two nations suggest that the Sarajevo assassination could not be accidental but an expected event that was ignored by Austria's lack of fore sight.

vii) Austria Hungary is held responsible for the outbreak of the First World War for internationalizing her conflict with Serbia. After the Sarajevo double murder, Austria rejected Serbia's demand to refer the third ultimatum for arbitration (Settlement) by the international court of Justice at The Hague. Emperor Joseph II of Austria instead consulted Kaiser William II of Germany, which dragged Germany with all her aggression into the conflict. Austria is also blamed for accepting Germany's advice to declare war on Serbia.

ix) Austria's poor diplomatic relations with Russia make her accountable for the outbreak of the First World War. Austria antagonized Russia by opposing her imperialism in the Balkans. In 1877, Russia defeated Turkey and forced her to sign the treaty of Sanstefano in which the big Bulgaria was created.

Austria allied with Britain and threatened war against Russia for her illegal creation of the big Bulgaria at the Berlin congress of 1878. Austria stood against the creation of the big Bulgaria and it was dissected into three i.e. reduced in size. . After the Berlin congress of 1878, Austria intensified her imperial designs in the Balkans that led to further conflicts with Russia. In 1879, Austria formed the dual alliance with Germany against Russia and France. Austria's activities threatened Russia's interest and dragged her into an alliance with France i.e. France Russian alliance of 1894. This set the pace for the formation of the triple entente in 1907, which caused more antagonism and tension that led to world war I by 1914.

3. SERBIA

i) Serbia shares the guilt of World War I for engineering conflict in an economically, politically and strategically located Balkan region. In 1912, she mobilized Bulgaria, Montenegro and Greece to form the Balkan

league. She used the league to fight Turkey and occupy her territories in Europe. She also fought and defeated Bulgaria in 1913, which increased her influence in the Balkans to the disappointment of Austria. Generally, Serbia contributed greatly to the Balkan wars of 1911 – 1913 during which she emerged as a leader of the Slav speaking race. This attracted the hostility of other powers particularly Germany, Austria and Turkey to defend their political, economic and strategic interest leading to the First World War.

ii) Serbian nationalism was too ambitious to guarantee peace in Europe. Serbian nationalism clashed with Austria's imperialism leading to the Sarajevo assassination and the First World War. The assassin of Franz Ferdinand and his wife was a member of the Great Serbian movement, which was against Austrian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Whether Serbian government was responsible for the murder or not is still a subject of dispute but Serbia's failure to suppress the activities of the greater Serbian movement makes her politically responsible for the assassination.

iii) It was Serbia that provided Austria with an excuse to declare war by refusing to comply with the 3rd term of the July 23rd ultimatum. She rejected the third term of the ultimatum that demanded for the intervention of Austrian officials in the investigation of the Sarajevo double murder. This provided Austria with a convenient pretext to declare war on her. Had Serbia humbled herself to accept all the terms of the ultimatum and risked her independence, the world would possibly have been spared from the great war of 1914-1918. She also wanted war because before sending her reply to the ultimatum, she had ordered for a general mobilization NB. This was before Austria declared war.

iv) Serbia is also blamed for being a close ally of the Triple entente that was antagonistic to the triple alliance. She was also overwhelmed with confidence that she recklessly pursued her ambitions of uniting all the Slavs in the Balkans. It intensified conflict between her on one hand against Austria and Germany on the other hand. This created more tension in Germany and Austria that made them determined to fight to destroy Serbia after the Sarajevo assassination as a way of breaking the solidarity of the triple entente alliance. It should be argued that Serbia's aggressive and arrogant attitude partly made Germany to support Austria against her.

v) Serbia's aggressive and arrogant attitude towards Austria and Germany created more tension that led to the outbreak of the First World War. This

partly made Austria to issue the unrealistic ultimatum and declare war against her in 1914.

vi) Serbia is also blamed for promoting anti Austrian activities and terrorist movements like the union, death and Black Hand society. Serbia started sponsoring these movements to sabotage Austrian rule after her annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878. It was these terrorist movements that masterminded the assassination of Franz Ferdinand with his wife and sparked off the First World War.

vii) Lastly, Serbia is blamed for magnifying her conflict with Austria by appealing for Russian support.

After the Sarajevo assassination, Serbia called for Russian support against Austria. This scared Austria and contributed to her declaration of war on Serbia. Serbia's appeal to Russia also explains why Russia mobilized in support of her in the aftermath of Sarajevo double murder. It was also Russia's mobilization that prompted Germany to declare war on her. One can therefore argue that if Serbia had not appealed for Russian support, Russia could possibly not have mobilized her troops and Germany would not have found a convenient pretext to declare war on her (Russia).

4. RUSSIA

i) Russia shares the blame for supporting Balkan nationalism and the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Her support of Pan Slavism led to the Balkan wars of 1878 and those of 1912 - 1913. The success of Slav nationalism in Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece stimulated greater nationalism, which undermined the existence of the Austrian Empire and even Germany. That Austria declared war on Serbia was because Serbian nationalism supported by Russia threatened her existence and the same explains why Germany declared war on Russia.

ii) It was Russia's support to Serbian nationalism that intensified Serbia's recklessness leading to the assassination of Prince Ferdinand and his wife that sparked off war in 1914.

iii) Even after the assassination, it was Russia's support to Serbia that partly made her defiant to Austria's demands. The Russian foreign minister Sazanov told the Serbian ambassador in Russia that; Russia would in no circumstances permit Austrian aggression against Serbia. This is what encouraged Serbia to reject Austria's ultimatum in full. Otherwise, Serbia in her relatively weaker position compared to Austria would not have dared take such a bold stand against Austria.

iv) Russia's interference in Serbian affairs with a claim to be the rightful protector of Slav population and orthodox Christians in the Balkans was rejected by other powers. Although this is justifiable to some extent, it carried more of Russia's hidden imperial, economic and strategic motives than true religious and ethnic aims. This attracted the attention of other powers particularly Germany, Turkey and Austria making it impossible to localize any conflict such as the Austro-Serbian conflict.

v) Russia made Germany to declare war on her. She ordered for general mobilization on 23rd July 1914 and refused to accept Germany's ultimatum to demobilize. This forced Germany to declare war on her as the only alternative. According to Professor Fay:

"It was primarily Russia's general mobilization when Germany was trying to bring

Austria to a settlement which precipitated the final catastrophe, causing Germany to mobilize and declare war"

vi) Russia's expansionist policy in the Balkans and the desire to check Germany's advance to the east made her to get entangled in the arms race and militarism. This was to challenge Germany's military might amongst others, which forced Germany to declare war on her. Actually, Russia's mobilization was not just to assist Serbia against Austria but target fully mobilized for Germany.

vii) Russia's quitting of the Dreikaisabund in 1878 made it impossible for alliance system to be an instrument of peace. After leaving Germany's camp, she joined the French camp (Triple entente) yet France was Germany's number one enemy. This put Germany on tension, incited her to prepare for war and forced her to declare war on her (Russia) and France as well.

BRITAIN

i) She shares the war guilt for being the most influential member of the triple entente that was antagonistic to the triple alliance led by Germany. Britain made separate treaties with Japan, France and Russia and consolidated them in the triple entente of 1907. This threatened Germany and made her to prepare for war and that is why she fought France, Britain, Russia and Japan.

ii) Britain is accused for causing World War I due to her international jealousy and self-seeking ambitions.

She was the champion of colonialism, enjoyed monopoly but never wanted other powers to challenge her status as the workshop of Europe. This accounts for imperialism and colonial economic conflicts especially with the new Germany that precipitated war.

iii) Britain also protested the Berlin-Baghdad railway that aimed at increasing German trade in the east to the extent of encouraging Russia in the Balkans from 1908, which had not been the case before. She wanted to use Russia to block Germany's advance, which only brought war.

iv) By 1914, Britain had built a huge and strong naval force but still resented any other power's attempts to do so, especially Germany. When Germany tried to challenge her naval superiority, she began modernizing and speeding up naval and arms manufacture that led to the arms race. This turned European balance of power into a balance of terror to cause the First World War.

v) Britain stands in the dock of history in as far as she fought to defend her self-interest in Belgium. She had a naval base in Belgium from where she controlled the eastern waters. This is what made her to champion Belgium independence and neutrality in 1839. Thus, the British declaration of war based on the violation of London treaty of 1839 was a mere camouflage of protecting her naval base against the threats from German troops in Belgium.

vi) Britain's refusal to settle the eastern question peacefully by partitioning the Ottoman Empire made it to be a historical centre of European conflicts that developed into World War I. If Britain had accepted the Russian policy of dividing up Turkey as early as 19th century, the Balkan wars of 1911-1913 would have been minimized and World War I would have started from elsewhere not from the Balkans.

vii) The Anti German feelings and propaganda created by the British press makes Britain responsible for the First World War. The London Times exaggerated war threats by Germany after the Sarajevo assassination and turned public opinion against Germany. This encouraged Austria to declare war on Serbia and Russia to mobilize for war at the same time. The British press propaganda also influenced the government to declare war on Germany on 4th August 1914.

FRANCE

a) France is blamed for her desire to revenge against Germany for the humiliations and losses of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. In 1871, Prussia

defeated France and subjected her to a heavy war indemnity of 5 billion francs, an army of occupation and snatched her two mineral rich provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. After 1871, France had a burning desire not only to recover Alsace and Lorraine but also to revenge against Germany and restore her national pride and prestige as a great power.

Public opinion favoured war and a statue symbolizing revenge was erected at Strasbourg city. A revengist movement led by opposition politician General Boulanger advocated for a war of revenge against Germany. This made Otto Von Bismarck of Germany to take a precautionary measure of starting alliance system and arms race to isolate France and defend Germany. Declaration of war against France on 3rd Aug 1914 was influenced by the need to suppress her spirit of revenge.

b) Although France fought a defensive war, there is evidence that she was not willing to be neutral in the Austro-Serbian war. In the aftermath of Austria's declaration of war against Serbia, Kaiser William II of Germany demanded France to state her position in the war. However, President Poincaré declined to guarantee the neutrality of France, which forced Germany to declare war on her. It must be noted that France's refusal to guarantee her neutrality was partly influenced by her desire to revenge against Germany and repossess her mineralized provinces of Alsace and Lorraine.

c) France contributed directly and indirectly to alliance system that led to the outbreak of World War I. Indirectly, her desire to revenge the losses of the Franco-Prussian war is what primarily made Bismarck to form the Dreikaiserbund (1873), Dual entente (1879) and triple alliance (1882) i.e. to isolate her and frustrate her desire to revenge against Germany. Directly, France initiated alliances against Germany. In

1894, she allied with Russia (Franco-Russian alliance). In 1904, she allied with Britain (Dual Entente) and in 1907; Russia joined the Dual Entente to form the Triple Entente. These alliances divided Europe into two hostile and antagonistic camps leading to the collapse of diplomacy and explosion of the First World War.

d) France was also entangled/ involved in militarism, naval, and arms race. After 1871, France started rearming herself with sophisticated weapons, embarking on conscription and improving her naval capacity as a move to launch a successful war of revenge against Germany. She also ventured in colonial acquisition and adopted the policy of assimilation in her colonies in order to get more manpower to fight Germany. Radical opposition

politicians like General Boulanger became more popular because of their advocacy for a revenge war against Germany. All these created fear suspicion, Jealousy and panic in Germany that culminated into the outbreak of the First World War by 1914.

e) France is also blamed for colonial rivalry and conflict that created tension and war fever by 1914.

She clashed with Germany twice for the control of Morocco in 1906 and 1911 i.e. The Tangier incident, 1905 (the 1st Moroccan crisis) and the Agadir crisis, 1911 (the second Moroccan crisis). Although these crises were settled diplomatically, Germany was left with a spirit of revenge, which she accomplished by attacking France in 1914.

f) France assured Russia of support in the Austro-Serbian conflict, which made it difficult to localize the issue. The French President Poincaré visited Russia from 20th July to 23rd July 1914 and promised French support to Russia against Austria. To quote him, Serbia has very warm friends in the Russian people and Russia has an ally, France. This is what morale boosted Russia to mobilize for war after Austria declaring war on Serbia.

g) However, in comparison to other powers, France takes the least responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War. This is because she fought a defensive war. Although she had the desire to revenge, she pursued it with reasonable patience and never went for war over Alsace and Lorraine as an immediate reason. When Austria attacked France, Germany gave France a limited time to state her position and when France declined, Germany declared war on her, marched and stationed her troops in Belgium in readiness to invade France. France therefore had no other alternative other than to mobilize and defend herself, thereby sharing a lesser blame.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE DEFEAT OF CENTRAL POWERS/GERMANY IN WORLD WAR I OR REASONS FOR THE TRIUMPH OF ALLIED POWERS IN WORLD WAR I

Background

World war I was basically fought between two belligerent camps i.e. the triple alliance and triple entente.

Germany and Austria-Hungary were the core members of the triple alliance and were called the central powers. France, Britain and Russia were the dominant members of the triple entente and were known as allied powers. Turkey, Romania and Bulgaria joined the central powers and USA joined the allied powers in 1917 after the withdrawal of Russia. Italy, though a member of the triple alliance changed camp and fought on the side of the triple entente. The war also involved colonies and other powers who joined either of the camps. The central powers began the war with much vigour and successes but failed to sustain the war in the long run. They were overpowered with massive losses and by 1918 all had surrendered. This was due to political, social and economic factors.

1. Military superiority of allied powers accounts for their success against central powers/Germany. The allied powers had better military equipments like tanks that were first used by the British, sophisticated fighter jets and airplanes for spying on the position of troops of central powers. The central powers were militarily inferior which made them to lose several battles. The range of the German U-boats were short and inflicted maximum damage on civilians than allied troops, which attracted negative public outcry against the central powers. The Germans tried to use poison gas but abandoned it after realizing that winds were blowing it back to their own base. Besides, German allies like Turkey, Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria were so weak that Germany would occasionally divert her troops to help them against the allied powers.

This diverted the German army and led to lack of concentration yet Germany was fighting on two fronts i. e. The Western front against Belgium, France and Britain and the Eastern front against Russia.

2. The naval superiority of allied powers also explains the defeat of central powers/Germany. The allied powers were boosted by Britain who had the best dreadnaughts and battleships manned by well drilled and experienced naval officers. These were effectively used to block Germany and her allies from accessing most European waters, which limited their combat operations to the mainland. Imports and exports involving central powers were therefore severely reduced, which worsened economic crisis and weakened them militarily. The British navy also demolished several German squadrons and U-boats on the Atlantic Ocean e.g. A very dangerous German squadron commanded by Admiral Graf that had

inflicted severe damage on British ships on the coast of South America was finally crushed in Dec 1914. Thereafter, the several German squadrons that were scattered throughout the world were hunted down and demolished.

Naval superiority made allied powers to effectively control European waters and freely move troops to any theatre of war unlike the central powers, which made the defeat of the central powers inevitable.

3. The reckless German submarine warfare strategy also contributed to the defeat of Germany and her allies. The Germans used unrestricted U-boat warships that were banned in Europe because of their destructive nature. From mid 1915, the Germans without any preliminary warning recklessly used U-boats to sink any ship be it for civilians, merchants, traders, refugees, soldiers or passengers as long as it was sighted in the war zone. The U-boats even sunk ships of neutral countries like Spain, Portugal and USA.

This led to death of several innocent civilians' traders and refugees e.g. in May 1915; the Germans sunk the British ship (Lusitania) in which over 1000 passengers including 100 American citizens perished. This created a public outcry in America to punish Germany for the wanton massacre that made USA to join the war on the side of allies and defeat Germany. On the other hand, German's overreliance on U-boats was unsustainable by 1918. The allies countered it with the "Convoy system" which rendered the U-boat strategy ineffective hence accounting for Germany's defeat.

4. The German invasion of Belgium in 1914 was a military blunder that contributed to the defeat of the central powers. On 4th Aug 1914, Germany invaded Belgium and attacked France. This was an outright violation of the 1839 London treaty in which the great powers had pledged to respect the neutrality and independence of Belgium. This portrayed Germany as an aggressive imperial power that does not respect international treaties. It irritated European powers most especially Britain who joined the war purposely to safeguard the 1839 London treaty, which had guaranteed Belgium's independence. Thereafter, Britain used her naval power to blockade Germany in European waters, which conditioned German's defeat by 1918.

5. Poor planning based on misconception created by the Schlieffen plan also contributed to

Germany's defeat in World War I. The German war plan was devised by her chief of general staff. Count Von Schlieffen in which German troops were to quickly march through Belgium into France, overrun Paris and defeat

France in about 6 weeks. Thereafter, the victorious troops were to rush to the East and defeat the 'inferior and backward' Russia in a few days. However the plan was a fiasco right from the moment it was tried. First of all, the war started with Russia on 1st Aug before France later on the 3rd.

Secondly, the Belgians waged a strong resistance and the quick march to France was a dream. Thirdly, the inferior and backward' Russians advanced much faster and attacked East Prussia, which prompted the Germans to divert over 4 more divisions from France to the East. This disorganized and weakened German forces right from the onset and retarded their effectiveness.

6. Numerical superiority of allied powers also contributed to the defeat of Germany and her allies. The allied camp had more states including large and highly populated countries like Britain, France, Russia, Belgium, Japan, USA etc. They were boosted by common wealth forces and vast colonies possessed by allied powers. On the other hand, Germany and her allies had very few colonies compared to those possessed by allied powers. Out of German allies, only Austria was militarily stronger while Turkey and Bulgaria were militarily inferior. The scale of the war subjected the four central powers to fight the whole world, which was impossible considering the fact that they were numerically disadvantaged.

7. The entry of USA on the side of allies boosted the allies and contributed to the speedy defeat of the central powers. In 1917, USA joined the allies against Germany partly to avenge the death of about 100 American citizens in the British ship Lusitania that was destroyed by German U-boat in 1915. Prior to 1917, USA had accumulated a lot of financial gains through sale of war related equipments and she was the most stable nation. It should be noted that by April 1917, the war had reached a stalemate where either side could not make significant gains and win. However, USA's entrance reinforced allied powers with financial and military backing at a time when both camps were exhausted and fatigued. It also helped to fill the gap left by Russia's withdrawal and that explains why the central powers failed to take advantage of it by making rapid gains, which could have won for them the war.

8. Encirclement of Germany by 1917 greatly contributed to the defeat of central powers. From 1916, the allies launched three simultaneous attacks from the Western, Eastern and Italian fronts. Americans launched a full scale invasion of Germans near Verdun, British used heavy tanks to shell German troops Amiens and Arras, and Canadians attacked German troops who

had earlier on taken over Ypres. French and Belgians intensified their attacks in the North of France. This encirclement overstretched and scattered the German troops and made the defeat of central powers inevitable since Germany was the only active member by 1918.

9. High spirit of patriotism and nationalism also contributed to the success of allied powers against Germany and her allies. Allied nations like Britain, France and Italy were led by democrats who instilled the spirit of patriotism and nationalism in their subjects. Their leaders used the mass media to mobilize all abled bodied persons to fight and defeat the central powers. For instance, in 1916 when the Germans attacked the main military base of French forces at Verdun, Marshall Potein, the French commander issued an inspiring call to his troops that "they shall not pass". This call became the French patriotic slogan that inspired confidence and resilience in French troops, which made the Germans to be ejected from France.

10. The role of charismatic leadership also contributed to the success of allied powers in the War. The French prime minister, George Clemenceau and his counterpart of Britain were more experienced and competent than the leaders of the central powers. They mobilized and moral boosted their nationals to fight and defeat Germany and her allies. On the other hand, central powers were led by less experienced and shrewd statesmen. Germany after the downfall of Bismarck was led by Kaiser II and army commanders Von Hidenburg and Ludendorff, who were less oriented in European politics and military organization.

Austria-Hungary was led by Emperor Francis Joseph whose age (84 years in 1914) had partly made him incapable of holding the ramshackle empire together (the empire was crumbling due to the rise of nationalism). Turkey was led by Sultan Mohamad V who had also failed to maintain harmony and co-existence between the various nationalities struggling to regain their independence. This created internal weaknesses that reduced the effectiveness of the central powers in the war and favoured the success of allied powers in World War I.

11. The defection of Italy and Romania to allied camp also contributed to the defeat of the central powers. Italy was a founder member of the triple alliance (led by Germany) and Romania was a close ally.

Germany and Austria thus expected both states to support them in the war. However in 1916, both Italy and Romania defected and joined the allies against the central powers. This created panic, confusion and low morale in the camp of the central powers. The defection led to leakage of long

war plans and strategies and boosted the morale in the allied powers that led to the defeat of the central powers.

12. Press propaganda was used to decampaign the central powers and mobilize mass support that led to the success of allied powers. The mass media was manipulated to popularize malicious and ridiculous information about the central powers. The British and French media were used by opportunistic politicians to depict Germany and her allies as imperialists who were fighting to dominate and oppress the world.

Lord Northcliffe, who was in charge of propaganda in Britain, dispatched leaflets to Austria-Hungary in which he promised the various nationalities their independence, if they deserted the Austrian Empire. The Czechs, Poles, Slovenes and Croats responded to the offer and joined the allies. They contributed to numerical superiority of allied powers that overwhelmed the central powers.

13. Economic hardship also accounts for the defeat of Germany and her allies. This was partly due to the fact that Germany diverted resources from productive sectors like agriculture to sustain the war that dragged on for 4 years. Worst of all, as the war progressed, allied powers imposed economic embargo on the central powers that banned imports and exports of food, medicine, arms and ammunitions throughout Europe. Britain enforced naval blockade where she confiscated cargoes of neutral ships trading with Germany purposely to wreck Germany's economy. This led to acute economic hardship like inflation, financial crisis, unemployment, poverty and starvation. On the other hand, allied powers easily traded in arras, ammunitions, food and medicines, which favoured them against the central powers. One should recapitulate that financial crisis led to poor armament, slow reinforcement, poor motivation and low morale that subjected Germany and her allies to defeat.

14. Internal instability also contributed to the defeat of Germany. By 1918, trade unionists, socialists and communists mobilized protests against the severe economic hardship and Germany's continuation of war against the allies. The communists attempted a revolution that was ruthlessly suppressed. These diverted attention and concentration of German leaders and soldiers from the war. On the contrary, allied nations were relatively stable with the exception of Russia. Trade unionists cooperated with their governments and workers were silenced with high wages. This created internal stability that left the allies with much freedom to concentrate on the war against Germany and her allies.

15. The abdication of Kaiser William 11 on 8th Nov 1918 and the signing of armistice by President Ebert

Was the final step in the defeat of the central powers By 1918, all German allies had surrendered and Germany was still persisting with the war amidst severe economic crisis, internal protests and threat of military coup. This forced top army commanders i.e. Ludendorff and Hindenburg to relinquish their power to the Reichstag. Kaiser William 11 was also forced by pressure of events to abdicate and flee to Holland, which made Chancellor Prince Marx to handover government control to Fredrick Ebert, the social-democrat leader. On 11th Nov 1918, Fredrick Ebert signed an armistice with the victorious powers that marked the end of the war and the final defeat of the central powers.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

EFFECTS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The First World War was the most destructive war fought between the highly organized states of the 20th century. It was the first war on a large scale that dislocated the political, social, economic and military structures and the whole world. Every belligerent state bore lasting scars of the terrible ordeal between the years 1914 - 1918. Its impact will directly and indirectly continue to affect the style and pattern of life of mankind in the universe.

Positive impact

i) Political freedom

The war gave rise to new and independent states on the map of Europe. The Versailles peacemakers granted independence to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia etc. The independent Republic of Yugoslavia was created by merging Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and Montenegro.

Rumania also became independent and even acquired Bessarabia from Russia and Transylvania from Austria-Hungary. Most of the newly created states were formerly under the Ottoman Empire. However, the merging of

different nationalities brewed conflict, which led to political instability that characterized the inter-war period.

ii) Territorial re-adjustment

Some territorial changes were witnessed due to the outcome of World War I. At Versailles, France regained the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, the works of arts and her flag that were confiscated by Germany in 1871. Germany also lost Schleswig to Denmark, Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium amongst others. Italy gained Trieste and Trientino from Austria which were inhabited by Italians but still ruled by Austria. Austria lost Bosnia and Herzegovina to the newly created state of Yugoslavia and Slovenia to

Czechoslovakia. These territorial re-adjustments created new boundaries and redrew the map of Europe.

iii) Formation of the League of Nations

The formation of the League of Nations in Jan 1920 was an outcome of the First World War. The devastations and sufferings of the Great War cautioned the great powers of the necessity to avoid a war of such nature in future. This gave rise to the League of Nations as an international organisation to maintain peace in Europe. This was because the weakness of the International Court of Justice was partly responsible for the outbreak of World War I and its disastrous consequences. The League of Nations was to diplomatically resolve conflicts and protect the territorial integrity and independence of weaker states as a strategy of creating a lasting peace.

iv) Rise of Japan and USA

The war led to the rise of Japan and USA since they were not greatly affected. After the collapse of the Tsarist regime in Russia, Japan expanded in the east. She took advantage of the eastern markets to strengthen her economy. By 1917, USA had supplied the allies with ammunitions and other supplies, which brought her economic prosperity. She also gave loans to states for financing the War and post war recovery from which she reaped a lot of interest after the war. After the war Japan and USA continued their dominance in the supply of manufactured goods to the world. This consolidated the economic, military and political influence of Japan and USA alongside Britain in European and World affairs.

V) The triumph of communism in Russia and its spread to Eastern Europe

The First World War led to the rise of communism in Russia that spread to Eastern Europe by 1939. The chaos and catastrophic effects of the war in

Russia created a revolutionary mood against the Tsarist regime led by Tsar Nicholas II. Consequently, revolutionary leaders like Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky mobilized the Russians in a dual revolution that ended in a communist government on Nov 1917. Thereafter, communism spread to Eastern Europe and became a threat to capitalist Western Europe by 1939. This later created an ideological struggle between communist Eastern Europe led by USSR and capitalist Western

Europe led by USA that is known as the Cold war.

vi) The downfall of conservative and autocratic governments

The collapse of conservative and dictatorial governments in Europe was also a consequence of the First World War. The negative effects of the war were blamed on conservative and autocratic regimes that were accused of provoking the war. The Germans blamed the Hohenzollem dynasty, the Russians accused Tsardom, Austrians and Hungarians 'fixed their eyes' on Hapsburg Empire as the Balkan states held the Ottoman Empire responsible for the horrible experience they went through. By 1939 these conservative and autocratic governments were over thrown and replaced by new once.

vii) The rise of Republicanism in Germany

The First World War led to the rise of constitutional and democratic government in Germany. As Germany was on the verge of her final defeat towards 1918, there was public outcry against Kaiser William II who eventually fled to exile and left a political vacuum in Germany. European powers like France and Britain were fed up of the autocratic German monarchical government and wanted a republican government in Germany. The British and the French therefore advocated for the establishment of a democratic government similar to those in Britain and France, which would be a puppet government of foreign powers. This led to the rise and existence of the Weimer republic which transformed Germany from a Monarchy to a democratic state between 1919 to 1933.

viii) Destruction of social class division

The war ended social class division in a number of European states. The war destroyed investments and properties of wealthy people especially the middle class and landlords in states like Britain and France.

The chaotic atmosphere created by the war favoured looting by the poor especially peasants some of whom became rich and moved to the level

of middle class. During the war, people of different social classes and nationalities fled and hid together and shared the same camps, sickbays and hospitals.

After the war, it became difficult to differentiate between a peasant and a middle class since the social gap was narrowed by the war. It led to the spread of the idea of social equality and fraternity that led to the rise of cultural tolerance in Europe. This ended Social class conflicts in Europe as there was mutual respect for all mankind without prejudice.

ix) Women emancipation

The First World War contributed to the growth of women emancipation movement. It created an environment that led to social changes in Europe and indeed the world. The war led to acute shortage of men since most of them were killed and disabled. It made women to be employed in factories, shops, public office, hospitals and schools that were formally for men. They started putting on tight miniskirts and trousers as they did work that were originally preserved for men. This led to women emancipation and the idea of equality since women's talents were realized. Women formed social movements to advocate for equality with men. Consequently, in Britain all women aged 30 and above were given the right to vote.

Thus the war led to social changes in the status of women that made them to play more active role in their communities.

x) Improvement in education

There was improvement in education, science, technology and further spread of industrial revolution. This was done because it was realized that Europe needed educated labour force for progress. In Britain, the 1918 education act tried to provide a full and adequate education for the country's children. Science and technology were also improved. After the war, wartime research and inventions were used to make industries more efficient and organized. For instance, there was development of bomber aircraft industry and air travel after the war. However, the progress of science and the sufferings experienced during the War made many people to lose faith in religion and the idea of the existence of the almighty God. This led to a decline in religious beliefs that made 1920's to be referred to as the Gay years.

xi) Romanticism and merry making

The War led to a culture of romanticism and merry making in Europe. The physical and psychological effects of the war made the youngsters and other survivors to resort to merry making in an attempt to forget the miseries, trauma, and stress from the war. In London and other big cities of Europe, people resorted to dancing, jazz music, parties and other leisure activities. Other drew pictures and made art pieces depicting the terrible experience they had witnessed. All these made the post-World War I period to be code-named Gay Twenties.

Negative impact

1) Depopulation

The greatest effect of World War I was the loss of millions of abled bodied persons let alone disabling many more. It's estimated that 13,000,000 people were killed in the actual fighting while 10,000,000 were permanently disabled. For every minute of fighting, four soldiers were being killed and nine wounded. At the national level, David Thomson reports that one Frenchman was killed every minute between August 1914 and Feb 1918. This death toll was further accelerated by famine, diseases during the war, appalling condition of prisoners of war and other calamities related to the war. The overall consequence was depopulation that left about 10,000,000 orphans and widows.

ii) Change in the population structure

The war changed the population structure in Europe. The massive death of men especially at the battle field created a demographic structure dominated by women and children than men. The high death rate was also followed by low death rate since the number of productive people was greatly reduced. It created labour shortage that made industrialists to resort to women and children. However most of the women and children were inexperienced and inefficient, which often resulted into production of sub standard commodities that could not be solved in the world market. On the other hand, employment of children in dangerous factories and mines was the beginning of child abuse, which is a social evil up to today. Thus, the First World War can be blamed for availing a favourable atmosphere that led to child labour with all its dangers on the children.

iii) Displacement of people

The war led to massive displacement of people in Europe. There was a large influx of homeless refugees and Internally Displaced Persons. It's estimated that about 21 million people were displaced and became homeless. Many

of these were kept in camps in Western Europe during and after the war. This left the allied powers with the problem of how to repatriate and rehabilitate such displaced persons. This burden was shouldered by the international community through the League of Nations.

iv) The plight of prisoners of war

The war left behind the challenge of prisoners of war. During the war, the allied powers got many Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, and Turks etc as prisoners of war. The central powers also managed to take a good number of Russians, British, French, Belgians etc as prisoners of war. After the war, belligerents had so many prisoners of war. For instance, Russia had about 427,000 prisoners of war. The challenge was big as such a state had to provide basic services like food, water, accommodation, medical services and security. This challenge ended after the League of Nations took over and repatriated the prisoners of war to their countries.

v) Destruction of property and infrastructure

The war led to wanton destruction of property and infrastructure with the exception of USA and associated powers outside Europe. Production assets like industries, mines, hospitals, clinics, educational institutions, shops, hotels, administrative centers, residential houses, roads, railways, bridges, military equipments and weapons all suffered destruction during the war. Of equal importance was agriculture where valuable food and cash crops together with livestock were killed, confiscated or destroyed. France, Germany and Belgium experienced the worst damage because they were at the centre of the war. The damages led to famine, starvation and malnutrition in the whole world. These were worst in Germany where production fell by 70%. The Russians suffered severe famine due to the German destruction of Ukraine wheat field that used to be the principle supplier of wheat in Russia.

vi) Economic decline

The war seriously drained the economy and resources of the world leading to economic decline and hardships. Huge chunks of money were squandered in financing the war and economic recovery programs after the war, yet most of the productive assets like industries and mines were razed to the ground. Some other industries that survived were closed and those that initially produced consumer goods resorted to production of war materials. This led to shortage of commodities, inflation, unemployment, heavy debt burden, poor standard of living and decline in international trade.

Britain that had dominated trade as the workshop of Europe suffered greatly due to the war. She concentrated on the production of war materials, which made her customers to switch to other countries for essential commodities. When the War ended, they could no longer renew their trade relations with Britain. Yet the few customers that remained were so devastated by the war that they did not have the money to buy British goods. Germany herself was crippled by reparations that she paid in kind and this destroyed the British trade the more.' "" "

Germany's economy suffered most as she was deprived of all her colonies in Africa, Middle East and Asia. She was disarmed and forced to pay a heavy war indemnity of £6,600m. This made Germany to be on top of the great economic depression in Europe. For instance, by 1931 Germany had 6,000,000 unemployed people while Britain had 3,000,000.

vii) The Great Depression of 1929-1933

The First World War, contributed to the outbreak of the World economic depression of 1929-1933.

Destruction and closer of industries led to mass unemployment and low purchasing power that huge quantities of commodities unsold. International trade declined because countries were left so poor that they could not import large quantities of foreign products yet their own domestic markets were flooded with surplus products. Above all many European countries were heavily indebted to USA as a result of loans borrowed to finance the war and reconstruct the economy after the war. The repayment of such debts to USA more over in form of Gold reduced money supply and led to the outbreak of the Great Depression by 1929.

viii) The downfall of Germany and her allies

The war led to the fall and disintegration of Germany and her allies. After her defeat, Germany was partitioned into two with the Polish Corridor mining through it to the port of Danzig. The Austrian empire disappeared from the map of Europe. Austria was reduced to a small land locked country with a population entirely German speaking of about 7 million while Hungary was isolated with a population almost entirely made up of Magyar of about 8 million.

ix) The end of former treaties and alliances

The First World War destroyed and ended the then existing treaties and alliances. The German invasion of Belgium in 1914 violated the London

treaty of 1839 that had guaranteed the independence and neutrality of Belgium. In 1915, Italy signed the treaty of London by which she joined the triple entente to fight against the triple alliance which she had been a member (since 1882 when she signed). With this, Italy fought against Austria and Germany who were her former allies. In 1917, Russia signed the treaty of Brest Litovsk with Germany by which she abandoned the triple entente and crossed to Germany's side after being defeated (by Germany). These shifting of sides weakened former treaties and alliances and made it impossible to renew them after the war. However, new treaties and alliances like the little entente of

Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia and France (1921-1927) and the axis alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan (1937) reemerged in the inter war period. The new treaties and alliances had different membership some of which included former enemies of World War I, hence the dynamics of inter war politics.

x) Political changes in favour of dictatorship

The war resulted into political changes that favoured the rise of dictatorship in Europe between 1919 and 1936. The social and economic problems created by the war made people to lose faith governments that led them into the war. This undermined the pre-war governments that was used by ambitious men like Lenin, Mussolini, General Franco and Hitler to mobilize the masses that led to the collapse of the then existing governments. This was responsible for the rise of Communism in Russia in 1917, Fascism in Italy (1922) and Spain (1939), and Nazism in Germany in 1934. These were because the masses preferred strong, militant and authoritarian governments that could effectively defend their territorial integrity and independence.

xi) The Negative implications of the 1919 Versailles settlement.

The First World War was concluded with the Versailles treaty of 1919 that had negative implications on Europe. The treaty was dictated and Germany plus her allies were forced to sign against their will. The terms of the treaty like; war guilt, reparations, disarmament, territorial and mandate clauses brought several negative changes against the defeated nations in favour of the victorious powers. Japan and Italy who were on the side of the victorious powers were also unfairly rewarded for their efforts. Consequently, they joined Germany in the Tokyo-Rome -Berlin axis and waged a network of aggressions that destabilized European peace in the inter war period.

xii) The outbreak of World War II

The First World War laid foundation for the outbreak of World War II. The destroyed European economy and led to economic depression that destroyed diplomatic relations and led to the outbreak of World war II by 1939. The war was also concluded by the unfair Versailles settlement that left Germany, Italy and Japan with a high spirit of revenge rather than reconciliation. It also led to the rise of aggressive leaders like Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy who waged a series of aggression that climaxed into the German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of World War II. To this extent, one can conclude that the Second World War was a continuation of the First World War.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

Introduction

The First World War finally ended at the 11th hour of the 11th day in the 11th month. It was after a spokesman of the central powers (Germany and her allies) conceded defeat and agreed to an armistice with Marshall Forhe, the commander of the allied forces. This left the leading statesmen with the task of settling the problems created by the war and maintaining world peace. After the surrender of Germany and her allies, the victorious powers met in a conference at Versailles in Paris between January and June 1919. They came out with the Versailles peace treaty; The Versailles treaty was an elaborate document of 800 words that contained 440 articles. It was a peace agreement signed between the victorious powers (who were 27 by then) and the defeated powers between 1919- 1923. The main treaty was signed in the hall of mirrors at Versailles. Other treaties imposed on the defeated powers were included in its final version, such were;

- i) The treaty of St. German with Austria in September 1919.
- ii) The treaty of Trianon with Hungary in June 1920.
- iii) The treaty of Nuilly with Bulgaria in Nov 1919

iv) The two treaties with Turkey i.e. the treaty of Serves (1920) and the treaty of Lousane in 1923 (after another government coming to power).

Although a number of states were represented at the Paris conference, the terms of the peace treaty was exclusively decided by three countries i.e. Britain represented by Premier Lloyd George, France led by Premier George Clemenceau, USA represented by President Woodrow Wilson and to a small extent Orlando of Italy. Of the big three statesmen, Woodrow Wilson of USA was more realistic in comparison to his colleagues. He was an idealist professor with little experience in European politics.

However, the role played by USA in the war convinced him that he had more solutions for European problems than any of the other statesmen. Nevertheless, his inexperience in European affairs made him to be overshadowed by Lloyd George and Clemenceau who were hardheaded/tough minded debaters.

No wonder that they were able to get things done from him, which he would not have voluntarily approved of.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WOODROW WILSON'S 14 POINTS

Woodrow Wilson wanted justice and impartiality to be extended to the defeated powers. He believed that injustice/unfairness on any of the belligerents (countries that fought) would take Europe and indeed the world back to the bad old days of war. It was against this background that he came out with 14 points, which was the basis upon which peace was concluded with Germany and her allies. The points were the outcome of his critical analysis of the causes of World War I and he made sure that they were accepted at the Paris peace conference.

It must be emphasized that Germany surrendered on condition that the 14 points and other statements made by Woodrow Wilson would be the basis of the Versailles peace treaty. Besides the 14 points, Wilson had announced that there shall be no annexations, no reparations, no punitive damages and that free acceptance by the people concerned would be the basis of any settlement. However, these principles were totally violated when the

treaty was drafted. Germany and her allies were not invited but called upon to answer charges at the conference.

The treaty of Versailles was not negotiated (as Wilson wanted) but dictated by the victors upon the vanquished (defeated) powers. It was simply presented to Germany and she was asked either to accept it in five days or face an invasion. Germany had no better choice than to sign what she called "dictated peace".

NB. Even at the time of signing the treaty, the German delegates led by its foreign minister were humiliated. They were kept in a hotel behind barbed wires and were not allowed to communicate to anybody. They were escorted in and out of the hall of mirrors where the treaty was signed like criminals escorted to and from the dock by prison warders/policemen.

ASSESSMENT OF WILSON'S 14 POINTS

To understand the composition of the Versailles treaty, it's imperative to examine Wilson's 14 points.

We need to assess the extent to which Wilson succeeded in implementing his good ideas considering that his colleagues had bad intentions upon the defeated nations. We therefore analyze whether the 14 points settled the post-war problems and avoided future conflicts or not. Thus;

1. All diplomacy and negotiations between states was to be carried out "Openly, frankly and in public view". He stood for mutual trust and confidence between nations through consultations and settling of disputes openly. This was to avoid secret treaties and alliances that had caused war in 1914. However, this was never implemented since the victor and defeated nations of Europe had very high nostalgia for revenge.

2. Wilson stressed "Absolute freedom of navigation on the seas in peace and war except in territorial water". This was partly due to the fact that naval rivalry and the determination of Germany and Britain to dominate the sea had caused naval race and led to World War I. On this sensitive issue, Wilson was out rightly opposed by Lloyd George of Britain. Britain could easily welcome the destruction and limitation of the German navy but not equality at sea. He argued that a strong navy was a luxury to Germany but a necessity to Britain.

3. He proposed the removal of trade barriers between states in international trade. This is because colonial economic rivalry and the policy of protectionism had partly contributed to the First World War.

This point worked to suit America whose industries and trade were not significantly ruined by the war.

However, other powers were so much devastated by the war that their industries and trade needed tariffs and other protective measures. They therefore rejected the idea after recovering in the long run.

4. Aware that arms race had contributed to World War I, Wilson's 4th point emphasized that nations should give guarantees that they would "disarm to the lowest level consistent with domestic safety".

While this provision was fully applied to Germany and her allies, other powers did not reduce the level of their arms. This gave Hitler an excuse to rearm Germany which resurrected the arms race in the inter war period.

5. Emphasizes impartial adjustment to all colonial claims in the interest of the colonized. Here, the interests and sentiments of the colonized were to be considered equal to those of the governments given to mandate or control. This went without any opposition from Britain, France, Belgium and Japan. This could be explained from the fact that they all wanted to gain from Germany's empire than gain from the colonized people.

6. Germany was to evacuate Russian territories because the Brest-Litovsk treaty of 1917 was forced on Russia by Germany (because Russia was defeated). Russia was to be assisted in every way that she may need and herself desire" for the free determination of her future. This idea went unopposed.

However, the principle of free determination of her future accelerated the success of the 1917 revolution, which upset democratic governance that Wilson and his associates had projected.

7. Evacuation and restoration of Belgium's independence. Belgium was the nucleus of World War I.

Germany and her allies had to withdraw all their forces from Belgium. This was accepted by both Britain and Germany since it was a primary factor why Britain declared war on Germany.

8. Provides for evacuation and restoration of French territory and the righting of the wrongs done to France in 1871 as far as Alsace and Lorraine were concerned. On this point, Wilson was successful since France recovered the two territories and even redressed the wrongs done to her by Prussia at Sedan in 1866. Britain also saw it right and fitting.

9. Provides for re-adjustment of the borders of Italy "along clearly recognizable lines of authority".

She was a member of the triple alliance but entered the war on the side of triple entente. However, she lost some territories during the war. She had to be rewarded and compensated with some other territories. Wilson did not encounter any opposition since this was in accordance to the principle of nationality and a way of rewarding an ally against the enemy.

10. Point ten States that "all peoples of Austria-Hungary were to be offered the opportunity of independent development". Austria-Hungary was hitherto (until then) made up of about 13 different races. This was a success since Britain and France could not deny democratic governments or obstruct the principle of nationality in Europe. Better still, the dissolution of Austria-Hungary and the new independent states posed no security problem in Europe.

11. Stresses the evacuation and restoration of Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania and an outlet to the sea for Serbia. Political and economic independence was to be granted to even other Balkan states. The allies adopted this point with the hope of settling the historical and contentious issues that had destabilized

Europe. This was finally affected in the treaty of St. German with Austria on Sept 1919.

12. Suggested the readjustment of Turkish territories and breaking up of the Ottoman Empire. Various nationalities under Turkey were to be granted self-governance (independence) while the Turkish population was to form an independent Turkey. The Dardanelles was to be open to ships and merchants of all nations. Wilson was not opposed by Britain or France who stood to benefit from the freedom of navigation and trade with the newly created states. This was later concretized by the treaty of Serves in 1920.

13. States that an independent Poland be created in those areas solely or "indisputably polish" and the Polish state had to be granted a free and secure access to the sea (Adriatic sea). Although this was not 344 % opposed by the allied powers, there is sufficient evidence to justify that the created Poland of 1919 was neither "indisputably" Polish in population nor her access to the sea was without territorial dispute.

