# UNIT 14 THE SOCIAL CLASSES IN EUROPE

**Structure**



## 14.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit you should be able to:

- differentiate the processes which brought about the integration of different classes of Europe into the emerging capitalist economy
- emphasize that in different countries these processes took different forms, and
- highlight that with the emergence of new classes in Europe a new political consciousness of different classes also came into existence.

## 14.1 INTRODUCTION

In Unit 15 you will read about the transition to modern class society and how new forms of production meant new forms of work. The class society that we are talking about was essentially an industrial society in which the patterns of life and ethics came to be increasingly dominated by the dominant capitalist ethos. In this Unit we will talk a little more about the transformation of classes and class relations. We will also talk about some changes in the pattern of daily life.

There was a great divergence in the rhythm of change between the industrial and the non-industrial areas of Europe, and in general the pace of change was much slower than was earlier presumed. The years between 1750 and 1850 were, however, crucial in making this pace and direction of change decisive.

There are also extensive debates over the patterns of social change in the different countries. One aspect of these debates is whether a generalisation can be made at all regarding this pattern of emergence of new class structures in the different countries of Europe. We will see as we go along that some generalisations can certainly be made with regard to the nature of social classes even given the different chronology of industrialisation and political contexts, but that they need to be qualified as compared to the earlier interpretations in research on these societies.

## 14.2 INTEGRATION OF LANDLORDS AND PEASANTS INTO CAPITALIST ECONOMY

In much of Europe, landed property still remained the principal form of wealth in the first half of the nineteenth century, and landlords continued to exercise political power. They, however, became integrated into the growing capitalism in agriculture and industry, and the social and

economic basis of their dominance was transformed. This fact will be underlined in our next Unit on the transition to class society. Here we will see how exactly this dominance was exercised, and eventually challenged by the new classes in capitalist society.

### 14.2.1 Landed Classes in England

The landed classes in England were the first to change the basis of their economy. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the wealth of the privileged sections had been increasing rapidly within a prospering economy of increased foreign trade, profitable agrarian ventures (such as sheep farming) and expansion in the textile, mining and ship building sectors. The section that profited most from these changes was the English landed aristocracy. It was therefore, able to determine the nature of agrarian change, economic policy in general, and also to have a greater role in early capitalist investment than in other European countries. You would have read about this in the Units on industrialization.

This entire process of restructuring along lines that ensured a smooth and profitable integration of the landed aristocracy into the capitalist economy and bourgeois society was helped along by the political victory of the land owning gentry in the 'Glorious Revolution' after the English Civil War, followed by the land enclosures of the 18th century. The estates of the British nobility ranged from a few thousand to fifty acres, from which they received their rents. The nobles owned approximately one-fourth of all the land in England. Increasingly they came to invest in commerce, canals, urban real estate, mines, and sometimes industrial ventures-all of which ensured not simply a smooth transition for the English aristocracy into the capitalist economy but also a smooth transformation of this English landed aristocracy into modern landlords deriving their wealth from capitalist ground rent and other diversified ventures rooted in Capitalism. The transformation of the landed aristocracy into modern landlords also coincided with a change in the social composition of the landed gentry, which increasingly began to include sections of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie who invested in land. The law of succession and primogeniture in England further contributed to the landed element being more open ended.

This very integration and basis of their transformed nature of dominance became, however, also the basis of the slower destruction of the patterns of political institutions and of manners and social norms and values. Through the corruption in the electoral system that we talked about in an earlier Unit, a mere four hundred families, managed to control a large number of seats in the House of Commons, apart from ensuring a decisive role in the polity for the House of Lords which they fully controlled. Between 1671 and 1831 English landowners continued to have the exclusive legal right to hunt game animals, and excluded from this privilege were even those renting land, the wealthy merchants who did not own land and all the poor. The agitation for the repeal of Corn Laws, the Chartist movement, and the successive Reform Acts of 1832, 1866, 1882, made dents in this overriding influence of the landed gentry, and it is only from the 1880's that we can seriously speak of the declining wealth or political influence of the landed gentry.