Both decisions incorporated and violated Germany's territory. This explains why Germany invaded Poland in 1939 to begin the Second World War.

14. Provides that an international organisation be formed to guarantee the independence of all states both great and small. This gave rise to the League of Nations whose role was very instrumental in maintaining World peace up to 1939.

If the 14 points were followed, Europe would have had peace after 1918. But as noted above, these points were violated. George Clemenceau the ageing premier who was nearly 80 years dismissed the 14 points cynically calling it "The fourteen (14) commandments" adding a contrast that "The good Lord had only ten," he emphasized the fact that "God gave us Ten Commandments, we broke them, Wilson gave us 14, we shall see",

George Clemenceau had excessive hatred for Germany and the Germans. He had twice seen German invasion of France during his lifetime and never wished to see France attacked for the third time by Germany. He therefore prayed for the destruction of Germany in order to avoid humiliation of France by Germany like in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 - 1871.

Although Lloyd George admired and valued Wilson's 14 points, he could not support him (Wilson) since the English people had a lot of negative feelings towards Germany. George himself had just won an election with a promise to 'Hang the Kaiser and make Germany pay'. These influenced him to support George Clemenceau during the conference. Thus, the difference in opinion between Woodrow

Wilson on one hand, George Lloyd and Clemenceau on the other hand had a lot of influence on the final terms of the Versailles treaty of 1919. In other words, Lloyd George and Clemenceau out competed Woodrow Wilson which made the Versailles treaty very unrealistic in resolving the post-war problems.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE TERMS/PROVISIONS OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY

The terms of the treaty of Versailles was written in a document that consisted of 15 parts with 440 articles and other annexes. The most significant terms of the treaty were;

1) The war guilt clause (article 231), entirely blamed Germany for the outbreak of the World war one. By this provision, Germany was forced to accept her own responsibility and those of her allies for all the losses and damages incurred by the allied and associated governments plus their nationals in the war.

2) The reparation clause (article 232), subjected Germany to the heaviest war indemnity in the history of the world. A reparation commission was established to fix the final sum that Germany was to pay to compensate the allied and associated powers for the direct and indirect losses incurred in the war. Indirect losses included pensions for war widows and orphans. After a lot of arguments and negotiations with Germany, the commission on 27th April 1921 dictated 6,600 million pounds or 34533,000 million dollars as the final reparations and drafted a schedule of repayments. Payments was also to be paid in cash and in tangible commodities like coal, chemicals, dyes, cattle, ships, timber etc. It was also provided that Germany loses the Coal mine of the Saar valley to France to compensate the destroyed Coal mines in the North of France.

3) The disarmament clause reduced the German army to 100,000 men and the navy to 15,000 men armed with only 6 battleships, 6 Light cruisers, 12 destroyers and 12 torpedo boats. She was to destroy her tanks, submarines and heavy artillery. Germany was not to have any military, naval or air forces. Imports and exports of war materials were banned in Germany. Naval training and conscription were also prohibited. The allies were duty bound to appoint commissioners to ensure that Germany faithfully implements the disarmament clause. Article 160 of the Versailles treaty stated that; by a date not later than 31st March 1920, the German army must not consist of more than 7 (seven) divisions of infantry and 3 (three) of Cavalry i.e. not more than 100,000 men.

4) The Rhineland was demilitarized and no military force was to be maintained in that area. The

Hitherto (until then) existing fortifications and harbours in the Rhine lands, Helgoland island and

Dune was to be demolished. Germany was warned against having military bases on the

Southwest, East and Rhineland since such would jeopardize the security of her neighbours, e.g. Poland, France and Czechoslovakia.

5) The territorial clause made a lot of adjustments on the territorial alignments (boundaries) of Europe in favour of other powers against Germany. Alsace and Lorraine were given back to France, Eupen, Moresnet and Malmedy to Belgium, Schleswig to Denmark, Saar Coalfield to France until the 1935 referendum overturned the decision, Mammel to Lithuania, West Prussia and Posen (to Poland to provide her access to the sea via a corridor of land that passed through Germany), Danzig; a predominantly German town and the main port of West Prussia was made a free city under the administration of the League of Nations, Germany agreed to cancel the treaties of Brest- Litovsk and Bucharest and surrender control over Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania that were given independence.

6) The decolonization clause dispossessed Germany of all her overseas colonies. Her colonies were taken over by the League of Nations. Article 119 of the Versailles treaty stated that; Germany renounces in favour of the principle allied and associated powers all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions. Consequently, Tanganyika and Cameroon were given to Britain, German South West Africa (Namibia) to the Republic of South Africa, Togo to France, Rwanda to Belgium etc. Germany was also forced to recognize the complete independence and full sovereignty of Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria. The victorious powers reserved the right to retain and liquidate all property, rights and interests of German nationals or companies abroad and the German government was required to pay compensation to them, it was through this arrangement that Germany forfeited her property and investments in Bulgaria, Turkey, Morocco, Liberia, Egypt etc.

7) Germany was ordered to return the flags, works of art and trophies that were looted from France in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871. She was also to compensate the University of Louvan for her documents and manuscripts that were vandalized/destroyed in 1871. Sultan Mkwawa's skull was also to be given to England.

8) International waters such as the Elba, Danube, River Niemen, Baltic Sea, Med. Sea etc were declared neutral and free to all ships of all nations. The Kiel canal was also opened to all nations.

Goods from allied nations were to be given favourable treatment on the German railway lines.

9) Kaiser William U, the German emperor was to be tried by a tribunal and was to be punished

accordingly which most likely was to be death sentence. However, this was impossible because the Netherlands government refused to hand him over to the allies for the trial.

10) To ensure that the above clauses were implemented, the German territory west of the Rhine,

together with the bridge heads were to be occupied by the allied troops for a period of 15 years.

This occupation was to be prolonged in case of any defiance / misbehaviour from Germany. It should be noted that Germany's behaviour was good and all the troops were eventually withdrawn by 1930.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE VERSAILLES PEACE MAKERS

1. To re-organize Europe for the purpose of maintaining world peace, security and stability.
2. To redraw the map of Europe and restore the balance of power. This was because German aggression had destroyed the balance of power to her advantage.
3. To map out strategies that would preserve the territorial integrity and independence of countries in Europe. This was because violation of territorial integrity and independence of states had led to poor diplomatic relations and the outbreak of World War I.
4. To reconcile the warring powers of World War I most especially Germany although her aggression was to be checked for some time.
5. To free the different races dominated by the central powers (Germany and her allies).
6. Disarm both the victor and defeated powers since arms race had partly caused the disaster of 1914 to 1918.

7. To recognize the principle of nationalism and self-determination by giving independence to the oppressed nations. This was because nationalism had primarily been responsible for the outbreak of the First World War.

8. The victorious powers most especially France, wanted to permanently destroy Germany plus her allies in order to safeguard themselves against German aggression that had caused the 1870 -1871 war and the 1914 - 1918 war.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE VERSAILLES PEACE TREATY OF 1919

1. The treaty concluded the First World War and created some relative peace in Europe. At Versailles,

Germany and her cohorts (allies) were forced to denounce war and accept defeat. The terms of the treaty e.g. disarmament and reparations weakened Germany and her allies which safeguarded Europe and mankind from war. This is why there was a period of relative peace up to the outbreak of WorldWar11 in 1939.

2. It brought diplomatic understanding that had failed in Europe before and during the First World War.

Collective decisions were made on international issues as opposed to the pre-1914 idea of every nation for itself and God for us all. Although the treaty was un-realistic to the defeated powers, it nevertheless brought together the formerly divided Europe before 1914 to a roundtable settlement as a step towards global co-operation.

3. The neutrality of all important water bodies was guaranteed. For instance, the Dardanelles (mouth of the Baltic Sea) that was an area of economic conflict was open to all ships of all nations to ensure free navigation. The treaty also removed trade barriers, which boosted international trade. Although countries pursued the policy of protectionism which undermined free international trade, the treaty has to be commended for ushering peaceful trade which renewed economic co-operation in Europe.

4. The treaty restored the balance of power that had favoured Germany and Turkey before 1914. The sizes of Germany and Turkey were reduced by giving independence to some states they had conquered prior to 1914. These included Poland, Rhineland, and Saar coal field that were detached from German control. Re union between Germany and Austria was forbidden as a strategy of weakening Germany and making it hard for her to dominate other powers.

5. The Versailles settlement made some territorial readjustments. France regained Alsace and Lorraine that were mainly inhabited by Frenchmen but forcefully annexed by Germany in 1871. Denmark also recovered Schleswig, which she had lost in the 1864 war with Prussia. Germany lost her colonies in Europe and Africa, which were given to mainly Britain and France. This weakened Germany and made her unable to revenge in the short run while it was fair to France that was unfairly treated by Germany in the 1871 Frankfurt treaty.

6. Independence was given to smaller states that were mainly under Turkish and Austrian empire. These included Poland, Iraq, Kuwait, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. This was the actual collapse of the Turkish and Austrian empires. The great powers evacuated Serbia, Rumania and Montenegro, which were hitherto (until then) under foreign rule. This meant that the treaty upheld the principle of nationalism and self-determination. Although nationalities like the Germans, Hungarians and Austrians were subjected to foreign rule, the degree of nationalism ignored was not greater than that of the Vienna settlement of 1815.

7. The treaty observed the democratic rights of the smaller nations. They were given freedom to determine their political destiny. For instance, a referendum was held in Upper Silesia that had a mixture of Germans and Poles. 60% voted for a union with Germany and 40% favoured Poland. They were eventually made to unite with Germany.

8. The treaty was fair to the land locked countries of Serbia and Poland. Serbia was given free access to the sea which made her to profitably engage in trade. The newly created Poland was provided with a corridor of land that passed through Germany to the port of Danzig in the Baltic Sea. This enabled her to participate in trade and gain economic stability.

9. The Versailles settlement came up with Disarmament policy which although applied only to the defeated powers, helped in maintaining world peace for some time. The disarmament clause; limited German army to 100,000, Austria to 30,000, Hungary to 35,000 and Bulgaria to 20,000.

Germany and her allies were forbidden from having submarines, war planes and compulsory military service. The disarmament of Germany and her allies safeguarded Europe and the world from German aggression for sometime. Germany in particular would have brought greater chaos than she did by 1939 if she had not been disarmed. Besides, the settlement is also credited for creating awareness, in European history of the dangers of weapons of mass destruction.

10. The Versailles peacemakers adopted Woodrow Wilson's 14th point, which advocated for the formation of an international organisation to maintain peace. This gave rise to the League of Nations that made significant political, social and economic contributions to world affairs.

11. The settlement made arrangements for the exchange of prisoners of war and resettlement of displaced persons. Consequently, Germany released the allied war prisoners and likewise the allied powers.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WEAKNESSES AND FAILURES OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY

The idea that World War I was fought to end all wars was rendered null and void by the unrealistic terms of the Versailles settlement. The unfairness of the treaty to the defeated powers created great need for revenge against the signatories of the settlement. This brought tension in Europe, which climaxed in the outbreak of yet another World War in 1939 justifying the view that the 1919 statesmen had made peace without peace. The foregoing are the weaknesses and failures of the Versailles peace treaty;

1. The treaty was imposed on Germany and her allies since there was no open and frank discussion. It was not negotiated but dictated by the victorious powers against the defeated nations making it unrealistic in an attempt to bring about reconciliation in Europe. The treaty was dominated by France, Britain and USA, who worked hard to see that the defeated powers were permanently disabled. It therefore failed to capture European public opinion.

2. Apart from Germany and her allies, the Versailles Treaty also left Italy and Japan dissatisfied. Italy and Japan were poorly compensated for the role

they played in the First World War. Orlando of Italy complained of poor rewards and left the conference in protest. Japan also lost interest and pulled out by April 1920 due to poor compensation. These made Italy and Japan to join Germany and form the axis alliance. The alliance strengthened their quest for revenge and led to a series of aggression and instability in Europe.

3. Similarly, the Versailles settlement led to the rise of dictators in Europe. Mussolini of Italy, Hirohito of Japan and Hitler of Germany used the unfairness of the Versailles Treaty as a stepping stone to rise to power. They blamed their respective governments for accepting the unfair terms of the settlement and promised a militaristic approach to reverse the terms of the settlement. This undermined people's confidence in their governments and made them to accept their dictatorship.

4. The Versailles settlement sowed seeds for the outbreak of the Second World War, The terms of the treaty were too severe and harsh to the defeated powers. The war guilt, reparations, disarmament and territorial clauses were manipulated to punish Germany and thus left her longing for a war of revenge. Japan and Italy were poorly compensated and that is why they joined Germany to form the axis alliance. The need to revenge against the Versailles settlement was responsible for a series of aggressions by the axis powers, which culminated into the German invasion of Poland and the Second World War.

5. The Treaty of Lausanne ignored the plight of Armenian Christians who had for long suffered from Turkey's oppression, exploitation and persecution. During the course of World War I, Britain promised to liberate Armenia from Turkey's rule. However, this was not included in the treaty of Lausanne of 1923 with Turkey. The Armenians were left at the mercy of the Turks who continued to oppress, exploit and persecute them more than before the settlement.

The Versailles settlement fragmented Europe by creating weak states that became vulnerable to aggression. It created 7 more states out of 19 that had existed in Europe prior to 1919. These included smaller states like Poland, Serbia, Czechoslovakia and Slovenia that were so weak economically and militarily. They could not sustain their economies and defend themselves from axis aggressions. The vulnerability of these states partly gave Hitler morale to conquer them one after the other, which created tension and instability in Europe.

' Article 231 of the war guilt clause was very unrealistic as it entirely blamed Germany for causing the First World War. It says;

The allied and associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of

Germany and her allies for causing all the losses and damages 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.

It's true that Germany was the most notorious trouble causer who contributed to the First World War, yet it's even more true that all those who participated in the war share some degree of responsibility.

Blaming and condemning Germany alone was unrealistic which left Germany on a look out for revenge.

Actually, Hitler's determination to destroy the war guilt clause contributed to the outbreak of the

Second World War.

8. Although the Versailles settlement imposed a heavy war indemnity on Germany, it failed to ensure effective payments of the reparations. By article 232, Germany was to pay a staggering sum of £6, 600 million as war reparations. This was a huge chunk of money that could not be paid by any single nation. Worst of all, Germany was denied the means as well as the resources from her industries and colonies, which were "looted" by the Versailles "big shots". Consequently it became impossible for Germany to pay the whole reparations and Germany repudiated (refused to pay) from 1920's. Even when Germany repudiated, there was no attempt by the peace makers to force Germany to complete the payments.

9. The Versailles peacemakers failed to enforce general disarmament as suggested by President Woodrow Wilson in his 14 points. Germany was properly disarmed and left with only 100,000 soldiers just to maintain law and order". As Germany was being disarmed, the victorious powers were arming themselves to the teeth. This was exploited by Hitler to re-arm Germany which resurrected the arms race and led to World War II.

10. The territorial arrangement of the settlement ignored the principle of nationalism just like the Vienna settlement of 1815. 2.5 million Germans were dished out to Poland, 3 million to Czechoslovakia and 2 million to Yugoslavia. This is what later forced Hitler to invade Austria, Czechoslovakia

and Poland in order to liberate the Germans who were subjected to foreign rule by the Versailles settlement. This led to the German invasion of Poland that sparked off the Second World War in 1939 justifying how unrealistic the treaty was in bringing about a lasting peace in Europe.

11. By subjecting German colonies to be controlled by the victorious powers, the Versailles peacemakers were too severe and unrealistic. The allies took advantage of the defeat of Germany and her allies to take over their colonies and expand their territories. For instance, Britain expanded from Uganda and Kenya to Tanzania that was formerly a German territory before 1919. This was also to cripple Germany militarily, economically and diplomatically. By this arrangement, the allied powers exhibited a high degree of self-aggrandisement.

12. The contrasting ideas of the leading statesmen were a serious weakness that made the Versailles treaty unrealistic. Clemenceau wanted to permanently weaken Germany so that she does not tamper with France's peace and security any more, Lloyd George was bent on annexing German colonies to strengthen British overseas influence and trade. General Orlando wanted to get the promises that made him to assist the triple entente against the triple alliance. Woodrow Wilson wanted justice extended to the defeated powers in order to bring reconciliation and promote world trade. This self interest led to several disagreements that made the Versailles conference to take four years just like the war itself. The Versailles peacemakers wasted a lot of time due to disagreements over the fate of the defeated powers. The first treaty of the Versailles settlement was signed on 28 June 1919 with Germany but the last treaty was signed as late as August 1923. This was equivalent to the four years in which the war was fought.

13. Although the Versailles settlement gave rise to the League of Nations, it nevertheless laid a very weak foundation for the league as a peace making body. The league was dominated by the allied powers from the beginning to the end. Besides, the settlement never considered and hence provided the League of Nations with an army. This made the League of Nations to rely on sanctions which proved useless against Nazis and Fascist aggressions of the 1930's.

14. The settlement also neglected the defeated and neutral powers. Russia was excluded simply because she had adopted communism during the 1917 revolution. Germany and her allies were also not part of it, although these powers were later admitted in the league, they attached little

importance to it and by 1939 most of them had withdrawn their membership leaving it weak.

15. The time in which the treaty with Germany was signed (1919) coincided with, the fifth (5th) anniversary of the Sarajevo assassination. It was on 28th June 1919 exactly 5 years from the murder of Franz Ferdinand and his wife. This made Germany very bitter because it gave an impression that she was being held responsible for the assassination. Secondly, it was hurriedly concluded without a proper assessment of the real causes and causers of the war. Thirdly, 1919 was when emotions and the quest for revenge were too high to guarantee justice in favour of the defeated powers.

16. The venue of the settlement meant that justice could not be extended to the defeated nations most especially Germany. Germany was forced to sign the dictated treaty in the hall of mirrors at Versailles which was the very hall where the German empire was proclaimed in 1871. The hall portrayed the existence of a united German empire. It was therefore a great humiliation and a psychological torture to Germany for the allies to force her to sign the dictated treaty in the hall of mirrors.

17. The venue of the settlement made the French Premier, George Clemenceau to become the chairman of the conference. This gave him an opportunity to have a lot of influence on the final verdict of the settlement. This was very unfortunate because France was a historical enemy of Germany.

Clemenceau himself had witnessed the German invasion of France in 1871 and 1914. He therefore used his position to totally destroy Germany's military might in order to avoid yet another invasion from Germany.

18. The Versailles peacemakers failed to implement the clause that demanded for the trial (by tribunal) of German ex-emperor Kaiser William 11 and other war criminals. This was not affected because the government of Netherlands refused to hand over Kaiser William to the allies for trial. Only a dozen of insignificant war criminals were tried and punished lightly. The most wanted ones were nowhere to be seen.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES/EFFECTS OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY ON GERMANY

The Versailles treaty of 1919 that Germany was forced to sign is one of the most unrealistic treaties that have ever existed in the history of mankind. The terms were carefully and skillfully manipulated to punish Germany plus her allies and reward the victorious powers. It therefore had negative impact on the social, economical and political developments of Germany. This is what made Germany to reject the Versailles treaty in the later years which objection was justified basing on the unrealistic terms of the settlement.

i) The Versailles framers/makers forced Germany to renounce war and accept defeat. This was done by the Weimer Republic that was hurriedly set up after the abdication of the troublesome Kaiser William II. However, this made the Weimer Republic unpopular to the majority of the Germans led by Hitler who blamed the government for accepting the Versailles settlement.

ii) The reparations which Germany was forced to pay crippled Germany's economy and led to the great economic depression of 1929 - 1933 in Europe. It left Germany too poor to fight unemployment, inflation and poverty. This is why Germany had the worst inflation in the history of the world between 1930-1933.

iii) Germany was weakened militarily by the settlement. She was disarmed and allowed to maintain an army of 100,000 just to maintain law and order. This left the Weimer Republic weak since even the 100,000 troops could not maintain law and order in time of political disturbance. The 100,000 soldiers could not even defend the territorial integrity and independence of the government.

iv) Germany was deprived of her colonies in Africa and Europe. They were given to Britain, France, Belgium, Austria, Japan and South Africa as mandate states. This undermined Germany's external trade opportunities which would have strengthened Germany's economy.

v) Germany was forced to hand back Schleswig to Denmark which she had forcefully annexed (from Denmark) in 1864. She was also forced to give back to France the mineralized provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. This seriously affected Germany's economic recovery since these territories were the richest in minerals e.g. iron and coal deposits.

vi) The settlement scattered the Germans under the newly created states. For example, 2.5 million Germans were given to Poland, 3 million to

Czechoslovakia and 2 million to Yugoslavia. The new state of Poland was provided with a corridor that passed through Germany to the port of Danzig in the Baltic Sea. This created restlessness in the Germans who were only liberated by Hitler's aggressive foreign policy.

vii) The treaty demilitarized the Rhineland. Germany was forbidden from maintaining an army and constructing forts on the banks of the Rhine. The fortifications that Germany had done were destroyed. This made it very hard for the Germans to maneuver and invade her neighbours in her quest for revenge.

NB. The allied troops were to occupy the Rhineland for 15 years.

viii) Germany was forced to cancel the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest signed with Russia and Rumania respectively. By the treaty of Brest Litovsk, Russia had surrendered to Germany western part of her territory that included Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland. These were the wealthiest part of Russia that Germany was forced to hand back to her.

ix) The Versailles treaty of 1919 contributed to political instability in Germany. The Weimer Republican leaders who accepted it were denounced by the Germans for signing the unrealistic treaty. This created internal opposition to the government, which made it unstable up to when it collapsed in 1934.

Hitler and Nazism exploited these circumstances to rise to power by 1934.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

REASONS WHY THE GERMANS REJECTED THE VERSAILES SETTLEMENT

Hints

NB. For details refer to the earlier notes most especially on weaknesses or failures of the treaty as far as Germany was concerned or else look in the previous notes on the negative consequences of the treaty on Germany i.e. why they rejected it with time.

i) The treaty was dictated and Germany was forced to sign. There was no discussion which could have given the Germans the chance to air their views.

ii) Germany totally opposed the war guilt clause, which put the whole blame for the outbreak of the war on her (Article 231). This was injustice of the highest magnitude since all those powers that fought in the war were guilty hence Germany had to reject the treaty.

iii) The reparation of £6,600 million was impossible to pay since no single country could pay for the destructions caused by the war. The British economic advisor J.N.K's argument that it should be £2,000 millions fell on deaf ears. Later in the 1920's the Germans defaulted, refused to continue paying the reparation and no one followed it up.

iv) Disarmament was restricted to only Germany yet disarmament was to be general. Worst of all, other powers were busy arming themselves. Germany was therefore left helpless amidst hostile and aggressive neighbours. This was why Hitler started re-arming Germany hence rejecting the disarmament clause of the treaty.

v) Loss of territories in Europe and Africa was resented by Germany. For instance, the mineral rich provinces of Alsace and Lorraine to France, Tanzania to Britain and Namibia to South Africa. She lost her markets, sources of raw materials and areas for investment to her foes (bitter enemies) which she could not swallow (accept).

vi) The settlement scattered German nationals by ignoring the principle of nationalism. For instance 2.5 million Germans were given to Poland, 3 million to Czechoslovakia and 2 million to Yugoslavia. This explains why Hitler later invaded such countries to liberate those Germans hence rejecting the terms of the Versailles treaty.

vii) The Germans complained that they were tricked to surrender based on President Wilson's 14 points.

They claimed that the 14 points was a swindle since many of the terms of the treaty violated it.

However, this was not justifiable because the 14 points of Wilson had never been officially accepted by the peace makers and the Germans had even ignored it early in 1918 when there were still chances of success. Moreover, Wilson had even added that Germany should pay for all the damages and should be completely disarmed. Thus it was not totally justifiable for the Germans to object to the reparations and disarmament clauses.

Viii) The Versailles settlement was monopolized by only 3 leading statesmen i.e. president Woodrow Wilson of USA, Gorge Lloyd of Britain and George

Clemenceau of France. It was chaired by Clemenceau who was totally biased and a bitter enemy of Germany. This is why the Germans had to reject the treaty later.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The Russian revolution of 1917 is the most important event in the political history of the 20th century. It was the first successful socialist revolution in the history of mankind. The revolution, whose causes were similar in many aspects, occurred twice in the same year (1917). The first was in March, which led to the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II and ended the reign of Tsardom in Russia. This gave way to the establishment of a provisional government under Prince Lvov. The immediate cause of the March revolution was acute food shortage.

The second revolution was masterminded by Lenin on 6th November 1917 through a coup against the provisional government of Lvov. This led to the establishment of the first Socialist Republic in- Russia.

The immediate cause was the failure of the provisional government to address the causes of the March revolution; hence the same fate had to befall it in November.

Historically, both the revolutions of March and November are called the Russian/Bolshevik/October revolutions of 1917. The Russians called it the "October revolution" because according to the Old Russian calendar, it was in the month of October (the old calendar is behind by one month). The revolution is also known as the Bolshevik revolution because it was spearheaded by the Bolshevik party. Bolshevik is a Russian word that means majority. The Bolshevik's party was dominated by workers who were exploited by the capitalists.

Attachments

No attachments



1. The nature of the Tsarist regime

The nature of the Tsarist regime contributed much to the outbreak of the Russian revolutions. It was characterized by dictatorship, oppression, repression, conservatism, religious intolerance and corruption.

The Tsars were insensitive to liberal demands for constitutional and parliamentary reforms, press freedom, equality of opportunities and before the law, improvement on the conditions of workers and peasants. Tsar Nicholas II himself was the law and no law could come into existence without his approval. He was so determined to maintain conservatism that he openly declared on his coronation ceremony that I will preserve the principle of autocracy as firmly and unswervingly as my late father. He dismissed liberal ministers and appointed conservative, incompetent and corrupt ministers who shamelessly took bribes and embezzled public funds. This made the liberals under the leadership of Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky to mobilize the Russians against the government through political parties, strikes, demonstrations and the Bolshevik revolutions of 1917.

2. The character and Personal weaknesses of Tsar Nicholas II (1894 -1917)

Tsar Nicholas II was physically weak and not ironic (strong) like his late father. He was a rigid, inflexible and conservative king who was obsessed with divine rights rather than people's rights. The Tsar failed to settle the social, political and economic problems faced by the Russians prior to 1917. He could not be firm in his decisions since he was too fearful for his life after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. In 1905, Tsar Nicholas II promised a number of reforms that made the Russians who had revolted following the Russo- Japanese war and bloody Sunday to cool down. He had promised amongst others;

Political and religious freedom, trial by jury, dismissal of oppressive officials and freedom to non Russians. However, by 1917 the Tsar had either ignored or forgotten his promises when he resorted to conservative and autocratic policies. This led to general disappointment and resignation of some capable politicians. Political parties, Liberals, Nihilists and socialists exploited such disgruntlement to intensify their activities against Tsar Nicholas II and his government leading to the outbreak of the 1917 revolutions.

After the outbreak of World War I, Tsar Nicholas II resorted to witchcraft in an attempt to win the war. He took courage and went to the frontline on August 15th 1916. This identified him directly with the failure of the Russian soldiers and the sufferings caused by the war to both soldiers and civilians. Interestingly, when he went to the frontline, the Russian affairs were left in the hands of the unpopular evil monk who caused a lot of unnecessary cabinet Reshuffles.

This was a serious mess in state affairs that called for a revolution.

NB. It appears as if Tsar Nicholas II believed that Rasputin was immortal (could not die). This was because after the murder of Rasputin in 1916, he spent two months trying to contact the evil monk through witchcraft.

ii) The fact that Nicholas II inherited a peaceful reign meant that his personal weaknesses as the last Tsar partly explain why the Russians went revolutionary in 1917 and not before.

3. The role of Tsarina and Gregory Rasputin

The negative influence of Tsarina and Rasputin in Russian politics prior to 1917 made the outbreak of the revolutions inevitable. Tsarina was the Russian Queen of German origin and Rasputin was a traditional native witchdoctor who became prominent in the royal family after healing Tsar Nicholas II's son Alexis, who was suffering from a blood disease known as haemophilia. Rasputin was considered by Tsarina as a friend and a "Divine counsellor" yet he was suspected to be involved in adultery with several women including Tsarina herself. Tsarina and Rasputin were anti reforms and unsympathetic to the Russian problems. They gave poor and fatal advice to Tsar Nicholas II not to enforce reforms. It should be noted that

Tsarina and Rasputin became the uncrowned empress and the king of Russia respectively from 1916 when Tsar Nicholas II went to command Russian soldiers in World War I. They caused unnecessary cabinet, Reshuffles and disorganized the Russian economy more than ever before. This became a serious mess in state affairs that called for mass action hence the revolution of 1917.

4. Weakness of the Dumma (Russian parliament)

The weakness of the Dumma (Russian parliament) left the Russians with no option other than the dual revolutions of 1917. The Dumma had limited powers and became a rubber stamp of Tsar Nicholas II and his cabinet. The Dumma was over influenced by the Tsarist government and could not pass

any law without government's approval. It was also denied powers to approve and vet ministers. Above all, the Tsar had powers to dissolve the Duma any time at his will. Tsar Nicholas II and his Prime Minister P.A Stolypin used this power to disband the second Duma that was dominated by opposition MPs in 1907.

Thereafter, they manipulated the election of Tsarist diehard supporters (sycophants) who dominated the third Duma. From then onwards, the parliament became an institution to promote the dictatorial, oppressive and corrupt regime of Tsar Nicholas II prompting the Russians to revolt in 1917.

5. Effects of industrial revolution

By 1917, industrialization had created socio-economic discontents that climaxed into the revolutions. It rendered many people jobless and caused rural-urban migration. This led to urban congestion, mobs and mob justice that made the situation in Russia to be very revolutionary. For the few who were employed, the working conditions were extremely bad. Their payments were very low yet the average working hour per day was between 10-14. The huge factories of St. Petersburg were poorly lit, poorly ventilated, had fast moving machines yet there were no protective guards for workers. The government provided no practical solution to this situation. These grievances were expressed through strikes, demonstrations and protests on several occasions. However, this forced the unemployed citizens and workers to stage a revolution as the last resort in addressing their problems.

6. Grievances of the middle class

The grievances of the middle class conditioned them to actively participate in the revolutions of 1917.

They included professionals like journalists, lawyers, teachers, doctors, engineers etc who were discriminated in spite of their high levels of education and qualification. They were particularly against special privileges that were given to the nobles and clergy in the political, social and economic structures of Russia. Besides, Industrialization led to the rise of a new middle class (wealthy and powerful businessmen) who hated the Tsarist government dominated by the old aristocrats. These new middle class and other professional middle class financed and mobilized the peasants for the revolution most especially of march 1917.

7. The rise and influence of Socialism

The rise and influence of socialism in Russia by 1917 greatly contributed to the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolutions. Socialist ideology was adopted from the teachings of Karl Marx and Engels who taught against capitalism, private ownership of property, social class inequality and advocated for the rights of workers, fair conditions of work, state ownership of property and abolition of special privileges of the nobles and clergy. Karl Marx, in his book "Das Kapital," analyzed the disadvantages of capitalism and private ownership of property and advocated for a revolution as the only solution to exploitation and inequality. The socialists were influenced by these teachings to form the Social Democratic Party in 1898 and Social Revolutionary Party in 1900 as a vehicle to advance socialist ideology. They condemned the Tsarist regime for its failure to address the problems created by industrial revolution such as unemployment, poor condition of work, exploitation and inequality. This created a revolutionary mood in the Russians and made it easy to mobilize the masses through strikes and demonstrations that climaxed into the dual revolutions of 1917.

8. The role of writers and the press

Other than Karl Marx, other writers and intellectuals like Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Gorky etc. were also influential in spreading revolutionary ideas in Russia. They condemned the unfair social, economic and political policies of Tsardom and advocated for mass action that inspired the Russians to adopt socialist ideology and revolt by 1917. Writers and intellectuals like Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin founded a revolutionary newspaper "Pravda" that they used to spread attractive propaganda against the Tsarist regime. The newspaper was effectively used to sensitize and mobilize the Russians against the injustices of the Tsarist regime through strikes, demonstrations and the revolutions of 1917. Although the newspaper was banned after the exile of Lenin and arrest of Stalin and Trotsky, it had already caused popular discontent amongst the Russians against Tsar Nicholas II and his government.

9. The role of foreign powers

The support from foreign powers such as Finland, Sweden, Poland, Switzerland and Germany greatly encouraged the Russians to revolt by 1917. Finland and Poland supported the revolution against Tsardom because they wanted to disorganize the Tsarist regime and regain their independence. It should be noted that revolutionary leaders like Stalin and Lenin who were exiled before 1917 mobilized funds, manpower and arms from such anti-Tsarist countries. Germany also supported the revolution in

order to destabilize Russia so that she withdraws from participating in the war (World War I) against her. This explains why

Germany directly supported the revolution by smuggling Lenin in a disguised train up to Berlin in 1917.

This is because Germany wanted Lenin to overthrow the provisional government and pull Russia out of the war in order to weaken the allied powers.

10. The contribution of Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin

The role played by Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin made the outbreak of the revolutions inevitable. These were ambitious and revolutionary leaders who decampaigned the Tsarist regime and mobilized the masses against the government through strikes, demonstrations and the revolutions in 1917. They condemned the political unfairness, economic grievances and social injustice of the Tsarist regime and mobilized the Russians and foreign powers against the government. Trotsky became the leader of the Mensheviks party that mobilized the Russians in the first revolution against the Tsarist regime in March 1917. On the other hand; Lenin was the leader of the Bolsheviks party who led the Russians to rise against the provisional government in the second revolution of November 1917.

11. Land policy

By 1917, feudalism was still practiced in Russia yet it had been discarded in other parts of Europe. Land was a monopoly of a few landlords while the majority of the Russians were either squatters or serfs.

Although the 1861 emancipation act freed the peasants from serfdom, nevertheless it imposed a heavy emancipation fee to the freed serfs. This was paid to their ex-landlords to compensate them for their lost labour. It forced the peasants to sell their land to clear the lump sum redemption fee. Consequently, they became landless at the end of it all. The peasants regarded the 1861 emancipation policy as an illusion which gave them legal freedom and not economic freedom. This was why Lenin's ideas of nationalization of land sold like hot cakes to the majority of peasants. The revolution was therefore provoked by the need to abolish the capitalistic feudal system of landlordism promoted by Tsar Nicholas II.

12. Effects of Natural Disasters

Natural disasters like bad weather led to poor harvest, famine and starvation, which made no small contribution to the revolutions. Besides,

Epidemic diseases like cholera, typhoid, influenza and dysentery invaded the major towns and cities like Petrograd making the political, situation more complicated.

Surprisingly, Tsar Nicholas closed his eyes and ears to such burning issues. This forced the Russian's into the revolutions of 1917.

13. Chain Reaction/External influence

External influence also played a role in the outbreak of the revolutions. Prior to 1917, Europe had experienced periodic revolutionary changes such as the 1789 French revolution, the 1830 and 1848 revolutions in Europe. The revolutionary principles of equality, liberty, nationalism and constitutionalism were adopted and preached by the radical Russians to the oppressed masses. This led to the rise of anti- Tsarist societies like the Bolsheviks under Lenin and the Mensheviks led by Trotsky. They were the mastermind behind strikes and demonstrations that spread revolutionary spirit amongst the Russians.

14. Nihilism

External influence especially western influence led to the rise of Nihilists and Nihilism in Russia. Nihilists were lawless and hardcore (diehard) individuals who valued their brainpower more than anything else.

They believed in testing and approving every human institution and customs through reasoning. By 1917, Nihilists had established the Nihilist Revolutionary Party with ambitions to overthrow Tsar Nicholas II through force and terrorism. They had a list of oppressive governments' officials who were systematically assassinated one after the other. Bukunin, one of their leaders advocated for the immediate destruction of the social, economic and political structures of Russia for the betterment of the Russians. This called for a revolution in 1917.

359

15. Russification policy

The Russification programme that involved russifying the conquered states (making them Russian through assimilation) contributed to the revolution of 1917. This was based on Tsar Nicholas II's political philosophy of one Tsar, one church and one Russia. Consequently, in Finland and Poland, Russian was made the official language while in Estonia and Litovinia, German (language) was banned yet they were Germans. The Jews were discriminated and persecuted because it was suspected that one of the

assassins of Tsar Alexander, 11 was a Jewish girl and partly because of religious differences. They were denied land, right to vote, high government positions and freedom of trade. These mistreatments undermined nationalism in the conquered states, denied Tsar Nicholas II support from such states, Jews and the Russians who never wanted the policy of Russification. This explains why the Jews and conquered states greatly participated in the revolutions of 1917.

16. The Russo-Japanese war (1904 -1905)

Russian's advancement in Asia made her to clash with Japan in the famous Russo-Japanese war. In the war, Japan thoroughly defeated Russia leaving her with 90,000 casualties and taking about 40,000 soldiers as prisoners of war. This was crowned up by the humiliating Portsmouth treaty through which Russia surrendered Korea, Manchuria, Port Arthur and the surrounding Peninsula to Japan. The humiliation of Russia in the war was a disaster not only to the Russian forces but also to the government of Tsar Nicholas II. It provoked disorder from all corners of Russia. It led to the assassination of a number of nobles, clergy and government officials. For example, Plehve the Minister of interior was murdered in 1904 and his uncle in 1906. These became a preamble for the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolutions of 1917.

17. The Red/Bloody Sunday.

The massacre of the red Sunday also contributed to the outbreak of the Russian/Bolshevik revolutions of 1917. The humiliation of the Russo-Japanese war led to a peaceful demonstration in St. Petersburg on Sunday January 22nd 1905. It was a demonstration of about 200,000 Russians under the leadership of a youthful priest. Father Gapon. The demonstrators demanded for political freedom and better working conditions amongst others. The peaceful demonstration turned violent when soldiers guarding the Tsars' palace used force to disperse off the demonstrators leaving 92 dead and 333 injured. It intensified protests throughout Russia and consolidated the influence of socialism over the workers. This undermined the popularity of Tsar Nicholas II leading to the outbreak of the 1917 revolutions.

18. Role of Political Parties

Political parties played a great role in bringing about the Russian revolutions of 1917. They criticized the Tsarist regime and promised to provide solutions to the problems of the Russians. For instance, the Social Revolutionary Party

aimed at improving the conditions of the peasants, the Liberators wanted more freedom and parliamentary democracy and the Social Democratic Labour Party wanted a communist Russia as prophesized by Karl Marx. By 1917, these parties had transformed themselves into the Bolsheviks majority party and Mensheviks minority party. The leaders of these parties most especially Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin mobilized workers through strikes, demonstrations and the revolutions of 1917.

19. Effects of World War I

The Tsarist regime was finally brought to its 'knees' by the repercussions of the First World War. From the start, the war was poorly planned; the soldiers were also, poorly facilitated, led and armed.

Three soldiers were to share two guns and others were sent to the battlefield with instructions to use weapons of fallen comrades (killed colleagues). Russia was disastrously defeated and her total casualties equaled to those of her allies put together. The Russian soldiers were fed up with war yet Tsar Nicholas II could neither improve their conditions nor withdraw from the war. When they were ordered to suppress the revolution, they mutinied and supported the revolution. Throughout Russia, soldiers joined the revolutionaries and their representatives were appointed to the various workers committees (soviets), which made the revolutions inevitable. Betrayed by his only survival mechanism. Tsar Nicholas II had to abdicate the throne on 15th March 1917.

The First World War also contributed to economic hardship in Russia which made the revolutions inevitable. It led to conscription of peasants into the army, which deprived agriculture of labour and led to severe famine. Besides, the Germans and Austrians dismantled industries, airports, communication lines and blocked the Baltic Sea, which made it impossible for Russia to trade with the rest of the world. The destruction of Ukraine wheat field led to acute food shortage where prices were hiked by 5%. These resulted to inflation, unemployment, redundancy and rural urban migration, which led to the creation of mobs in St. Petersburg and Moscow. These mobs were behind the rampant strikes and demonstrations that resulted into the revolutions.

A number of scholars have concurred that the First World War played the greatest role in the outbreak of the Russian revolution. This can be supported by the following arguments. In the first place, the war made the Russians to take Lenin's ideas seriously. Otherwise, before the war, he was very unpopular and his revolutionary ideas were dismissed as "selfish and

opportunistic". Secondly, by 1914 the fall of Tsardom was not yet a foregone conclusion because it was still popular. This was witnessed when thousands of Russians attended the celebration to mark the 300 years of Tsardom in 1913. Thirdly, the Russian declaration of war against Germany in 1914 was greatly supported by the masses. All these means that the war that lasted from 1914- 1917 played a much more serious role in the revolutions.

The political, economic, social and military weakness of Tsarist government provoked a revolution that started from St. Petersburg on 8th March 1917. Tsar Nicholas II fled to exile and this gave way to a provisional government led by Prince Lvov with Milyakov as foreign minister and Kerensky as the minister of war. However, the provisional government learnt nothing and forgot nothing from the causes of the March revolution. They failed to address the causes of the revolution, which provoked another revolution in November. The most outstanding issues that made the provisional government to fail were that;

20. It insisted on participating in World War I that had devastated the Russian economy. This made the Bolsheviks who demanded for unconditional ending of the war to get foreign support from Germany and become more popular than ever before. Things were blown out of proportion when it was realized that Milyakov (foreign minister) had sent a letter to the allies informing them of Russia's determination to fight until Germany and her allies were defeated. This provoked a hostile demonstration with the slogan "Down with Milyakov" which forced Milyakov, Kerensky and even Lvov to resign.

21. The provisional government failed to improve on the socio-economic conditions of the masses. Bread riots, inflation, unemployment, poor working conditions and discrimination were still the evils of the day.

Internal reforms like redistribution of land to peasants were postponed till the end of the war. These made the masses to do away with the provisional government in November 1917.

22. The middle class who dominated the provisional government were inexperienced and not influential in Russian politics. They were few and had no wealth and prestige compared to the French middle class.

They therefore commanded little support from the workers and peasants who refused to recognize their leadership. Besides, they delayed elections to the constituent assembly just because they feared they would lose to the

opposition. This made them to lose the support of the masses and rendered them vulnerable to the Bolshevik revolutions of November 1917.

23. Lastly, the return of Stalin and Lenin from exile made the outbreak of the November revolutions inevitable. They returned with a ringing call for the establishment of a socialist government of the workers and peasants. Lenin vigorously mobilized the Russians against the Provisional government with three catchwords of "peace, bread and land." His vow to end the war, provide food and land popularized the Bolsheviks party amongst the workers and peasants. Within a few months, the Bolshevik party became very popular with the workers accounting for 60% of the increased membership. Having gathered enough popularity, Lenin confidently lamented; History will not forgive us if we do not take power now and to delay is a crime. Consequently on the night of 6th November 1917 the Bolsheviks troops occupied all public buildings. They announced the overthrow of the provisional government and the establishment of a new provisional government on 8th November 1917. Lenin became the chairman of the new government and Stalin was responsible for foreign affairs.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE REVOLUTION(S)

1. It was a mass movement that was supported by a great majority of the Russians. The revolution was spearheaded by intellectuals and supported by peasants and workers. The peasants and workers greatly participated in strikes and demonstrations that climaxed into the revolution making its success a reality.
2. The high level of unity amongst the Russian revolutionaries also accounts for their success. They were united under the Bolsheviks party with a firm belief in the establishment of a socialist government. The confidence which they had in socialism made them determined to sacrifice their lives and property to uproot the Tsarist government and establish a socialist government.

3. The anti-revolutionaries' attempt to suppress the revolution using foreign troops favoured the success of the revolution. The Bolsheviks condemned it as a move by the opponents of the revolution to impose foreign rule on the Russians. This made even those who had been reluctant to join the revolution hence contributing to its success.

4. Paradoxically, the revolutionaries were supported by foreign powers like Finland, Sweden and

Switzerland. The revolutionary leaders like Stalin, Trotsky and Kerensky mobilized funds, manpower and arms through such friendly countries. In some instances, foreign power gave direct assistance to the revolution. For example, Germany supported the revolution to cause chaos in Russia so that she (Russia) withdraws from participating in the war against her. This is why Germany smuggled Lenin into Russia in a disguised train. Germany wanted Lenin to overthrow the provisional government and end the war which he did in November 1917, hence the success of the revolution.

5. The personal weaknesses of Tsar Nicholas II greatly contributed to the success of the revolution. By 1917, Nicholas was too unpopular amongst the peasants, workers and his ministers. Even his own soldiers never rescued him since they were fed up with war. When the revolution began, he was too confused that he abdicated the throne in favour of his brother Duke Michael on 15th March 1917. The Duke refused his will and the revolutionaries; established a provisional Republican government.

6. The sufferings and destructions caused by World War I also accounts for the success of the revolution.

By 1917, everybody especially soldiers wanted unconditional end of the war yet the provisional government was determined to continue with the war. This earned Lenin-who promised to end the war massive support in the November revolution. The war also preoccupied European powers like France and Britain, who never wanted the communist revolution to succeed and made it impossible for them to intervene in the early stages of the revolution. Their intervention through the Russian civil war from 1919 was too late to overthrow the communist revolutionary government because it had already been consolidated.

7. The success of the revolution was also due to genuine grievances. By 1917, Russia was infested with all sorts of problems. There was inflation, unemployment, nepotism, famine, natural calamities and soldiers had lost the battle against Germany. The inability of the provisional government to

address these problems made the Russians to give overwhelming support to the revolution and that's why it attracted massive support from the Russians.

8. The unpopular war policy of the Provisional government greatly contributed to the success of the Bolshevik revolution of November 1917. The Provisional government that was established after the first revolution in March continued with the Tsarist policy of fighting Germany and her allies in World War I.

The Russians had suffered a lot due to the war and expected the Provisional government to withdraw Russia from the war. They were surprised to learn that Milyakov (minister of foreign affairs) had sent a letter to the allied powers that reaffirmed Russia's commitment to fight Germany and her allies. This made the Bolsheviks whose top agenda was to withdraw Russia's participation in the war to be very popular. It's this situation that was used by the Bolsheviks to mobilize a mass demonstration that forced Milyakov, Kerensky and Prince Lvov to resign, hence the success of the revolution.

9. The timing of the revolution was strategic and this made it to succeed. The revolution was staged in 1917 at a time when the First World War had worsened the problems of inflation, unemployment, poverty, famine, starvation, anarchy and lawlessness. Besides, the army and royal troops were too demoralized by heavy military losses that they were also in a revolutionary mood. Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin noted this popular discontent and decided to mobilize for a revolution in 1917 before the war could end. One should note that if they had mobilized for a revolution before 1914 they could not have received a mass support since Tsardom was still popular to the majority of the Russians.

10. Besides, the influence of the communists over the army after the 1st Menshevik revolution in March greatly contributed to the success of the Bolshevik revolution in November. The communists dominated the leadership of the Petrograd Soviets who had control over the army and security in the city. This explains why they easily influenced the army commander Kornilov to stage a coup in October that forced the provisional government to release political prisoners and communist leaders such as Stalin. Although the coup was eventually suppressed, they nevertheless re-organized and used the army in a well coordinated revolutionary movement that succeeded in Nov.1917.

11. The release of political prisoners and the return of exiled communist leaders, i.e. Lenin and Stalin made the success of the November revolution

inevitable. The Kornilov coup of October 1917 forced the provisional government to release imprisoned political leaders and allow Lenin and Stalin to return from exile. It strengthened the Bolsheviks party and reactivated opposition against the provisional government.

Lenin, Stalin and released political prisoners greatly participated in the revolutionary committee that mobilized the Russians for the success of the revolution of November 1917.

12. The inability of the Provisional government to control freedom of association, speech and press made the success of the revolution inevitable. The socialists used such freedom to mobilize workers through strikes and demonstrations against the Tsarist and later Provisional government for their failure to address the side effects of industrial revolutions e.g. unemployment, poor working condition and exploitation by capitalists. Russian journalists, intellectuals and revolutionary leaders like Lenin and Stalin also utilized such freedom to popularize the Bolsheviks manifesto that emphasized land redistribution, provision of bread (food) and peace. All these destroyed the support of the Tsarist regime and later the Provisional government and accounted for the success of the Bolsheviks revolutions of 1917.

13. The role of revolutionary leaders like Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and Kerensky were very influential in the success of the revolution. They were men filled with revolutionary zeal who mobilized the workers, peasants and soldiers through their moving speeches. For instance, Lenin's promise of peace, bread and Land was a solution to the immediate problems the Russians were facing. This gained him mass support and made the revolution a success.

14. Lastly, the revolution succeeded because it was supported by the army. The only survival instrument for the unpopular Tsar Nicholas was the army, which unfortunately had suffered a lot from the First World War. This made them to mutiny and fraternize with the revolutionaries leaving Tsar Nicholas II defenseless. The army also maintained law and order, arrested, imprisoned and murdered the collaborators of the old regime. The Cheka (secret police) under the leadership of Felix Dzerzhinsky was established to terrorize and eliminate those who were opposed to the revolution. These measures left the revolution intact hence its success.

Attachments

No attachments



CONSEQUENCES OF THE RUSSIAN/ BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTIONS

The Bolshevik revolution of 1917 is by far the most important event in the political history of Europe during the 20th century. It is a watershed/ Landmark in the history of both Russia and the world at large. The revolution brought fundamental changes in the political, social and economic structures of Russia and Europe as the foregoing analysis reveals.

POSITIVE IMPACT

i) The revolution led to the establishment of the first communist government in the history of Russia and the entire world. The Russian revolutionaries led by Stalin and Lenin were communists who were inspired by Karl Marx's socialist ideas that was written in 1847. After the First World War, communism spread from Russia to other parts of Europe. By 1945, Eastern countries like Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Poland had adopted communism and there was an increase in socialist vote in Western countries such as France, Germany and Italy. Thus, the Bolshevik revolution led to the first socialist government in Russia that later spread to other parts of the world.

NB Russia was later transformed into a super world power with a permanent place in the security council of the United Nations organisation (U.N.O).

ii) Associated with the above was the rise to power of commoners (men of low birth) for the first time in Russia. Revolutionary leaders like Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky were commoners who rose to prominence only because the revolution had destroyed the social class discrimination that existed in Russia. By 1917, Russia was still under the ancient system of Tsardom in which important political posts were dominated by the Nobles and clergy. This system was buried together with the monarchy in 1917.

iii) The success of the Bolsheviks in November led to the withdrawal of Russia from the First World War.

The Russians had suffered greatest amongst the allies from World War 1 yet the provisional government was ready to continue with the war. Lenin promised to end the war and when he rose to power he signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty with Germany on 3rd March 1918 that ended Russia's participation in the First World War. This cowardly withdrawal prompted USA

to enter the war on the side of allied powers so as to bridge the vacuum created by Russia's withdrawal.

However, Russia's withdrawal isolated her from the allied powers and explains why she was not invited at the Versailles settlement of 1919. It also explains why Russia was out of the League of Nations not until 1930's. This left the League of Nations weakened since Russia and other Eastern countries were initially blocked from joining the League because of their communist ideology. Even when Russia was eventually admitted in 1934, there was no genuine co-operation between her and western capitalist powers who felt threatened by Russian communist ideology.

NB. The treaty of Brest-Litovsk declared Ukraine independent of Russia. Russia lost 1/3 of her nationals and 1/9 of her coal mines to the independent state of Ukraine.

iv) The revolution was a check and balance to Russia's imperialism over Europe. For instance, Finland that had been under Russia since the 1815 Vienna settlement was granted her independence as a reward for her assistance in the revolution. Poland also took advantage of the political instability during the revolution to declare her independence from Russia. This was confirmed at the Versailles settlement and accepted by Lenin in the treaty of Riga in 1921. Thus, the revolution provided a favourable opportunity to countries that had been dominated by Russia to regain their independence.

v) The communist revolution of-1917 led to the collapse of feudalism in Russia. By 1917, the ancient system where land was dominated by nobles and clergy at the expense of the peasants still existed in Russia yet it was non-existent in other parts of Europe. After the revolution. Land was nationalized by the government and redistributed to peasants for collective farming and ownership. The new Land policy provided more employment opportunities and reduced rural urban migration. It also reduced famine, income inequality and the exploitation of peasants by the rich landlords. Besides, other private enterprises like industries, factories and banks were nationalized and put under the control of workers. All these measures safeguarded the peasants and workers against exploitation by capitalists.

vi) By 1917, the non-Russian nationals who had been conquered by Russia were subjected to unfair treatment. But after the revolution, they were made part of USSR in form of Republics. This equality of all races within USSR was legalized in the 1923 constitution. The Republics formed by these

nationalities were granted considerable freedom that favoured the development of their language and culture. This is what transformed USSR from a backward country to one of the super powers in the world.

vii) The communist revolution contributed to the rise and growth of nationalism in Asia and Africa. The communists condemned imperialism and colonialism as the highest stage of capitalism and exploitation. They advocated for decolonization, worldwide adoption of communism and state ownership of production as a means of fighting exploitation of peasants and middle class by capitalists. They also supported decolonization movements in different Asian and African countries to fight for independence against colonialism. It was this advocacy and support against colonialism that strengthened Asian and African nationalism against colonialism, hence contributing to decolonization process outside Russia.

viii) The Bolshevik revolutions led to improved relationship between Germany and Russia. Germany assisted the Russians in the revolution with a hidden aim of causing confusion in Russia, which would make Russia to withdraw from the First World War. This is why Germany smuggled Stalin from exile in a disguised plane up to Russia. This led to better diplomatic relationship between Germany and Russia after the success of the revolution.

NEGATIVE IMPACT

ix) It led to the collapse of the Tsarist monarchy that had ruled Russia for over 300 years. Tsar Nicholas II was forced to abdicate in favour of his brother Duke Michael who declined the offer and the monarchy collapsed. Tsar Nicholas II and his family members were shot dead by the revolutionaries in 1918. This ended the Tsarist oppressive, dictatorial and corrupt regime plus the influence of the Catholic Church in Russian affairs.

x) There was massive loss of lives and destruction of property. This resulted from the clashes between the red army of the revolutionaries and the loyal supporters of the provisional government. Heavy bloodshed also resulted during the nationalization of land that was resisted by the nobles and clergy.

Power struggle between Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks intensified violence and street battles. There were also widespread strikes and demonstrations by workers and peasants on the streets of Moscow and St. Petersburg. All

these resulted into loss of lives, property, famine and exile to millions of Russians.

xi) There was a general economic decline in Russia as a result of the revolutions. The strikes, demonstrations, violence and civil war that ensued had drastic consequences on agriculture, industrialization and trade. Factories, mines and railways were grossly mismanaged leading to a decline in foreign exchange and economy. This resulted into the severe famine of 1924 that led to the death of over 1 million people.

NB. This unfortunate economic situation created by the revolution was reversed by Lenin's New

Economic Policy (NEP) that relaxed the radical communist policies.

xii) The Bolshevik revolutions led to civil war in Russia. The supporters of the Tsarist regime organized a counter revolutionary force in the north and southern parts of Russia against the revolutionary government. They were supported by the British and French up to 1924 when the counter revolutionary forces were defeated. This led to civil strife,, economic stagnation and violence in Russia from 1917 to 1924.

xiii) The Bolshevik revolutions led to the rise of Nazism in Germany and Fascism in Italy. The revolution gave rise to communism which became a threat to the property of the middle class and wealthy landlords. Hitler and Mussolini promised to fight communism and gained support from the rich landlords, middleclass and industrialists. This led to the rise of Nazism in Germany and Fascism in Italy. It should be noted Nazis and Fascist aggressions were executed under the guise of fighting communism, which had emerged from the Bolshevik revolutions of 1917.

xiv) Lastly, the Russian revolution laid foundation for cold war that divided Europe into two antagonistic camps. The revolution gave birth to communism in Russia which later spread to Eastern Europe. This created a struggle by Russia to expand communism in Europe, which clashed with the determination of western powers led by USA that intended to contain the spread of communism and promote capitalism in Europe. It set off an ideological struggle rotating a round communism and capitalism that is called the cold war. This undermined the League of Nations leading to the collapse of international diplomacy that destabilized world peace.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background

The idea of the League of Nations was adopted from President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteenth point (last point), which stated that an International Organization be formed to guarantee the independence of states both great and small. To Denis Richards, the League "...**was Wilson's greatest gift of Europe**

The League of Nations was first adopted at the Paris peace conference and thus becomes an integral part of the Versailles settlement. It officially came into existence on 10th January 1920. The League had 26 articles (clauses) of the covenant (constitution) and the most important of all was the sanction clause. In the initial stage, the League was composed of only the allied and associated powers plus key neutral states. They were 42 but the number 'increased to 55 by 1926. However, 9 countries including United States of America, whose President had suggested the idea of forming the League did not join it. The League was based in Geneva, Switzerland, as it's headquarter.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ORGANS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The League of Nations had a number of Organs, Commissions and Committees to implement its aims and objectives.

1. The General Assembly

The general assembly met annually and comprised of representatives of all member states. All independent states were eligible to be members of the general assembly. Every member state was to send up to 3 delegates but each state would have only 1 vote. The General Assembly formulates general policy guidelines for the League of Nations and discusses the budget prepared by the council generally, the assembly discusses

international social, economic and political matters that were likely to endanger world peace.

2. The Council

The council was the executive arm of the League of Nations. Its delegates consisted of 4 permanent members from the big powers i.e. Britain, France, Italy and Japan and 9 other non permanent members and adhoc representatives. However, other permanent members were later admitted with approval of the assembly and the council. The council was a smaller organ that met more frequently, at least three times a year. It handled more urgent matters with a unanimous decision i.e. its decision were to be accepted by all delegates.

3. The Permanent court of international justice

This was a Court of appeal with 15 Judges of different nationalities. It was launched on 15th Feb 1922 and worked up to October 1945. Its Judges were elected by the General assembly and the council. The primary role of the permanent Court of International Justice was to settle legal disputes amongst member states with the hope of maintaining peace, stability and natural Justice. It also had powers to advice the general assembly and council on legal issues. By 1939, the court had settled 70 major cases and successfully organized 400 International treaties. There w[^] no provision for appeal against court decision although the court could review its own Judgment basing on evidence brought before it. The headquarter of the court was at Hague in Holland where the idea was born in 1899 by Tsar Nicholas II of Russia.

4. The Secretariat.

The Secretariat was the administrative organ of the League of Nations. It was based in Geneva and led by a secretary general who was appointed by the Council and approved by the assembly. Its staff was appointed by the Secretary General in consultation with the council. The secretariat operated throughout the year and its staff was permanently employed. The work of the secretariat was to co-ordinate all activities and other organs of the League of Nations. This includes; preparing agendas, resolutions and reports for submission to the general assembly and the council. The cost of running the secretariat was paid by member states.,

In addition to the above organs, the League had commissions and committees to handle specific and miscellaneous issues. For instance, there "were commissions for labour, health, disarmament, minority groups,

economic and financial organisation, refugees, children, women rights, mandate and drug trafficking. These supplemented the other organs in executing the role of the League in Europe.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASON FOR THE FORMATION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS/ AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The basic aims and objectives of the League of Nations were found in articles 9 to 17 and 23 -24 of the league covenant (constitution). Generally, the League was formed due to political, social and economic considerations.

1. The need to maintain peace

The League of Nations was an instrument to preserve and promote world peace and stability. The First World War was the worst experience (by then) that had led to massive loss of lives, displacement of people and destruction of property. It was caused partly due to the weakness of international organisation to settle disputes and preserve world peace. The league was formed to address this weakness. It was to be a forum to arbitrate and settle disputes peacefully before such disputes escalates to war. Thus, one can argue that the League of Nations was formed to maintain international relations and pre-empt the outbreak of another major war in Europe.

2. To protect the territorial integrity and independence of states

The desire to promote the respect for territorial integrity and independence of member states against aggression also led to the formation of League of Nations. Europe had suffered the dangers of French aggression of 1792-1815 and German aggression prior to 1914 that had led to wars and instability. It should be emphasized that the violation of territorial integrity of smaller states like Serbia by Austria is what sparked off the outbreak of the First World War. The league was therefore formed to avoid this by protecting such smaller and weaker states against aggression by bigger and stronger states. This was to be achieved through sanctions and military intervention amongst others. It should be noted that article 16 provided for collective

security and action against any aggressive power. This was extended to nonmembers in article 17. It was also spelt out that an aggressive power was to be expelled from the league by the council.

3 Promotion of Diplomacy

The league was formed to promote diplomacy in settling disputes. This was because the First World War was partly caused by the weakness of international organisation and the collapse of international diplomacy. The League was therefore formed to address this weakness and promote dialogue other than militarism in settling disputes. All legal issues between states were to be referred to the international Court of Justice that was the highest court of appeal. This was to promote and defend the concept of international justice.

4 Reduction of arms race

The League was formed to limit the manufacture of dangerous weapons and promote disarmament. Both the defeated and victor powers were to be disarmed to the lowest level consistent with domestic security.

Although Germany and her allies were disarmed, the league was to monitor them closely and frustrate the resurrection of arms race. This was precisely because arms race had contributed to the outbreak of the First World War. It explains why a disarmament commission was established. Its role was to conduct research and advice the council on military, naval and air issues.

5 Suppression of sea Pirates

Sea pirates were problems whose solution was to be found by the League of Nations. They were a threat to international trade in big waters e.g. Mediterranean sea, black sea, R. Danube and Pacific: Ocean. The pirates were looting and high jacking ships making trade on sea a risky venture. The league was to find a way of forming an army that would hunt for pirates on the sea and paralyze their illegal activities. This was to promote trade and peace on the sea.

6 To Control Drug Trafficking

The growing concern over drug trafficking and consumption of dangerous drugs was also responsible for the formation of the League of Nations. Drugs such as opium, marijuana and mairungi were affecting people's mind, reasoning, causing people to go crazy and promoting violence. The league

was formed to monitor and frustrate the production, sales, transportation and consumption of such intoxicating drugs.

7. Social Political and Economic Co-operation

The league was also formed to promote social, political and economic co-operation on a global scale. The First World War had left problems such as inflation, unemployment, famine, social disintegration, mistrust by smaller states against bigger states because bigger states had dominated smaller states at the Versailles Settlement. Besides, there was a problem of homeless, displaced and traumatized refugees. There was also the problem of reconstruction of Europe after the war and that is why a financial commission for loans was formed. The league was therefore formed to handle the post world war Social, political and economic challenges. This is why articles 23 and 24 advocated for worldwide co-operation in handling global problems.

8. To Improve the Condition of workers.

The desire to improve on the working condition of workers and to stop exploitation of workers by employers was another issue that led to the formation of the League of Nations. Workers were being exploited through low payments, over timework for no payments in poor sanitary and risky environment.

Consequently, most workers were very poor, malnourished and demoralized. By 1920, the working conditions in industrialized nations were so poor that intervention by international organisation (League of Nations) was urgently needed. The International Labour Organisation was formed to protect workers rights and privileges against exploitation by employers.

9. Administration of Mandate States

The need for proper administration of mandate states was also responsible for the formation of League of the nations. The Versailles settlement had taken over the colonies of Germany and her allies that were in different parts of Africa, Asia and the Middle East. These colonies were given to the victor's powers. The administration of such states was to be taken over by the League of Nations. This is why the league established the mandate commission that was to oversee how fairly they were being governed.

10. To preserve the achievements of the Paris peace settlement

The League of Nations was an offspring of the Versailles settlement and thus aimed at maintaining the achievement of the Versailles settlement. It was

formed to implement treaties under the Versailles settlement like the Versailles treaty with Germany and the treaty of St German with Austria plus other treaties that were yet to be signed with other defeated powers e.g. Bulgaria and Turkey. It should be emphasized that President Woodrow Wilson came with the idea of the League of Nations in the last point of his memorandum (14th point) after realizing that the previous 13 points and other resolutions would not be affected if an international organisation was not formed. This made it very easy for the Versailles peacemakers to endorse and support the formation of the League of Nations.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, 1920- 1945

The League of Nations played positive and negative roles in the social, political, economic and humanitarian developments of Europe during the inter-war period. Its achievements were more in the economic, social and humanitarian fields as compared to politics and peace.

1. Peace

The League maintained relative peace in Europe from 1920 to 1939. It organized world peace conferences that revived the spirit of internationalism and the concert of Europe in the Inter-war period. In 1925, the league initiated the Locarno conference that led to the signing of Locarno treaty by Britain, France, Germany, Belgium and Italy. The treaty brought temporary reconciliation between Germany and her former enemies i.e. Britain and France. It made Germany to join the league from 1926 up to 1934 when Hitler withdrew Germany's membership from the League of Nations. This also brought Germany back to international community and into the disarmament talks, which ushered a new era of peace in Europe.

Stresemann (German foreign minister, 1923-1929) stressed that the Locarno treaty introduced "a new era of co-operation among nations, a time of real peace"

2. Legal disputes

The League of Nations established the international court of justice as the highest court of appeal. It was established by article 14 of the league covenant (constitution) in 1920 as a valid and authoritarian body for settling legal disputes. By 1939, the court had settled 70 cases and presided the signing of over 400 treaties. This promoted the spirit of diplomacy and dialogue as opposed to violence in settling conflicts.

Henceforth, the league is credited for promoting peaceful settlement of disputes, reconciliation and harmony in Europe.

3. Dispute between Germany and Belgium over Eupen and Malmedy

The League of Nations successfully resolved conflict over Eupen and Malmedy between Germany and Belgium. The Versailles treaty of 1919 gave Eupen and Malmedy (German territories) to Belgium. In 1920, Germany lodged a series of protest to the council of the League of Nations against the giving of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium. The council discussed the complaint in September 1920 and wrote to the German government, that its decision regarding the transfer of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium was final.

This bold stand by the council scared and frustrated Germany's attempt to repossess Eupen and Malmedy that was bound to bring Belgium into a serious conflict/war with Germany.

4. Conflict between Finland and Sweden over Aaland Islands

The league intervened and settled a dispute between Finland and Sweden over control of Aaland Islands, which bordered both nations. Finland and Aaland Islands initially belonged to Sweden but were annexed by Russia in 1809. However, during the 1917 Russian revolution, Finland declared her independence and the fate of Aaland Islands remained unclear. A serious dispute arose between Finland and Sweden for the control of the Islands. The council of the League of Nations took up the matter and established a commission of inquiry, which recommended that the Islands be given to Finland. Eventually, the council gave control over the Islands to Finland in 1921 and in April 1922 an international convention guaranteed the neutrality of the islands and granted them international protection. This ended the conflict between Finland and Sweden over Aaland Islands.

5 Conflict between Peru and Columbia over Leticia

The League of Nations successfully settled conflict between Peru and Columbia over Leticia in South America. In 1922, Peru surrendered control

of Leticia to Columbia. However, in 1933 Peru invaded Columbia and captured Leticia. The league set a commission of inquiry into • crisis. The commission did its investigations and recommended that Leticia should be handed over to Columbia. This was implemented and the matter was permanently settled.

6. war between Greece and Bulgaria, 1925-1926

In 1926, the league intervened and stopped the war that had broken out between Greece and Bulgaria. In 1925, a border dispute arose between Greece and Bulgaria. The Greek army marched into Bulgaria and occupied part of her territory. Bulgaria appealed to the league, which ordered Greece to withdraw her troops and pay compensation for the damage caused. Britain, France and Italy were authorized to send military officers on the spot to enforce the resolution of the League of Nations. This forced Greece to withdraw her troops and compensate Bulgaria for the losses incurred. On the other hand, the league also settled Greek refugees from Asia Minor under the terms of the 1923 treaty of Lausanne.

7. Dispute between Turkey and Iraq

In 1926, the League of Nations settled conflict between Turkey and Iraq over Mosul. Mosul was a rich oil deposit on the Iraqi- Turkish border. Both Turkey and Iraq rivaled for the control of the disputed oil deposit of Mosul. The league instituted a commission of inquiry that recommended Mosul to be under Iraqis control. Turkey accepted the commission's report and surrendered the area to Iraq To this extent; one can assert that the League of Nations was successful in peaceful settlement of world disputes without recourse to war.

8. Condition of workers and children

The League of Nations addressed the plight of workers and children. The International labour organisation (ILO) was formed under the leadership of Albert Thomson, a French socialist. It inspired the formation of trade unions and labour organizations worldwide. This advocated for better wages, salaries and working condition. The International Labour Organisation also advocated for the rights and privileges of workers.

In Persia, ILO condemned and stopped child labour where exploitation of young children was rampant.

Thus, the League of Nations earns a credit for sphere heading the struggle to liberate workers and children against exploitation by capitalists.

9. Drug trafficking

Drug trafficking was reduced as an achievement for the League of Nations. Before the formation of the League, there was rampant drug abuse and addiction that had become a social evil. The league members formed a drug trafficking committee to monitor and fimstrate the production, sales, transportation and consumption of intoxicating drugs like opium, marijuana, and cocaine. In 1925, a permanent central opium board was established to check on the licensing of imports, exports and transportation of opium. By 1945, these measures had drastically reduced the production, sales and consumption of toxic drugs. This restored peace, order and made the world a better place to live in.

10. Slave trade and slavery

The League of Nations ended the problem of slave trade and slavery. A slavery commission was established in 1924 to deal with the evil of slave trade and slave dealers. It condemned and frustrated the abduction, sales and enslavement of slaves. The league made the abolition of slave trade an international issue. It ended slave trade and slavery that were still rampant in Arab states. This was a justifiable struggle to emancipate mankind from oppression and social evils.

11. Health

The League of Nations achieved better health standards in Europe by 1945. In 1920, the first session/sitting of the council established epidemic commission that successfully dealt with the spread of cholera, dysentery and influenza from Russia to Holland. In 1923, the League of Nations established the World Health Organisation that conducted research on health related problems and possible solutions. It held many conferences to sensitize people against causes, prevention and cure of diseases. These led to an improved health standards and provided better atmosphere for physical and economic developments.

12 Resettlement of internally displaced persons and refugees

The League of Nations scored a significant success in the resettlement of internally displaced persons and refugees. After 1920, there were so many displaced persons and refugees scattered in different parts of Europe. The league took good care of these victims by providing food, shelter, clothing and medicines before repatriating them to their countries. In 1927, a convention concerned with international relief union was formed to help those suffering from natural disaster and displaced person. The refugees

department led by a Norwegian explorer Fridtjof Nansen gave timely assistance to Austrian and Greek refugees.

13 Plight of prisoners of war

The League advocated for fair treatment of prisoners of war and repatriation to their mother countries.

From 1920- 1925, the league successfully repatriated all World War I prisoners of war with majority going to Germany, Bulgaria and Turkey. For instance, about 427,000 prisoners of war that were in Russia were repatriated/ returned to their respective countries. The league assisted them with food, medicines, blankets etc to help them to settle down in their countries. It should be noted that the current United Nations High Commission for Refugees was inspired by the concerns of the League of Nations over the plight of refugees and displaced persons in war situations.

14 Socio- economic achievements

The League of Nations made remarkable achievements in the social and economic fields. In 1927, the economic commission of the league organized a world economic conference that resolved to promote free international trade without restriction. The financial committee was established to provide loans for the reconstruction of Europe. It gave loans to poor countries that had been devastated by the First World War.

The countries that benefited included; Greece, Bulgaria, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Iraq and

Czechoslovakia. The financial commission also helped to reduce the problem of counterfeiting, forgery, double taxation and fluctuating value of Gold. All these measures reduced poverty that had made poor nations vulnerable to aggression and promoted peace in Europe.

15 Mandate System

The League effectively implemented the mandate system. It established the mandate commission to oversee the administration of states under the mandate system. The states in question were Namibia, Togo, Cameroon and Tanganyika. These were former colonies of Germany that were given (Mandated) to big powers to govern on behalf of the League of Nations. The states had created problems at Versailles and had become a source of conflict between the great powers. In all, the mandate commission on behalf of the League proved effective in minimizing the exploitation of colonies by those mandated to govern them.

16 Administrations of Danzig and Saar Coalfield

The League also played a role in the administration of German ports of Danzig (1920- 39) and the Saar coal region (1920- 35) that were "grabbed" from Germany at the Versailles settlement. These states were so strategically significant that they could not be given to any single country. By taking direct administration of these states, the league avoided conflicts and war over such territories. In 1935, the league conducted a referendum in the Saar region that favoured the return of the region to Germany. In all, the mandate commission on behalf of the league proved effective in preventing the exploitation of colonies by those mandated to govern them.

17 Aggression

In 1927, The League of Nations declared all acts of aggression illegal. This resulted in to the signing of the Kellogg pact of 1928. The pact was named after the United States of America secretary of states who initiated the idea together with Briand, the French minister of foreign affairs. It was signed by 65 countries including Russia, who had not yet become members the League of Nations. The signatories of the pact renounced (rejected) war as an instrument of policy except on self-defense. The significance of the pact lies in the fact that it was signed by USA and Russia who by then were not yet members of the League. It also filled up the gap in the covenant since the covenant did not provide for safeguards against aggression.

However, the meaning of self-defense was not clearly defined in the pact. Never the less, in spite of this loophole, the Kellogg pact temporarily restrained aggression and consolidated peace for some time.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WEAKNESSESAND FAILURES OFTHE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1 Conflict between Poland and Lithuania

The League of Nations is blamed for ratifying and accepting polish aggression against Lithuania. Conflict between Poland and Lithuania arose over possession of the city of Vilna. In 1920, Poland invaded and annexed Vilna yet it had been given to the custody of Lithuania. The league did not

condemn or even try to settle the conflict but accepted the Polish occupation. This was outright acceptance of aggression and militarism as opposed to dialogue in resolving conflicts.

2 Corfu incident

The League of Nations registered another setback over the Corfu incident. On Aug 1923, 4 Italians (a driver, a general and two officers), were murdered by Greek bandits on Greek territory. Mussolini held Greece responsible and retaliated by bombarding and occupying the Greek Island of Corfu. Greece appealed to the league for arbitration but Mussolini refused to co-operate and the League instead ordered the Greeks to compensate Italy for the murders. It should be noted that Mussolini withdrew Italian troops only after securing a huge compensation of 50 million Lire from Greece. Thus, the league is accused for approving Mussolini's invasion of Greek territory and ratifying a huge compensation for the murder of the 4 Italians.

3. Conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay, 1928

The League of Nations failed to settle conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay. Armed conflict (war) between the states started in December 1928. The council of the League brought Bolivia and Paraguay to around table settlement but both states continued with the bloody conflict. The League of Nations imposed sanctions on both states but other members of the league declined (refused) to implement it. In March 1935, Paraguay resigned from the League of Nations and the league lost interest in the conflict. Thus, it's safe for one to conclude that the League of Nations failed to settle the armed conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay.

4. Japanese invasion of Manchuria, 1931

The League of Nations failed to restrain Japanese aggression on China and her eventual occupation of Manchuria. In 1931, Japan invaded Manchuria, a Chinese territory and renamed it Manchukuo. The league failed to take action against Japan and many members of the league were instead in support of Japan. Lord Lytton's (an Englishman). Commission condemned the invasion and recommended that Japan should withdraw her troops. The league accepted the report but failed to implement it. However, Japan rejected the report and withdrew from the league on May 1933 and the league did not take any action against her.

In 1930's more Japanese troops poured into Manchuria to pacify the area. It was only during the course of World War II that military action against Japan was taken, by which time the league had effectively ceased to exist.

5 Italian invasion of Ethiopia, 1935

The Italo-Ethiopian crisis was yet another event that portrayed the weakness of the League of Nations.

In 1935, Italy using poisonous gas against civilians invaded Abyssinia (Ethiopia) to avenge the 1896 defeat at the battle of Adowa. No serious action was taken against Italy and by 1936 she had conquered the whole of Ethiopia. Britain and France were more concerned with the need to preserve Italy's friendship than to defend an African country i.e. Ethiopia. This was because they themselves had conquered many parts of Africa in the second half of the 19th century. Although sanction was imposed on Italy, it proved ineffective in forcing Mussolini out of Ethiopia. Thus, the League of Nations failed to live to its expectation of defending small and weak nations against aggression by big and mighty powers.

6 Germany's Invasion of Rhine lands, March 1936

Germany's invasion of Rhine lands was an event that showed the failure of the League of Nations. On March 1936, Hitler invaded the Rhine lands, which threatened the security of France and Belgium. The invasion also violated the Versailles settlement of 1919 and the Locarno treaty of 1925 that had prohibited the presence of Germany troops on the demilitarized zones of Rhine lands. The league merely condemned

Germany but took no other punitive action against her. This was because the members of the league were afraid of confronting German troops under Hitler's leadership.

7 The Spanish civil war, 1931-39

The Spanish civil war was an event that showed gross negligence and weakness of the League of Nations.

In 1931, the monarchical government of Spain was overthrown and replaced by a republican government.

General Franco picked up arms and led a co-ordinate rebellion against the republican government. From 1936- 1939, there was a bloody confrontation between General Franco's rebels supported by Italy and Germany against the Spanish republican government backed by Russia and mercenaries.

forces recruited from several European countries including Britain, USA and France. The League of Nations did nothing and was inactive over the bloody Spanish civil war. The league is therefore blamed for neither settling the conflict peacefully nor condemning and restraining Russia, Italy and Germany from participating in the civil war.

8 German Annexation of Austria, March 1938

The German annexation of Austria was yet another event that exposed the ineffectiveness/ weakness of the League of Nations. In March 1938, Hitler invaded and annexed Austria to Germany. Austria was made to live under German military occupation and Nazis were appointed rulers. This was an open violation of the Versailles treaty of 1919 that had forbidden the reunion of Austria and Germany. The League of Nations took no action against Hitler and German annexation of Austria. By keeping aloof, one can conclude that the League of Nations failed to preserve the Versailles settlement of 1919 for which it was formed.

9 German annexation of Sudetenland (Czechoslovakia), 1938

The League of Nations was also a failure over the German invasion and annexation of Czechoslovakia. In 1938, Hitler attacked Sudetenland (in Czechoslovakia) and in March 1939, he went ahead and merged the rest of Czechoslovakia with Germany. The League of Nations did not take any positive step to restrain German aggression against Czechoslovakia. Besides, the Munich conference delegates appeased Hitler by approving the German annexation, which was an open acceptance of aggression by one-sovereign state against another.

10 The German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War

The German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War were perfect testimonies that the League of Nations failed to bring a lasting peace in Europe. On 1st September 1939, German troops invaded Poland from all fronts and almost devastated the whole country. Britain and France gave Hitler an ultimatum to withdraw within 24 hours but Hitler objected. Consequently, Britain and France declared war on Germany on 3rd September 1939, which amplified the German- Polish conflict into the Second World War. As usual, the League of Nations did not restrain or condemn German aggression and the declaration of war by Britain and France (on Germany). It must be noted that, had the League of Nations been a strong and authoritarian organisation, Hitler would have feared to

violate the territorial integrity and independence of Poland, which would have averted the outbreak of the Second World War.

11 Lack of a joint standing army

The League of Nations failed to establish a joint standing military force of its own to enforce its resolutions and maintain peace. Article 16 of the league constitution, which provided that member states should send troops when called upon was undermined by an amendment of 1923 that members were free to fight or not in a crisis situation. This explains why most members of the league e.g. Germany, Japan, Italy and Russia (by 1935) refused to send their troops to fight in crisis situations. Lack of a joint standing army reduced the league to the status of a "toothless backing bull dog" that relied on sanctions, which proved useless against aggressions. This encouraged a series of aggressions that climaxed into the German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War. It also explains why the League became ineffective in countering/ handling the Nazis and fascist aggressions over Europe in the inter war period. It should be stressed that if the League of Nations had its own standing army, Hitler would have thought twice before invading Poland. Even when he could have invaded as he did, such an army would have been used to "push" him out of Poland, which could have averted the Second World War.

12 Failure to mobilize for collective security

The League of Nations failed to mobilize its members for collective security. Nations ignored the idea of collective security in preference to their own national security. The army (Collective) had national duties to execute and in times of need could prefer to serve their country other than global duties assigned by the League of Nations. Donald Kegan argues that; "Hitler's path was made easier by growing evidence that the league of nations was ineffective as a device for keeping peace and that collective security was a "myth" (The western Heritage, by Donald Kegan , P936). In other words, the failure of the League of Nations to mobilize members for collective security explains why there was no collective action against Hitler, which encouraged him to wage a series of aggression that led to the outbreak of the Second World War.

13 Poor organisation and system

The League of Nations was loosely organized with unclear and unstable membership. It was a laisez fair organisation with free entry and exit similar to co-operative society principle of "open and voluntary membership".

There was no condition for membership and punishment for withdrawal of membership.

This explains why Germany, Japan, Italy and Russia easily joined the league in 1920's and all had withdrawn their membership by 1936. All these were possible because the League of Nations did not put strong conditions and measures against entry and exit of members.

14 Failure to involve United States of America Germany and Russia right from the start

The absence of United States of America right from the start was a serious weakness of the League of Nations. The league failed to secure the membership of United State of America yet she was the world economic and military power who could have strengthened it. U S A had played a leading role in ending the First World War and the idea of the League of Nations came from her president, Woodrow Wilson.

Her absence denied the league of the active role of its architect / parent that was crucial for its success.

Besides, the league did not involve Russia and Germany right from the start merely because of suspicion.

Russia was initially isolated because of adopting communism through the revolution of 1917 and Germany because of her pre- 1914 arrogance and aggression. Although Russia and Germany were later admitted, their commitment was feeble/ weak and no wonder that they had all pulled out of the league by 1936. It must be noted that the absence of Russia from the start locked many eastern powers outside the League of Nations because of the strong influence Russia had over them after the 1917 revolution in Russia.

15 Failure to avert economic depression

The League of Nations failed to promote economic co-operation in Europe, which contributed to the outbreak of economic depression. It failed to implement economic reforms necessary for free trade and that is why United State of America and other Nations pursued the policy of protectionism and economic nationalism. It also failed to address the loophole in the gold standard system that limited money supply yet production of most nations had increased. These weaknesses undermined international trade and diplomatic relations between European powers

leaving nations flooded with surplus products in narrow domestic market leading the great depression of 1929- 1935.

16 Failure to control re-armament

The League of Nations failed to control re- armament in the inter- war period. The disarmament commission failed to implement universal disarmament and concentrated only on Germany. As the commission disarmed Germany, others like Britain, France and Russia were re-arming themselves to the teeth in violation of the Versailles treaty of 1919. Germany insisted that the allied powers should also disarm and France took it jokingly. Her attitude was "security firsts disarmament after words," However, Hitler's attitude was that. "Because other powers had not disarmed as they had promised, it was wrong to keep Germany helpless" He concluded that; re-armament was the only road to power and national achievement". Consequently, Hitler withdrew Germany from the disarmament conference of Geneva in 1932, the League of Nations in 1934, re-instated conscription and embarked on massive rearmament that revived arms race.

17 Inadequate funding

The League of Nations had weak financial base. Very few member states co- operated in funding the activities of the league. It therefore survived on the good will of its members and had no money of its own. The League of Nations therefore had insufficient money to finance its activities and implement its resolutions that made it to fail.

18 Failure to maintain unity

The League of Nations failed to maintain unity in the inter- war period. Selfish interest, mistrust, suspicion

and the spirit of revenge led to the formation of rival political groups and organizations for example, the Balkan pact of March 1934 v/as signed between Romania, Greece and Turkey against imperial interest of the big powers in the Balkans. Britain, United States of America, France and Russia formed the democratic alliance against the axis alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan. The formation of such alliances and counter alliances divided Europe into two hostile and antagonistic camps that led to the outbreak of the Second World War. Thus, one can blame the re-emergence of alliance system in the inter- war period led to the failure of League of Nations to maintain unity in Europe.

19 Failure of mandate system

Lastly, the mandate commission of the League of Nations was not totally successful. France encountered a lot of resistance in Syria due to her poor administration and policies against the Syrians. Britain's mandate and rule in Palestine completely failed to reconcile Arabs and Jews over the establishment of a Jewish national home. The 1930 investigation report of the mandate commission exposed the failure of Britain to settle conflicts between the Jews and Arabs over the "wailing wall" that was part of Solomon's temple of worship. Consequently, Britain surrendered her mandate over Iraq. There was also bitter resistance in the German territories in Africa e.g. Tanganyika, Namibia, Togo and Cameroon that were mandated to Britain, France and the republic of South Africa. Germany opposed surrendering her former colonies to the commission as a way of depriving her of her possession / territories.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE FAILURE/ COLLAPSE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The League of Nations scored a remarkable achievement as an instrument of peace in the 1920's.

However, it failed to maintain world peace in 1930's. 1930's witnessed a network of aggression that climaxed into the German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War. The failure of the League of Nations was generally due to its own weaknesses and other factors as discussed below.

1. Lack of a joint standing army.

The League of Nations failed because it lacked a standing army of its own to maintain peace. It relied on mobilizing members to send troops to fight in case of emergency / crisis (collective security), which proved too slow and ineffective against aggression. Moreover, the idea of collective security was ignored in preference to national security since nations concentrated on using their army for their own security. Lack of a joint standing army of its own made the league to be theoretical rather than practical in handling world disputes. This encouraged the axis powers to embark on a series of aggression because they were aware that the

league had no standby force that could be used against them. The success of Nazis and fascist aggressions that destabilized Europe was partly because the League of Nations had no army of its own to force them out of the territories they invaded.

2 Ineffectiveness of economic sanctions

The League of Nations failed because of ineffective penalties against aggression. It relied most on imposing economic sanction against offenders, which proved too incompetent in restraining aggression.

Sanctions were poorly monitored and not fully implemented partly because the league had no army to enforce them. The sanction imposed on Italy due to Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 excluded export of oil, coal and steel to Italy. This instead facilitated Mussolini's conquest of the whole of Ethiopia by May 1936. The league lifted/ abandoned sanction against Italy after realizing that it had failed to force Mussolini out of Ethiopia.

3 Association with the Versailles settlement of 1919

The League of Nations failed because it was an off ring of the Versailles treaty of 1919 (originated from Versailles treaty), u ""25 formed to preserve the terms of the Versailles settlement most of which were too unrealistic to guarantee a lasting peace in Europe. Germany, Italy and Japan who were cheated at Versailles hated the League of Nations as a promoter of the terms of the settlement and were determined to undermine it right from the beginning. They formed the axis alliance and embarked on aggression partly to challenge the credibility of the League of Nations to maintain peace. Other defeated and neutral powers regarded the league as an organization to consolidate the gains of the signatories of the Versailles treaty and disassociated themselves from it. All these made the league very unpopular right from the beginning and its collapse/ failure by 1939 became inevitable.

4 Absence of United State of America

The absence of United State of America right from the start left the league weakened and made its failure a foregone conclusion. In March 1920; the U.S.A senate (parliament) rejected the Versailles treaty and the League that they were meant for European and not American affairs. Besides, the League of Nations neglected some aspects of President Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. These made U.S.A to isolate herself (isolationist policy) from the League of Nations. However, this was unfortunate for the success of the

league because the original idea for the formation of the league came from U.S.A's president, Woodrow

Wilson. It left the league almost as an "orphan" in the hands of Britain and France who did not take proper care of it and hence it failed. Above all, U.S.A was the world's economic and military giant / power that could have helped the League financially and militarily to fight aggression. In the absence of United State of America, the fate of the league relied greatly on Britain and France who were so exhausted and incapacitated / weakened by World War I that they did not have sufficient financial and military power to commit to the League.