### 14.2.2 Landed Classes in France

The situation of the Continental nobilities was not quite the same, although they too retained their dominance well into the twentieth century. In France the nobility was divided into the nobles of the sword and those of the robe. The former families enjoyed privileges deriving from military service, while the latter had gained their titles either by serving in the bureaucracy or had purchased them. Besides, some of them were what is known as the Court nobility, who also monopolized all the highest offices in the bureaucracy, the church and the army until the eve of the Revolution. There was a great degree of difference between them and those who were based in provinces. More important all nobles whatever their status, continued to enjoy feudal privileges long after the commercialisatin of agriculture, growth of international trade and commerce, and the emergence of a well entrenched bourgeoisie. The nobility in France had not followed the pattern of exerting its dominance through control over land or on the basis of reorganising agriculture along modern lines. It had asserted its need for greater revenues in a changing world by reasserting its old feudal dues, with the result that when the Revolution came it had not transformed its basis of dominance. It was also in a much weaker position economically than the English or the East German landed aristocracy; at least for a time therefore

it lost its pre eminence which it had regained with the Restoration. Its basis and forms of dominance were not so well integrated into the capitalist economy, with the result that its forms of dominance were more varied, linked to the Court and service, particularly during periods that combined constitutionalism with monarchy.

### 14.2.3 Landed Classes in Eastern Europe

The East European landed aristocracy was even more complex in nature. In Prussia, the position of the Junkers became much stronger with the capitalist transformation of agriculture, particularly as they were clearly linked to more authoritarian political structures after the unification of Germany. The landed class was more open ended in the western regions than in East Germany, and the forms of its integration into the capitalist economy and social structure were also different, although there is a need not to exaggerate this aspect in the light of new research. In the eastern region the landlords were employers of wage labour in a more widespread form, while in the west their income derived primarily from rent. However, throughout Germany, the continued dominance of the landed classes in the army, the bureaucracy and in the institutions of political life was much more visible and pronounced well into the twentieth century, long after the English and French landed classes had conceded their pre-eminence to the bourgeoisie. Well integrated into the world market, the Junkers were able to hold their own in the capitalist world economy, as well as to influence state policies in their favour, particularly through protective tariffs. The voting pattern ensured their political dominance over the nation and in their localities.

### 14.2.4 Landed Classes in Central Europe

In other countries of Central Europe the landlords retained much of their feudal character particularly as agriculture continued to be the main sector of the economies. Polish and German landlords continued to be found outside the limits of their national boundaries, becoming strong defenders of both status quo and social reaction against nationalist aspirations in these areas. In Russia the eighteenth century saw what could be called the creation of a new nobility. Peter the Great's linking of state service with social status within the nobility, as well as with the intensification of the institution of serfdom, created both unity and a stake in the perpetuation of feudal patterns of dominance very distinct from the patterns of dominance in Western Europe and Germany. The landed aristocracy here was able to retain social, political and economic dominance right up to the 1917 revolution through the way in which the agrarian reforms of 1861 were carried out, and through the prevention of substantial political reform. You would have already read of this in the Units on Russia. But this is not to suggest that the basis of their dominance remained unchanged. They increasingly employed wage labour, received ground rent, were integrated into the market in a more direct way even with regard to their relationship with the peasantry, and the exclusivity that they enjoyed with respect to land ownership was finished once and for all. The dissolution of landed estates and distribution of land to the peasantry dealt a final blow to them and destroyed their preeminence in the social and political spheres. In other words landlordism actually vanished in Russia with the destruction of capitalism, which is something that was not achieved elsewhere till the end of the Second World War, and the only in Eastern Europe. In the rest of Europe landlords remained, if not preeminent, then at least the privileged or the 'elites' of West European societies.