5 Failure to enlist Germany and Russia right from the start

Besides United State of America, the League of Nations failed to enlist the membership of important powers like Germany and Russia in the initial stage of its existence. Germany was out of the League of Nations from the beginning because she viewed the League as an organization the victors against the vanquished/ defeated. Members of the League Were also relaxed on Germany's membership because suspicion and memories of Germany's aggression were still fresh in their minds. Germany only joined the

League of Nations in 1926 after the Locarno treaty of 1925 had reconciled her with her former enemies e.g. France, Britain and Belgium. Russia was also locked out of the League until 1934 because of adopting communism through the revolution of 1917. This kept many Eastern powers outside the League because

Russia had strong influence over them especially after the revolution of 1917. The League therefore failed to lay a sound and vibrant foundation for its success right from the start. Although Germany and Russia were later admitted in the League of Nations, they became halfhearted members their membership by 1939.

6 Desertions by Japan, Germany and Italy

Desertion of the League of Nations by Japan, Germany and Italy left it weakened and incapable of achieving its aims and objectives in the inter-war period. The league had no conditions on membership and penalties against withdrawal of membership. It was a laisez fair (loose) organization with free entry and exit of membership. This explains why Japan easily withdrew in 1933 after the league condemn her over occupation of Manchuria, Germany withdrew in 1934 after the failure of the disarmament conference of 1932 and Italy withdrew in 1936 after her occupation of

Ethiopia. After deserting the League of Nations, these powers (Japan, Germany and Italy) challenged the league through a network of aggressions that contributed to its collapse.

7 Insufficient funding

The League of Nations failed because of weak economic and financial base. It did not have a clearly defined financial system of membership contribution and depended on the good will of its members.

Prominent members like Britain and France were economically weakened by the First World War and the great depression of 1929-1935. These made them to relax on giving financial assistance to the League. The

League therefore lacked sufficient resources/ funds to finance its objectives, hence its failures.

8 Appeasement policy

Appeasement policy pursued by Britain and France in the inter-war period undermined the League of Nations and contributed to its failure. The policy antagonized the issue of collective security and made the league inactive against the Nazis and fascist aggressions since the powers behind it i.e. Britain and France were the most influential members of the league. This tolerated and promoted Nazis and fascist aggressions that led to the outbreak of the second war, which terminated the existence of the League of Nations.

9 Lack of massive support

Lack of massive support/ universal support also contributed to the failure of the League of Nations. The League concentrated on Europe and ignored other parts of the world. Even in Europe, it was monopolized by gigantic (powerful) states like Britain and France against weaker and smaller states such as China, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Consequently, these smaller and weaker states lost confidence in the league since it failed to safeguard them against the Nazis and fascist aggressions of the 1930's. This denied the League of Nations massive support leaving it unpopular and incapable of performing its duties.

10 Ideological difference/ Disunity

Ideological difference within members of the League of Nations accounts for its failure by 1939. The emergence of communism through the 1917 revolution in Russia divided Europe into the East dominated by communism

supported by Russia and West dominated by capitalism that was supported by France and Britain. This is part of the reason why Russia withdrew from the League of Nations, which blocked communist states of China, Czechoslovakia, Slovenia etc. from the league. Besides, democratic powers such as France and Britain were antagonistic to dictatorial states of Germany, Italy and Japan (axis powers). It explains why there was unnecessary disagreement in the council that made it impossible to adopt a common policy against aggression. Generally, ideological difference promoted suspicion, hatred, jealousy and rivalry that doomed (failed) the League of Nations.

11 Defective system of voting and the principle of equality

Defective system of voting was also responsible for the failure of the League of Nations. The League was based on the principle of equality in voting (one man, one vote) and equality of all member states. This was defective and not practical because countries such as Liberia, Iraq and Greece could not be as important as Britain, France and Russia. The idea of one-man one vote undermined pride of super powers and partly made them i.e. United States of America, Russia, Germany, Italy and Japan to have low regards for the League of Nations. It also left the League lukewarm because a country or group of countries would refuse to approve resolutions/ decisions that were against their interest. It should be stressed that attempts to change the constitution failed because it needed a unanimous / collective decisions that was due to defective voting system.

12 Economic depression 1929 -1935

The effects of economic depression undermined the League of Nations and caused its downfall. The depression created problems like deflation, unemployment, poverty and famine that contributed to the rise of Hitler who embarked on aggression to lift Germany out of it, inter alia. Members of the League of Nations were too pre- occupied with the problems created by the depression that they neglected the league.

For instance, Britain went into hiding to re-organize her economy, Russia concentrated on spreading the gospel of communism in Eastern Europe and Germany used the opportunity to rearm herself and embark on aggression. The depression also made members financially weak and incapable of funding the activities of the League. Thus, the effects of economic depression weakened the League politically and economically and made it to fail in the inter war period

13 Re-armament and arms race

The failure of the League of Nations to control re-armament in the inter-war period also contributed to its failure to live to its expectations. The disarmament commission concentrated on disarming Germany only and ignored great powers such as Britain, France and Russia. This forced Germany to withdraw from the disarmament conference of 1932 plus the league (in 1934) and embarked on a re-armament program that led to re-emergence of arms race. It led to the production of sophisticated weapons including weapons of mass destruction that created suspicion, hatred, rivalry and a series of aggression, which contributed to the failure of the League of Nations.

14 Rise of nationalism

The rise of nationalism in Europe also contributed to the failure of the League of Nations. The League of Nations was a combination of different powers with different national interest to defend. Members were too much concerned with their selfish national interest at the expense of the League, which undermined diplomatic co-operation and success of the League. For instance, Britain wanted to use the league to dominate Europe and maintain the balance of power, France was bent on using the league to encircle Germany, which amongst other reasons forced Germany out of the league in 1934. It should be emphasized that Germany, Italy and Japan hated the League of Nations because it was formed to consolidate the 1919 Versailles settlement that had undermined their national pride. The scattering of Germans in the new states of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland made Hitler to embark on a struggle for re-unification that led to a series aggression, World War II and the collapse of the League of Nations.

15 Rise of dictatorship and aggression

The rise of dictators likes Mussolini in Italy, Emperor Hirohito in Japan, Hitler in Germany and General Franco in Spain undermined the success of the League of Nations. Mussolini rose with a hangover to revenge the 1896 defeat at the battle of Adowa, which forced him to invade Ethiopia in 1935. Hitler came with a burning desire to revenge on the Versailles peacemakers, re-unify Germany and create a great German empire. Hirohito sprung with a determination to annex territories and when the League of Nations rebuked him for invading Manchuria, he withdrew Japan from the League. It must be noted that Mussolini,

Hirohito and Hitler rose with ill-conceived negative attitude against the Versailles settlement and the League of Nations and that is why they embarked on a network of aggression with intension of undermining the League of Nations. The failure of the League of Nations to contain such aggressions that led to World War II, undermined people's confidence in the league and that is why it was replaced by the U.N.O in the 1945.

16 The outbreak of World War II

The outbreak of the Second World War was the most immediate event that hastened the collapse of the League of Nations. The league failed to promote social, political and economic co-operation and that is why there were alliances and counter alliances, re-armament, hostility and aggressions that led to the outbreak of world war II. Britain, France and Russia supported Poland while Italy and Japan supported Germany. This was a perfect proof that the league had failed to maintain a lasting peace in Europe. It is this realization that prompted the Sanfrancisco delegates to replace it with the U.N.O.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The term Fascism refers to an axe surrounded by a bundle of rods that was used as a symbol of power and authority. In the ancient Roman Empire, "Faces" was used as a badge/ identity to show the authority of rulers and magistrates over life and death. The sticks symbolized unity and the axe was a symbol of power.

The Italian version of fascism was fascio, which refers to a group or squad of a few determined and superior men.

In the post-world war I Italy, the fascists portrayed themselves as the only symbol of authority and power for the revival of Italy and forceful elimination of socialism and communism. Fascism was founded in Milan, a city of Italy. It was composed of Industrial capitalists, middleclass men and frustrated jobless youth.

Attachments



CHARACTERISTICS AND PRINCIPLES OF FASCISM

The basic principles, programs and characteristics of fascism were;

1. It was a totalitarian /dictatorial system of government with no provision for democracy or opposition.

The leader was "all in all" and ruled through decrees. He had firm control of the army and civil service and was above the law.

2. Fascism preferred the state to an individual or group of individuals. The greatness of the state was more important than the interest of an individual.

3. Belief in extreme nationalism. It was based on superiority complex that one's own nation is superior to others. This is why Mussolini's emphasis was on creating a great, mighty, prestigious and superior Italian state above other states.

4. It was a single party state system with no provision for multipartism. Everybody had no choice except of supporting one nation, one party and one leader. The fascists were bonded together in the fascist state by the strong and intolerant personality of their leader.

5. The government aimed at establishing an independent and self-sustaining national economy.

Government was at the fulcrum/ center of directing economic programs although not through public ownership of production.

6. It emphasized violence and its own military power. Its supporters believed in the cult of violence and war as the highest court of appeal. Mussolini openly stated that peace is absurd fascism does not believe in it. In other words, fascists were irrational men who were moved to act by emotions rather than reasons and commonsense. In short, they relied on force/ militarism other than dialogue in handling crisis situations.

7. Fascism emphasised that law and order should be maintained at all cost and that people be allowed to own private property. It opposed nationalization of property and this is why communism (that advocated for nationalisation of property) became the first class enemy of fascism.

8. Indoctrination through education was yet another characteristic of fascism. The curriculum was dominated by fascist ideologies and schools became almost fascist party branches. Children, teachers, lecturers and professors were made to swear an oath of allegiance to fascist government. Children were also taught to hate other political ideologies e.g. communism.

9. Lastly, fascism supported an imperialist and aggressive foreign policy to increase the influence and prestige of the state in the whole world. This is part of the reason that drove Mussolini to adopt an aggressive foreign policy in the 1930's.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE RISE OF MUSSOLINI/ FASCISM IN ITALY

Benito Mussolini was born in 1883 at Romagna, in northern Italy to a black smith. He had a varied career and experience. At different times he had been a teacher, soldier, pacifist, casual labourer, journalist and socialist. He joined the First World War in 1915 and returned to journalism after sustaining an injury. He was disgusted by the betrayal of Italy at the Versailles Settlement and the inability of Victor Emmanuel III's government to handle post war problems such as inflation, unemployment, low production, rehabilitation and resettlement.

In November 1921, Mussolini founded the national fascist party at Milan with a black shirt uniform. There was total breakdown of law and order. Besides, there was confusion in parliament where political parties were so evenly balanced that it became impossible to form a stable government. Fascism had got 22 seats in parliament and Mussolini started to advocate/ demand for direct representation in government. The government rejected this demand, which made Mussolini and his supporters to march to Rome on 28th October 1922. He succeeded without resistance from the king and army who were fed up with the viscous cycle of violence in Italy. The premier Giolitti resigned and King Victor Emmanuel III called upon Mussolini to form a government. This was a significant victory for fascism. In spite of the fascist minority in parliament, Mussolini formed his cabinet and forced the parliament to give him dictatorial power for one year. He used

emergency power to destroy the Italian parliamentary system of government and establish a classical fascist state in Italy.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE RISE OF FASCISM AND MUSSOLINI IN ITALY

The circumstance that led to the rise of Fascism and Mussolini is attributed to social, political and economic conditions that prevailed in the post-World War I era. Generally, the reasons for the rise of fascism and Mussolini were due to internal and external factors.

1. The repercussions of World War!

The impact of the First World War aided fascism and Mussolini to power by 1922. The war had negative consequences on Italy, which favoured the rise of strong anti-government movements. It led to the death of more than 600,000 Italians, both civilians and soldiers. Mussolini associated the democratic government with such losses, decampaigned it as weak and incompetent of handling the Italian affairs. This paralysed the democratic government and undermined its popularity in favour of fascism and Mussolini.

2. Post-world war socio' economic problems

The post war socio- economic problems conditioned the rise of fascism and Mussolini by 1922. Since the unification of Italy (1871), successive governments failed to address socio- economic grievances such as inflation, poverty, unemployment, poor standard of living, corruption and urban congestion. These problems worsened after the end of world war I. Mussolini used such problems to decampaign the liberal democratic government and popularise his fascist propaganda with promises of better working conditions and employment to all. He also promised a rapid economic transformation through a comprehensive economic recovery program. This explains why fascism won mass support from ex-soldiers, jobless and idle youth, hence the rise of fascism in the history of Italy

3. The unrealistic terms of the Versailles Settlement

The unfairness of the Versailles treaty on Italy cultivated a favourable ground for the rise of fascism and Mussolini in Italy. In 1915, Italy, a member of the triple alliance joined the First World War on the side of triple entente according to the secret London treaty of 1915. She was promised territorial rewards that included Ethiopia, Tunisia, Austrian, German and Turkish territories. However, at the Versailles Settlement, these promises were not fully implemented and Italy was poorly compensated. The Italians felt betrayed by the Versailles treaty and Victor Emmanuel III's failure to secure better terms for them.

Mussolini and fellow fascists denounced the Versailles peacemakers and Victor Emmanuel's government as traitors and promised to revenge. This made fascism and Mussolini to gain more support at the expense of other rival political parties and Victor Emmanuel III's government, hence the rise of fascism in Italy.

4. Weaknesses of Victor Emmanuel III of the democratic government

The weaknesses and failures of Victor Emmanuel III's democratic government made the rise of fascism and Mussolini in Italy inevitable. The government failed to handle crucial socio-economic problems like inflation, unemployment, poverty, high crime rate, and bloodshed. Victor Emmanuel III also failed to establish a broad based government that could have promoted unity and harmony. His government ignored violence with a false hope that the opposition would clash, weaken and destroy themselves. Mussolini exploited such negligence and violence to weaken other rival political groups and undermine the democratic government. Besides, the democratic government was led by incompetent and cowardly politicians who failed to use the army to stop the fascist march to Rome. Such weakness explains why they just called Mussolini to set up his government instead of resisting his march to Rome.

5. The communist and socialist threats

The communist and socialist threats also contributed to the rise of fascism and Mussolini in Italy. In 1917, communism emerged in Russia and started spreading to Western Europe. By 1922, Socialist and communist supporters were agitating for nationalisation of property and that government other than private individuals should control the means of production. This became a threat to the wealth of the middle class, industrialists capitalists and landlords. Mussolini and his fascists opposed communism, promised security of wealth and clashed with socialist and communist supporters. This

earned Mussolini and fascism material and financial backing from the wealthy class of Italians for their rise to power.

6. Mussolini's abilities

Mussolini's personal abilities and characters were a big push for the rise to power of fascism in Italy.

Mussolini had a wide experience as a casual laborer, teacher, journalist and a soldier, which helped fascism to attain power by 1922. His experience as a casual labourer inspired him with a spirit of hard work and exposed him to injustices suffered by the lower class in Italy. Teaching turned him into a disciplinarian and a role model who knew how to impart knowledge and morals in others. Journalism inspired him with skills in research, investigation and writing captivating articles. His life as a soldier taught him how to obey, command and gained him personal friendship amongst the soldiers. He was also a master political tactician and a gifted demagogue with rare oratory skills. His eloquence and romantic moving speeches attracted the middle class, capitalists, unemployed youth and ex-soldiers. Mussolini organized political rallies and military parades with fascist patriotic slogans that popularized fascism throughout Italy. Mussolini's mobilization ability was of paramount importance in the fascist march to Rome, which was the most immediate event that led to the rise of fascism in Italy.

7. Role of the black shirts

The role of fascist militia, the black shirt was instrumental in the rise of fascism and Mussolini to power.

The black shirt was a military wing of the fascist national political party whose name was derived from the colour of their uniform. It was a terrorist squad that was used to destroy other political groups and discredit the government. They systematically assassinated prominent opposition members especially socialist and communist political opponents. The black shirts also coerced people to support the fascist national party, which strengthened fascism and thus contributed to the rise of fascism and Mussolini in Italy.

8. Weak parliamentary system.

The loss of respect for the parliament by the Italians favoured the rise of Mussolini and fascism in Italy.

The system of proportional representation that was introduced in 1919 made it difficult for any single party to win a mass support and form a stable

government. This is because there were so many political groups with varied interests e.g. the liberals, nationalists, socialists, communists and the fascists.

Consequently, the parliament where all these parties were represented became a venue for chaos and disorganization, which weakened Victor Emmanuel III's government and provided a convenient opportunity for the fascists to march to Rome. Besides, the parliamentarians were messed up in corruption, embezzlement and bribery at the expense of people's socio-economic problems. This made people to lose respect for the parliament and opted for fascist dictatorship under Mussolini's leadership.

9. Mussolini's ambitions.

Mussolini, the leader of the fascists was ambitious, which helped fascism to rise in Italy. Ambition made Mussolini to have a wide and rich experience as a casual labourer, teacher, socialist and a journalist.

Mussolini's ambitions dragged him to organize the first fascio in Milan in 1919 and form the national fascist party in 1921. Ambition for power made Mussolini to terrorize and eliminate rival political groups, which left fascism as the greatest threat to the democratic government by 1922. The same ambition is what made Mussolini to organize the fascist march to Rome that became a turning point in the rise of fascism in Italy.

10. Role of the press.

The press played a significant role in the rise of fascism in Italy. Mussolini, the leader of fascism was a journalist and the editor of a socialist newspaper "Avante" which exposed him and his ideas to the Italians. Mussolini started his own newspaper, "Il Popolo d'Italia" after disagreeing with the socialists over participating in the First World War. He used the newspaper to popularise fascism throughout Italy.

Through the "Il Popolo d'Italia", the Italians were educated about the origins, aims, objectives and principles of fascism. Mussolini also used press propaganda to decampaign rival political groups e.g. socialists, communists, liberals and the democratic government itself. All these, consolidate fascists' support for political take over by 1922

11. Appeasement policy of Britain and France

Appeasement policy pursued by Britain and France in the Inter war period also contributed to the rise of Fascism and Mussolini in Italy. The spread of communism and socialism from Russia after the revolution of 1917 was

opposed by western countries most especially Britain, USA and France. Mussolini and his fascists also opposed and fought socialism and communism in Italy. This made Britain and France to support fascist militarism through appeasement policy. They saw fascist dictatorship as a lesser evil with hopes that fascism would liquidate communism and socialism. This made Mussolini bold and determined which encouraged him to march to Rome without fear of foreign interference.

12. Disunity and weakness of fascist political opponents.

The disunity and weakness of fascist opponents paved way for the rise of fascism and Mussolini in Italy.

Fascist political rivals regarded each other as more of a threat than fascism. The communists refused to cooperate with the socialists. The socialists were divided between moderates and hardliners. Experienced / old politicians like Giolitti and Orlando had by 1922 outlived their usefulness and confessed that Mussolini could provide better leadership than themselves. They are blamed for failing to oppose Mussolini / fascism until it was too late and too ineffectively. For instance, Giolitti supported Mussolini and only joined the opposition in 1924 when Mussolini had already entrenched fascism in Italy. Giolitti (the prime minister) and King Victor Emmanuel III supported fascism in the 1921 elections in order for the fascists to have many representatives in parliament and support the democratic government. Although the fascist party won only 22 seats and socialists party 122 seats, it never the less gave the fascists a flat form to popularise fascism, gain national support and be in better relations with the king and his officials.

This partly explains why the king instead of resisting fascist march to Rome just welcomed Mussolini to form his government. Thus, the political miscalculation by king Victor Emmanuel III's government and the weakness of other groups became a turning point in the rise of fascism in Italy.

13. The success of the fascist march to Rome

The most immediate event that led to the rise of fascism in Italy was the famous fascist march to Rome.

On October 28th 1922, Mussolini mobilised all fascist supporters from all parts of Italy to march to Rome.

King Victor Emmanuel III and the army declined to fight them and they entered Rome without resistance.

Besides not resisting the fascist march to Rome, King Victor Emmanuel III asked Mussolini to form his government, which became a landmark in the rise of fascism in Italy. HL peacock argues that; This was the famous fascist march on Rome which really heralded the rise of fascism to importance in Italy.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

METHODS USED BY MUSSOLINI TO CONSOLIDATE FASCISM IN ITALY, 1922-1943:

Mussolini and fascism assumed state power over Italy in 1922 and reigned up to 1945 when Mussolini was killed. He used a combination of internal and external policies to strengthen and consolidate fascism in Italy from 1922-1945.

1. Creation of abroad based government

In the initial stage, Mussolini created a broad based government as a strategy to draw opposition closer so as to easily monitor their activities. He also appointed opposition leaders in his government in order to popularise fascism and check on subversive activities of the opposition. Thus, Mussolini disorganized and weakened opposition by scattering them in different government departments. There was hardly any serious criticism from the opposition who were part and parcel of fascist administrative organ in Italy.

It should be emphasised that Mussolini retained authority to appoint, promote, demote and dismiss officials in the local government and provinces. He used such power to appoint only those whose loyalty to fascist ideology were unquestionable and dismiss those with questionable loyalty to fascism. By 1935, this strategy had left the local government to be dominated by fascists, which consolidated fascism in Italy.

2. Suppression of rival political opponents

Mussolini used dictatorship to suppress rival political opponents and consolidate fascism. By 1925, the socialists had gained ground due to the disputed elections of 1924 and violence against opposition.

Mussolini appointed Ferinacci, a bloodthirsty diehard supporter as secretary general of the National Fascist Party, (NFP). Mussolini and Ferinacci led gangsters of armed fascists to terrorise and "deal" with anti-fascist elements in Italy. For instance, Matteotti and Amandola were murdered when they complained of violence, rigging of the 1924 elections and demanded for Mussolini's resignation. Others with anti-fascist ideas were arrested and exiled to Lipari Island in the Mediterranean Sea or sentenced to life imprisonment. By 1935, these policies had uprooted opposition parties leaving the national fascist party as the only one in Italian political landscape.

5. Press censorship

From 1925, Mussolini instituted press censorship to control public opinion in favour of fascism.

Opposition newspapers were banned, their offices attacked, checked and locked. Anti-fascist journalists and editors were arrested and exiled to Lipari Island. Radios, films and theatres were carefully monitored and brought under state control. These measures helped to undermine rival opposition parties and strengthen fascism in Italy.

4. Control of education

Mussolini controlled Italian education system as a method of consolidating fascism in Italy. Education was centralised and textbooks based on fascist ideology were used in schools. Schools and institutions were made to teach the origin, aims and principles of fascism. The fascist Ten Commandments were taught in all schools and pinned in all public places to be mastered by all Italians. The tenth commandment, which much emphasised, stated, Mussolini is always right. Pupils and students were forced to join government youth organizations where they were indoctrinated with fascist and anti-democratic ideas. University professors and teachers were forced to swear allegiance to fascism and promised never to teach anti-fascist ideologies. These measures led to the emergence of a new generation that was completely loyal to fascism, hence consolidation of fascism in Italy.

5. Creation of corporate state system

In 1926, Mussolini transformed Italian parliamentary system into a corporate state system through the fascist grand Council. In this system, people were grouped according to their occupation in corporation (profession) each corporation sent representatives to parliament. This was to cater for the interest of various groups such as peasants, Industrialists, workers, employers

and land lords to bring them under fascist control and deny communism a chance to gain support. Cooperating representatives replaced the former parliamentarians who had boycotted the parliament after the murder of Matteotti and Amandola.

These representatives, with representatives of the fascist party were to settle all problems related to wages, hours of work and other conditions of work. They passed laws that declared strikes, demonstrations and trade unions illegal. These restored law, order and peace, which earned Mussolini more support and hence consolidated fascism in Italy.

6. Establishment of fascist grand council

In 1926, Mussolini created the fascist grand council that was composed of hard-core supporters of the national fascist party. It was a supreme organ that coordinated government activities and had more influence than the parliament in Italian affairs. The members of the fascist grand council were answerable to Mussolini alone. They had authority to make and amend laws that favoured fascism at the expense of other political ideologies. For instance, in 1928 the fascist grand council was given power to nominate the head of government and make a constitution. This increased Mussolini's power in policy making, which he used to transform Italy into a total fascist state.

7. Fascist influence on elections and parliament

Mussolini rigged the 1924 parliamentary election, which gave fascism majority representatives in parliament. Thereafter, he put an end to free election in order to maintain fascist dominance in parliament.

On 3th January 1925, Mussolini abolished a law that had given parliament power to try any minister suspected of wrong full acts. This denied opposition of a significant weapon to censor fascist hardliners who were doing injustice to other political groups in Italy.

8. Role of the army and police

Mussolini transformed the black shirt into a highly disciplined army. The army and police were reorganized and empowered to maintain law and order unlike during the regime of the democratic government when the army and the police were agents of lawlessness. The army and police under Feranacci's leadership were used to terrorise and arrest anti-fascist elements in Italy. He also used the army to spy and paralyse the activities of rival political organisations such as the socialists, communists and liberals.

All these weakened opposition and helped to consolidate Mussolini's leadership in Italy.

9. Socio- economic developments

Mussolini embarked on public works schemes as a strategy to gain more support and consolidate fascism in Italy. He improved on the civil service and curbed down corruption, embezzlement and bribery that had been big problems during the previous governments in Italy. He achieved this by terrorising and inflicting heavy penalties on those who abused their office. Mussolini also constructed and improved on roads, railways, bridges, public buildings, hospitals and schools. These created employment to about 4 million Italians who were initially unemployed. Although these measures were not very successful by 1933 (due to economic depression), it never the less helped to build public confidence in fascist government under Mussolini's leadership.

10. Persuasion and propaganda

Mussolini manipulated public opinion in favour of fascism through persuasion and propaganda. He and his cadres spread malicious propaganda against rival groups such as the socialists, communists and Jews.

Mussolini mobilised Italians against the Jews using anti-Semitic propaganda. This earned fascism support from Italian traders who were facing stiff competition from the Jews in their business.

11. Imprisonment of the communists

Mussolini's campaign against communists also helped to consolidate fascism in It should be noted that Mussolini's rise to power was partly due to his opposition to communism, for him to rise to power, Mussolini embarked on policies to eliminate communism from Italy. He arrested, tortured and imprisoned communist hardliners, which terrorised communist supporters and sympathisers. Diplomatically, this gave Mussolini and Fascism support from Britain and France who were equally scared of communist threat. It also earned fascism massive support from the clergy, capitalists, landlords and industrialists. This was because their wealth was threatened by nationalisation of property, which the communists were advocating for.

12. Familiarisation tours

Mussolini organised familiarisation tours, which helped him to acquaint himself with the problems of the common man in Italy. He mixed freely with

the common man in Italy, which portrayed his love as a true nationalist. In his familiarisation tours, he freely associated with peasants and joined them in their gardens.

This strengthened Mussolini's personal relationship with the Italians made them to support him as one of their sons and helped to consolidate fascism in Italy.

13 Adventures foreign policy

In his foreign policy, Mussolini pursued aggressive and an adventurers policy, which won him support from Italian glory seekers and patriots. It also helped to divert public attention from his dictatorship at home. In 1935, he conquered Ethiopia, which event wiped off the 1896 humiliation when Ethiopians led by Menelik II defeated Italians at the battle of Adowa. He also conquered and occupied Albania in 1939.

From 1936-1939, Mussolini involved Italian troops in the Spanish Civil war, in which western democratic powers (Russia and mercenaries forces from Britain, France and United State of America) were defeated and fascist dictatorship led by General Franco regained power. These revived Italian glory, expanded the influence of fascism and consolidated fascism.

14 Alliance system

Mussolini used alliance as a method of consolidating fascism in Italy. In 1937, he allied with Germany led by Hitler and Japan under Hirohito's leadership in the famous Rome - Berlin- Tokyo axis. The alliance gave Mussolini diplomatic support that was essential in strengthening fascism. The axis powers also pledged military assistance towards one another in case of war with non-members of the alliance. The confidence created by axis alliance made Mussolini to deliberately provoke France by claiming Corsica Island, Tunisia and Djibouti. These made Mussolini and fascism very popular amongst Italian nationalists, patriots and glory seekers.

However, it should be noted that the same confidence created by the Rome- Berlin-Tokyo axis intensified aggression in Europe that led to the outbreak of the second world war, the death of Mussolini and collapse of fascism.

15. Treaty signing the Lateran pact (1929)

In 1929, Mussolini signed the Lateran pact with the Pope, which reconciled the Catholic Church and the state. It should be noted that since the unification of Italy in 1871, the Catholic Church had opposed successive

post-unification governments. However, Mussolini negotiated with the Pope and signed the Lateran pact in which the Catholic Church was declared a state religion and an independent Vatican state was created. The Pope was also to be paid huge chunks of money as compensation for his losses. In return, the Pope recognised and approved fascist government in Italy. In the words of V.D Mahajan ...the survival of Mussolini's dictatorship for more than 21 years was due partly to his reconciliation with the Pope. The pact brought Catholic Church under fascist control, made Catholics in Italy and a broad to support fascism under Mussolini's leadership.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

ACHIEVEMENTS OF BENITO MUSSOLINI/FASCISM IN ITALY, 1922-43

Mussolini and his fascist regime in Italy made remarkable achievements in the history of Italy. In his domestic and foreign policies, Mussolini scored great successes. Generally, Mussolini made remarkable achievements amidst failures in the social, political and economic structures of Italy. NB. Take a clear stand point if you are asked to Assess or examine the achievements/ contributions/ polices of Mussolini or fascism in Italy.

ACHIEVEMENTS:

DOMESTIC POLICIES AND REFORMS

1. Law and order

Mussolini/fascism restored law and order in Italy. Before and in the aftermath of Mussolini's rise to power, there was confusion, anarchy and total breakdown of law and order in Italy. However, Mussolini used tough measures such as imprisonment, torture, terror and intimidation that re-established peace and stability. He also created an efficient spy network that checked on subversive activities of the opposition most especially his communist and socialist opponents. Strikes and demonstrations were violently suppressed, which normalised the operation of factories and industries.

2. The army

Mussolini achieved much in his military reforms. Before Mussolini rose to power, Italian army was weak and indisciplined. Different political groups like the communists, socialists, nationalists, and liberals had their own armies that were agents of violence. However, Mussolini transformed the pre 1922 armies into a highly disciplined national army by 1930. He created a large army that was well equipped with modern facilities and military training became compulsory for everybody. He also improved on the naval strength of Italy. During the fascist regime, Italy's naval power rose to the levels of France and Germany. There was also immense progress in the field of aeronautics (flying and navigating aircraft) and radio engineering, which improved the efficiency of the army. The transformed and modernised army was used in maintaining law and order, defending the independence and territorial integrity of Italy and fighting allied powers in the Second World War.

3. Infrastructural development

The fascist regime under Mussolini's leadership scored a great achievement in the field of public works.

Mussolini built and renovated roads, schools, railways, towns, hospitals, and canals. About 5000kms of railway lines were electrified. Communication was improved and telephones were used in urban areas by 1930. Mussolini also built mighty autostrade (motor ways) carving their way through the mountains and over valleys, (although at the expense of minor roads). The old monuments of Italy were properly preserved. This promoted patriotic and nationalistic feelings, which instilled confidence in the Italians.

4. Agriculture

There was a marked improvement in the field of agriculture. Agriculture was improved through afforestation, irrigation, land reclamation and giving subsidies to farmers. Farmers were motivated to use better seeds, manures, fertilizers and modern methods of agriculture. Mussolini also gave awards of gold, silver and bronze to the most productive and innovative farmers. By 1939, these measures had revolutionised agriculture to the extent that wheat and grain productions doubled. This made Italy that had suffered hunger, inflation, poverty and unemployment to become one of the prosperous and powerful states in Europe.

5. Industrialisation

Mussolini's fascist regime witnessed a significant progress in the industrial sector. Industrialisation was boosted by giving state subsidies to industrialists.

New technologies from various countries were introduced. Modern industries were built and industrial production doubled by 1939. This includes iron and steel industries, Fiat company, Pirelli rubber company and oil refineries. HEP production doubled and reduced the shortage of coal as a source of power. In 1933, an institute for reconstruction of industries was established. The state directly controlled many banks and large-scale industries in an effort to solve economic depression. All these transformed the pre-1922 backward Italy into an industrialised nation by

1939.

6. Education

Mussolini's education reform was a great achievement in the history of Italy from 1922- 1943. Before came to power, the level of education was low and many Italians were illiterate. However, Mussolini built and renovated schools, colleges, universities and libraries. This promoted education and literacy to the extent that the 1931 census indicated 80% literacy rate.

7. Corporate state system

Mussolini and his fascist regime created corporate state system to bring harmony between employees and employers. In 1926, a trade union law was enacted. It established only three kinds of union i.e. for employers, semi-skilled and unskilled labourers. Every citizen who obliged to subscribe yearly to one of the union whether joined or not people joined because failure to do so would mean no protection for one's rights yet one would have subscribed to a union. 211 employees and workers were indoctrinated with fascism, which undermined political liberalism that hitherto existed. Through the corporate state system, laws were passed that declared strikes, demonstrations and trade unions illegal.

This harmonised the relationship between workers and employers and helped to promote law, order, peace and stability.

8. Fight against communism and socialism

Mussolini succeeded in containing the spread of communism and socialism in Italy: Communism started spreading from Russia after the Russian revolution of 1917, threatening the property of the rich landlords, middle class and industrialists. He used spy network, force and terrorism to identify, isolate and paralyse the activities of communists and socialists. Although there were established corporations for workers, communists and socialists never succeeded in establishing a dictatorship as in Russia. In this regard,

one liberal Member of Parliament remarked of Mussolini He has saved Italy from the socialist danger which has been poisoning our life for twenty years.

9. Concordat with the Pope i.e. Lateran pact (agreement)

In 1929, Mussolini signed the Lateran pact with the Pope, which reconciled the Catholic Church and the state. Since 1870, there was a poor relationship between the Pope and previous Italian governments because Rome was taken away from the church as the capital of a united Italy. Determined to gain the Pope's support, Mussolini entered negotiation with the Pope and signed the Lateran pact. In the pact, the Catholic Church was declared a state religion. Rome was recognised as the capital of Italy, the Vatican was declared totally independent, the Catholic Church was to be compensated for losses incurred and the Pope approved fascist government in Italy. A number of historians have concurred that the concordat with the Pope was the greatest achievement that Mussolini registered in the political history of Italy.

FOREIGNPOLICY

Fascists/ Mussolini's foreign policy were primarily to make Italy a powerful and prosperous nation in order to revive the past glory. Mussolini was dissatisfied with the then Italian boundaries and had ambitions of expanding it. Consequently he perused an aggressive and sometimes diplomatic foreign policy that aimed at establishing a vast Italian empire.

10. Recovery of lost states

Mussolini successfully increased Italian influence in the Mediterranean Sea. In 1923, he signed the treaty of Lausanne with Greece in which Italy regained the Islands of Dodecanese and Rhodes that she had lost to Greece in 1920. A year after (1924),-Mussolini signed the treaty of Rome with Yugoslavia by which Italy regained the long disputed town of Fiume although part of it i.e. Susak and port Barros went to Yugoslavia.

11 Corfu incident, 1923-1924

Mussolini succeeded in securing compensation for 4 Italian citizens who were murdered by Greeks. On 21st Aug 1923, General Enrico, Tellini and two other Italian staff working on the territorial arrangements of Versailles treaty were murdered on the boarder of Greece and Albania (They were actually in Greece).

Mussolini reacted by forcefully occupying Corfu Island and demanded 50 million Lire compensation from Greece. The Greek government paid the 50

million Lire compensation and Mussolini withdrew his troops on 27th September 1924.

12 Influence on Albania

Mussolini successfully financed an internal revolt in Albania that overthrew president Zogu from power.

In 1926, he signed the treaty of Tirana with Albania by which Albania became a satellite state of Italy and in 1939 he annexed Albania, which became part of Italian empire. Mussolini also gave aids to Albania and exploited Albanian oil in return. This marked the first stage in Mussolini's effort to establish Italian influence in the Balkans along other great powers like France, Russia and Austria.

13 Promotion of European diplomacy

Although Mussolini was a dictator and an aggressor, he is credited for promoting European diplomacy. He promoted European diplomacy with other powers through the Locarno and Munich conferences of 1925 and 1938 respectively. Mussolini also signed commercial treaties with great powers such as Russia and France that promoted trade and improved diplomatic relations with such powers. He also signed treaties of friendship with Hungary in 1927 and Austria in 1930. In the treaty with Austria, Mussolini provided arms and money for the Austrian chancellor's private army. All these made Italy diplomatically stronger than ever before.

14 Conquest of Abyssinia (Ethiopia)

Mussolini annexed Ethiopia and made it part of Italian empire. On October 1935, conflict arose between Italian army working in Italian Somaliland and Ethiopian army at the well of "wall". The Italian and Ethiopian armies quarreled sparking off a fight that led to the death of 30 Italian soldiers. Mussolini revenged by attacking and annexing Ethiopia to Italy. He renamed it Italian East Africa with himself as the emperor. This successfully revenged the humiliating defeat of Italians by Ethiopia at the battle of Adowa in 1896. When the League of Nations condemned Mussolini's action, he withdrew from the league and remained emperor of Ethiopia until his defeat in 1941. Thus, conquest of Ethiopia promoted Italian influence and glory abroad.

15 The Spanish civil war

Mussolini participated in the Spanish civil war in which he succeeded in restoring a fascist regime under General Franco's leadership. In 1936, a

revolution occurred in Spain leading to the overthrow of General Franco and the establishment of a republican government. General Franco withdrew to Morocco, waged a civil war with Mussolini and Hitler's support, defeated Spanish, British plus French troops and returned to power in 1939. General Franco established a fascist state in Spain courtesy of Mussolini in Italy. This strengthened Italian influence in the Mediterranean Sea and also frustrated the rise of communism in Spain.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WEAKNESSES AND FAILURES OF MUSSOLINI/FASCISM IN ITALY

1. Dictatorship

Mussolini is blamed for being a fanatical dictator. He established a fascist state i.e. rule by decree. In 1922, he forced the parliament to grant him dictatorial power for one year and extended it throughout his regime. The fascist Grand Council and corporate state system were all instruments of his dictatorship. In 1925, Mussolini abolished political parties, which event suffocated pluralism. Thereafter there was intensive persecution of opposition through imprisonment, exile and death that denied Italians peace, democracy, freedom of choice and expression.

2. Discrimination

Mussolini's achievements were monopolised by a few diehard supporters of fascism at the expense of the masses. In his domestic policy, he is accused of promoting dualism and more poverty in the south in comparison to other parts of Italy. He also encouraged anti-Semitism where the Jews were segregated and persecuted.

3. Press censorship

Mussolini and his fascist regime censored the press just to promote fascism. The opposition newspapers were banned and their offices were locked. Anti-fascist journalists, editors, presenters of radios, films and theaters were arrested and exiled to Lipari Island. These undermined press freedom and "killed" freedom of expression.

4. Election malpractices

The fascist regime under Mussolini's dictatorship was responsible for election malpractices. The 1924 elections were rigged in favour of the National Fascist Party. The army was used to terrorise people to vote for fascist candidates, which caused resentment that led to the murder of Matteotti and Amandola. (They opposed rigging and were murdered by fascists).

5 Failure of self-reliance

Mussolini and fascist policy of self-reliance failed to succeed. The policy of protectionism boomeranged leading to high levels of inflation and unemployment. This is because cheap and superior goods from more developed nations such as Britain and Belgium were blocked from Italy. As Economic depression came to an end, Mussolini's priority shifted from economy to military and semi-military production primarily to help him in his imperial ambitions. This led to general poverty amongst the ordinary masses in the post-depression era.

6 Economic decline

There was general economic decline during the fascist reign of Mussolini. By 1930, Italian economy had clearly deteriorated. Mussolini failed to stabilise the exchange rate and the revalued Lire too high. The welfare and conditions of work of Italian workers were the worst in Europe. They were the lowest paid in Europe yet the cost of living was very high. The rate of inflation and unemployment were also very high.

The poor state of economy made the government unable to provide services to the rural areas. By 1939, the rural areas lacked good roads, electricity, water, hospitals, schools etc.

7 Corruption and Embezzlement

Corruption and Embezzlement characterised fascist rule under Mussolini's leadership. There was excessive corruption, bribery and embezzlement of government official. This led to the failure of government programs such as poverty eradication and land reclamation. Mock/fake factories and companies were also established just to attract government subsidies, which made the government to loose huge chunks of money.

8 Failure of the battle of Natality / births

The battle of births declared by Mussolini was a failure by 1939. In 1922, Mussolini launched the battle of births. Mussolini argued that a nation with a big population (e.g. Germany before World War I) was powerful. Consequently, he declared the battle of births in which he aimed to

increase the population of Italy from 37million to 60 million. To achieve this; high taxes were introduced for bachelors and awards were given to the most fertile mothers. Those who produced twins, triplicates, quadruplicates, etc. received the most prestigious awards. However, this policy was not very successful given that by 1940 the population had increased merely to 43.8 million. This was partly because many people fled to other countries to escape fascist oppression and dictatorship.

9 Land shortage

Land shortage in the rural areas was a problem during Mussolini's fascist rule in Italy, Mussolini's battle for births and resistance to rural -urban migration created land crisis in the rural areas. Little attempt was made to redistribute land from capitalistic landlords to the poor peasants. In 1930, about only 15 families held a total of over 1 million acres of land. Much of the land used for wheat production like hillside terraces were more suitable for olives and fruits than wheat.

10 Alliance with Hitler of Germany

In his foreign policy, Mussolini is accused for collaborating with Hitherto promote fascism and Nazism in Europe by fighting other political ideologies like communism, socialism and democracy. In 1937, Mussolini signed the Rome- Berlin axis and in 1939, he concluded the pact of steel with Hitler. This solidarity encouraged Hitler's aggression in Europe that led to German occupation of Poland in 1939 and the outbreak of the Second World War.

11 Aggressive foreign policy

Lastly, Mussolini's foreign policy was more aggressive than diplomatic. He embarked on imperial wars in Greece, Albania, Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and Spain. These wars led to loss of lives, destruction of property and hostility with other powers. His aggression and alliance with Hitler are blamed for the outbreak of World War II that led to the heaviest bloodshed and destruction of property in the history of the world. It should be noted that the Second World War came with events that led to the death of Mussolini and the end of fascism in Italy.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Causes

The world economic depression refers to the global economic meltdown or crisis that was characterised by surplus agricultural output especially in North America, closure of industrial and banking institutions, mass unemployment, financial crisis, deflation (opposite of inflation) and low purchasing power.

Generally, it was a situation of inactive/rigid economic activities that paralysed the whole world from 1929-1935.

The depression started from the Canadian agricultural sector, spread to other sectors and covered the whole world after the collapse and closure of the stock market in the United States in October 1929. This global economic disaster was caused by economic, social and political factors.

1. Over Production and capitalism

The great depression was basically caused by capitalistic tendencies which emphasises profit maximisation at the expense of the workers. In 1920's, technological and scientific advancement led to over production of industrial and agricultural products. Commodities like cotton, coffee, cocoa, wheat and meat were produced in surplus/excess of domestic consumption capacity. The capitalists maximised profits by over engaging workers in the production of surplus and maintained wages as low as possible.

This reduced the purchasing power of workers with the effect that the surplus products could not be sold unless their prices were reduced. However, their prices were not reduced because it would reduce the profit margins. This left huge quantities of industrial and agricultural products unsold that forced the capitalists to stop further production. It resulted into unemployment, financial crisis and general economic stagnation.

2. Income Inequality and Massive Poverty

Persistent income inequality and massive poverty in Europe made the outbreak of economic depression inevitable. In 1920's, there was intensive oppression and exploitation of workers that most workers were living below the poverty line. Increased profits from industries were monopolised by capitalists at the expense of the workers. This created a high income gap between the rich capitalists and the poor. For example, from 1923-29, industrial profits increased by 72% while the average wage for industrial workers rose by a mere 8%. It is estimated that in 1929, about 1/3 (a third) of

all personal incomes went to nearly 5% of the population (capitalists). The implication of this scenario is that money was concentrated in the hands of very few people while the general public had almost no money to buy commodities. This resulted into low purchasing power, aggregate demand and general poverty that forced price downwards. It

should be noted that people were starving not because there was no food but because they had no money to buy food that was in glut/ surplus.

NB. The great depression of 1929-35 is by far the worst in the history of the world. It was a situation where millions of people were starving, yet thousand tones of wheat were being burnt down in some areas to prevent its price from falling further.

3. The effect of World War I

The First World War devastated world economies, left it in shambles and contributed to the depression.

The war destroyed industries, ships, farms, gardens and abled man power. Its estimated that a total of over 186 billion dollars were losses that were incurred from the First World War. These had negative impacts on the level of production, purchasing power and trade. Trade declined because countries were left so poor that they could not import large quantities of agricultural products. Thus, there was low level of imports and consumption which explains why the depression was severe in USA that was the greatest producer of commodities in the inter war period.

4. Article 232 of the Versailles treaty i.e. reparation

The depression was escalated by the payment of war reparations that was imposed on Germany and her allies. Besides, Germany and her allies were allowed to pay for the reparations in form of tangible items like cattle, chemicals, ships, agricultural and industrial products. On top of this, Germany and her allies were neither free to export nor import goods to and from other European powers. This affected trade between Germany, her allies and the victorious powers of World War I, which led to the depression.

Germany and her allies resorted to borrowing loans from USA. This created a vicious cycle where money flowed from USA to the defeated powers, to the victorious powers who also paid it back to USA. This made trade and other economic activities to decline and almost came to a standstill, thus making the depression inevitable.

5. The American Loans Scheme

During and after the First World War, European countries borrowed huge loans from USA to finance the war and reconstruct their economies. When USA pressurised for repayment of her loans plus the interest, it created an economic crisis where huge chunks of money flowed from indebted countries to America not in exchange of goods and services but in repayment for loans. This reduced the level of investment, aggregate demand and purchasing power leading to financial crisis, inability to sell the countries' output and a reduction in international trade.

It should be noted that the inability of young and weak states like Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland to pay their debts forced USA to stop giving her loans to defaulters. She even charged high tariffs to foreign goods, which prevented her debtors from paying their debts in kind. This left them indebted and unable to engage in any meaningful economic activity leading to the outbreak of economic depression.

6. The Gold Standard System

The Gold standard system that determined the amount of money in circulation also contributed to the depressing economic situation. According to the system, the amount of money in circulation in an economy was supposed to be equivalent to the total value of Gold bullions in its reserve. From 1925, Gold lost value and yet the system was inflexible / rigid. Thus, it limited money supply and reduced demand in countries that had very little Gold yet they could not buy more. When USA began demanding repayment of her loans in terms of Gold, the indebted countries had to reduce their money in circulation as more and more quantities of their Gold went and were locked up in USA. This left Gold reserves in most European countries empty and caused financial crisis that gave rise to economic depression.

7. USA Policy of isolationism and protectionism.

The policy of economic nationalism and isolationism that was practiced by nations especially USA affected international trade and led to economic depression. In 1920's, nations adopted a protectionist policy in which they wanted to safe guard their infant industries and domestic markets from competition by foreign powers. USA protected her industries by charging high import duties with an ambition to export more of her products abroad. Other countries reacted in the same way not only against USA but also against other powers. This restricted international trade and left most countries flooded with surplus products in home markets hence the depression.

8. Weaknesses of the League of Nations

The failure of the League of Nations to promote economic co-operation in Europe contributed to the Great depression. It failed to ensure free trade and that is why America and other nations pursued a protectionist policy that gave rise to the depression. The League also failed to come out with a clear way of handling currency circulation, which was determined by the gold reserves thus creating a rigid economic situation.

The League even failed to come up with clear policies on debt recovery and repayment which spoilt the economic relationship between America and her debtors. All these made the outbreak of the depression inevitable.

9. Reduction in the efficiency of Labour

The post war Labour condition also contributed to the great depression. During the war, a number of capable and experienced labour force, officers and men were either killed or maimed. After the war, governments put a ban on immigration of labour from poverty hit regions to areas that were better in economic terms. There was therefore no free mobility of skilled labour from areas of underutilization to those where such labour could be fully utilised. It gave chance for children and women who were inefficient to be employed in farms and industries. Such labour. This depressed price levels and made the great depression inevitable.

10. Unemployment

Persistent problem of unemployment was also responsible for the outbreak of the great depression.

Unemployment was caused by over population, demobilisation process after World War I, industrial revolution and the closure of banking and industrial sectors. By 1929, over ten million people were unemployed in Europe. The purchasing power of the unemployed was zero yet governments were other welfare services. This led to acute poverty, low aggregate demand and government revenue and inability to buy commodities that caused the depression

11. Speculation by Prominent Politicians and Investors

Speculation by prominent politicians and investors created psychological fear/economic panic that made the outbreak of economic depression inevitable. As company and industrial profits increased from mid-1920, speculation about the prospect of making quick money intensified.

Consequently, investors and other ordinary people rushed to buy more shares with a hope of selling at a higher price and making abnormal profits. Eventually, the average cost price of a share rose from 9 million dollars in 1924 to 26 million dollars by 1929. However, uncertainty and panic developed from October 1929 that made many people rush to sell their shares as the price of shares dropped drastically. This was due to political and economic announcements made by prominent world class politicians through credible/respected newspapers about the depression in different parts of the world. It created negative psychological feelings that made the depression to be felt even in areas where it had not yet reached. For instance, the announcement about the collapse and closure of the prominent world stock market in the USA in October 1929 caused a sudden collapse of share prices, hence the depression.

12. Political instability

The inter war period (1919 to 1939) was a turbulent period characterised by chaos, discontent, revolutions and lack of diplomatic co-operation. In Russia, there was a civil war between the communists and the supporters of the exiled Tsar Nicholas II. Besides, Russia was isolated by western countries led by USA because she had adopted communism in 1917. This divided Europe into two and frustrated trade between the western countries led by USA and the eastern countries under the leadership of USSR. In Germany, there was political instability masterminded by Nazism. In Italy, Mussolini was having a hard time from his political opponents. There were also labour grievances and trade unions were causing more tensions between employers and employees to the extent of strikes in some instances. All these were not conducive for proper economic growth and developments, hence the great depression.

13. The collapse of the world stock exchange market in the Wall Street/The Wall Street crash

The collapse and closure of the prominent world stock market of USA in October 1929 paralysed world economies and contributed to the depression. Rumours and press propaganda about the Wall Street crash made people rush to withdraw their savings from banks and sell their Shares at give-away prices. By June 1930, the average price of a share was 25% of its peak level in 1929 and was still falling down. It made America unable to lend any more loans and she began to demand for the once that had been lent. It affected banking institutions to the extent that over 4,200 banks were closed between 1929 - 1932. This locked people's savings and

reduced the purchasing power. Industries could not secure loans yet their products were not being bought and so they also closed down. This led to more unemployment, surplus products, low purchasing power, investment and consumption that depressed price levels downwards.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES OF ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

The depression had short-term and long-term consequences in the political, economic and social structures of the world. Its negative consequences were more impacting than the positive consequences.

POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES

1. Rise of new economic reforms and organisations

On a positive note, the depression made governments to adopt new economic reforms and promote organisations in order to contain the depression. Co-operative societies were promoted in order to regulate production and marketing of commodities. Banks, industrialists and farmers were provided with working capital to save them from financial crisis. Unemployment benefits, social security fund, labour laws and pension schemes were reforms that were enforced to increase the purchasing power and fight poverty, famine and starvation. In Britain, the iron and steel industries of Sheffield and Birmingham were merged together in order to regulate the production and prices of their products. The need to promote greater economic co-operation made the Scandinavian countries to form the OSLO block and USA formed a regional integration with South American states. These laid foundation for the current economic organisations such as EEC and ECOWAS.

2. Growing influence of Socialism

The great economic depression strengthened the influence of socialism especially in Eastern Europe and America. The sufferings caused by the depression made people to develop hatred against liberalism, democracy and capitalism that were accused of causing the depression. On the contrary, Russia that had adopted socialism in 1917 was not affected much

by the depression and this facilitated the spread of socialism in the Eastern countries of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Romania and Poland. In USA, there were radical political movements that started advocating for socialism as the best alternative to address the problems of the poor workers and improve the standard of living. The communist party of USA was strengthened and it played a vital role in organizing workers, blacks and whites to fight against racism and capitalism. However, this showed seeds for the outbreak of the cold war in Europe.

3. The end of Gold Standard system

The Gold standard system was abandoned because it had contributed to the depression. Countries started issuing money that was not backed by gold (fiduciary issue). It was aimed at improving the terms of trade and correcting inequalities that had arisen to form exchange rates. This revived international trade because it also opened way for countries without gold deposits to freely participate in trade. However, the Gold standard system was not completely abolished all over Europe. It was still maintained in countries such as Switzerland, Belgium, Holland and France. Nevertheless, by 1970 these countries had all abolished the system due to its loopholes.

4. Rise of economists i.e. J.M Keynes

Economic depression led to the rise to greatness of economists like J.M .Keynes. J.M Keynes analysed the causes of the depression and provided solutions to problems affiliated/related to the depression. He invented the famous Keynesian theory of unemployment in which he stated that unemployment arises due to deficiency in aggregate demand for goods especially in times of economic depression. Consequently, he suggested measures to increase aggregate demand such as; reducing taxation, subsidisation of consumers and use of expansionist monetary policies amongst others. These ideas were utilised by governments and contributed to the end of economic depression, which made Keynes to be famous.

NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

1. Break down of financial institutions

In the first place, the depression led to the collapse and closure of financial institutions. Banks especially in USA diverted depositor's money to buy shares with a speculative motive of making huge profits.

However, dramatic fall in prices of shares left Banks in a hopeless situation. It created panic and speculation that made millions of people to rush to

withdraw their savings from banks with a belief that their cash would be safer at home. This left the bulking institutions without money and consequently many banks were closed down. For example, over 4,200 banks were closed in America between 1929- 1932. Speculation was also responsible for the closure and collapse of stock market in the USA. The collapse and closure of financial institutions made people to lose their savings.

2. Unemployment

The depression resulted into mass unemployment due to the collapse of industrial, banking, agricultural and other employment sectors. The surplus output and low demand made the industrial, factory and Land owners to lay off workers, which resulted into mass unemployment. For instance, in USA, the number of the unemployed rose from 1.5 million in 1929, to 5 million in 1930, 9 million in 1931 and 13 million in 1932. By 1931, it is estimated that about 6 million people were unemployed in Germany, 3 million in Britain and over 3 million in France. In USA, the unemployed were nicknamed "Hoovervilles" and lived in camps under a very desperate socio-economic condition.

3. Collapse of Industries

The great depression led to the collapse of industries and other related sectors. Factories were producing surplus products yet prices and demand were very low. This subjected industrialists to heavy losses and consequently they closed down factories. It also undermined other sectors such as agriculture, trade, investment, etc. This was because the collapse of industries affected forward and backward linkages between the industrial and other affiliated sectors.

4. Low Level of Investment

The great depression of 1929-35 had negative effects on investment. The collapse and closure of the world stock exchange markets affected millions of investors who had bought their shares at very high prices.

Investors had speculatively bought many shares, moreover some of them on credit. The dramatic fall in the price and demand for shares left investors with huge losses. This was because there was no hope of selling their shares at the speculated rate in order to make the much expected profit. It discouraged investors and other people from further investment not only in shares but other sectors as well. This led to a drastic decline in government revenue because income from taxes, trade and industries were very low. It

was due to this that governments failed to improve on their economies and standard of living of the people.

5. Low Standard of Living

The inactive economic situation led to a decline in the standard of living. There was famine, poverty and starvation because people did not have money to buy the glut/surplus products. Many families failed to afford the basic necessities of life and were living below the poverty line. Health, education, transport and communication were in a sorry state. It was not uncommon to see landlords confiscating their tenants' property before finally evicting them for failure to pay rent arrears. In USA, homeless people in camps were nicknamed "Hoovervilles" after the president of the USA who was blamed for the depression.

Donald MC-COY remarked of these conditions that; The American people were affected as though a war had been fought from coast to coast

NB. These poor conditions are of much interest because people were suffering and starving not because of lack of commodities but due to lack of money to buy the glut.

6. Decline in International Trade

There was a drastic decline in international trade as a result of the depression. It left countries flooded with surplus products in narrow domestic markets that could not be bought due to the low purchasing power. This forced countries to resort to protectionism as a way of protecting domestic markets against foreign competition. Consequently, the level of imports and exports were reduced which brought international trade to almost a standstill.

7. Decline in diplomatic relations

The depression led to poor relations amongst European powers. European countries hated USA for her policy of economic nationalism and isolationism that escalated the depression. Anti-US feelings intensified as America pressurised indebted countries to repay her debts. In Europe, poor relations developed between the victorious powers and the defeated powers as the victorious powers continued to demand for war reparations from the defeated powers. This was because the depression had paralysed world economies that no one country could think and were not able to repay any loans or war reparations yet America and the victorious powers badly needed their money to offset the depression.

8. Weakened the League of Nations

The depression is one of the factors responsible for the weakness and failure of the League of Nations in Europe. It weakened the economic status of member states which made the League bankrupt and unable to finance her activities. It also made powers like Germany, Japan and Italy to resort to aggression as a way of addressing the hard economic situation. This undermined the role of the League of Nations in maintaining world peace. The depression also destroyed international co-operation as countries pursued self-sustaining national policies and protectionism. Countries concentrated on addressing the problems created by the depression and ignored the activities of the League of Nations. This is what partly made Germany and Japan to withdraw their membership from the League of Nations, which left it weakened.

9. Political changes and the rise of dictatorship

The depression resulted into political changes that favoured the rise and consolidation of dictatorship in Europe. Poverty and starvation made people to loose trust in democratic leaders and longed for militaristic dictators who promised a radical or military approach to the depression. This led to the rise of Hitler in Germany (1934) and General Franco in Spain (1939). In USA, the depression led to the rise of Franklin de-Roosevelt who defeated Hoover in the presidential elections of 1932. In many states like Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, USA etc., the leaders used force to suppress popular uprisings caused by economic hardships, which promoted authoritarianism.

10. Second World War

The depression contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. It led to the rise of dictators whose ambitions amongst others was to destroy western democratic governments and socialism. This was responsible for the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis alliance against western democrats that created tension and led to the outbreak of war in 1939. The depression also made powerful countries to resort to aggression against weaker states as a way of getting raw materials and securing market. This is partly the reason why Japan invaded China in 1931 and Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 that sparked off the Second World War. It should be noted that by weakening the League of Nations and destroying international relations, the depression opened way for rivalry, jealousy and hatred that culminated into the Second World War.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

HOW THE DEPRESSION WAS SOLVED

1 A world economic conference attended by 66 states was held in Genoa in 1933. It was aimed at finding solutions to the economic slump that had paralysed the world. The delegates came out with modalities that removed obstacles to free trade, stabilised world currency and enforced a uniform tax on imports and exports. These restored the pre-1929 trade relations and ended the depression.

2. Other powers resorted to drastic measures in order to deal with the depression. Most leaders became dictators and used force against strikes and demonstrations that were provoked by the slump (depression). Some powers hiked (raised) tariffs to protect infant industries. Britain for instance charged high tariffs on imported steel to safeguard her own-Steel industry from foreign competition.

Quotas were also imposed on imports and exports as strategies to protect infant domestic industries.

These were short-term methods that were used by European powers as a solution to the then depressing economic situation.

NB: When nearly every country resorted to protectionism, these measures worsened the depression in the long run.

3. "Germany-violated the Versailles peace treaty as a way of addressing the depression. She occupied the Saar coalfield, Rhine-lands and embarked on rapid industrialisation especially under Hitler. Germany even repudiated / stopped paying the heavy war indemnity that was imposed on her at the 1934 Laussane convention. These made Germany to revive her economy and participate in international trade, which pulled her out of the depression.

4. USA embarked on some reforms that contributed to the end of the depression. She depreciated the value of her dollar (deflation, in order to increase the purchasing, power as well as sales). USA also realised her weakness and broke her pre-1919 policy of economic nationalism and

isolationism. She resumed giving loans and grants to European countries. She even opened her internal markets which induced other powers to do the same. These reactivated international trade and revived European economies, which brought down economic depression.

5. Formation of regional Economic integration was used by European powers to resolve the economic crisis. Aware that protectionism and isolationism had caused the depression, European powers embarked on forming regional Economic integration to revive free trade. USA formed an integration of South American states, the Scandinavian countries formed the OSLO blocks and the agricultural states of Eastern Europe were joined together under the British Common wealth in 1932. These created and expanded trading blocks, restored free trade and economic co-operation that solved the depression.

6. Powerful states like Britain, France and USA provided unemployment benefits and relief to the unemployed and destitutes. This was free money that was given to the unemployed and destitutes who were above 18 years for the purpose of survival. This policy was later adopted by small and poor states in order to improve on the deteriorating standard of living. Such free money and relief increased money supply and purchasing power that enabled consumption of the glut/excess commodities and hence brought down economic depression.

7. Abandonment of the Gold standard system also provided a solution to the depression. By 1933, most European states discarded the Gold standard system that had contributed to the outbreak of the depression. European countries started issuing money irrespective of the amount of gold in reserves.

This increased the supply of money and hence the purchasing power. It also allowed countries without gold reserves to freely participate in international trade, which brought the depression to a standstill by 1936,

8. Some powerful states adopted an aggressive foreign policy to handle the economic slump/depression.

They embarked on territorial conquests and annexations to acquire raw materials, markets and areas of investment to address domestic problems created by the depression. For example, Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931 to exploit the abundant silk and cotton for her survival. It's also for a similar reason that Italy occupied Ethiopia and Germany invaded her neighbours by 1939. The aggressive powers were able to secure raw materials and

open fresh markets for their manufactured goods, which helped them to address the problem created by the depression.

9. Socio-economic reforms were also used to address the depression. These were policies designed for the modernisation of agriculture, industry and social services. Investment in public works was undertaken e.g. construction of roads, railways, dams and bridges. Progressive taxes were imposed in order to redistribute wealth fairly. Trade unions were given powers to organise and bargain for the rights of workers. All these increased people's earnings, created more jobs and increased the standard of living as a solution to the economic slump.

10. Adoption agro-based industries were also used to provide solution to the depression by 1935. European nations built agriculturally based industries e.g. corn/maize industry in USA, cotton industry in China and wheat industry in India. Such agro-based industries promoted forward and backward linkage between agriculture and industries. This strengthened agricultural and industrial sectors, expanded employment opportunities, increased the purchasing power of the masses and revived European economy.

11. Lending was restricted because whatever money was to be borrowed would be directed to poverty alleviation other than investments. USA that was the greatest financier of Europe in the 1920's stopped giving loans because it had become a risky venture since those who borrowed before 1929 had defaulted to pay. She instead started demanding for her loans in order to boost her economy. These enabled USA that had suffered greatly from economic depression to revamp her economy and jump' out of the depression.

NB) other states like Britain and France started pressing for reparations, which unfortunately was not paid by the defeated powers like Germany.

12. On the other hand. Governments took direct control of banks in order to regulate money supply, reactivate the level of economic activities and solve the depression. The Governments reduced interest rates, which increased the level of borrowing and investment. This intervention improved the level of economic activities, income and purchasing power that halted economic depression by 1936.

Government control of banks also restored people's confidence in banks with the effect that people who had withdrawn their savings (and hidden in their homes) re-banked them. This revived the financial positions of banks

and saved those that were on the verge of closing, which would have worsened unemployment.

13. Military conscription was one of the strategies used to end the depression. Germany, France and Britain embarked on military conscription through which able bodied men were recruited into the national armed forces. This expanded employment opportunity and addressed the problem of unemployment that was also responsible for the prevalence of the great depression. It also improved income level and increased purchasing power. This led to consumption of glut commodities and thus reduced the challenge of surplus commodities.

14. Political changes led to the rise of strong governments that ended economic depression. The depression made people to lose trust in democratic leaders and longed for militants who promised a radical solution to the depression. This led to the rise of Hitler in Germany (1934) and the conservative government in Britain. In USA the depression led to the rise of Franklin de-Roosevelt who defeated Hoover in the presidential elections of 1932. The new governments learnt lessons from the weaknesses of the previous governments and made socio-economic reforms that led to the end of the depression.

They also used force to suppress popular uprisings caused by economic hardships that restored law and order, which reactivated economic activities.

15. Adoption of new deal policy also enabled Europe to address the depression. The new deal policy was initiated by the new USA President Franklin D Roosevelt from 1932. The policy that was adopted by other countries provided for unemployment benefits, pensions to retired workers, minimum wages, rural rehabilitation and loans to large farmers. These measures increased employment opportunities, income levels, purchasing power and demand for goods and services, which ended economic depression.

16. Lastly, the rise and influence of J.M. Keynes was paramount in ending the depression. J.M. Keynes, a classical economist proposed solutions that helped Europe to stop economic depression by 1935. He analysed the causes of the depression and provided solutions to problems associated with the depression. Keynes invented the famous Keynesian theory of unemployment in which he stated that unemployment arises due to deficiency in aggregate demand for goods. Consequently, he suggested measures to increase aggregate demand such as: reduction of taxation,

subsidisation of consumers and use of expansionist monetary policies amongst others. These ideas were implemented by European governments and contributed to the end of economic depression by 1935.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

BACKGROUND:

The Weimer Republic was a democratically elected government that was established in Germany after the collapse of the German empire in 1919. As Germany was being defeated in the First World War, public opinion turned against Kaiser William II who resigned and fled to exile. His Chancellor, Prince Max also failed to contain violence and resigned. This created a power vacuum and led to the rise of various political parties such as the communists, the socialists, the Republicans, the liberals and the democrats.

A Provisional government under Fredrick Ebert, the leader of the social democrats was formed to make peace and prepare for general elections. In January 1919, the constituent assembly delegates were elected.

The first meeting of the delegates was held at Weimer town in November 1919 where a new constitution (the Weimer constitution) was declared. It provided for a Republican form of government and Ebert became the first President. The government was called Weimer Republic because it was founded at Weimer town in central Germany.

NB. The National Assembly met at Weimer because Berlin the capital city of Germany was insecure with violence and clashes perpetuated by the different political groups. Although the Weimer Republic was very unpopular right from the beginning, it survived until 1933 when Hitler destroyed the constitution and instituted perfect Nazi dictatorship in Germany. Generally, the rise and downfall of the Weimer Republic was due to internal and external factors.

Attachments

No attachments



REASONS FOR THE RISE OF THE WEIMER REPUBLIC

1. The need for a democratically elected government based on western models influenced the constituent Assembly delegates in Germany to institute the Weimer Republican government. The delegates were inspired by the French and British republican systems of government to destroy the German monarchical government and adopt a republican government.
2. The defeat of Germany and the devastating effect of the First World War also contributed to the rise and existence of the Weimer Republic. By 1918, the allied powers had destroyed the German economy and there was serious famine, starvation, inflation and unemployment. These provoked strikes and demonstrations against Kaiser William II who abdicated and fled to exile. The Germans were frustrated by his monarchical government and decided to adopt a democratically elected government in the name of the Weimer Republic.
3. The resignation and abdication of Kaiser William II left a power vacuum through which the Weimer Republic rose. Due to pressure from the First World War and the hostility of the Germans, Kaiser William II fled to exile leaving a power vacuum. If Kaiser William II had not fled to exile, there would not be any-power vacuum in Germany and the Weimer Republic would possibly not have triumphed in Germany.
4. The role of foreign powers was very influential in the rise of the Weimer Republic. The monarchical government of Kaiser William II was a big problem to European powers and that is why they fought and defeated it in the First World War. Foreign powers needed a puppet government that would dance to their tunes and this is why they supported the rise of the Weimer Republic.
5. The need for reconciliation and peaceful co-existence with other European powers was also instrumental in the rise of the Weimer Republic. German aggression had isolated her from the rest of Europe and made Germany an enemy of nearly the whole Europe (with exception of a few like Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey). It had also retarded the development of Germany and undermined her position in international affairs. This forced the Germans to adopt the Weimer Republic in order to bring peace and reconciliation between Germany and Europe.

6. The threat of communism also gave way to the Weimer Republic. The workers and the poor were influenced by the Russian revolutions of 1917 to demand for a communist regime in Germany. This led to the formation of a party known as "Spartacus" group led by Carl Liebknecht and Rose Luxemburg Who were in close contact with the Bolsheviks in Russia. They engineered strikes and demonstrations that forced Kaiser William II to exile and gave way to a provisional government.

However, communist influence was a great threat and a source of insecurity to the wealthy Landlords, businessmen and other professionals. This made them to denounce the Spartacus group and support a republican government that would maintain law, order and protect their wealth. Heavy bloodshed, clashes and insecurity in Berlin were also responsible for the rise of the Weimer Republic. It made the constituent assembly delegates to shift the National Assembly venue from Berlin to Weimer. It was from Weimer where a constitution and the Republic were declared under a social democratic leader, Fredrick Ebert.

8. The need for political liberties that brings power to the people through parliamentary election was also behind the rise of the Weimer Republic. The Germans were fed up with the dictatorship of Kaiser William II and lack of political freedom. They demanded for a reduction of the president's power to end dictatorship that gave rise to the Weimer Republic.

9. Lastly, the Weimer Republic was favoured by the need to end Prussian dictatorship and dominance in German politics. From 1871 - 1918, Prussia monopolised German politics and key positions at the expense of other states. She favoured religious intolerance where the Protestant faith was made a state religion. This was opposed by other states most especially the south German states where the catholic religion had strong influence. All these forced the Germans to wage a struggle to end such a monopoly, thus leading to the rise of the Weimer Republic.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE COLLAPSE OF THE WEIMER REPUBLIC BY 1933:

The Weimer Republic was very unstable except from 1923 - 1929 under Stress man. It was very unpopular right from the beginning and this laid foundation for its collapse. Generally, the Republic was affected by political and socio-economic problems that made its downfall inevitable by 1933. This was due to the following factors.

1. The Weimer Republic was very unpopular from the beginning because it was associated with the unrealistic Versailles treaty of 1919. The treaty for instance disarmed Germany, blamed her for causing the First World War and imposed the heaviest reparation in the history of the world on her.

The Weimer Republican leaders were blamed for betraying the Germans by accepting and signing the harsh terms of the Versailles settlement. The Republic therefore became very unpopular which opened way for Hitler to rise and destroy it in 1933.

2. Internally, the Weimer Republic was established on a very weak foundation that contributed to its collapse. The Germans had no experience and love for a democratically elected government. They were used to Prussian dictatorship and Bismarck's policy of blood and Iron. This is why the Republic was rejected and denounced right from 1919.

Internationally, the Weimer Republic was isolated which made it vulnerable to collapse. She was invited in the Versailles settlement as a "criminal" and was out of the League Nations for a long time.

This denied the Republic diplomatic support that could have prolonged its lifespan.

3. The role of various political groups like the communists, socialists, Republicans and Nazis also undermined the existence of the Weimer Republic. These parties criticised and undermined the government for accepting the Versailles treaty and failing to improve the socio-economic welfare of the Germans. They used their own armies to perpetuate violence and civil war in order to eliminate their opponents. The national assembly in which all these parties were represented became a fertile ground for chaos and disorder. All these undermined the credibility of the Weimer Republic leading to its collapse by 1933.

4. The stability of the Weimer Republic was also affected by a number of coups. In 1920, the monarchists under Dr. Kamp occupied Berlin and temporarily brought an end to the Weimer Republic. In 1923 and 1924, the royalists led by General Ludenford and the Nazi led by Hitler attempted a coup against the government respectively. Although these coups were

suppressed, they nevertheless shook the Republic; left it weakened, hence contributing to its collapse.

5. The Weimer Republic had incompetent political leaders who failed to handle the post war challenges of Germany. A part from Stress man (foreign minister 1923 - 1929), the other Republican leaders failed to contain violence and insecurity that made people lose confidence in the government.

Besides, the Republican leaders were incapable of handling socio-economic problems like unemployment and inflation, which made even the few who had supported the government to withdraw their support. This weakened the republic and led to its collapse.

6. Economic problems also affected the stability of the Republic. German economy was devastated by the First World War and war reparations worsened the problems of inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation. The 1929-35 economic depression delivered the last devastating blow to Germany's economy and created more problems. For instance, the number of unemployed Germans rose from 4 million to 6 million between 1930 to 1932. This made people to loose confidence in the Weimer Republic and support the opposition. This is why Hitler got more support and seats in the parliament during the depression, which was at the expense of the government.

7. The rise and role of Hitler and Nazism greatly contributed to the downfall of the Weimer Republic.

The unfavourable post war condition in Germany favoured the rise of Hitler and growth of Nazism.

Hitler blamed the Weimer republic leaders for betraying the Germans in the First World War and accepting the Versailles treaty. He also criticised the government for the worsening socio-economic problems of unemployment, inflation, famine and starvation. This earned Hitler a lot of popularity at the expense of the Weimer Republic. For example, in 1929, the Nazi won only 107 seats in parliament but this increased to 230 in 1932. This growing influence of Hitler and Nazism forced president Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as a chancellor in 1933, which he used as a stepping stone to bring an end to the Weimer Republic.

8. Foreign invasion was yet another problem that contributed to the downfall of the Weimer Republic. In 1923, the French invaded and occupied the Rhur industrial region. They looted Germany's industries

before they withdrew in 1926. This crippled Germany's economy because the Ruhr had abundant source of power. The Germans blamed the Republic for its failure to defend the country and shifted their loyalty to Hitler. This is because Hitler promised to create a strong German economy and revive Germany's supremacy as opposed to the Weimer Republic.

9. Lastly, the untimely death of President Hindenburg in 1934 marked the end of the Weimer Republic. It left a political vacuum through which Hitler, rose to power and brought an end to the Republic. It was only after the death of Hindenburg that Hitler added the presidential power to himself. Otherwise, if Hindenburg had not died, Hitler's rise to power would have been delayed and the lifespan of the Weimer Republic would have possibly gone beyond 1934.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background

Hitler was an Austrian born on 20th April 1889 in the Austro-German border town of Braunau. His father, Alois Hitler was a minor customs official in Austria. In 1902 his father died and in 1907 his mother also died. Hitler did not get proper education on account of his obscure background and being a total orphan. His ambition was to become a fine artist but this was frustrated when he failed to join the Vienna academy of fine art in 1907. For some time, Hitler lived a poor lonely life at Vienna as a sign painter, casual labourer of odd jobs and a street beggar. This is what shaped Hitler's personality of poor interpersonal relationship, intolerance and hatred of the bourgeoisie, the royalists, the socialists, the Republicans and the Jews.

In May 1913, Hitler went to live in Munich, a city in Germany. He fought for Germany in World War I where he was promoted to the rank of Lance Corporal and awarded the "Iron cross" for his bravery.

Towards the end of the war, Hitler was badly wounded and was hospitalized when the armistice was being signed. He was discharged and returned to Munich where he lived for some time on occasional work.

Hitler was very disappointed with the defeat and humiliation of Germany in the First World War. His views were that Germany was not defeated due to

her military weakness but was "stabbed in the back" (betrayed) by its leaders and traitors like the Jews, Socialists, Pacifists, Democrats etc. This experience haunted him for a long time as he later wrote;

The more I tried to glean some definite information of the terrible events that happened, the more my head become a fire with rage and shame.

Hitler later joined the National German workers socialist party which was later renamed Nazi. He distinguished himself as a true patriot and his oratory and demagogic skills earned him the leadership of the party. In 1924, Hitler attempted a futile coup against the Weimer Republic for which he was imprisoned for five years but was released after only 6 months. While in prison. Hitler wrote his book

"Main Kampf (my struggle) which became the bible of the Nazis. This made him and the party more popular. By 1933, Hitler and Nazism were very popular amongst the Germans. In the elections of March 1933, the Nazi won 288 seats in the parliament. This forced president Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor, which became a flat form for his rise to power in 1934.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

THE RISE OF HITLER TO POWER

Hitler's rise to power is one of the most spectacular events in the history of great men of the world. His rise is significant not only because he established a perfect Nazi dictatorship that led to the Second World War but also because his origin and background were more obscure than any leader history has ever seen.

His rise to power can be attributed to the post World War 1 condition in Germany but his personal character was the most important. According to Strong;

Hitler was not a military genius like Napoleon /, master of state craft like Bismarck, a diplomat like Cavour, not an experienced politician like Clemenceau/Lloyd George, not a thinker like Lenin, an organiser like Trotsky or a planner like Stalin. Although he possessed a diabolical fiare which was

a sort of an amalgam of all their qualities. Its even more interesting that president Hindenburg had very poor personal opinion about Hitler and never thought of promoting him. He assured Gergor Stressor that,

I gave my word of honour that Bohemian Corporal (Hitler) will never be chancellor.

In spite of this sentiment, Hitler was appointed Chancellor by Hindenburg himself in 1933. When

Hindenburg died; Hitler added the presidential power to himself and established perfect Nazi dictatorship in Germany and over Europe for the next 11 years.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

FACTORS FOR THE RISE OF HITLER AND NAZISM IN GERMANY

1. The First World War and the 1919 Versailles treaty

The repercussions of the First World War and the unrealistic terms of the 1919 Versailles treaty on Germany laid foundation for the rise of Hitler and growth of Nazism. The war gave Hitler military experience, which he used to eliminate the anti-Nazi political opponents and rise to power. The war also devastated Germany's economy and left behind inflation, unemployment, famine and starvation.

These were used by Hitler to decampaign the Weimer Republic, popularise Nazism and rise to power by 1933.

Besides, the Versailles treaty blamed Germany as a sole causer of the war and imposed heavy reparations that worsened the socio-economic problems of the Germans. These made the Weimer Republic that accepted the Versailles settlement to be very unpopular in Germany. Hitler used this to decampaign the Weimer Republic and the Versailles peacemakers. This earned him and the Nazi more popularity and seats in parliament leading to his rise to power.

2 Weaknesses of the Weimer Republic.

The weaknesses of the Weimer Republic favoured Hitler's rise to power. The Weimer Republic was very unpopular amongst the Germans because it accepted the Versailles settlement that was very unfair to Germany. Hitler denounced this in the strongest possible terms and promised to revenge on the signatory powers which increased his popularity in Germany. The Republic had incompetent politicians who failed to address the socio-economic problems of the people and maintain law and order. They did not bother about violence and civil war because they falsely thought that it was the best way of leaving the opposition to fight and destroy themselves. This made the Germans to lose confidence in the government and shift their loyalty to Nazism under Hitler. Hitler also used such violence to destroy his political opponents and remain as a champion of the opposition. This forced Hindenburg to appoint Hitler a chancellor with hopes of using him to control violence and strengthen the Weimer Republic. Hitler exploited these weaknesses to rise to power by 1934.

5. The economic depression of 1929-1933

Economic hardships due to the great depression of 1929 - 1933 greatly elevated Hitler and Nazi's position in the German politics. Of all European powers, Germany was the most affected by economic depression. About 6 million Germans were unemployed and Germany experienced the worst inflation in the history of the world. This created discontent and frustration, which undermined the confidence of the Germans in the Weimer Republic. Hitler stressed the need for a strong Government that would violate the Versailles settlement, regain Germany's market and colonies as the only solution to the hard economic conditions. This earned the Nazi more popularity and seats in the parliament that contributed to Hitler's rise to power.

4. The threat of communism

The communist threat played a significant role in the rise of Hitler and Nazism in Germany. By 1934, Germany was an industrialised state and German industrialists had a lot of influence in the German affairs. On the other hand, communism had also grown strong amongst the workers who were being exploited by the capitalists. The communists advocated for nationalisation and redistribution of wealth.

Hitler strongly opposed this and promised to protect properties of private individuals. This gained him support from the middle class, wealthy Landowners and industrialists who were threatened by a communist revolution. They used their wealth to finance the Nazi party, which greatly

strengthened the party and made it able to mobilise and win more seats in the parliament.

5. Role of the Nazi party

Hitler used the Nazi party as a stepping-stone for his rise to power. He drew Nazi party members mostly from the ex-soldiers of the First World War. The ex-soldiers supported Hitler because they wanted him to rise to power and address their needs such as retirement benefits and compensations to those who were maimed in the war. These ex-soldiers within the party formed a small force that was used to protect speakers at Nazi meetings and crush all political opponents. Thus, Hitler used the Nazi party to command great respect and popularity, which forced President Hindenburg to appoint him Chancellor. This opened chance for his rise to power.

6. His Personality

Hitler's rise to power can also be attributed to his extraordinary personal talent and indomitable

will power. Hitler was a gifted demagogue and an orator that earned him the leadership of the Nazi party in 1920. His mobilisation and rare skills made the Nazi party to be the strongest in Germany. He used his oratory skills and propaganda to move the audience with him. In 1933, he proclaimed in parliament that; the disqualification of a great people cannot be permanently maintained, it must be brought to an end! Hitler would also explode (shout) like thunder and ask for blood of the German enemies. He mixed politics with religion and stressed his points to the point of crying. This showed Hitler's concern for the problems that the Germans were facing and earned him more support and seats in the parliament, hence his rise to power.

7. Hitler's writings

Hitler popularised his political ideas through pamphlets, articles in the newspapers and books which earned him more support. In his writings, he emphasised the superiority of the Germans, the weaknesses of the Weimer Republic and called for revenge against the signatories of the Versailles treaty. The most popular of all his books was "Mein Kampf" or 'my struggle' which he wrote while he was in Prison. Originally he wanted the title of the book to be "four and a half year of struggle against lies, stupidity and cowardice" but eventually agreed to a brief title "my struggle". In his

writings, he gave the Germans a high-sounding 25-point programme where he promised something everybody.

He promised to protect workers against exploitation, consumers against producers, small traders against large-scale traders, property against communist threats etc. As he pronounced to everybody, Hitler was able to gain their support and rise to power.

8. The role of the Nazi storm troopers

The Nazi storm troopers, SA (Sturmabteilung) was Hitler's private army that was dominated by the jobless youths. They were a terrorist squad that used violence and terrorism to destroy the communist and socialist opponents, discredit the Weimer Republic and leave the Nazi unchallenged. They were paraded everywhere during elections to intimidate voters to vote for Nazi candidates. For example, in the March 1933 election where the Nazi won 288 seats. It was the same storm troopers that threatened Hindenburg to appoint Hitler chancellor in 1933. Hitler's appointment gave him much publicity and opportunity to popularise himself and Nazism which became a stepping stone for his rise to power.

9. Traditions of the Germans

The character of the Germans also helped Hitler and Nazism to rise to power. The Germans had no respect for a democratically elected government like the Weimer Republic. They had strong tradition for authoritarian government led by powerful army officers and men like Von-roon, Von-moltke, Bismarck and Kaiser William II. The Germans preferred a government that could give them security and military glory than political freedom and democracy. They therefore wanted a strong man who could take them out of the chaos created by politicians since 1919. Hitler was the best choice and the Germans supported his rise to power.

10. The Death of President Hindenburg

The death of President Hindenburg in 1933 was a blessing in disguise for Hitler's rise to power. His death left the post of the President vacant, which Hitler just added to himself. This was instrumental in determining Hitler's position as a full master of Germany. Otherwise, if Hindenburg had not died, there would not have been a political vacuum and Hitler would possibly not have been the President in 1934.

Attachments

No attachments



HOW HITLER CONSOLIDATED POWER, 1934 -1945

1. Hitler centralised and vested in himself all authority over German affairs. He dissolved the past administrative structure and created his own with himself as the highest political figure. Jews and other suspected enemies of the state were dismissed from the civil service. He appointed his loyal friends, relatives and fellow veterans to administer on his behalf in the up-country districts and the Federal states of Germany. They were responsible to him as the appointing authority and therefore worked according to his orders and policies.
2. Hitler banned all political parties and declared all their activities illegal. He started with the socialist party, then the catholic party and finally the monarchists. Such drastic actions bullied the opposition, forced their leaders into hiding and left the Nazi party as the only legitimate party in Germany.
3. He also used suppressive policies against his political enemies and saboteurs. Hitler used spies and secret police to inform him on daily events. He set special prisons (concentration camps) for those with anti-Nazi ideas. A number of them were killed. For example Ems, the leader of the socialist party was brutally murdered together with other socialist supporters. This demoralised Hitler's opponents and consolidated Nazism in Germany.
4. Hitler's anti-Semitic policy (racist policy against the Jews) destroyed their influence and helped to consolidate his power. He regarded the Jews as traitors and self-seekers with a worldwide ambition to undermine the superiority of the German race. Consequently, in 1935 Hitler enacted the Nuremburg law for the protection of the German blood and honour. The law deprived Jews of their citizenship, prohibited them from; marrying non-Jews, holding government jobs, owning business or practicing their profession. Warning signs like Jews strictly forbidden in this town or Jews enter this town at their own risk were common in many public places. Jews were assassinated, arrested, unfairly tried and sent to concentration camps where they died in millions. Their shops and other properties were looted and vandalised. These, forced many Jews to flee to exile abandoning their property and investments in Germany. Henceforth, Hitler's persecution of the Jews radically eliminated their threat and consolidated his power.

5. Hitler censored the press and broadcasting to keep the Germans ignorant of his weaknesses. Dr Joseph Goebbels was appointed a minister of propaganda with exceptional power to control media and communication. Only articles that favoured Nazism were allowed to be published and those with anti-Nazi ideas were blocked. It was a criminal offence to perform communist plays like that of Bertholt

Brecht or listen to Jewish music like those of Felix Mendelson and Gustav Mahler. Internal opposition could thus not gain ground and survive due to lack of effective communication.

6. Hitler also used education to consolidate Nazi philosophy and gain more support. He encouraged parents to take their children to public schools other than religiously founded schools. School children were made to Join Hitler Youth Group Association from where they were indoctrinated with Nazi ideas. Boys underwent military training and Girls were taught to be responsible mothers in order to produce and create a huge army for Germany. Children were made to believe that Hitler was always right and that their first duty was to obey him. Teachers, Professors and Lecturers were forced to sign an oath of obedience to Nazism and to teach only Nazi ideas. All these led to the emergence of a new generation that was completely loyal to Hitler and Nazism.

7. The basis of Hitler's consolidation of power was the Enabling Law that was prepared by the Nazi Grand council and passed through the Reichstag on March 1933. It gave Hitler absolute powers to amend the constitution as long as it was in the interest of the Germans without consulting the parliament for the next 4 years. Hitler used this bill to pass Laws that strengthened the Nazi and undermined his other political opponents and parties. For instance, he used the bill to ban other political parties and left the Nazi as the only ruling party in Germany.

8. Hitler brought the church under state control since it was a potential source of opposition.. In 1933, he signed an agreement with the Pope in which he promised not to interfere in the church's affairs and the Catholic Church agreed to disband the catholic center party and to quit politics. However, when the Catholics protested the banning of the catholic youth league that was rivaling Hitler's youth group, Hitler arrested and sent to concentration camps thousands of priests and nuns. The same was done to the Protestants when they protested Hitler's appointment of a Nazi as a Bishop and mistreatment of the Jews. Thus, by persecuting the Church,

Hitler brought the church under state control although resistance to his persecution continued.

9. Hitler's pro-German foreign policy was useful in consolidating his power. His policies of revenging and violating the Versailles treaty, rearming Germany, withdrawing Germany from the League of Nations and expansionist policy to create a 3rd German empire were all in the interest of the Germans.

All these foreign adventures earned Hitler more support from the Germans although it also contributed to his downfall and death in 1945.

10. Economically, Hitler reduced the pre-1933 socio-economic problems and hardships, which earned him more support from the Germans. He modernised agriculture and farmers were paid very well. New industries were set up and technical institutions were established to provide skilled manpower. He moved workers around the country to places where jobs existed. Hitler also conditioned foreign countries to buy German products by refusing cash transaction and accepting Barter trade. All these measures reduced unemployment, inflation, famine and starvation that had characterised Germany before Hitler rose to power (economic depression).

11. Hitler abolished trade unions that had become a source of strike and instability in Germany. Their funds were confiscated and leaders were imprisoned. By June 1933, The Nazi Labour Front was created to replace trade unions. All German workers were made to belong to the Nazi Labour Front. It addressed workers problems and advocated for their rights, which checked the problems of rampant industrial strikes that had paralysed German economy during the period of economic depression.

Abolition of trade unions also safeguarded industrialists and businessmen from a communist revolution that was a threat to their wealth and investments. All these gained Hitler and Nazism massive support that strengthened Hitler's rule.

12. Hitler took advantage of appeasement policy to strengthen his rule in Germany. In the interwar period, Britain and France pursued appeasement policy in which they tried to reconcile with Germany by not resisting her claims and aggressions amongst others. Hitler used this as an opportunity to rearm Germany, reorganise German economy and concentrate on dealing with internal opposition and the Jews. He also utilised the lack of intervention by Britain and France (due to appeasement policy) to annex

the Rhine lands, Austria, Saar region and Czechoslovakia. All these popularised Hitler and Nazism in Germany, hence consolidation of Power.

13. Alliance system was also used by Hitler to consolidate his power in Germany by 1939. In 1934, Hitler signed the German-Polish pact through which he forged a friendly relationship with Poland until 1939 when he invaded Poland. In 1937, he allied with Italy and Japan in the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis. It was a defensive alliance that also checked on the threat of communism and democracy not only in Germany but the whole Europe. The alliance helped to strengthen Germany's diplomatic relations and provided Germany with external support that helped Hitler to resist allied forces from 1939 to 1945.

14. Lastly, Hitler built a strong army that was used against internal and external enemies. Gradually, he changed the storm troopers into a national highly disciplined and equipped army. The German navy, warships and aircrafts were also modernised. By 1939, Hitler had revived the German military superiority, which was destroyed in the First World War. It was this military power that enabled him to suppress internal opposition and resist the allied powers from 1939 to 1945.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

THE DOWNFALL OF HITLER AND NAZISM IN GERMANY

As Germany drew towards defeat and Berlin was about to fall Hitler committed suicide on 30 April 1945. Kaiser William II's aggressive foreign policy was responsible for the First World War and led to the downfall of the German empire. History repeated itself from 1939 - 1945 when Hitler's aggression provoked the outbreak of the Second World War and finally led to the collapse of Nazism in Germany.

Internal and external factors were responsible for the downfall of Nazism although external factors played a primary role.

WHY HITLER AND NAZISM COLLAPSED IN 1945

1. The downfall of Mussolini and the collapse of Fascism in Italy also contributed to the downfall of Hitler and the collapse of Nazism in

Germany. Mussolini, who was Hitler's closest ally in Europe, was executed by his own soldiers on 28th April 1945. This affected the morale and strength of Hitler and partly made him to commit suicide out of frustration.

2. Hitler's oppression and dictatorship in Germany also contributed to his downfall. He persecuted the church, the Jews, banned all political parties and executed his political rivals like Amess the leader of the socialist party. This earned him more opposition and denied him internal support that contributed to his downfall.

3. Lack of clear political agenda and principles was also significant in the downfall of Nazism and Hitler.

The Nazi party was dominated by ex-soldiers and radicals whose chief concern was dictatorship and conquests. The party was therefore devoid of cadres who could have politicised the Germans and international communities about Nazism. This made the Nazi not to have a strong political base and contributed to its downfall.

4. The downfall of Hitler was also due to the decline of German economy. The German industries and factories were destroyed by allied bombardment during the Second World War. Agriculture and trade were also impossible during the war. This brought a serious financial crisis that affected the morale, determination and strength of the German troops and led to their defeat in the Second World War.

5. The size of the German empire by 1939 also contributed to the downfall of Hitler and Nazism. Hitler had created a heterogeneous empire that included the Czechoslovakians, Austrians, Dutch and Poles.

These nationalities were conquered and they used the event of the Second World War to resist Hitler's foreign rule, which weakened him and made his downfall inevitable.

6. Hitler's aggressive foreign policy also contributed to his own downfall and that of Nazism. Hitler terrorised and attacked his neighbours like Austria, Zchechoslovokia, Sudetland and Poland. This earned Hitler more enemies and isolated him from the international community. It also exhausted the army and partly contributed to their failure to defeat the allies that conditioned Hitler's downfall.

7. Hitler's withdrawal from the League of Nations also made his downfall inevitable by 1945. Hitler violated the 1919 Versailles treaty and withdrew Germany from the League of Nations because it was an offspring of the

Versailles settlement. This was a diplomatic blow to Hitler which isolated him from the international community and made his downfall inevitable.

8. The Second World War was the immediate event that contributed to the downfall of Hitler and Nazism in Germany. By 1945, Germany was defeated from all fronts and her economy was in shambles. The German soldiers had surrendered and the Germans were starving to death. The Russian red army had invaded and conquered Berlin. All these could not be tolerated by Hitler and forced him to commit suicide on 30th April 1945. This marked his own downfall and the downfall of Nazism.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CAUSES

The Second World War is the most destructive war that mankind has ever experienced. It started with the German invasion of Poland on 1st Sept 1939 and ended with the surrender of Japan on 14th August 1945.

The war was fought between the axis powers of Italy, Japan and Germany (Rome-Tokyo- Berlin axis) against the allied powers led by Britain, France, Russia and USA. A number of factors played a role in this most destructive war. However, the Versailles settlement of 1919 was the primary factor in the outbreak of the war.

CAUSES

1. THE VERSAILLES SETTLEMENT OF 1919

a) It has been argued that the Versailles settlement of 1919 sowed seeds for the outbreak of the Second World War. The peace treaty was very unrealistic in its attempt to create a lasting peace, which ploughed ground for the outbreak of war in 1939. It was a dictated treaty that Germany was forced to endorse (sign) without negotiation. The German delegates were not allowed to defend themselves and although they tried to defend themselves in writing, their defense was ignored. The delegates were treated like criminals who were escorted in and outside the hall of mirrors. This created a strong desire for revenge, which partly made Hitler to adopt

an aggressive foreign policy that dragged Europe and indeed the world to the holocaust of the Second World War.

b) The Versailles settlement imposed unfair penalties on Germany that left her longing for a war of revenge. The disarmament clause destroyed Germany's navy, air force and reduced her army to 100,000 soldiers armed with 'sticks'. Worst of all, other powers especially France and Britain started rearming themselves. This gave Hitler an excuse to rearm Germany and attack smaller nations like Poland that made the outbreak of the Second World War inevitable.

c) Article 231 of the settlement entirely blamed Germany for the outbreak of World War I and article 232 imposed an impossible sum of 6.6 million dollars as war reparations. This irritated Germany because she was accused and made to pay for a gigantic crime where everybody that fought was guilty. As L.C.B

Seaman puts it; The purpose of the settlement was not to be fair and just to the Germans but to impose drastic penalties upon her. (L.C.B Seamans: 193).

The payment of the reparations suffocated Germany's economy and contributed to the great economic depression of 1929-35. Hitler capitalised on this to rise to power and challenge the Versailles peacemakers which climaxed into the Second World War.

d) The territorial clause denied Germany most of her colonies in Europe, Asia and Africa. Germany lost many of her nationals and resources to the newly created states like Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

This was very unrealistic because it also neglected President Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination and nationalism. Germany remained aggrieved by the loss of her nationals and resources to the newly created states. Indeed, Hitler's invasion of Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland (that sparked off the war) were partly to liberate the Germans who were deliberately scattered in Europe by the peacemakers. This is why TAYLOR argues that; The Guns which saluted the signing of the settlement opened the Second World War.

e) Nevertheless, it was not only Germany that came out of the Versailles settlement with a quest for revenge. Italy and Japan that had fought on the side of the triple entente against triple alliance were very disappointed by their rewards. Japan regarded the rewards of a few Islands and some parts of China as poor compensations for her role and complained bitterly

of being treated as an unequal at Versailles. This is why Japan occupied Manchuria, conquered more areas and quitted the League of Nations by 1933. Italy also complained of poor compensation and it was a common talk in Rome that, "Italy had won the war but lost the peace". This is partly why Orlando left the conference in protest and Mussolini invaded Ethiopia in 1935. Thus, the unfairness of the Versailles peacemakers to fellow allies made Italy and Japan to join

Germany and form the Rome-Tokyo-Berlin axis. This strengthened the desire for revenge and was responsible for a series of aggression by the axis powers that climaxed in the invasion of Poland and the Second World War.

2. APPEASEMENT POLICY

Appeasement policy has been very much blamed for causing the Second World War. It was a deliberate move to satisfy the demands of aggressive powers provided that they were within the boundaries of reality and common sense. The policy was based on dialogue and compromise as opposed to violence as a solution to axis aggression. This is because there was a general feeling that the Versailles treaty was very unfair to the axis powers and that they should not be opposed if the Second World War was to be avoided.

Neville Chamberlain of Britain started the policy in collaboration with France. He argued that; another major war could be avoided by pleasing aggressive powers like Germany.

It was due to this policy that no military action was taken against Japan when she occupied Manchuria (1931), Mussolini when he invaded Ethiopia (1935) and on Hitler when he invaded the Rhine lands (1936), Austria (1938) and Czechoslovakia (1938). Appeasement reached its' climax in the Munich conference of

Sept. 1938 (Metternich agreement) where Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister and Deladier, the French Prime Minister accepted Germany's annexation of Sudetenland (part of Czechoslovakia) and Hitler promised that he would not make any other territorial demand or wage any more aggression.

Unfortunately, success and absence of military intervention gave Hitler and his allies a false impression that the appeasers were cowards and would never fight them whatever the provocation. It is this feeling that encouraged Hitler to invade Poland and refuse to withdraw as demanded

by Britain and France. This set the world ablaze in the holocaust of the Second World War.

Appeasement policy gave Hitler a "breathing space" time to re organise Germany and ally with Italy and

Japan. The lack of intervention against aggression caused by appeasement policy was used by Hitler to strengthen Germany economically and militarily in preparation for war. It should be emphasised that Hitler's occupation of Rhine lands, annexation of Austria and Czechoslovakia increased Germany's economic and military strength, which encouraged him to invade Poland that triggered off the war. On the other hand, he used it to strengthen diplomatic relations and form the Roma-Berlin- Tokyo axis. The re organisation of Germany and formation of axis alliance made appeasement policy a boomerang/ backfire that led to the outbreak of the Second World War.

Appeasement policy undermined the League of Nations leading to the collapse of international diplomacy.

It contradicted the idea of collective security making the league unable to act against Fascist and Nazis aggressions, because Britain and France who were pursuing the policy were the most influential members in the League of Nations. This made the Fascists and Nazis to embark on a series of aggression without fear of reaction from the league.

Besides, appeasement policy contributed to the rise of Mussolini and Hitler to power and consequently the spread of Fascism and Nazism in Europe. Mussolini and Hitler opposed and fought against the spread of communism and socialism from Russia. On the other hand, Britain and France were also threatened by the spread of socialism and communism since the Russian revolutions of 1917. This made Britain and France to indirectly support Fascist and Nazis aggression through appeasement policy. They calculated that Fascism and Nazism would destroy communism and socialism, which would also leave the Fascists and Nazis weakened and exhausted. Unfortunately, the Fascists and Nazis waged a series of aggression under the guise of fighting communism, gained strength and provoked the outbreak of World War II by 1939.

NB. It has to be rewinded back that Britain and France decided to appease Germany and her allies because of the unfairness of the Versailles treaty. Otherwise, if the Versailles settlement was realistic, Germany and her allies

would have possibly reconciled and there would be no appeasement policy and thus the outbreak of war in 1939.

3. ALLIANCE SYSTEM

The resurrection of alliance system in the inter war period cannot be neglected in the outbreak of World War II. Italy, Germany and Japan formalized the Rome-Berlin -Tokyo axis in 1937. Britain, France, USA, Belgium and Poland formed the allied or democratic powers. These alliances were based on divergent and conflicting ideologies. The allied powers were struggling to promote democracy while the axis powers were propagating and promoting totalitarianism/dictatorship. These ideologies were very incompatible and that is why the German invasion of Poland was magnified into the Second World War due to ideological differences. Once again, the alliance system had divided Europe into two hostile and antagonistic camps that made the Second World War inevitable.

NB. It has to be noted that the revival of alliance system in the inter war period can be traced to the Versailles settlement of 1919. Germany, Italy and Japan that formed the Rhine-Berlin-Tokyo axis were birds of the same feathers who were cheated or unfairly treated at the Versailles settlement. It was therefore only a matter of time that the three powers converged with a common aim of revenging against the signatories of the settlement. This also forced the "Versailles powers" to form the democratic alliance as a counter measure to the axis alliance.

4. THE ARMS RACE

Like World War I, arms race also contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War. Hitler got an excuse to rearm Germany because other powers did not disarm but were instead rearming themselves secretly. He (Hitler) argued thatbecause other powers had not disarmed as they had promised, it was wrong to keep Germany helpless. It made Germany to embark on an intensive rearmament programme.

Consequently, Hitler started a grand scheme of conscripting 500,000 men into the German armed force.

He modernised the German air force and it became one of the strongest in the world. The same challenge was taken by Japan and Italy. This made the axis powers to be confident of themselves and adopted an aggressive foreign policy that climaxed into the Second World War. On the other hand, Britain and France could not just sit back and watch these developments. They reacted by adopting a large-scale rearmament programme in which

factories produced guns, tanks and fighter planes as fast as they could. Each power became anxious to display its military might and shopped for an opportunity which came through the German invasion of Poland.

NB. It was the desire to destroy the disarmament clause of the Versailles settlement that made Hitler to rearm Germany, which triggered arms race and the Second World War. Otherwise, if the Versailles peacemakers had enforced general disarmament as stipulated in the Versailles settlement, Hitler would not have got an excuse to rearm Germany, which could have maintained some relative stability in Europe.

5 THE WEAKNESS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The weakness of the League of Nations as a peacekeeping body also shares responsibility for the outbreak of the Second World War. The activities of the League of Nations was monopolised by Britain and France who unfortunately undermined it by pursuing appeasement policy. The League failed to enforce general disarmament which provided Hitler with an opportunity to rearm German and provoke the war. Besides, the League had no army of its own and it was considered "a toothless backing bull dog". Although article 16 provided that member states should send troops if necessary, a resolution was passed in 1923 that each country was free to decide whether or not to fight in a crisis situation. This gave ceremonial burial to the idea of collective security, which facilitated aggression in Europe. Donald Kegan argues that.

Hitler's path was made easier by growing evidence that the League of Nations was ineffective

as advice for keeping peace and that collective security was a myth (Donald Kegan, p 936).

In other words, the weaknesses of the League of Nations encouraged Hitler's aggression in Europe that drove the world into the Second World War. By 1939, all the axis powers had pulled out of the League of Nations which made it even more difficult to restrain their aggression.

NB. However, a logical flashback reveals that the League of Nations was an offspring of the Versailles settlement (Woodrow Wilson's 14th point). Its role amongst others was to defend the Versailles settlement.

To Clemenceau, the best use of the league was as an "instrument for perpetuating the peace settlement .In fact, the weaknesses and failures of

the League of Nations became a foregone conclusion because of being associated with the unrealistic Versailles treaty.

6. ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

The effect of Economic depression also played a role in the outbreak of the Second World War. The slump/depression caused a global political, social and economic crisis. This gave an opportunity for Hitler to rise to power. As other countries were busy handling the problems caused by the depression, Germany used the opportunity to rearm herself. She devoted most of her resources to the army, navy and a.i.r force.

This was because America was forced out of European affairs while Britain and France went into 'hiding to reorganise their economies. This left Hitler with no serious threat since the League of Nations was even weakened by the depression.

The depression also made some powers to resort to aggression as a way of securing raw materials and markets. Mussolini urged the Italians to be war like and resurrect the former Roman Empire if they were to survive the depression. He became practical when he invaded Ethiopia in 1935. Economic crisis also forced Japan to invade Manchuria in 1931 in order to exploit coal and silk. Hitler's invasions of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Rhine lands and Poland were partly for market and economic prosperity.

Economic depression destroyed international relations which degenerated into the Second World War. It made nations to protect their markets through protectionism and high tariffs, which increased tension and hostility that gradually graduated into the Second World War.

NB. However, a critical analysis reveals that the reparations and territorial clauses of the Versailles settlement contributed significantly to the depression. In fact the serious economic crisis that Germany faced from 1919 to 1939 was rooted in the Versailles peace treaty.

7. THE RISE OF DICTATORS

The rise and role of dictators and aggressors undermined world peace and led to the outbreak of the Second World War. In the inter war period, militants like Mussolini of Italy, Hitler of Germany, Hirohito of Japan and General Franco of Spain overthrew democratic governments and created autocratic governments based on blood and iron policy. The dictators converged in the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis and embarked on foreign aggression that was intended to promote dictatorship and destroy

democracy. It created a struggle by democratic powers like Britain, France and USA to contain such aggressions, stop the growing influence of dictatorship and consolidate democracy in Europe. This created fear, panic, suspicion and hatred that exploded into war in the aftermath of German invasion of Poland. To this extent, it is justifiable to argue that the Second World War was in fact a struggle between two contradictory ideologies.

8. NATIONALISM

The rise and growth of nationalism in Europe also conditioned the outbreak of the Second World War. The Versailles peacemakers of 1919 were guided by their selfish national interests at the expense of German nationalism. Consequently, German nationals were scattered in the newly created states like Austria, Czechoslovakia, Sudetenland and Poland. The scattered Germans were incited by propaganda from the Germans in Germany (Hitler inclusive) to demand either for reunion with their mother country or full independence. The Germans and Hitler argued that it was double standards to subject Germans foreign control when the First World War was fought for self-determination i.e. Independence of nations. This provided Hitler with a convenient pretext to annex Austria, Czechoslovakia, Sudetenland and Poland, which led to the outbreak of the Second World War.

9. IMPERIALISM

Imperialism also accounts for the outbreak of the Second World War. Britain and France manipulated the Versailles Settlement of 1919 to satisfy their imperial desires and undermine defeated powers most especially Germany. They distributed German colonies in Asia and Africa amongst themselves using the mandate commission of the League of Nations. The need to compensate the loss of German territories and influence made Germany to embark on a series of aggression that climaxed into the invasion of Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War. Alongside Germany, Japan and Italy also had burning desires to expand their territories and influence which explains why Japan invaded Chinese territory of Manchuria and Italy occupied Ethiopia. This forced France and Russia to sign an agreement in 1935 to check on German, Japanese and Italian imperialism. Thus Imperialism led to fear, suspicion, antagonism and aggression that made the outbreak of World War II inevitable.

10. ANTI-SEMITISM

World War II was also caused by anti-Semitic / racial feelings and activities against the Jews in Italy and Germany. The Nazis led by Hitler and Fascists under Mussolini's leadership had a grand programme to exterminate/Wipe out the Jews from Germany and Italy respectively. Consequently, the Jews were harassed, persecuted and massacred by Nazis and Fascist hardliners. It was opposed and condemned by France, Britain, Russia and USA. This is what amongst other reasons attracted these powers to join the War against Germany when she invaded and occupied Poland.

11. ROLE OF THE PRESS

Press propaganda was also responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War. The mass media in Germany and Poland caused war fever by over exaggerating atrocities committed by each other. Hitler used the German newspapers and radio stations to exaggerate the persecution of the 2.5million Germans in Poland. This incited the Germans in Germany and those in Poland against Polish authorities. The Polish newspapers and radios also magnified the threats of German government and German's in Poland against the Polish government. Press propaganda created suspicion, fear, panic and tension that were used by Germany to attack Poland. It should also be noted that press reports about the atrocities committed by German soldiers in the event of invasion of Poland is what terrified other powers, like Britain, Russia and France to join the war against Germany.

12. THE COMMUNIST THREAT

The threat of communism in Western Europe also contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War.

After the Russian revolution of 1917, communism spread to Eastern Europe and started threatening Western Europe by 1939. Communist influence set in a struggle by workers and peasants against exploitation and segregation. This favoured the rise of dictators and their aggressions in Europe. Hitler of

Germany, Mussolini of Italy and Hirohito of Japan took advantage of the fear of communism amongst western capitalist countries and launched a series of aggressions in the 1930's. They did it under the pretext of fighting communism, which went unopposed up to 1938. It should be stressed that Britain and France considered Fascist and Nazis aggressions a lesser evil than communist threat and that partly explains why they pursued appeasement policy, which is one of the factors responsible for the outbreak of the second world war.

13. THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR 1931-1939

The Spanish civil war was an event that led to the outbreak of the Second World War. The Spanish monarchy was overthrown in 1931 and replaced by a republican government. The leaders of the ousted monarchy including General Franco fled to South America. In 1935, General Franco moved to North America from where he coordinated a rebellion against the republican government. From 1936-39 there was a disastrous confrontation between General Franco's rebels supported by Italy and Germany against the republican government supported by Russia and foreign mercenary forces from several European countries including Britain, USA and France. The war ended in 1939 with the overthrow of the Republican government by General Franco who established a Fascist state in Spain. On one hand, this success intensified the hostility, hatred and antagonism of Italy, Spain and Germany against Britain, Russia and France, which became a rehearsing, ground for the outbreak of the Second World War. On the other hand, the war increased the prestige of Italy and Germany and gave them confidence of success in an event of any other war. It's this false confidence from the Spanish Civil war that dragged Hitler to attack Poland, which sparked off the Second World War.

NB. The official British and French position over the Spanish civil war was that of non-intervention to which Italy and Germany had initially consented only to violate it continuously by supporting General

Franco. The Fascist forces destroyed British and other vessels trading with the republican government of Spain. The British and French were disgusted by the violation of the principle of non-intervention and establishment of a Fascist state in Spain.

The official British and French policy of non-intervention over the war was interpreted as a sign of cowardice and fear of the Fascist and Nazi military power. This made the Fascists and Nazis to harden with their policy of aggression that dragged Hitler to attack Poland and set the world a blaze in the holocaust of the Second World War. Besides, the refusal of Britain and France to officially join Russia in the war against General Franco and his Fascists plus Nazis supporters made Russia to feel isolated and loose trust in Britain and France. This is what prompted Russia to sign a non-aggression pact with Germany in August 1939, which morale boosted Hitler to invade Poland and begin the Second World War.

The rise of General Franco and Fascism in Spain consolidated totalitarianism / dictatorship in Europe, alongside Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany. This encouraged Hitler to invade Poland with assured support from General

Franco and Mussolini hence the outbreak of World War II. -Furthermore, the consolidation of totalitarianism threatened the security of Britain, France and Russia forcing them to take action against Germany after the German occupation of Poland.

14. THE GERMAN INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF POLAND, 1st SEPTEMBER 1939

Lastly, the immediate event for the outbreak of the Second World War was the German invasion and occupation of Poland on September 1939. After occupying Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia, Hitler stepped up his claims for the Polish Corridor, port of Danzig and Posem. Hitler falsely hoped that Britain and France would not interfere as they had done when he occupied the Rhine lands, Austria and Czechoslovakia. With this false impression, Germany under Hitler attacked Poland from all fronts and almost brought it to ruins. Britain and France gave Hitler an ultimatum to withdraw within 24 hours that Hitler defied. This made Britain and France to declare war on Germany on 3rd September 1939. They were joined by Russia, the United States plus their colonies while Germany was joined by Italy, Japan and their colonies.

NB. It is questionable whether Hitler would have invaded Poland if it were not because of the need to liberate the 2.5 million Germans and territories that were given to Poland by the Versailles settlement of 1919. One can therefore argue that if the Versailles settlement had not forced the 2.5 million Germans and some German territories to Poland's control, Hitler could perhaps not have invaded Poland and the Second World War could not have been inevitable by 1939.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR APPEASEMENT POLICY

These questions demand the reasons why appeasement policy was used in Europe after the First World War up to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. Thus, give a background to appeasement policy, Explain the reasons and Conclude.

Reasons

1. The Russian and communist threat forced Britain to pursue appeasement policy. The influence of Russia and communism in the Middle East, China and Europe was a great obstacle to the British interests. There was also panic amongst the propertied classes of Britain by a mere mention of the word communism. Thus, Chamberlain saw communist threat as more dangerous than fascist and Nazi aggressions and decided to compromise with the Nazis and Fascists through appeasement policy.

Moreover, the axis powers carried their aggression under the guise of fighting communism which could not be resisted by Britain.

2. The need to maintain the balance of power also made Britain to adopt appeasement policy in the inter war period. The British expectation was that the axis powers and Russia would fight and destroy themselves through aggression, which would favour her policy of isolationism. It was hoped that the axis powers could liquidate the Soviet Union, which would eliminate the Russian domination of the world through communism. It was with this reasoning that Britain did not put up any resistance against German aggression in Austria, Czechoslovakia and indirectly supported Japan and Italy to occupy Manchuria and Abyssinia respectively. However, appeasement policy boomeranged and instead facilitated the axis powers to destroy the balance of power.

3. The unrealistic nature of the Versailles settlement created a public sympathy for Germany and her allies in Britain. It was argued that a disarmed and weakened Germany was "a vast Centre of economic depression" and a line of weakness for communism. This forced Britain to try to relax the most unrealistic clauses of the Versailles treaty through appeasement policy that was to bring reconciliation and peace in Europe.

4. Internal weakness of Britain after World War I was another reason why she used the policy of appeasement. Appeasement was; almost pre-determined by the precarious state of her economy, her own indecision in policy and by sundry embarrassments within the empire. Economic depression had created problems like inflation, mass unemployment and huge debt burden. It is this precarious economic condition that created an imaginary fear of communism. It also made Britain to emphasise German economic recovery for her own economic recovery since Germany was her best customer at one time. Thus, the British economic predicament or problems forced her to follow a policy of peace which was to give her time to re organise her economy.

5. Besides economic weakness, Britain was also militarily weakened and exhausted that she could not easily fight the axis' aggression. USA and USSR had become the world super powers and Britain had lost her pre-war customers which also left her militarily weakened. Chamberlain admitted that Britain was not prepared for a full-scale war and this is partly responsible for the British policy of appeasement.

6. The bad experience of the First World War also gave rise to appeasement policy in the interwar period.

It had caused socio-economic and political destructions and disturbances to the whole world. War was therefore seen as the worst experience of mankind and there was every need to avoid it at whatever cost. This is what forced Britain and even France to follow the policy of concession and peace through the appeasement policy.

7. The anti-colonial movements especially in Asia tied the hands of Britain that she could not fight the axis' aggression. By 1919, there were revolutionary movements in British colonies that diverted the British attention towards Africa. This could not enable her fight the axis' aggression in Europe and that is why she used the policy of appeasement.

8. The weaknesses of the League of Nations was yet another reason for the British policy of appeasement. The League of Nations had no army of its own and relied-on sanctions which proved useless against the Nazi and fascist aggression in Europe. This made Chamberlain to hijack the role of the League and pursue .appeasement policy. He argued that war could be avoided through settling disputes by personal, contacts and negotiations with the axis powers, which gave rise to appeasement policy.

9. The withdrawal of USA from the concert of Europe (League of Nations) also gave rise to appeasement policy in the history of Europe, USA was the brain behind the League of Nations and she was a world military and economic super-power. Her withdrawal left European politics in the hands of Britain and France who were weak economically and militarily and hence incapable of fighting the axis powers. If USA had joined the League of Nations, the League would have been strengthened and there would be no need to appease the axis powers.

10. The inability of the British politicians to properly understand the character and ambitions of the axis powers made Britain to pursue appeasement policy. They thought that the axis powers were fighting communism yet they were using communism as a camouflage of their

hidden ambition to dominate the world. Chamberlain falsely believed that Hitler meant business and would honour him word if the injustice done to Germany at Versailles were reversed. This is why he appeased Hitler at the Munich conference of 1939 in which Germany was appeased with Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia. It was only when Hitler attacked Poland and Britain declared war on Germany on 3rd September 1939 that Chamberlain realised his blunders. He admitted this on the same day (3rd September 1939) in his remarks that;

This is a sad day to all of us and to none is it sadder than to me. Everything that / have worked for, everything that I have hope for, everything that I have believed in life has crushed into ruins.

Attachments

No attachments



[Brainshare](#)

ROLE OF EUROPEAN POWERS AND PERSONALITIES IN THE OUTBREAK OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

1. GERMANY/HITLER'S ROLE

a) Germany was primarily responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War. Hitler started the arms race in order to avenge the disarmament clause of the Versailles settlement and dominate Europe. This was adopted by other powers and created hostility, fear, panic and recklessness that led to the Second World War.

b) Hitler created the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis to oppose and destroy the influence of the western democratic powers led by Britain and France. This made the western powers to form the democratic alliance that divided Europe into two antagonistic camps leading to the Second World War

c) Germany led by Hitler boycotted the League of Nations and left it weakened. The Nazi aggression challenged and made the League of Nations to fail to preserve peace in the interwar period. The weakness of the League opened way for war other than diplomacy as a means of settling world disputes hence the outbreak of the Second World War.

d) The German and Hitler's aggressions in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Rhine lands, Sudetenland and Poland disorganised Europe and led to the

outbreak of the Second World War. It also encouraged other powers like Japan and Italy to become aggressive. This escalated tension in Europe and led directly to war when Germany occupied Poland in 1939.

e) Hitler and Germany misinterpreted the British desires for peace through appeasement policy as a sign of weakness and cowardice. This made him to embark on a vicious cycle of aggression that led to the Second World War. Hitler is therefore accused of abusing appeasement policy, which made it to boomerang and cause war.

f) The German/Hitler's invasion of Poland on 1st September 1939 was the immediate event that led to the Second World War. It made Britain and France to realise the futility of appeasement policy and declare war on Germany that began the Second World War.

g) The German/Hitler's defiance to the British and French ultimatum after the invasion of Poland is what made Britain and France to declare war on her (Germany). When Germany invaded Poland, the French and British gave her an ultimatum to withdraw within 24 hours which Hitler refused to abide by. Had Hitler complied with this ultimatum, Britain and France would have had no excuse to declare war on Germany and the Second World War could have not been inevitable.

2. BRITAIN

a) Gave moral support to aggression by the axis powers as a counter measure to communism in Europe.

She encouraged the Japanese aggression in Manchuria, Italian invasion of Abyssinia, the Nazi aggressions in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Rhine lands. This provoked a vicious cycle of aggression that climaxed into the German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of the Second World War.

b) The British policy of appeasement was a boomerang that contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War. It was regarded by Hitler and Mussolini as a sign of weakness and cowardice. This encouraged fascist and Nazi aggressions that reached its peak in the German invasion of Poland and began the Second World War.

c) Britain was also entangled in the arms race that created fear, panic, recklessness, which graduated to war in 1939.

d) She was a champion of the democratic alliance that antagonised the axis alliance and caused war in 1939. Besides, Britain had allied with Poland which encouraged her to take a bold stand against

Germany and declare war after the German invasion. If Poland had not relied on British support, she would have possibly looked for a diplomatic solution other than war against Germany's occupation of her territory.

e) It was Britain that declared war on Germany on 3rd September 1939, which magnified the conflict between Germany and Poland into the Second World War. This was after Germany's refusal to withdraw from Poland as demanded by the ultimatum.

f) Britain was 'a big force' behind the unrealistic Versailles settlement that sowed seeds for the outbreak of the Second World War. The settlement was very unfair to Germany, Japan and Italy and left them with nostalgia to revenge. This forced them to converge in the axis alliance and wage a series of aggression that climaxed into the Second World War.

3. FRANCE

a) France is blamed for supporting Chamberlain's policy of appeasement that led to a series of aggression and the outbreak of war in 1939. If France had not supported or opposed Chamberlain's policy, it's possible that he would have dropped it and handled the Nazi and Fascist aggression militarily. This was bound to threaten Mussolini and Hitler and hence reduce aggression in Europe. Consequently, Hitler would have possibly not invaded Poland and the Second World War would have been avoided in 1939.

b) France was the 'greatest shareholder' of the unrealistic Versailles settlement that became a foundation for the outbreak of the Second World War. The Versailles settlement was chaired by Clemenceau who skillfully and carefully manipulated the terms of the settlement to punish Germany for her crimes in the First World War and the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 - 1871. This irritated Germany and left her determined to revenge, which led to the outbreak of the war in 1939.

c) France is also blamed for her involvement in the arms race and alliance system. She entered into a number of alliances in order to strengthen her diplomatic position against Germany. In Sept 1920 she signed the Franco-Belgian treaty; which was a military alliance against Germany. Similar treaties were signed with Poland in Feb 1921, Czechoslovakia in 1924, Rumania in 1926 and Yugoslavia in 1927.

This divided Europe into two armed and antagonistic camps that exploded into the Second World War in the aftermath of the German invasion of Poland.

d) France is accused of collaborating with Britain to declare war on Germany on 3rd September 1939. If France had not supported Poland against Germany, the German-Polish conflict would have remained a localized affair between the two states. Thus, the French involvement is what magnified it into a European war and finally the Second World War.

4. RUSSIA

a) Russia is blamed for signing a non-aggressive treaty with Germany in 1939. This encouraged Hitler to invade Poland on September 1939 that triggered the Second World War. The treaty gave Hitler a false impression that Russia would not join the war against her and this is partly why she violated the British and French ultimatum to withdraw. However, Russia changed and joined the allied powers against Germany.

b) The spread and threat of Russian communism led to the rise of Hitler and Mussolini who played a leading role in the outbreak of the Second World War. It also made Britain to pursue appeasement policy, which indirectly facilitated aggression by the axis powers and led to the outbreak of war in 1939.

c) Russia's isolation from the League of Nations which also blocked communist countries in Eastern Europe from the League left the League weakened. It made the League a narrow association of a few Western powers and therefore failed to capture European public opinion. This provided a line of weakness for aggression and explosion of the Second World War.

d) Russia is also accused for joining Britain, France and Poland against Germany. This escalated the war to Eastern Europe which graduated to the Second World War.

5. JAPAN AND ITALY

a) Japan and Italy are accused for the outbreak of the Second World War for waging aggression, which partly encouraged Hitler's aggression that led to war in 1939. Japan is blamed for invading the Chinese territory of Manchuria and Italy is accused for her invasion of Abyssinia. These started a series of aggression that climaxed into the Second World War by 1939.

b) Japan and Italy are also blamed for arms race and alliance system that contributed to war by 1939.

They are accused of joining Germany in the German centered Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis alliance in 1937. This assured Hitler of support in case of war and

therefore encouraged him to invade Czechoslovakia and Poland that sparked off the Second World War.

c) Lastly, Japan and Italy assisted Germany against allied powers in the Second World War. This strengthened Germany and made it impossible to defeat Germany by 1945. Indeed Japan put a stiff resistance in the east that was only broken by the US atomic bombs in August 1945.

d) Japan is accused for her reckless bombing of the U.S fleet at Pearl Harbour on December 1941. This is what provoked U.S.A to join the war against the axis powers.

6. POLAND

a) Although Poland fought a defensive war, she is blamed for signing a military pact/agreement with Britain in 1939. This threatened Germany for Germany could not tolerate a strong neighbor with powerful connections to Britain. This partly forced Germany to declare war on Poland and destroy her before it was too late.

b) Poland is also accused of occupying the German territories of Danzig, Posen, Upper Silesia and a corridor of land that passed through Germany to the Baltic Sea. These included 2.5 million German nationals that were given to her at the Versailles conference of 1919. When Hitler demanded for the German territories and nationals, Poland refused which forced Hitler to declare war and set the ball rolling for the Second World War. However, the blame for this largely rests on Britain and France who had given Poland such territories and populations at the Versailles conference of 1919.

c) Lastly, Poland is accused of declaring war on Germany after the German invasion of her territory in 1939. Although this was justifiable, she is blamed for ignoring diplomacy as a priority in resolving conflicts.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCES/ EFFECTS OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The Second World War is the most disastrous event in the history of the world. In a real sense, it is the greatest war that mankind has ever experienced. In the war, the axis powers were finally defeated in 1945 and the allied powers came out victorious. The war affected all aspects of human life as well as international politics of that time and the present generation. Generally, the war had positive and negative consequences in the social, political and economic structures of the world some of which can be traced up to the present era.

Positive consequences

i) The war gave rise to European economic integration and regional economic organisations to improve the welfare of mankind. This led to the formation of organisations like the Organisation of European Economic Co-operation and Development (O.E.E.C.D), European Coal and Steel Community (B.C.S.C), European Free Trade Association (E.F.T.A) and European Economic Community (E.E.C) in 1958. After the war, American companies that had made abnormal profits from producing war related products bought shares in European countries which led to the formation of multi-national companies. These companies expanded their investment throughout the world e.g. B.A.T, Pepsi cola and oil companies such as Shell and Caltex.

ii) The war led to the defeat and downfall of great military dictators of Europe. The pressure of the war forced Hitler to commit suicide while Mussolini was killed by his own soldiers towards the end of the war. This marked the collapse of Nazism and fascism in the history of Europe. Militaristic leaders in other areas like Spain and Japan were overthrown. These undermined totalitarianism and paved way for democratic governments throughout Europe.

iii) On the other hand, the war led to the liberation of states that were victims of aggression by the axis powers. The defeat of Germany and her allies was followed by the granting of independence to smaller states like Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Ethiopia that had been under German and Italian rules. This was done by the allied powers during and after the end of the war. A number of Germans, Italians and Japanese who had settled in such conquered territories were expelled to their mother lands after the war.

iv) The formation of U.N.O to replace the League of Nations whose weakness was responsible for the outbreak of the war was an outcome of the Second World War. The idea for the formation of U.N.O came from

Dumbarton Oaks war time conference of 1944 between USA, Britain, Russia and China.

Thereafter, the first draft of the U.N.O was signed in April 1945 at San Francisco. On Oct 1945, the U.N.O was officially proclaimed at its headquarter in New York with six (6) organs to facilitate its role in world affairs. The main concerns were peace, international co-operation and development.

v) The establishment of the Jewish state of Israel in 1948 and the rise of Zionism were occasioned by World War II. During the course of World War II, the Jews were persecuted and massacred by the Nazis, Fascists and Arabs. Consequently, Jewish immigrants flooded Palestine-and a serious conflict developed with the indigenous Palestinian Arabs. Britain tried in vain to resolve the conflict and referred it to the UN Security Council In 1947. In 1948, the Security Council created the Jewish state of Israel out of the Arab state of Palestine. However, this marked the beginning of a protracted conflict between the Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, which have been a constant threat to world peace.

vi) The war resulted into abandonment of appeasement policy. Appeasement policy that was intended to avoid war instead boomeranged and caused the outbreak of war in 1939. Chamberlain was so disappointed by Hitler's unending demands and invasion of Poland that he regretted for having pursued appeasement policy. The invasion made Britain and France to realise the blunder of appeasement policy and join the war against Germany. From then on wards, the policy was abandoned in the diplomatic politics of Europe.

vii) The Marshall Aid plan and COMECON were initiated to help the West and East respectively to revamp economies that were dislocated by the war. The Marshall Aid plan was an economic recovery scheme in which food, fuel, machinery, raw materials and money (valued at \$13 billion) were given to save the collapsing capitalist economies of Europe. The Russian Prime Minister Viache Molotov responded by initiating the Molotov plan and COMECON to save the badly revenged socialist economies. These aids were to help the antagonistic blocs to reconstruct their economies and solve economic problems like inflation, unemployment, poverty and starvation.

viii) The rise and growth of nationalism in the Middle East, Asia and Africa were also due to the war. It led to the rise of USA and USSR who supported decolonisation movements especially in Africa against the British and

French colonial masters. The war also weakened France and Britain and thus weakened their abilities to manage their colonies which gave the colonised people chance to fight for their independence. The few people who fought in the war were inspired with revolutionary ideas that they used to champion the move towards independence. All these contributed to the decolonisation of countries such as Ghana, Sudan, Egypt, Libya, Palestine, Kuwait, Israel etc. One should acknowledge that the decolonisation process led to loss of colonies by European powers.

Negative consequences

ix) The war resulted into massive destruction of lives. Over 50 million people died as a direct consequence of the war. Of these, about 22 million were soldiers and 28 civilians. About 6 million Jews were exterminated in Germany and areas occupied by the Nazi troops during the war. There were mass killings in concentration camps which became death camps. Prisoners were made to dig mass graves &om where-, they were shot and buried. Generally, about 12 million people lost their lives in concentration camps as a result of terror unleashed by the fascists and Nazis. The overall consequence was depopulation and a change Sin the population structure.

x) Properties whose value cannot be quantified were also destroyed during the war. Intensive bombardment of towns and cities demolished properties such as industries, houses and war machineries. Industrial towns like the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were completely razed to the ground by US atomic bombs which became the worst destruction in the history of mankind by. 1970. This left behind the problem of reconstruction amidst financial crisis that befall the world due to the war.

xi) There was also a large influx of homeless refugees and Internally Displaced Persons. Thousands of them were kept in camps in Western Europe during and after the war. Most of these were people like the Jews who were fleeing the Nazi and fascist aggressions. This left the allied powers with the problem of how to repatriate and rehabilitate such displaced persons. This burden was shouldered by the international community through the UNO.

xii. On the other hand, there were migrations outside Europe. Fear of death in Europe forced some families and groups of individuals to flee as far as America, Australia and South Africa. War criminals who were wanted to answer charges for atrocities they committed during the war also fled

across Europe as a strategy of evading arrest. This explains why some of the most wanted Nazi and fascist commanders were not arrested and tried.

xiii) The Second World War changed the balance of power and led to the rise of USA and USSR as super powers. The Soviet/Russian soldiers consolidated communism in Eastern Europe and Russia emerged as a super power commanding great influence in Eastern Europe. USA that did not suffer much from the war and whose atomic bombing of Japan brought the war to an end also emerged from the west as a dominant power. The rise of USA and USSR were at the expense of Britain, France and Germany who were the hitherto traditional superpowers.

xiv) The emergence of USA and USSR led to intense rivalry, suspicion, hatred and conflict that gave rise to cold war. This was partly because of the struggle by Soviet Union/Russia to consolidate and spread communism, which was antagonized by American determination to spread capitalism. This divided the world into two antagonistic ideological camps, which led to the formation of NATO by USA in 1949 and Warsaw Pact by USSR in 1955. It should be noted that Russia planted communist regimes in her areas of occupation that threatened western powers and led to the cold war. On the other hand, countries that did not want to identify themselves with the two antagonistic camps under the leadership of India formed the Non Align Movement.

XV) Economic decline was direct consequence of World War II Productive sectors like agriculture, trade, transport, communication and industries were disrupted and destroyed during the war. The British and French economies for were shattered and left in a quagmire state. This brought famine, starvation, inflation and unemployment to millions of survivors.

xvi) Germany was partitioned into two separated by the famous Berlin wall that belonged to

Russia had a socialist government and West Germany that was given to USA Britain and France had a capitalist, government. This was to punish Germany for her aggression that had led to the outbreak of the first as well as the second world wars. It was also to weaken Germany in order to safeguard Europe and the world from further German aggression and war.

NB. The division of Germany ended with the reunification of Germany in 1991

This only ended when the compensation bill was cleared.

xvii) Japan was devastated by the Second World War. She became a physical ruin, an economic desert and a Centre of political turmoil/confusion. The Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were razed to the ground by American atomic bombs whose effects were still being felt up to 1970. She was also forced to abandon her claims of Manchuria that was given back to china. Worst of all Japan was colonised by USA in order to compensate for the destruction of USA's fleet at Pearl Harbour in 1944. This only ended when the compensation bill was cleared.

xviii) It also stimulated rapid scientific innovations that led to the production of weapons of mass destruction. The war witnessed the use of atomic bombs for the first time in the history of mankind. This was used by USA with devastating impact on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After the war, Russia, Japan, Britain, Iraq, North Korea and Pakistan embarked on research in the production of weapons of mass destruction. This was responsible for the nuclear crisis that has degenerated to war in post-World war II era. It also enhanced arms and rearmament in post-World war II era.

However from the summer of 1942, the rapid advancement of the axis troops were systematically checked and reversed. The Nazi and Fascist troops lost several battles and by 1944 they were defeated.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

REASONS FOR THE DEFEAT OF THE AXIS POWERS/GERMANY

1 The axis powers were faced with internal opposition that made them vulnerable to defeat by the, a powers. Germany, Italy and Japan had dictators who could not rally and Mussolini were very unpopular, which made their own people to turn against them. This explains why Mussolini was arrested and executed by his own fellow fascists, which led to the surrender of Italy. This also partly made Hitler to commit suicide and marked the defeat of Germany as well. On the other hand, there was patriotism in allied countries due to charismatic leadership of Winston Churchill, FD Roosevelt, Truman and Stalin. Their popularity made it very easy to mobilise resources most especially manpower to fight and defeat the axis powers. '

2. Externally, the axis powers were faced with internal resistance from the countries that they invaded and occupied. By 1941, the axis powers had successfully occupied countries like Poland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and states of Eastern Europe. The axis rule in these states was very brutal, autocratic and full of atrocities. Such states formed resistance movements and waged a series of resistance to the axis forces e.g. local militias snipped at axis forces and blew up bridges while factory workers sabotaged industrial production through vandalism and go slow tactics. In Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Marshall Tito mobilised the Yugoslavs and successfully repulsed German troops. Such resistance diverted and weakened axis forces to the advantage of allied powers. Resistance groups also provided military information and direction to allied powers that made the defeat of Germany and her allies inevitable.

3. The naval superiority of the allied powers also explains the defeat of the axis powers. Britain and USA had the best navy in the world. They used their naval power to dominate the European coastlines and made it impossible for the axis powers to get reinforcements from Europe. In 1941, the British and American navy sunk the German sub marine and surface raiders. All these explain why Germany was very successful over her neighbours between 1939- 40 but failed in the subsequent battles like the one in Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

4. Technological superiority of allied powers also account for their success against axis powers. Britain and USA manufactured more sophisticated fighter jets, tanks^ planes, missiles, bombs and warships. In 1940, Britain produced a radar that easily detected allied warplanes and ships before they could bombard her strategic military bases. The manufacture of atomic bomb by USA and its disastrous impact on Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 is what stopped Japanese stubborn resistance and ended the war.

5. Lack of foresight was also responsible for the doom that befell the axis powers. They ignored the necessity of fighter planes. Japan for instance concentrated on the production of battleships that made her vulnerable to bombings by the allied warplanes. Germany also made a mistake of concentrating on the production of "V" rockets at the expense of strengthening her air defense. On the other hand, the allied powers concentrated on the production of warplanes, missiles and radars. These tilted the military balance of power in favour of the allies and led to the defeat of the axis powers.

6. Hitler's military blunder was also responsible for the success of the allied powers. He underestimated the military strength of allied powers. Hitler invaded England with a misconception that none of the

British colonies would assist her. He and his troops were demoralised when British colonies rallied behind their master to fight against axis powers. Hitler's invasion of Russia which was code named Operation Barbarossa (June 1941) was a military disaster. Hitler also failed to realise the dangers of acute winter where temperature was as low as -40°C and even refused to withdraw his troops from Russian territories. He did not effectively plan for winter and the German troops did not have the badly needed heavy clothes to protect them from severe cold. This exposed them to the disastrous consequences of winter, which affected the rapid advancement of Nazi troops. This is why the 6 divisions of the Nazi troops failed to defeat Russia in 1942. This demystified the view that German troops were invincible and morale boosted Russian and other powers determination to fight Germany.

7. The success of the allied powers was also determined by the size of their population and number of colonies. USA was supported by the whole of North and South America, France and Britain enjoyed support from their several colonies in Africa and commonwealth states like South Africa, India, Egypt and East Africa. The 1919 treaty of Versailles deprived Germany of her colonies, which were given to France and Britain as mandate states. Thus the axis powers had few populations and colonies that made them to be outnumbered in the battlefield. The large scale of the war divided the axis powers into thin/smaller units that were defeated one at a time. For instance, Germany failed to consolidate her initial success against Russia because the six divisions of the Nazi troops were too few to effectively monitor the area (because the area was too wide).

8. Shortage of raw materials and supplies to the axis power also accounted for the success of the allied powers. The League of Nations imposed economic embargo on Japan in 1931, Italy in 1935 and Germany in 1936. This made them unable to import the necessary war materials like rubber, cotton, copper, atomic and oil products to reinforce their military strength. It also created a serious economic crisis that affected the morale, strength and determination of the axis troops to the advantage of the allied powers.

9. Paradoxically, the allied powers were actively involved in trade and others like USA and USSR gained prosperity by producing war related materials. For example, Russia shifted her industries to rural mountains of the

East after the German occupation of the West and produced vast quantities of arms and other war materials. USA's war industry was producing 120 warplanes and 70,000 tanks per year. By 1945, allied powers had 4 times as many tanks as the Germans. These developments compared to economic crisis of the axis powers made the axis powers unable to withstand the allies after 1942.

10. The role played by USA in the war played a decisive role in the defeat of axis powers. President FD

Roosevelt had considered World War II as a European war and promised neutrality with USA as an "arsenal of democracy" through his "cash and carry policy for arms". However, there was a radical policy change in which USA started supplying arms free of charge to Britain and France according to the Lease-lend act of March 1941. In the same year (1941), Japan invaded Hawaii Island and destroyed American pacific fleet at Pearl Harbour, which prompted USA the war against the axis powers. To join The involvement of USA boosted the allied powers with the badly needed financial, human and technical resources since she had the most stable economy. For instance, USA freely supplied tanks, warships, fighter planes and tanks that helped to halt rapid advancement of axis powers and shift the military balance of power in favour of allied powers.

11. Press propaganda through the mass media e.g. newspaper, radio and magazines also aided the success of allied nations against axis powers. Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill used the London times and British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) to inform the world that the allies were fighting dictatorship, persecution and barbaric leadership. Franklin D Roosevelt utilised the Voice of America (VGA) to mobilise Americans and the whole world to fight the axis powers. Such press propaganda created a negative public opinion against axis powers and made it difficult to mobilise the masses for effective military campaign. It also favoured the formation of resistance movements in areas controlled by axis powers that made the success of allied powers inevitable.

12. The downfall of Italy in September 1943 and the defection of Badoglio who succeeded Mussolini was paramount in the success of allied powers against axis powers. In the aftermath of Anglo-American invasion of Italian mainland on 3rd September 1943, Badoglio withdrew Italy from the axis camp and joined the allied powers. This betrayed axis powers and led to leakage of military secrets and information to the advantage of allied powers. It also reinforced the allied camp given that Italy was used as a

strategic base for aircraft and store for war materials. These played a crucial role in the subsequent defeat of Germany and Japan that marked the triumph of allied powers in World War II.

13. The death of prominent axis leaders i.e. Mussolini and Hitler also contributed to the defeat of axis powers.

By 1945, Italy and Germany could no longer withstand the fire power of allied nations and there was public outcry for immediate end of the war. In 1943, Mussolini fled to Northern Italy from where he was assassinated by disgruntled fascist supporters. He was replaced by Badoglio who defected and helped the allied powers against the axis powers. In 1945, Hitler out of desperation committed suicide in a bunker. He was succeeded by a weak willed Admiral Doenitz who accepted to surrender unconditionally on 7th May 1945. The death of Mussolini and Hitler denied Japan of their inspiring leadership and support and that was why she (Japan) surrendered unconditionally in the aftermath of the dual bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

14. The role of US atomic bombings was the most instrumental in the final success of the allied powers.

Japan had occupied vast parts of the east and defeated the US troops at Pearl Harbour in 1941. They had high moral and determination to fight even after the surrender of Germany and Italy. However, they were demoralised and hence surrendered because of the USA's atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. USA used US B-29 bomber to demolish Hiroshima on 6th Aug 1945 and Nagasaki on 9th Aug 1945. These forced Japan into unconditional surrender that marked the final success of the allied powers and hence defeat of the axis powers.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Introduction

The cold war refers to the global state of affairs that was characterised by persistent tension and conflicts between the western countries led by USA

and Eastern countries led by Russia. Precisely, it was a propaganda war or diplomatic war or an ideological war that involved the inevitable clash between communism and capitalism. It was not a state of armed struggle but a situation in which the rivals i.e. USA and USSR while maintaining their peacetime diplomatic relations continued to have secret hostility, malice, sabotage and diplomatic aggression towards each other. The conflict remained "cold" because there was no actual fighting between the two antagonistic camps and it was "war" because it was a conflict of the most serious and deadly nature.

Although the cold war was manifested openly in the aftermath of the Second World War, it started mildly in 1917 after the birth of communism in Russia. Thereafter, the western countries considered the Soviet Union a greater enemy than Hitler and Mussolini. They pursued appeasement policy to Hitler and Mussolini because they felt that communism was a greater danger than fascism and Nazism. From 1960 - 70, the cold war was basically between the members of the War-Saw pact led by USSR and NATO under USA. It finally ended with the collapse of USSR on 3rd October 1990.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CAUSES OF THE COLD WAR

1. Ideological conflict (communism Vs capitalism)

The emergence of communism after the success of the 1917 Russian revolution laid foundation for the outbreak of the cold war. Communism was able to spread to eastern European countries and became a serious threat to the western powers who saw it as a challenge to their capitalist ideology.

Consequently, the troops that had been sent by western powers to help Russia in the war against

Germany was used in vain to crush the communist state at birth (because the plan was foiled by the red army). However this conspiracy could not be forgotten by the Russians and left a legacy of intense bitterness that led to the cold war.

2. Russia's expansionist policy (Sovietisation of Eastern Europe).

During and after the Second World War, Russia occupied most of the areas that fell in the hands of the allied forces in order to spread and strengthen communist regimes in eastern countries like Poland, Belgium, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania and East Germany. This alarmed USA who tried to frustrate Russian expansion and hurried to expand her areas of influence in Western Europe and the third world countries, hence the cold war. The cold war was therefore a clash between the Sovietisation policy of Russia and "Americanisation" policy of USA.

i). The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Aid Plan.

The Truman doctrine/Marshall aid plan made the outbreak of the cold war inevitable. Aware that

communism was born and bred in poverty, USA came up with the Marshall Aid Plan that was started by General George Marshall (the US secretary of state 1945 - 47). This was a gigantic scheme in which food, fuel, machinery, raw materials and money (valued at \$13 billion) were sent to save the collapsing capitalist economies of Europe from further communist influence. The aid was strings attached to capitalism. The soviet Prime Minister Viache Molotov blatantly announced Moscow's (Russia's) opposition to the plan.

He counter balanced by initiating the Molotov plan and establishing the council of mutual economic assistance. This move and counter moves constituted the cold war.

4. The Iron Curtain Speech^ March 1946

Winston Churchill's speech on "world affairs" especially the Iron Curtain Speech made in the West

Minister College at Fulton (USA) escalated the East-West tension. In this speech, he proclaimed that;

From Stettin on the Baltic to Trieste on the Adriatic an iron curtain has descended across the face of the continent. Behind that line lies all the capitals of the ancient states of central and

Eastern Europe ...all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the soviet sphere and all are subject....to control from Moscow.

The Russians received this message hysterically. Government papers worsened the situation by printing sections which seemed to suggest that

war against USSR was about to start. Stalin openly accused Churchill and Truman of preparing a new war against Russia. This ended wartime alliance and was the beginning of outright political struggle called the cold war.

NB. Churchill was no longer the British prime minister having lost the general election of 1945.

However, his views still carried great weight (as a former premier).

5. Post war Future of Poland

The post war future of Poland raised tension between USA and Soviet Union to fever point. This became a sensitive issue given that the German occupation of Poland is what dragged the allied powers to take up arms against Germany. The problem was that the Soviet Union had established a communist regime in Poland (at Lublin). Britain and USA protested and wanted Poland to be free from soviet influence and have democratically elected government. This set in motion a struggle by the Western

powers to destroy the communist government on one hand and the soviet determination to meet this challenge on the other hand made the cold war inevitable

NB. Stalin argued that Poland should have a friendly government to Russia because in the two world wars, Germany had invaded Russia through Poland. Although this is true, it carries more of Russia's disguised imperialism to extend her communist ideology over Europe.

6. Failures of Yalta and Postdom conferences

The self-interests of the big powers at Yalta and Postdom conferences made no small contribution to the cold war. Among others, these conferences were intended to determine the fate of the defeated countries like Germany after the end of the war. However, each power had different intentions and attitudes over such countries. Britain wanted to set up democratic governments there, France wanted to set up strong army fronts in those countries, USA wanted to empower them economically and extend capitalism to them while Russia wanted to spread communism to those countries. Eventually, each country started pursuing different programs in its area of occupation. When the western powers joined hands, Russia felt justified to meet the challenge which resulted into the cold war.

NB. Towards the end of 1945, Britain and France had occupied western Germany while Russia occupied the eastern part as a strategy to check German aggression. The occupation was to be temporal. However as

Britain and France withdrew, Russia refused on the ground that she wanted to create a buffer state. This was opposed by other powers including America, which escalated tension between the two blocks.

7. Rearmament

As tension mounted, the super powers revived the manufacture of more sophisticated and deadly weapons in preparation for war. After the Second World War, it was generally felt that USA was the strongest nation due to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, there was also a fear of Russia since it was the red army that defeated Hitler. Russia was not sleeping; she went down on research, made a similar atomic bomb in 1949 and exploded it. America reacted by manufacturing it's anti, which set in motion the cold war. On the other hand, development of sophisticated weapons made war a risky venture because both sides would be completely destroyed hence the war remained cold.

8. Alliance system

The resurrection of alliance system after the Second World War became a vehicle for the cold war. In 1949, USA formed the N.A.T.O. as a tool to safeguard Western Europe from communism and Russian imperialism. USSR reacted by forming the War Saw pact in 1955 to safeguard Eastern Europe from capitalism and American imperialism. This divided Europe into two hostile and antagonistic camps hence the cold war.

9. Spy Net work

The role of Spy network contributed a lot to the development of the cold war. Secret agents and organisations were used to leak out military secrets and technology between the two antagonistic camps. The Soviet Union used the notorious secret organisation known as KDG and

Cominform/Communist Information Bureau while USA used C.I.A. Their agents sometimes brought dangerous, exaggerated and threatening information that intensified the suspicion, jealousy and hatred between the two states.

10. The role of men on the spot

The role of men on the spot helped to destroy the harmonious relationship between the western and eastern blocks. Kennan, an American ambassador in Moscow and a specialist in soviet affairs advised USA to oppose USSR everywhere with an emphasis that;

The USA must regard the Soviet Union as a rival, not a partner in the political arena.

In USSR, Zhdanov, a fanatical Marxist and the closest political ally of Stalin believed that the main aim of USA was to strengthen imperialism, hatch a new imperialistic war and combat communism. He consequently advised Stalin to oppose and wage war against capitalism and imperialism. Thus, Kennan greatly influenced public opinion and USA's policy against USSR while Zhdanov shaped Moscow's / Russia's hostility against USA that led to the outbreak of the cold war.

11. Economic Motives

Economic reasons were also responsible for setting in motion the cold war. USA and USSR rivaled to acquire raw materials for their industries, markets for their manufactured products and areas for investment. For instance, USA was bitter over Russia's influence in the east because it would block her from tapping oil and investing in oil companies in the Middle East. This caused more tension between the two super powers leading to the cold war.

12. Strategic Motives

The scramble for areas of strategic importance has also been held responsible for the outbreak of the cold war. Areas that were scrambled for included outstanding deserts, ports of Danzig, Mombasa and the Cape of Good Hope, major seas and waters like Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Baltic sea. These places were strategically important for trade, testing weapons, research and scientific experiments.

13. The weakness of UN O

The weakness of UN O also contributed to the outbreak of the cold war. As an international organisation where America and Soviet Union were permanent members, UNO was the only reliable tool to stop conflicts between the two super powers. However, U N failed to stop arms race, which caused more tension between Western and Eastern Europe. It also failed to ensure unity amongst its members and that is why USA formed NATO, which became the vehicle for cold war. If UNO was a strong peace-making Organisation, it would have maintained unity and co-operation between U S A and USSR and the cold war would have been avoided

14. Intervention of USA and USSR in civil wars

The role of USA and USSR in the liberation and civil wars throughout the world escalated the east-west tension and led to the outbreak of the cold war. USA and USSR supported either the ruling government or rebels as long as their ideologies and influence were accepted, in the Chinese war of 1949, USA supported the government of Chiang Kaishek and USSR supported the rebel forces of Mao Tse-Tung until he succeeded. As for the Korean crisis of 1950-1953, USA supported South Korea while USSR supported North Korea. The Cuban missile crisis of 1952 and the Vietnam war were the worst events in the relationship between America and the Soviet Union. These events made the outbreak of the cold war inevitable.

15. The death of charismatic leaders

The death of compromising leaders and the rise of new and uncompromising leaders made the cold war inevitable. President Franklin D Roosevelt who was tolerant to the Russians was replaced by the intolerant Truman (in U S A). On the other hand, the rise of uncompromising leaders like Stalin, Molotov and Churchill worsened the east-west tension. These were new and inexperienced leaders who heightened the propaganda, jealousy, mistrust and hatred between the eastern and western blocks and made the cold war an inevitable event in the post-World War II era.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

CONSEQUENCE/SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COLD WAR

The cold war brought positive and negative political, social and economic consequences not only in Europe but the entire world up to the present era.

Positive consequences

1. Spread of communism

The cold war led to the spread and consolidation of communism in Eastern Europe. Russia was alarmed by the growing threat of the Western powers led by USA and hurried to strengthen her influence in the East. By 1949, she had succeeded in setting up communist governments in the Eastern states of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Albania.

Russia aimed at using these states as satellite states on her western frontiers against the west in an event of a "hot war".

2. Military balance of power

The cold war created a military balance of power in Europe. The tension and conflicts it caused prompted USA and USSR to venture into manufacture of weapons of mass destruction such as atomic, biological and nuclear weapons. Thereafter, USA brought western states under her control through NATO (1949) while USSR did so to eastern countries through the WARSAW PACT (1955). This led to emergence of USA as a super power in western Europe and Russia as a dominant power in Eastern Europe. It should be noted that possession of sophisticated weapons by USA and USSR made outright military confrontation too risky and that is why both states resorted to proxy wars using other states.

3. Formation of Non Align Movement

The rise and existence of Non Align movement (NAM) was a consequence of the cold war. This was done by states that wanted to be neutral in the cold war. The Non-Aligned Movement was formed at the Bandung conference for Asian and African countries in April 1955. The conference was spearheaded by Nehru of India and sponsored by the governments of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia.

NB: The Non Aligned states were divided amongst themselves and such divisions weakened the movement. With time, the non-aligned members ceased to be neutral and took sides in the cold war.

4. Decolonisation

The cold war contributed to the decolonisation of a large part of Africa and other races that were still under colonialism. Karl Marx defined imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism and this made it a target of the communist states led by Russia. After the Second World War, these states sponsored political movements that aimed at uprooting colonialism and imperialism. For example, the MAU MAU and FRELIMO movements for independence were assisted by Russia. It was due to such assistance that some African states regained their independence from 1950 - 1970.

However, to another extent the cold war delayed the decolonisation process especially in Africa. This is because America supported colonialism since it was a sign of capitalism. This is what delayed the independence of S. Africa and Angola up to the 1980's and 1990's.

5. Foreign Aid

The cold war led to increased flow of foreign aid to member countries of the two camps. USA assisted Western Europe through the Marshall Aid plan as a reward for accepting capitalism while Russia assisted Eastern Europe through the Molotov plan and council of mutual economic assistance, for being loyal to communism. These ideology biased foreign aids were extended to Africa by USA and USSR as long as their political ideologies were adhered to. All these assistance contributed to economic recovery of the world after the Second World War.

6. Education

The cold war indirectly promoted education. America and Russia embarked on an intensive

mobilisation programme as a strategy to strengthen their political ideologies and undermine each other.

They competed in awarding scholarships for students to study in their countries. These students were indoctrinated with either the communist or capitalist political ideologies that they were supposed to promote on returning back to their country. Such students and countries got accidental benefits from the cold war.

7. Space exploration

The cold war resulted into space exploration in an attempt by USA and USSR to surpass and threaten each other. On September and October 1959, Russia sent Rockets Lurik II and Lurik III respectively to the moon. These adventures were to counteract the American. Pioneer V satellite that was sent to the sun. In 1961, Yuri Gagarin of Russia and Armstrong of USA made successful adventures into the space. It's important to stress that all these efforts for space exploration were done on rival basis because of the cold war.

Negative consequences

8. Political instability

There were political unrests as a result of indirect military confrontation between USA and USSR in different parts of the world. USA and USSR sponsored capitalist and communist wings respectively to rise to power in an attempt to spread their ideologies. For example, America supported South Korea in the Korean war of 1950-53. In the Chinese war of 1949,

America supported Chiang Kaishek while Russia supported Mao-Tse-Tung. Such support and counter support by America and Russia was also evident in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Vietnam, coups in third world countries and Arab-Israel conflict, which were very destructive military adventures.

9. International terrorism

The cold war led to international conflicts and terrorism sponsored by the two antagonistic camps. The two super powers used suicide bombers, high jacking of planes and ships, kidnapping and assassinations to eliminate their real and potential enemies. These were common in the Middle East, Balkans, Kashmir and Africa. It was under these circumstances that Samora Michael and Indira Gandhi were assassinated.

10. Arms race

The possibility of cold war graduating to hot war led to the resurrection of arms race. Russia went back to her five-year plan of heavy industry and armaments. USA and the west reacted by speeding the manufacture of nuclear weapons. There was also increased scientific research in military hardware, nuclear science and rearmament in Europe. These led to the production of weapons of mass destructions such as atomic, biological and nuclear weapons in preparation for actual war with the rival camp. These weapons became a constant threat to world peace and stability. On the other hand, the threat of such weapons of mass destruction has led to SALT talks and nuclear test ban treaties between the west and eastern block states.

11, Alliance system

Tension caused by the cold war led to the revival of alliance system after the Second World War. USA formed NATO in 1949 as a defensive tool against communism and its threats to the west. USSR reacted by forming War-saw pact in .1955 as a counter measure to NATO and the threat of capitalism from western powers. There were also economic organisations like EEC, OEEC, SEATO, Arab league etc. These were based on either communist or capitalist political ideologies. These alliances created fear, suspicion and antagonism that hindered cooperation amongst European powers.

12. Formation of secret international spy network and organisations

The cold war led to the formation of secret spy network and organisations that were used to leak out military secrets and technology between the

two antagonistic camps. USA used the CIA and FBI, USSR used the KGB and Cominform or Communist Information Bureau and Israel used MOSSAD.

These organisations and spy networks played a significant role not only in the American/Russian affairs but the whole world.

13. Weakness of the United Nations Organisation (UNO)

The cold war weakened the UNO and was partly responsible for its failures by 1970. UNO was formed to create and maintain world peace and unity amongst others. This was made impossible because USA and USSR who were the key players in the cold war hijacked the role of UNO and divided the world into two conflicting camps. Ideological difference between USA and USSR hindered the success of the Security Council since America and Russia were permanent members of the Security Council. They used their veto powers to further or promote their political ideologies.

14. Dictatorship

The survival of dictatorship in Africa and elsewhere was partly due to support from either the communist or capitalist blocks. This was done as long as these ideologies were implemented. For instance, USA supported apartheid regime in S. Africa because it was a symbol of capitalism. Russia supported Fidel Castro in Cuba because of his pro-communist policies.

NB Other dictators in Africa amongst others; Mobutu Sese Seko of Congo, General Idi Amin of

Uganda and Kamuzu Banda of Malawi survived because of support from either the communist or capitalist states one at a time. This led to the survival of dictators with their exploitative and oppressive regimes.

It should be noted that huge chunks of money was wasted in arms race, intelligence networks, support of dictators and funding rebellions in different parts of the world during the cold war. It is estimated that the amount of money squandered during the cold war could finance the budgets of developing nations for more than one financial year.

15. Partition of Germany

The cold war led to the division of Germany and the Berlin blockade of 1948-1949. During the Second World War, different parts of Germany were occupied by Russia, USA, Britain and France. Germany was partitioned by the four powers into four zones of occupation. However, the cold war tensions made three zones/ areas of occupation to form western Germany.

This left East Germany under Russian control. West Germany had a capitalist political ideology and East Germany had a communist form of Government.

NB. In 1948, the western powers introduced currency reforms in West Germany. This forced Russia to blockade the city of Berlin by closing all its entrance and building the Berlin wall. The western powers reacted by air lifting the necessary food supply to western Germany from June 1948 to September 1949. Thus, one can argue that the cold war made Germany to be partitioned and turned into a theatre of conflict between the eastern and western block states.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

Background

The U.N.O. is a new global/international organisation that was formed by allied powers to replace the League of Nations, whose weaknesses had made great contributions to the outbreak of World War II. The general idea of the UNO was formulated at the Dumbarton Oaks conference (USA) by Britain, USA, Russia and China on Oct 1944. The 1st draft of the UN charter was later signed by 51 nations on April 1945 at San Francisco conference (USA). Thereafter UNO was officially declared on Oct 1945 at its headquarter in New York. The UN was created with six organs to implement its aims and objectives i.e. the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat.

NB: The UN has original members and new members who can be admitted by some criteria. The membership is open to all peace-loving states who accept the rules contained in the charter and who in the judgment of the organisation are willing and able to execute their obligations. The Security Council plays the most significant role in admitting or refusing admission of any state. Membership of a state can be suspended on the recommendation of the Security Council and a state can be outlawed by the general assembly.

Attachments



i) The General Assembly

The General Assembly is composed of representatives from all members of the UN, who has one vote each. It meets once a year in September but special sessions can be called in times of crisis by the members themselves or by the Security Council. The General Assembly has powers to discuss, review, supervise and criticise the activities of other organs of the U.N.O. The General assembly also has powers to admit, suspend or expel any member. Decisions on issues of major importance require a two third majority but minor issues could be resolved by a simple majority.

ii)The Security Council

The Security Council meets more often than the General Assembly. It was created with 11 members of the UN out of which five are permanent members i.e. Britain, USA, Russia, France and China. In 1965 its membership was increased to 15 with the same 5 permanent members. Each member of the Security Council has one vote and every permanent member of the council has the right to veto the decision of the General Assembly. Resolutions require 9 of the 15 members that must include the 5 permanent members. The primary duty of the Security Council is to maintain World peace and Security. It has to submit annual or special reports to the General Assembly.

iii)The Economic and Social Council

The economic and social council comprises of 27 members who are elected for three years by the General Assembly. Its main function is to make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and other socio-economic problems. The Council executes responsibilities assigned to it by the General Assembly and those requested by member states. It also supervises and co-ordinates other commissions and specialised agencies like WHO, ILO, FAG, UNICEF, UNESCO, IMF etc. (about 30 in all).

iv)The Trusteeship Council

This is an improvement of the mandate commission of the League of Nations. Its members were elected by the General Assembly. It was to look after the mandated territories of the defunct League of Nations in order to ensure fair treatment by the mandated states. The states in question were 11 in total. They were territories taken from Germany and her allies after World War I and those grabbed from Italy and Japan in 1945. The trusteeship council visited the territories under the trusteeship system to assess how they were being administered. The Council could send questionnaires to states concerned with the aim of getting information regarding the political, economic and social developments of the mandated territories. The major aim of the council was to prepare the territories for either self-rule or union with other existing states.

v) The International Court of Justice

The International Court of Justice is an improvement of the permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations. It is based at the Hague with 15 judges of different nationalities, elected for a three year term by the General Assembly and Security Council jointly. The court caters for legal matters especially cases between two or more states. It also advises the other organs on legal issues.

vi) The Secretariat

The Secretariat is the administrative organ of the UN. The Secretary General is the Chief Administrative Officer of the Secretariat. He or she is appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council for a 5 year term. The Secretary General is assisted by a large number of subordinates who have to scrutinize the various roles of the UNO. The Secretariat is based at New York as its headquarters. The Secretary General in accordance to the UN charter brings issues to be discussed before the council and makes annual report about the performance of the Secretariat. The bill for maintaining the Secretariat is paid by all member states of the UN. However, USA makes the biggest contribution in comparison to other members of the UN.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WHY U.N.O WAS FORMED

1. The Primary concern of the U.N.O was to create and maintain law, order and peace. The outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 was a perfect proof that the League of Nations was incompetent in maintaining world peace. There was therefore need for a stronger international organisation that would bring the world together and maintain peace. This gave rise to the UNO.

2. The need to stop aggression was an issue behind the formation of UNO. This was because Kaiser William II and Hitler's aggression were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First and Second World wars respectively. The wars were the worst experiences that mankind had ever faced. The UN was therefore formed to protect weaker nations who are vulnerable to aggression from powerful states in order to avoid yet another destructive war.

3. The desire to bring to justice those who committed crimes against humanity was also responsible for the formation of UNO by 1945. These included the Nazi and fascists who conducted mass killings of the Jews, communists and other innocent civilians during the Second World War. These were serious crimes that could not be handled by the domestic laws of the different states. The UN was therefore formed to carry out a series of trials through military tribunals like the Nuremburg tribunal and to punish those found guilty.

4. The UNO was to enforce disarmament and stop arms race that was responsible for the outbreak of the two world wars. Besides previous weapons like poisonous gas, long range artilleries, missiles and war planes, there was also atomic bomb that was made and used by US on Japan. These weapons of Mass destruction were a great threat to the survival of human race. The Security Council was to create awareness of the danger of weapons of mass destruction and enforce measures to stop the manufacture, proliferation and use of such weapons.

5. The UNO was formed to facilitate decolonisation and democratisation of those nationalities who were dominated and oppressed. Colonialism and dictatorship had outlived their usefulness and there was a desire for independence and democracy especially in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The UN through the trusteeship council was to ensure a peaceful transformation from colonialism and dictatorship to independence and

democracy. This was because nationalism had been a source of tension that was partly responsible for the outbreak of the two World Wars.

6. The UNO was also formed to check on threats to the environment which was potentially dangerous to mankind. Weapons of mass destruction especially atomic bombs used in World War II had destroyed the world habitat flora and fauna. In addition testing of dangerous weapons like chemical weapons on deserts and water was causing a serious environmental hazard to mankind. All these explain why efforts were made to establish the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP). It was to control pollution, desertification and improve on the rural and urban settlements amongst others.

7. The UNO was also concerned with the need to eliminate the problem of human and drug trafficking. By 1945, the war atmosphere had made human trafficking and consumption of intoxicating drugs to flourish. The sales and consumption of opium and marijuana were on a scaring level to peace and security. These drugs were causing social unrests, making people to run crazy, idle and disorderly in the society. There was therefore need for an international organisation to handle such global threats to mankind hence the formation of UNO.

8. The UNO was also founded to rehabilitate and resettle prisoners of war and displaced persons who were made homeless by the Second World War. Besides, oppressive, tyrannical and despotic governments had forced several people to flee to neighboring states for fear of persecution. The prisoners of war, Internally Displaced Persons and refugees were faced with the challenges of psychological problems and a acute need for humanitarian assistance or lack of basic necessities.

The UNO through the UNRWA (United Nations Relief Works Agency) and UNHCHR were to provide food, water, shelter, medical care and psychological treatment to prisoners of war, displaced persons and refugees in the World.

9. The UNO came with the need to improve economic co-operation and status of the World. World economies were shuttered by the destructions caused by the Second World War. It was to mobilise funds to help weaker and poor states to reconstruct and strengthen their economic positions. Trade

6. Similarly, children's rights and welfare were promoted and protected by UNO.' Children's rights were officially declared in 1959 and it was

promulgated to the whole world through various sensitisation programs. The rights declared included the right to education, parenthood, name, nationality, play, leisure etc. UNICEF funded children's education most especially funding the girl child education and welfare in many countries of the world. All these, reduced the abuse of children's rights and other related injustices against children.

7. UNO reduced the sales and consumption of intoxicated drugs like opium and marijuana. This was achieved by sensitizing people through seminars and mass media such as radio, TV, magazines etc. about the dangers of such drugs and drug abuse generally. The anti-drug commission declared the above drugs illegal and those who handled them were to be severely punished in respective countries. These measures checked on the production, transportation, sales and consumption of such drugs. Eventually, the rate of crimes committed by consumers of such drugs was significantly reduced by 1970.

8. Environmental threats were successfully checked and reduced by the UNO. By 1970, the UN had embarked on a global sensitisation program to control pollution, desertification and improve on rural and urban settlement patterns. Bio diversity program with emphasis on afforestation and reforestation programs alongside utilisation of world forest were promoted. These were accomplished through the mass media, workshops and seminars. These programs helped to conserve the environment against threats like pollution and desertification.

9. Decolonization and democratization was achieved by the U.N.O through the Trusteeship council.

The council was able to oversee the administration of the mandate states and provide guidance towards the granting of independence. The council was able to guard against exploitation and oppression of the colonies by those powers mandated to govern them. This facilitated independence of Countries like Libya, Somali land, Namibia, Indonesia, Kuwait, Israel and

Palestine. The U.N.O was also influential in promoting democratic governance in the post independent era of such countries. This helped the colonised states to recover easily from the long term consequences of colonial oppression and exploitation.

10. U.N.O scored success in the reduction of cultural intolerance and racial segregation. It achieved this through joint research and cultural exchanges. By 1970, UNESCO had offices in all the member states where

people were sensitised about the value of other cultures. UNO also decampaigned Apartheid in South Africa and anti-semitism in Europe. In 1970, the Economic and social council organised a global youth conference in which the challenges facing the youth were discussed. This promoted international co-operation and tolerance amongst people of diverse cultural background.

11. As far as world peace is concerned, the U.N through the Security Council registered some achievements. It diffused many conflicts and tensions that could have led to the outbreak of the third world war. The Berlin blockade by Russia in 1948 was lifted through the intervention of the President of the Security Council from 1950-53, it dealt with conflict between North Korea and

South Korea where a truce was signed in July 1953 and hostilities ended. In 1960, the council settled the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. The Suez Canal crisis was also peacefully resolved in 1956 when the General Assembly compelled France, Britain and Israel to withdraw their offensive weapons from Egypt. A number of other political conflicts were also successfully resolved by the International Court of Justice. Thus, the role of the UN through the

Security Council and General Assembly was very instrumental in the preservation and maintenance of global peace, security and stability.

12. Disarmament was one of the most remarkable contributions of UNO towards world peace. In 1946, the Security Council set up the atomic energy commission to control the production of atomic energy and weapons. In 1963 and 1969, the council presided over the signing of test ban treaties that banned the -production and use of weapons of mass destruction such as chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. The Security Council also initiated SALT I (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) in 1948 and SALTII in 1956 through which nations cooperated to limit the amount of long range missiles and bombers in their possession. Although the UN partially failed in disarmament, it succeeded in reducing the production of such weapons and frustrating attempt by countries like USA who possessed such weapons from using them.

13. The establishment of the Jewish state of Israel in 1948 was an achievement for UNO. The congress system had granted the Jews citizenship in various states where they had fled due to persecution.

However during the course of World War II, the Jews were again persecuted and massacred by the Nazis, Fascists and Arabs. After World War II, a serious dispute and often wars arose between the Jews and the Arabs. In 1947, the conflict was brought to the UN Security Council, which did a series of investigations. In 1948, the council created the Jewish state of Israel out of the Arab state of Palestine. This was a positive step in the protection of minorities and displaced persons from homelessness, persecution and massacre.

14. Increased membership since its inception in 1945 is a testimony of UN's success. In 1945 when UNO was formed, only 51 states signed the charter and became members. However, UNO's popularity tremendously increased due to numerous achievements it registered to the extent that its membership grew to over 100 by 1970. This brought more states together and increased the level of cooperation that maintained global peace, law, order and stability.

15. Lastly, UNO addressed the issue of justice and accountability for international crimes committed during the Second World War. The International Court of Justice based at Hague was one of the organs of UNO created to handle legal issues related to war crimes and compensation. Nazi war criminals such as Goebbels who was Hitler's chief of propaganda and Himmler Heinrich were tried at the Nuremberg tribunal although they committed suicide. Several other Nazis, Fascists, Japanese, Italians etc. who persecuted the Jews and committed other crimes were also tried and punished accordingly. Other than war crimes, the court also resolved several disputes that involved member states by 1970. This laid a sound and vibrant foundation for justice, accountability and peaceful resolution of disputes in Europe.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

WEAKNESSES AND FAILURES OF THE UNO

The loans and grants from IMF and world bank had some negative consequences on the development of the third world countries they had strings attached that promoted political ideologies of the western capitalistic powers sometimes the third world countries were forced to

invest in non-priority areas on the directive of the lending body i.e. IMF or world bank besides it accelerated unemployment because of the so called experts who were sent and paid very highly to monitor the aids or projects worst of all the loans were lent at very high interest rates and that is why poor countries who depended on such loans became poorer by 1970.

2. Although the UNO reduced drug trafficking, it failed to eliminate it completely. This was because the UNO did not have an effective and competent force to control drug trafficking on land, air and the sea. Thus, the sales and consumption of cocaine, opium and marijuana continued to the extent that it became an acceptable way of life amongst many societies in the middle east. This promoted anti-social behaviours and crimes like murder, defilement, suicide bombing etc. These undermined peace, stability and prosperity in Europe by 1970.

3. The decolonisation and democratization programs were incomplete by 1970. The UNO did not have a clear policy for granting independence to the colonised nations. The independence especially of African nations was mainly due to the efforts of the oppressed and exploited Africans other than the UN. Moreover, America and other Western capitalists were against decolonisation.

This is because imperialism is the highest form of capitalism and that is why USA supported apartheid, which explains why South Africa, Angola and Mozambique were still colonised by

1970. The rise and existence of autocratic and undemocratic leaders like Fidel Castro in Cuba,

Kamuzu Banda in Malawi and Mobutu Sese Seko in Congo demonstrate the failure of the democratisation program of the UN. This was because some members of the UNO especially USA and USSR supported such dictators as long as they were able to further their political ideology.

4. The rise and existence of neocolonialism and its associated evils in third world countries exposed the failure of UNO. After colonialism, European powers resorted to neocolonialism as an indirect means to control, exploit and oppress the third world countries. This was accomplished through imposing unfavourable foreign political ideologies like capitalism and communism, economic policies such as liberalisation and establishment of military bases e.g. USA in the Middle East and Africa by more developed nations in less developed countries. By 1970, these practices had led to underdevelopment of third world countries and subjected formerly

independent states to depend on their former colonial masters in a neo colonial relationship. The UNO is therefore blamed for keeping aloof as neocolonialism undermined the independence and democratisation process of nations.

5. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) of 1948 failed to totally achieve its objectives by 1970. It was not fully accepted in many states especially in Arab nations as a western concept designed to undermine traditional culture. For instance, provision for equality between man and woman was rejected as a ploy to destroy the family tradition that had sustained communities since nations were created. It did not also have laws to punish those who violated the rights stated in the declaration. The UDHR just presents a strong moral appeal and a common standard of rights to be achieved by all nations. This made many governments and dictators to easily violate human rights with impunity (without punishment) as there is no legal provision for punishment in the UDHR.

6. The promotion and protection of children's rights failed to succeed in some other ways. The UN emphasised the rights of children without the corresponding duties that made many nations who believed in children working for their families to ignore it. The UN did not also provide a law to punish those who violated children's rights by 1970, thereby making it easy for those who violate children's rights to do so with impunity. Worst of all, some rights of the children that were promoted by the UN contradicted cultural practices of some societies. For instance, the right to equality between girls and boys could not be accepted in many African and Arab states because the society valued boys more than girls. This explains why such societies continued to violate the right to education of the girl child more than boys through early marriage. Thus, UNO failed to fully achieve its objective of promoting children's rights by 1970.

7. In the field of politics and peace, the UN failed more than it succeeded. This was due to the inherent weakness of the UN itself. For instance, the veto powers of the five permanent members of the Security Council made it impossible to resolve and implement several problems and policies respectively. For example, Russia invaded Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1958 respectively and vetoed the Security Council's resolution to withdraw her troops on both occasions. This means that the veto powers of the five permanent members gave them a "license" to wage aggression and block any UN resolution against them.

8. The UN failed to stop cold war politics and its associated tension in Europe. During the cold war, western countries led by USA and the eastern countries led by USSR embarked on sabotage, propaganda, and diplomatic aggression in a bid to promote antagonistic ideologies of capitalism and communism. In this period, the role of the UN was hijacked by USA and USSR to perpetuate their conflicting political ideologies. Disputes were settled by either USA or USSR yet the UN ever if not rarely condemned America or Soviet Union for ignoring the UN as a peace making body.

9. Germany remained divided between the West and East in spite of the existence of UNO. Before 1945, Germany was a united nation with a strong economy and a high spirit of nationalism.

However, cold war politics made Germany to be partitioned into two i.e. west Germany with the ideology of capitalism and East Germany with communism. In 1948, the Berlin wall was created to completely separate West Germany from East Germany. Although the blockade was lifted in 1949 through the intervention of the UN Security Council, Germany nevertheless remained a divided country between the West and East. This was associated with diplomatic aggression, sabotage and hostility perpetuated by USA and USSR on the background. UNO should therefore be discredited for its negligence that made Germany to be torn apart during the cold war era.

10. The UN failed to fully wipe out cultural intolerance and racism. Though the UN embarked on global sensitisation campaign against racism and cultural intolerance through UNESCO, the campaign was not fully successful by 1970. People still remained intolerant and failed to live in harmony with those from diverse cultural background. For instance, Arabs and Jews, Europeans and Africans; often failed to live in harmony and that was why they fought each other on racial basis. Apartheid in S Africa where Africans were systematically segregated by the whites was the worst form of racism that the UNO failed to address. The fact that Apartheid and other cultural arrogance cited above still existed by 1970 illustrates the failure of UNO.

11. The UN'S policies on disarmament, weapons of mass destruction and space exploration were great failures. By 1945, it was only America with Atomic bomb but nearly all the super powers had such weapons of mass destruction by 1970. Even third world countries like India, Pakistan, North Korea and Iraq possessed such weapons. Even when the testing of such

weapons was outlawed (prevented) by the UN, America and Russia persisted to do so. The UN and America practiced double standard of frustrating smaller nations from acquiring weapons of mass destruction while the great permanent members of the UN continued to maintain and manufacture such weapons.

There was also the misuse of space for exploration by 1970. All these violated atomic energy commission terms of 1946, SALT talks and test ban treaties, whose primary objective was to ensure effective disarmament without weapons of mass destruction and space exploration.

12. Politically and militarily, the UN registered more failures as an instrument of peace by 1970. The Iraq-Iran war persisted for 8 years without any concrete settlement by the UN. It also failed in the Chinese war of 1953 where America openly supported Chiang Keiserk and Russia supported Maotse-tung. In the Vietnam war of 1967-73, USA Intervened and perpetuated the conflict and the UNO did nothing against USA.

The UN totally failed in the Arab-Israeli conflict since it was formed up to 1970. From 1948 when the state of Israel was created, the Israelites and Arabs conflicted over the disputed territories in areas like the Gaza strip and Jerusalem city. Tension boiled to war point when Israel on her own terms declared Jerusalem her city. An Ineffective economic sanction was imposed on Israel, which never compelled her to change her position on Jerusalem. This led to suicide bombings, violence and counter violence that led to massive death and destruction of property. The UN proved incompetent of resolving the conflict, which made it to remain one of the most serious conflicts in the world by 1970.

The UN failed in the Korean war of 1950-53 because of the double standard policy of USA and USSR who are permanent members of the Security Council. In the war, USSR supported North Korea while USA backed South Korea, which rendered UN's policy of uniting North Korea and South Korea a total failure.

The UN's diplomatic and military intervention in the Congo crisis of 1960s failed to yield peace.

In 1960, Belgium prematurely granted Congo independence leaving behind intertribal war that the UN failed to settle. It was a shame to UN that Congolese Prime minister, Patrice Lumumba and UN Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold lost their lives during the crisis in Congo. The UN is blamed for failure to restore law and order in Congo that was taken

advantage of by Mobuto SeseSeko, the then Congolese army commander to rise to power (1966) and establish a classic despotic government in Congo. Above all, the UN intervention in Congo was condemned by Russia as a USA's guise to extend her imperialism. Worst of all, the Congo venture was too expensive that it almost brought the UN into financial crisis, given that Russia and other states declined to pay their share of the cost

13. Lastly, the UN failed to totally eradicate terrorism in the world. By 1970, the world experienced rampant assassinations, hijack of planes, planting of time bombs and suicide bombings especially in Asia and the Middle East. The most disastrous ones occurred in the Middle East between the Palestinians and Israelis over the disputed Gaza strip and Jerusalem city. Terrorism was also perpetuated by USA and USSR to enforce their rival political ideologies of capitalism and communism respectively. It was ironical that USA and USSR who are permanent members of the Security Council could resort to terrorism without being restrained by the UNO.

NB 1: The UN has failed to bring to Justice the al-shabab who are the mastermind of world terrorism.

2 Over reliance on sanctions other than military intervention is a fundamental weakness of the UN.

It was only successful in Rhodesia where a trade embargo was declared but failed in South Africa, Israel and Portugal.

There is no doubt that the UNO largely failed to maintain world peace but one should note that the issue of world peace has always been a complex and complicated issue for any international organisation. This is because every state whether big or small is determined to do all that it can to promote its own interest, regardless of the interest of other states or mankind as a whole. In an atmosphere where there is violence all over the world and each state is spending huge chunks of money on arms and defense, peace in the world will remain a dream, which no international organisation can achieve. All that can be done is to reduce the prevailing tension and conflicts in the world, which the UN has undoubtedly played its role.

However, the role of UNO in maintaining world peace was supplemented by the contributions of other regional and continental organisations in different parts of the world. This was done by O.A.U that settled several disputes and conflicts in Africa and hence preserved peace in Africa.

The South African Development Co-operation (S.A.D.C) also maintained peace and settled conflicts peacefully amongst the states of Southern

Africa, the E.A.C. did the same in East Africa before its collapse, the NATO and the Warsaw Pact also maintained peace, harmony and Unity between the western and eastern countries respectively.

ECOWAS and EEC brought Economic integration and co-operation amongst the West African and European nations respectively. These climaxed into political co-operation and hence ushered peace amongst the West African and European nations. One can therefore argue that by bringing peace and co-operation within their areas of influence, such organisations played a supplementary and complementary role to the UN in maintaining world peace.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Abdicate: To relinquish/surrender one's ruling position or power.

Abolish: Official end of a law, system or practice.

Abrogate: To end/formally revoke an agreement, treaty or constitution.

Absolutism: Complete/totalitarian system of rule where the ruler is unquestionable and unchecked e.g. by Parliament, judiciary or executive.

Account for: To explain or give reasons for an event, e.g. outbreak of a war or revolution.

Aggression: Angry and threatening behaviour, spoken or physical actions that causes harm to a person, group of persons, country/declaration of war.

Aggressor: A person or country that is the first to declare war/attacks.

Alliance: An agreement where each member state party promises to help one another e.g. when attacked by none member states.

Allies: An alliance of nations joining together to fight a common enemy, e.g. Britain, France, Russia plus others against Germany and her supporters in the first and second world wars.

Ambassador: A very important person (VIP) who is sent to represent his nation in a foreign country and he or she is officially recognized by the host country.

Amnesty: An act of forgiving political opponents or those who violated the law.

Analysis: A detailed study or investigation where the key issues are identified described and objectively evaluated.

Anarchism: From Greek word 'Anarchia', which means non-rule. A radical political view that a society would be better without law, government or leadership.

Anarchy: Total breakdown of law and order in a society due to failure by government or leadership.

Anschluss: The union of Austria and Germany in March 1938.

Anti-clericalism: Social/political view based on hostility to the Catholic Church, and especially to the power and privileges of the clergy.

Anti-commintern pact: Agreement signed between Germany and Japan (Nov 1936), which asserted both countries' hatred to international communism (Italy signed in 1937).

Anti-Semitism: Anti-Jewish feelings due to either religious or racial difference or both, used by Hitler and Mussolini to persecute the Jews.

Apartheid: A South African policy of complete legal separation of the races, including banning of all social contacts between blacks and whites.

Appeasement: The name given to the policy of attempting to avoid war through concession, conciliation/peaceful settlement of conflicts. Associated with Anglo-French policy towards axis powers in the inter war period.

Arbitrary: Not based on any reason or pre-determined plan, subject to individual discretion or

Preference e.g. arbitrary imprisonment or detention.

Arbitration: Peaceful/diplomatic settlement of conflicts by appointing a neutral person to mediate and reconcile the conflicting parties, persons or countries.

Aristocracy: A privileged class with hereditary claims and entitlements (based on birth) in a stratified/classified society e.g. Nobles or any privileged group.

Assess: To make a critical evaluation with a view of passing judgement about something. Due consideration should be given to strength and weaknesses, positive and negative implications or changes that should clearly be separated. The role of other factors, personalities and countries should also be analysed. A clear and consistent stand point should be given.

Asylum: Protection/safeguards given by a government or any authority to persons who flee their country for political persecution.

Autocratic: A system of rule that is dictatorial and absolute e.g. Ancient regime in France and Tsarist regime in Russia.

Autonomy: Refers to self-government or independence i.e. personal and political independence.

Axis: A term first used by Mussolini in Nov 1936 to describe Italy's alliance with Germany. Germany,

Italy and Japan formed an alliance that led to the term "axis powers" being used to describe the alliance, which also included their other allies in Eastern Europe

Balance of power: A political equilibrium in which no one nation is powerful enough to pose a threat to others.

Balkans: A large Peninsular in South Eastern Europe surrounded by the Adriatic, Ionian, Aegean and the Black Sea. The region is now occupied by Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, the European part of Turkey and the former republic of Yugoslavia.

Belligerent: War like. Person or nation eager to fight or engaged in war.

Bloc: A group of countries in special alliance linked together by common interest.

Blockade: A war strategy where a place or state soldiers, ships, armed men are used to prevent people and commodities from entering or leaving a city or region.

Bolsheviks: Majority or radical faction group in Russia, which was formed in 1903 by Lenin after the split of the Social Democratic Party. It was renamed

communist and thus became the communist party in the aftermath of the revolution of 1917.

Bonapartism: A political pressure group in France, which sprung up after 1815 based on the promises of some members of Napoleon's family to revive his glory in France and Europe. It favoured the preservation of moderate gains of the French revolution but resisted the danger of more radical social reconstruction.

Boomerang: A plan, agreement, move etc. that backfires with negative consequences on its author.

Bourgeoisie: The social class in between the lower and upper classes, The middle class e.g. Doctors, Journalists, Teachers etc. They own property, means of production and distribution.

Buffer: A neutral zone or place created between two or more rival powers to prevent a clash/confrontation.

Capitalism: 1 an economic and social system based on the right of private individuals to own and control the means of production and distribution of goods.

2) An economic system in which social/political influence lies primarily in the hands of a social class that controls the means of production and distribution.

Central powers: Countries that fought on the same side with Germany in the First World War,

Chancellor: A high ranking person especially in a state or institution of higher learning.

Charter: A written legally binding document that establishes an Institution or organisation and specifying rights; includes the articles of incorporation and the certificate of incorporation.

Class struggle: A politically motivated conflict between different social and economic groupings, such as between the workers and employers or peasants and land owners.

Coalition: A group of two or more people, governments or parties that merge and work together for a common purpose.

Colonialism: Establishment of a rule by a stronger country over a weaker one with a primary motive of exploitation; the use of the weaker country's resources to strengthen and enrich the stronger country.

COMECON: Council for Mutual Economic Co-operation Initiated by Molotov to counter balance the Marshall Aid plan during the cold war era.

Comment: To express your opinion or feelings towards something.

Cominform: Communist Information Bureau, A spy network system used by USSR During the cold war.

Communism: An economic and social system based on collective ownership of the means of production and distribution of goods. It's a political theory developed by Hegel, which establishes a classless society where resources e.g. land, roads, industries etc. are communally owned by the people under the custody of the state.

Compare: To consider events, people issues etc. in order to bring out similarity.

Concert of Europe: The spirit of togetherness in resolving conflicts that developed in Europe after the downfall of Napoleon I.

Concession: An agreement by a person, country, groups of countries in order to avoid a problem, i.e. to concede or yield to something or demand.

Conclusion: A generalized opinion, idea, position or judgment about the whole essay after a lot of considerations.

Concordat: Assigned written agreement between the state and the Roman Catholic Church e.g. France and the Pope (1801), Italy and the Pope (1929).

Confederation: A group of independent states that are politically united.

Congress system: A network of diplomatic meetings and co-operation that were held in Europe from 1818-1825. The idea came from the second Paris peace meeting of 20th Nov 1815.

Conscription: Compulsory military service, started by the French revolutionaries.

Conservatism: Belief that the existing benefits and institutions should be preserved rather than be endangered by untried innovations and controversial reforms i.e. spirit of resistance to changes.

Consolidation: To strengthen or make something firmer e.g. power.

Conspiracy: A secret plan or plot to carry out some harmful or illegal act (especially apolitical plot).

Constitutional monarchy: Monarchy where the King's power is limited by the provisions of the constitution and the role of the Parliament.

Continental system: Napoleon's policy of frustrating British trade in Europe with intentions to destroy Britain's economy.

Contrast: The act of distinguishing by comparing differences e.g. differences between concepts, events, countries etc.

Convention: An international agreement that specifies procedures, rights, duties etc. It may also mean a large formal assembly/meeting or government e.g. national convention government in France, 1792-1795.

Coup or Coup d' etat: A sudden, illegal and more often violent change of Government by those holding some political or military power.

Decree: An official order made by government, head of state/Kingdom.

Define: To give a concise, clear and authentic meaning of e.g. a word (without details).

Demagogue: A political leader who seeks support by appealing to popular passions and prejudices or exciting people's feelings and emotions e.g. Hitler.

Democracy: A political system in which the supreme power lies in a body of citizens who freely elect their representatives, i.e. Government by the people. It also means the doctrine that the numerical majority of an organized group can make decisions binding on the whole group i.e. will of the majority over the minority.

Describe: To give an account in a chronological order of e.g. an event in words.

Despotism: A form of rule/government in which the ruler is an absolute dictator (not restricted by a constitution or laws or opposition etc.). It also implies dominance of people through threat of punishment and violence.

Depose: Force some body to leave or remove (especially) a leader from power.

Diet: A historical term used to refer to the legislative assembly/parliament in some countries e.g. Japan Prussia.

Diplomatic maneuver: Use of diplomacy to gain an advantage or tactical results. Also means a coordinated action aimed at evading an opponent.

Discuss: To analyse, examine and consider an issue critically, giving reasons, advantages/positives and disadvantages/negatives.

Disenfranchise: To deprive/remove the right to vote.

Divine right: The doctrine/idea that Monarchs/Kings derive their right to rule directly from God and are not accountable to their subjects. They are considered to be God's representatives on earth and thus answerable only to God

Doctrine: A system of beliefs that is taught and accepted as authoritative, e.g. by a church, school or political party.

Dreadnaughts: A type of battleship of the early 20th century equipped with big guns, all of the same caliber. Named after a British called HMS Dreadnaught.

Duke: A high ranking nobleman.

Duma: A semi-constitutional legislative assembly/parliament that existed in Russia and some other republics in the former USSR from 1905-1917.

Dynasty: A sequence of powerful rulers who are from the same family origin.

Edict: A formal or authoritative proclamation of a law e.g. edict of fraternity in France by 1793.

Egalitarianism: The doctrine of the equality of mankind and the desirability of political, economic and social equality.

Empire: A group of countries/states that is ruled by one country/state under the leadership of an emperor or empress. Also refers to a monarchy with an emperor/empress as head of state.

Emigres: People who leave their country for political reasons e.g. exiled nobles and clergy who fled France due to revolutionary changes of 1789-1799.

Entente: An alliance or agreement between countries that is not too formal, originated from French entente cordiale 'Friendly understanding.'

Espionage: The systematic use of spies to get military or political secrets e.g. Metternich era.

Estate: One of the three major social groups who possess distinct political rights and are part of the body politic of France before the French revolution of 1789. The First estate comprised of the Clergy, the second; the

nobility and the third was for the rest of the population i.e. peasants and middle class.

Estates general: Historical term used to describe assembly/parliament of representatives of the three estates in France.

Examine: To study or consider in details and subject to an analysis in order to discover essential features or meaning.

Explain: Clarify or interpret the points you present by giving a detailed description or reason or justification for.

Extremism: Ideas and practices that that favours very strong (often violent) actions.

Fascism: A political philosophy that advocates for an authoritarian hierarchical government (as opposed to democracy or liberalism), militarism and glorification of the executive power vested on one dominant leader. It also refers to an Italian nationalist, authoritarian and anti-communist state of 1922-1943.

Federation: The act of making a political unity out of a number of separate states or colonies or provinces so that each member retains the management of its internal affairs.

Feudalism: The social-economic system that developed in Europe in the 8th century; where land was granted by the King (monarchy) and the masses (peasants) lived as serfs.

Franchise: The right to vote in a democratic election.

Fraternity: The spirit of brotherhood, friendship and support amongst people of the same group, i.e. people with similar interest or those engaged in a particular occupation e.g. the legal or medical fraternity.

Fuhrer: German word that means 'leader', used by Hitler as the German leader.

Gold standard: A monetary system in which the basic unit of currency was defined/determined by a stated quantity of gold 2) Currency system where money was exchangeable for a fixed amount/weight of Gold.

Guerilla: A member of an irregular armed force that fights a stronger force by sabotage and harassment or a form of warfare conducted by small, mobile troops against a regular army.

Guillotine: A machine with a weighted blade mounted between two vertical poles; used by Frenchmen for beheading criminals most especially during the French revolution of 1789.

Hundred Days: A brief period from March to June 1815 during which Napoleon I deposed King Louis XVI and ruled France i.e. after the first exile in Elba.

Ideology: An orientation or set of attitude and beliefs that characterize the thinking of a group or nation also refers to an imaginary or visionary theorization of issues, challenges or beliefs.

Imperialism: 1 A political situation where a powerful country/nation extends its rule/control over other countries/nations that are not as powerful as herself.

2 A political orientation or belief in creating an empire or aggressive extension of authority by a state or country.

3) The practice by a country of acquiring economic and political power over other territories, usually with an ambition of commercial or industrial expansion.

Indemnity: Payment for compensation for loss or injury e.g. war indemnity. It can also refer to legal exemption from liability for damages caused.

Infallible: Incapable of making a mistake, error or failing e.g. The papal infallibility.

Interim: Temporary, not final or lasting until somebody or some more lasting solution is found e.g. interim government.

Iron Curtain: An impenetrable barrier to communication or information especially as imposed by rigid censorship and secrecy; used by Winston Churchill in 1946 to describe the boundary/demarcation between democratic and communist countries or border between Russian controlled communist countries and the American influenced capitalist nations.

Isolationism: The policy of withdrawing from international politics or military engagement, Also implies or commitments e.g. Britain's policy after the downfall of Napoleon I and USA's policy in the inter war period.

Jingoism: Fanatical patriotism or an appeal intended to arouse patriotic emotions/feelings, it also refers to radical belief that one's own country is always the best.

Junker: Hereditary Prussian aristocrat who dominated the army and civil service.

Junta: A group of military officers who rule a country by force after seizing power

Justify: Defend, explain, clear away, or make excuses for by giving good reasons for an event or statement.

Laissez Faire: The doctrine/belief that government should not interfere in trade/ economic activities. Implies absence of government action through subsidies, customs duties and regulative laws.

League: An association of states or organizations or individuals that come together for a common action or purpose.

Legislative council: A law making body or parliament.

Legislature: Persons who make or amend or repeal laws.

Legitimate: In accordance with recognized or accepted standards or principles or law i.e. based on known statements, events or conditions e.g. legitimate rulers.

Legitimist(s): A person or group of persons who advocates for the restoration or return to power of a legitimate king , ruler or dynasty basing on divine right to rule e.g. bourbon monarchynapartists after the downfall of Napoleon 1.

Liberal: Abroad minded person who values or advocates for progress, reform and the protection of peoples' freedoms and rights. It also means a person tolerant to change i.e. not conservative.

Liberalism: The act of granting/respecting people's freedom, views or opinions. It also means a Political orientation that favours social progress by reform and changing laws rather than by revolution.

Liberty: Freedom of choice- to think or feel or do what pleases someone or group of persons e.g. liberty to choose whatever occupation one wishes.

Mandate: Territory surrendered by Turkey or Germany after World War I and put under the administration of some other European power until they were able to stand by themselves. Also refers to an official order or authority to do something or a document that gives an official instruction or command.

Marxism: The economic and political theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels that hold that human actions and institutions are economically

determined and that class struggle is needed to create historical change from where capitalism will ultimately be superseded by communism. Initiated in 1848 and was later developed by Marxists as a basis for communism.

Mein Kampf: A book written by Hitler during his imprisonment from 1923 to 1924 where he highlighted his visions and goals for Germany.

Mensheviks: A Russian member of the liberal minority communist movement that advocated for gradual reforms and opposed the Bolsheviks before and during the Russian revolutions of 1917. They advocated for a more democratic leadership and better discipline.

Middle class: The social class between the lower and upper classes. Its composed of skilled workers, professionals, businessmen and wealthy farmers.

Militarism: A political orientation of a people or a government to maintain a strong military force and to be prepared to use it aggressively to defend or promote national interests

Monarch: A royal ruler of a country or head of state usually by hereditary right.

Monarchy: An autocratic rule led by a monarch who usually inherits the authority.

Monarchist(s): A person or group of persons who advocates for a monarchical system of rule.

Monroe doctrine: An American foreign policy/principle that opposed intervention in American affairs from outside powers. It was declared by USA President James Monroe in Dec 1823.

Nationalisation: Changing something from private to state ownership or control. It also implies action of forming or becoming a nation.

Nationalism: A passionate loyalty and aspiration of an individual or a group of individuals for freedom and independence against foreign interest or interference or domination.

National assembly: A French congress established by representatives of the third estates on June 17th 1789 to enact laws and reforms for the Frenchmen.

Nationality: The status of belonging to a particular nation by birth or naturalization or being a citizen of a country or nation. It also refers to people having common origins or traditions and often making a nation.

Nazism: A socialist philosophy characterized by racism, aggression, expansionism and coerced obedience to a strong and authoritarian leader e.g. Germany under Hitler.

Nihilism: A revolutionary doctrine that advocates for destruction of the existing system including all authorities and institutions. Developed in the 19th century and was more pronounced in the Bolsheviks revolutions of 1917.

Oath: Legal or formal promise to do something. It usually invokes a divine witness, regarding future acts or behaviour.

Oligarchy: A political system governed by a few people/small groups who undemocratically assume power i.e. self-imposed.

Ordinance: Official order or special law enacted by a government e.g. St Cloude ordinance of 1830 in France.

Orleanist: 1) A supporter of the Orleans branch of the Bourbons that was descended from a younger brother of King Louis XIV. 2) A French monarchist who support the claim to the throne of King Louis Philippe and his descendants.

Ottoman: The Turkish dynasty that ruled the Ottoman Empire from the 13th century up to its dissolution after World War I.

Outline: Describe briefly or give the main points and sub points or summary of something without minor details.

Pact: A written agreement/treaty between people, states, parties etc.

Pan Germanism: The political belief that all German speaking peoples should be brought together in one political unit.

Pan slavism: The belief that all Slav peoples should be brought together in one political unit under the protection of Russia.

Papal infallibility: The belief that the Pope, being the representative of God on earth, could not make mistakes in all matters of church doctrine and government.

Partition: The act of dividing up a country or colony or separation by the creation of a boundary that divides or keeps apart.

Patriot: A person who passionately loves and defends his or her country.

Patriotism: The spirit of devotion and love for a country and willingness to sacrifice for it, Associated with pride and loyalty based on past glory/achievements.

Plebiscite: A vote by all members of an electorate to determine public opinion on a question of national or public importance.

Pluralism: A political system that allows different political or religious groups to co-exist and share power in some instances. It also means a social organization in which diversity of racial or religious or ethnic or cultural groups is tolerated.

Proliferation: A growth or spread especially of deadly weapons to those who do not have them, e.g. nuclear weapons.

Proletariat: A social class comprising those who do manual labour or work for wages.

Propaganda: Information or statement that is often biased or misleading used to promote a political cause or point of view.

Protectionism: Economic policy where a country's industries are protected from foreign competition by imposing high taxes on imports.

Provisional government: A temporary government pending the establishment of a more stable and lasting one e.g. the Russian government after the overthrow of the Tsarist regime from March 1917 to Nov 1917.

Radical: Opinions or actions far beyond the accepted norm or standard, supports complete political or social reform.

Reactionary: Extremely conservative, an opponent of liberalism reforms or progress.

Red shirts: The followers of Giuseppe Garibaldi, one of the 19th century Italian unification leaders.

Referendum: A legislative or parliamentary act (single political question) which is referred for final approval to a popular vote by the electorate.

Reichstag: A historical term for imperial German parliament.

Reparation: Compensation from a defeated nation(s) to victorious power(s) for war damage or losses.

Republic: A state or political system in which power is held by the people and their elected representatives, and which has a president other than a monarch.

Revolution: A fundamental change in a society e.g. political, economic, and social changes or the overthrow of a government by those who are governed.

Revolutionaries: People involved in the process of bringing change in a society.

Romanticism: 1) An exciting and mysterious quality (as of a heroic time or adventure).

2) A late 18th century and early 19 century movement in art and thought, which focused on emotion and imagination rather than reason or rationality.

Sanctions: Penalties or forms of compulsion imposed by law on a state or an official order that restricts trade, cooperation etc. with a specific state in order to compel her to do something e.g. promotion and protection of human rights.

Satellite state: A nation which is (dependent upon another for economic support and political guidance or direction.

Secession: The act of separation or breaking away e.g. from an alliance or federation.

Serf: An agricultural labourer in the middle ages who was tied to working on a particular estate/land owned by a feudal lord.

Serfdom: An ancient form of servitude/slavery where a landowner physically owns peasants on his estates and has freedom to sell them at his will.

Socialism: A political and economic ideology or theory of social organization based on the belief that a country's wealth and resources i.e. Land, transport, natural resources and key industries should be collectively owned, controlled and shared equally by the community as a whole

Sovereign : A nation's ruler, King or queen usually by hereditary right.

Sovereignty: Royal authority; the dominion of a monarch or supreme power to govern.

Soviet: 1) of or relating to or characteristic of the former Soviet Union or its people. 2) Russian-council. Thus applied to communist system of

government based on representation of the people through a hierarchy of local councils.

State: 1) A nation or territory considered as an organized political community under one independent government or a community/area that is part of a federal republic. 2) The way something is with respect to its main characteristics i.e. main points in brief.

Statesman: A man who is a respected leader in national or international affairs.

Suffrage: The right to vote in political elections.

Summary: The main points or facts in a concise/condensed form, without details, illustrations, examples etc.

Super power: A strong and powerful state that influences events throughout the world.

Tennis court oath: A pledge made by the members of France's national assembly in 1789, in which they vowed to continue meeting until they enact a new constitution for France.

Terrorism: The calculated use of violence (or the threat of violence) against civilians in order to attain goals that are political or religious or ideological in nature; Its done through intimidation or coercion or instilling fear in the public.

Third Reich: The term used to describe Nazi dictatorship in Germany, 1933-45 ie the third German empire.

Totalitarian: (Of a system of government) consisting of only one leader or party that has complete power/control and forbids opposition. It extends its influence over all areas of private and public life in the society.

Treason: A crime that undermines the offender's government e.g. a coup attempt.

Tyranny: A form of government in which the ruler is an absolute dictator (not restricted by a constitution or laws or opposition etc.) or dominance through threat of punishment, force or violence.

U- boats: German submarines.

Ultimatum: Final warning or demand that action will be taken against a person, group of persons or state unless there is compliance with particular demands.

Ultra: A person with extreme political or religious views.

Utopia: An imaginary place, society, state or situation in which everything is thought to be perfect or ideal

Veto: The power or right to prohibit or reject a proposed or intended act or plan (especially the power of a King or President to reject a bill or resolutions passed by the parliament).

Warsaw pact: A military alliance formed in 1955 by the Soviet Union and seven Eastern European countries.

Weapons of mass destruction: Deadly weapons that have the potentials to kill or injure large numbers of people (civilians and soldiers) at once including nuclear armaments, biological and chemical weapons.

Xenophobia: Intense or irrational dislike or fear of strangers, foreigners or alien culture.

Zemstvo: Elective rural council established in Russia as part of Tsar Alexander II's reforms.

Zollverein: A customs union for economic benefits of German states, which was spearheaded by Prussia

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

PRE-COLONIAL SOCIETIES

1. DESCRIBE THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF BUGANDA UPTO 1855?

Approach

- Give a brief background of Buganda.
- Describe/clearly explain the social, political and economic organization of Buganda
- Conclude.

Background to the question

- Buganda was one of the numerous kingdoms which sprung up after the collapse of the vast Chwezi Empire.
- It was established in the North western shores of Lake Victoria and East of Bunyoro.
- The people of Buganda were known as Baganda.

Political organization.

1. The Kabaka was the political head with a highly centralized administrative
2. His powers were hereditary and absolute i.e. had control over life and death of his subjects.
3. He could appoint, promote, demote and dismiss any of his chiefs without consulting anybody.
4. Next to him in command was the Katikkiro (chief minister)
- 5 Other prominent chiefs apart from the Katikkiro were the Ornulami (Chief justice) and Omuwanika (finance minister).
6. Then followed by nobles (abakungu), clan heads (abakulu b'ebika), co-chiefs (ab'amasaza), sub-county chiefs (ab'amagomboloJa) parish chief (ab'emiruka) sub-parish chiefs (abatongole),
7. Chiefs were responsible for mobilizing the people for public work in the regions.
8. Buganda had a legislative council called the Lukiiko made up of clan heads, Kabaka's appointees and county chiefs.
9. Its work was to formulate laws and advise the Kabaka.
10. Had a strong standing army known as Abasirikale, this included the royal bodyguards (abambowa)
11. The queen mother (Namasole) and queen sister (Lubuga) were also important persons at the king's court.
12. Promotion was based on merit; a person would only rise to high position if he exhibited the ability to do things efficiently.

Economic organization.

13. Agriculture was the backbone of Buganda's economy, they grew *matooke* as their staple food and crops like yams, sweet potatoes, beans, cassava among others.

14. There was division of labour, men cleared gardens, engaged in trade and fishing, yet women planted and harvested.

15. Baganda also domesticated animals like cattle; sheep, pigs, goats and chicken for meat, milk and eggs. They used *Hiima* herdsmen (*Balaalo*) on their farms.

16. They also carried out fishing especially those on the shores of Lake Victoria and the islands of Ssese.

17. They also hunted wild animals like elephants for ivory, Buffalo, antelope and pigs for meat, leopards for skins. The Kabaka also hunted in his free time.

18. The bark cloth making industry made high quality bark cloth that they found market outside the kingdom.

19. Practiced iron-working where knives, swords, bangles, axes, pangas and hoes were made.

20. The Baganda also participated in Long Distance Trade with the coastal Arabs supplying mainly slaves and ivory in exchange for guns, clothes and glass ware.

21. They also engaged in craft work like making canoes, mats, beads and necklaces.

22. Baganda also received revenue from tributary states like Karagwe and Busoga. These were supposed to pay an annual subscription to the Kabaka as part of their alliance.

23. Taxation was another form of revenue for the kingdom.

24. There was also the raiding of neighbouring societies like Bunyoro, Busoga and Kooki for slaves, Cattle and ivory.

Social organisation

26. Ganda society was organized on a clan basis. Animals, fish, plant names were given as totems e.g. Bush buck (*Engabi*), edible rat (*omusu*) etc.

27. The king (Kabaka) belonged to the mother's clan and this ensured loyalty as each clan dreamt of producing the Kabaka.

28. Each clan was supposed to supply the Kabaka with a wife
29. Society was divided in classes i.e. Royal Family (Abalangira n 'abam': the nobles (abakungu n' abataka), clan heads, the commoners or pc (abakopi) and the slaves (abaddu).
30. Among the Baganda were diviners (abalubaale) who consulted the government on behalf of others. They always asked for gifts like cows, goats, Sheep.
31. Religiously, the Kabaka was the spiritual leader of Buganda, he was considered semi-divine with direct contact with ancestors.
32. Baganda believed in small gods (Balubaale) e.g. Musoke for rain. D. for hunting, Walurnbe for death and Mukasa for water bodies.
33. They also believed in witchcraft. Sorcerers (Abalogo) were consul' by those who wanted to harm others and were greatly feared.
34. Baganda also believed in a super natural being called Katonda or Liisoddene. This Lubaale cult was built on worship of spirits of the dead.
35. Baganda dressed in backcloth, animal skins, beads and necklaces, those from royal family wore skins of Animals like Antelopes, leopards and lions.
36. Royal regalia that included drums, spears, stools and animal skins were symbols of power among the Baganda,
37. The Ganda housing system was bee hive shaped with wooden poles and grass thatched.
38. Baganda spoke a similar language known as Luganda which enhanced unity.
39. Marriage was polygamous, the more children a man could have the more prestige he could Cournand. However, marriage was not allowed between close relatives and people of the same clan.
40. There were royal burial grounds at Kasubi (Amasiro) for Kings and Ebijja for commoners.
41. Respect for elders was a must.
42. There was also a class of herbalists who treated those who were sick.
43. Boat racing, wrestling and dances were common forms of entertainment among the Baganda.

N.B: This Monarchy was abolished by president Milton Obote in 1967 however in 1993 it was revived by the 'NRM government with Ronald Muwenda Mutebi II as its Kabaka.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

2. DISCUSS THE ORGANISATION OF PRE-COLONIAL ASANTE KINGDOM

Approach

- Show a brief foundation of Asante kingdom
- Examine its social, political and economic organization

Background

It was founded by members of Oyoko clan of Akan speaking people around 1620 in West Africa. Her capital was Kumasi. Its rise and expansion attributed to the clan, state building genius and military strength of kings like ObirYeboa, Opukuwere, and Osei Tutu. Nineteenth century was at its climax having expanded to includethewholeofmodern Ghana, Ivory Coast and Togo because of its strong political, social and economic set up as seen below,

Political organization

1. The society was highly centralized led by Asantehene. Also known as Kumasihene, resident at the capital Kurnasi,
2. It was divided into provincial and metropolitan Asante.
3. Metropolitan Asante (Kurnasi) led by Kurnasihene (Asantchcnc)
4. Amato states were located in the radius of 15 - 40 miles outside Kumasi, led by Arnunihene
5. Asante states such as Nsuta, ofinso, Dwaben and Kokofu had a large degree of autonomy, led by Arnunihene who could be summoned to Kumasi by the king at any time.
6. Amunihene and Kumasihene formed the Asante confederation council

7. Amunihene took an oath of allegiance to the Asantehene and pledged never to wage war against one another.
8. Vassal states outside the radius of 25 - 40 miles from Kumasi only paid tributes. Amato states also recognized the "golden stool."
9. Military service was compulsory for all able bodied men
10. Amunihene contributed soldiers to the Asantehene in case of a national campaign; otherwise each Amunihene raised and maintained his own army
11. The kingdom had no standing army. However Osei Tutu introduced, square military formation and Krontehene took up the position of army commander by the king's will.
12. By the end of 19th century the Asante had become essentially an in state and she was able to dominate West Africa for some time.
13. War implements were at first spears but from 1650's onwards the coming of Europeans on the West African coast. Asante sold slaves to acquire arms and ammunitions for the expansion of the kingdom.

Economic organization:

14. The economy was basically agricultural, producing mainly for subsistence with yams as the staple food.
15. The kingdom was involved in trade with North Africa and West African coastal European traders mainly exports were Kola nuts, gold, in exchange for salt, fire arm, clothes and other European products.
16. The economy was centrally controlled by the king who was the richest man.
17. Tributes were also got from the vassal states lying outside 40 miles from Kumasi in form of gold, slave and livestock
18. Taxation was also an important source of revenue; they included poll taxes, death duties among others.
19. Slave trade was also carried out to sale off the criminals; in fact it was part of their culture.
20. They also took part in legitimate trade when it was introduced they exported items like gold etc

21. There was mining of minerals like gold which was also controlled by the Asantehene

Social organization

22. The king was regarded as divine; he was the religious leader as well.

23. The 'golden stool' was the most important symbol of unity and it bound people together. It was believed to have come from heaven to priest Okunofe Anokye who gave it to Osei Tutu.

24. The clan was the basic social, political and economic unit.

25. Slavery was a deeply rooted institution although slaves could rise to position of prominence depending on merit

26. There was belief in traditional religion

27. There was respect for the Odwiri festival (annual ceremony) on this day, the Asante feasted, planned and prayed for their nation

28. Kingship ties and inter-marriages were important in forging unity for their nation.

29. The Islamic influence also existed in Asante which expanded in north spreading Islamic and Arabic cultures in the kingdom as the king employed Muhammedans as private secretaries and civil servants.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

3. EXAMINE THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF THE FON / DAHOMEY BY THE MIDDLE OF 19TH CENTURY

Approach

Examine the political, social and economic organization of the Fon.

Background to the question

The Fon society is popularly known as Dahomey, scholars stress the origin of Dahomey from the reign of Wegbaja. Dahomey was founded out of the conquest of several small Aja states under the Aladaxonu dynasty. It was located in the poorest areas of West African coastal areas. It reached the

peak of its power between 1818-1858, with its capital at Abomey; they were Aja speaking people, and prominent leaders of Dahomey included wegbaja

I 650-1 680), Agaja (1708-1740), Tegbesu (1740-89) Gezo (1818-1858 Glele (1859-1889) and Behanzin (1889-1894).

Political organization

1. Dahomey had a centralized system of political organization with the king on the top
2. The king had excessive powers he could appoint, promote or demote his officials.
3. The king was assisted by a cabinet with ministers responsible for specific duties or departments. These included; Migan prime minister, the chief of the army was Mingi and also chief magistrate and superintendent of police, Meu the minister of finance who collected revenue, Yevogan minister in charge of overseas trade and European relation then Tokpe minister of agriculture.
4. There was also a council of advisors from whom the king chose his ministers.
5. There was a spying system traditionally known as the Naye
6. The king appointed a female counterpart to each minister to monitor the activities of the officials. They were believed to be kings wives some of them were not
7. Dahomey was divided into metropolitan Dahomey with Abomey the capital as its nucleus and Provincial Dahomey that consisted of the other outlying provinces.
8. The king appointed governors to administer the provinces on his b, below the governors were the village chiefs. They ensured law an", order, settled minor cases, collected tax among other duties.
9. There was a policy of Dahomanization in which the conquered pre and people were initiated and incorporated into Dahomey This ensured unity.
10. Dahomey had a well organized, well trained, Disciplined and skilled army.

The army was responsible for the expansion of the kingdom, raiding, defending against external aggression and suppressing rebellions. It was composed of men and women.

11. The female section of warriors which is believed to have been braver was known as Amazon.

12. There's an intelligence institution known as Agbadjigbeto which was responsible for spying her neighbours and also spread propaganda in the empire especially about the intelligence findings,

13. They had a centralized judicial system; there was a royal court of appeal at the king's palace presided over by the Mingi where severe punishments were given.

14. The king could reduce or abolish sentences if he wished.

15. King's word was law but he was not above the law, for example king Gilele was fined for breaking the law.

Economic organization

16. They carried out livestock census, village chiefs reported the number of animals slaughtered and skulls were kept to make periodic checks.

17. Trade was an important economic activity in the kingdom.

18. Slave trade was a major source of tax revenue to the kingdom before it was abolished.

19. Dahomey raided her neighbours for slaves whom she sold to the traders at the coast.

20. Honey, black pepper and ginger were only produced by the royal family.

21. When slave trade was abolished, Dahomey shifted to palm oil, slaves were diverted to serve as labourers in palm oil plantations, and state palm oil plantations were started

22. Goats, sheep, cattle and pigs were kept for food and trade purposes.

23. The state collected many taxes like customs duty, transit tolls, death duties etc.

24. They were hunters, basket weavers and craft men and produced several hand craft materials for sale,

25. There was regional specialization in agriculture e.g. the Aja produced maize alone; Zamanda produced millet, ground nuts and maize.

26. Tributes were collected from her vassel states like Yoruba, Ife among others

27. Salt mining was done and Yevogan collected one pebble of salt for every bag of salt mined.

Social organization.

28. They had many religious beliefs and gods, the state controlled religion which helped in national unity

29. The king licensed the chief priests of all religious societies

30. The gods of conquered people were absorbed into the Dahomenian group of gods

31. All the religious societies had to recognize the position of the king as the head of human society,

32. The king forbade secret societies because they might prove a threat to royal power.

33. Human beings were sacrificed to the gods for blessings

34. The ancestors were important to the well being of each Dahomean family, but the royal ancestors were especially important because the well being of the society depended on them.

35. Royal ancestors were honoured annually in celebrations where people and officials from the whole nation gathered at the capital (Kumasi).

36. The monarchy displayed its wealth and power while great servants were rewarded for their loyalty to the king

37. Dahomey had a stratified society it consisted of the privileged royal class at the top of the strata, which consisted of the kings, his relatives and all descendants of the king.

38. Below this class were the kings' ministers, military commanders, plus provincial and village chiefs.

39. Below them were the commoners consisting of the free born of Dahomey like peasants, artisans etc.

40. At the bottom was the servant class consisting of serfs and slaves; they could be sold off, worked in state plantations could be sacrificed to the ancestors at ceremonies.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

4. ACCOUNT FOR THE DISENTEGRATION OF THE DAHOMEY KINGDOM DURING THE 2ND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

Approach

- Brief background of the downfall of the kingdom.
- Factors for the decline
- Conclusion

Background

Dahomey started declining at the close of the 19th century, in 1892, the French invaded Dahomey and took its leader Behanzin a captive and exiled him to West Indies setting the last blow to the kingdom existence.

Factors to consider

1. The vastness of the kingdom, by 1840, the kingdom swallowed most territories including Ifebu, Savaloy, Idassa among others controlling them from Abome, became difficult.
2. Weak character of Behanzin, he murdered his own people especially those who proposed the option of surrender 'this made him so unpopular and his people then resorted to supporting the French.
3. The British act of disarming the Fon and stopping the importation of guns into Dahomey deprived them with guns and this made them vulnerable to British imperialism.
4. The Naye occasionally influenced the king to take wrong decision, they , could misinform the king about the activities of the chiefs, and this made the king to do several mistakes which led to the downfall of the kingdom .
5. The dictatorial nature of Dahomey kings, they over taxed their subjects, sold them into slavery, this made the people hate traditional rule, that's why

when the French took over Dahomey in 1892, they supported them indirectly.

6. Decline in trade activities due to the seizure of Port Novo in 1883 and denied the kingdom the economic backbone necessary for protection of the kingdom

7. The kingdom was hit by natural calamities like drought and famine as it was located in poor Savannah and its capital was on a plateau.

8. Resistances from vassal states militarily and economically weakened the kingdom (those states wanted to break away from Dahomey), their breaking away deprived the kingdom from tributes.

9. The kingdom was torn apart by her over ambitious foreign policy, leaders invaded other societies leaving them wounded and others captured e.g. in 1844, Gezo invaded Egba and was defeated on 15th March 1864, Glele was defeated by Ketu. This militarily weakened the kingdom and the French found an already weak kingdom.

10. Death of able leaders like Gezo deprived the kingdom able leadership; Behanzin who succeeded them could not overcome the dangers that apparently faced the kingdom.

11. Weakness of Glele, he had inferiority complex, he believed that he who makes powder wins the battle meaning that he who could not make powder (the gun) could not defeat the whites, this was made worse when he opted to poison himself rather than surrender the territory, this all made the kingdom vulnerable to British rule.

12. The French invasion of Dahomey in 1892 marked the final collapse of the kingdom.

Attachments

No attachments



Brainshare

5. EXAMINE THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF BUNYORO KINGDOM BY 1885.

Approach

- Bunyoro's background

- Analyze the political, social and economic organization of Bunyoro kingdom by 1885.

Background of Bunyoro

- Bunyoro came into existence after the disintegration of Bunyoro Kitara Empire founded by the Bachwezi.
- In around 16th century small states emerged Bunyoro inclusive and came to be known as Bunyoro kingdom
- By the 17th century Bunyoro kingdom had developed her political, social and economic systems.

Political organization

1. The kingdom was centralized headed by a king called Omukama.
2. The king had absolute power and was a final being i.e. controlled lives his subjects. .
3. He was assisted by the powerful chiefs both provincial and junior chiefs who carried out routine work in the state.
4. Chiefs collected taxes, tributes and maintained law and order in the kingdom they were answerable to the Omukama.
5. The kingdom was divided into counties, sub counties and village units all under chiefs.
6. The king had powers to appoint, dismiss official, chiefs were appointed from member of the first class.
7. When Kabalega succeeded Kamurasi, he centralized the administration appointing his supporters to various political positions.
8. Promotion was based on merit rather than birth; he could appoint and dismiss officials.
9. From 1870 onwards it became obligatory that county chiefs and hereditary leaders lived near the palace to be supervised by the king.
10. The king was the supreme judicial authority and several punishments were administered to criminals.
11. Courts could handle minor cases on behalf of the king.
12. They had a national standing army from 1870 called Abarusura headed by the king (Kabalega)

13. It was divided into 5 battalions of about 400 soldiers situated all over the country.

14. The army crushed internal revolts, defensive and offensive purposes.

Social organization.

15. The kingdom was divided into three distinct classes.

16. The Babiito royal and ruling class at the apex they were basically pastoralist

17. Followed by Bahima cattle keepers they loved cattle and detested cultivation

18. At the bottom were the Bairu agriculturalists, they owned land and were the peasants.

19. They were religious and believed in many gods but the greatest of all was Ruhanga the creator.

20. Each clan had its own god i.e. Musisi god of Lake Albert, Muhingo god of war etc.

21. They had pet names like Amooti, Atooki, and Apuli etc

22. They carried out cultural ceremonies i.e. omukewo tree ceremony where sacrifices were made to their gods.

Economic organization

23. The economy was controlled by the Omukama; he controlled the wealth of the kingdom

24. Bunyoro carried out agriculture and grew crops such as maize. Millet cassava, ground nuts for domestic use and then for trade.

25. For purposes of food security each chief was encouraged to double food production especially during Kabalega's reign.

26. They carried out animal keeping especially cattle and goats which provided meat as well as hide.

27. They carried out fishing from Lake Albert, Edward. George among other minor water bodies.

28. Trade was also a common practice where salt from Lake Katwe.

Kibero and Kasenyi were sold to Buganda, Busoga, and Acholi etc.

29. There were several markets in Bunyoro like at Buyaga and Bugangaizi ~, Bunyoro carried out iron working and made military weapons like spear ... and arrows as well as fanning tools.

31. Raiding was also carried especially on their neighbours like Lango, Buganda for cattle.

32. The kingdom also did pottery whose products were sold to neighbours.

33. Bunyoro used to get tributes from the vassal states, such as Ankole, Karagwe in form of sheep, cattle etc.

Attachments

No attachments