### 14.2.5 The Peasantry in Europe

As referred to in the previous Unit, the peasantry, in the sense that we know of it in the pre-industrial era, disappeared in Europe with the agrarian changes of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. Yet, as the absolute numbers of those engaged in agriculture did not decline significantly till the mechanisation of the 40s, the peasants and landlords continued to be an integral component of modern European society. The situation of the peasantry and the nature of its integration into modern class society were clearly determined by the nature of land settlements and the forces of the market, in other words the specific features of the development of capitalism in their countries. The influences of community, religion, and culture were mediated by the experiences of market and land situation. The relationship with the landlord remained a crucial aspect of their social and political experience, being for the most part antagonistic but sometimes converging in the face of opposition to policies in favour of

industry, a factor that explains their statusquoist politics at crucial junctures. The ' outside' world through the rural-urban interaction-working class, transport, literacy, political developments in the cities permeated into their lives in significant ways. All these resulted in changing conceptions of property, criminality and state authority. Capital accumulation in the countryside and the erosion of common communal rights led to significant class formation within the peasantry in most areas of Europe.

The yeomanry of the English social structure was destroyed as a class by the 18th century enclosures, and although some land tenures remained into the nineteenth century, one can say that the peasantry as a social entity had no existence in England, as the major elements in agricultural production became the capitalist farmers and the rural labourers. Here, and in Eastern Germany in a much more pronounced fashion, but really all over Europe, the development of capitalism and modern class society meant the break up of peasant societies, and the differentiation of the peasantry into classes ranging from the peasant petty bourgeoisie to the rural proletariat. The peasantry throughout Europe was varied and complex in its relationship with the market, with the land and with the landlords and the local political institutions. It expressed equally complex social attitudes and political allegiances. Primarily the determining feature of peasant behaviour and its place in modern rural society was the assets held by the peasantry as a whole in a certain area and by individual peasants within these areas. Its social and political expression was shaped by the need to adapt to the changes that market and capitalism entailed.

In France the peasantry that gave social thrust to the revolution of 1789, became differentiated giving rise to conflicting interests in the rural society, at the same time that it became integrated into the post-revolutionary political structures. It gained from the land settlements following the Revolution, becoming involved in a variety of agrarian ventures and tenures which sustained its status as a whole even through the periods of political backsliding represented by Napoleon and the Restoration etc. It never became a great supporter of the Republic or an opponent of the Empire. Its different strata reacted more in relation to prices, markets or food shortages, which retained forms of social protest that never achieved the political overtones necessary for challenging the political arrangements. More often into the 20th century the French peasantry became aligned with conservative groups rather than with radical or working class movements. They became transformed into 'Frenchmen' through the educational and cultural developments related to the State and mass media, particularly newspapers.

In Germany peasants continued to survive and even prosper not only in the areas east of the Elbe and in agrarian Bavaria, but also in the proximity of the industrial centres like the Ruhr and Saxony. Studies on Bavaria and Westphalia show that large peasants, i.e. those with horses and land to feed their families, were able to increase their yields despite the unfavourable conditions of the Emancipation, participating, as they did, in proto-industrial production for trans- regional markets. The perception of commonality disappeared with the commercialisation of peasant agriculture and class conflicts within the peasantry. Even in 1939, long after Germany's road to rapid industrialisation, 25% of the population still engaged in agriculture, reflecting the integration of peasants into modern class society through an agrarian capitalism. In Russia too the commercialisation of agriculture and the proletarianisation of a significant section of the peasantry led to a differentiated peasantry, with a small kulak stratum that remained opposed as a whole to the landed aristocracy. The nature of its demands and the forms of protests as well as its perception of its enemies however underwent a significant change with the development of capitalism in agriculture. More than anywhere else in Europe, the peasantry in Russia became responsive to political appeals and played a significant role in the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the socialist regime. You would read more about it in the units on Russia.

What needs to be emphasised here is that with the development of capitalism in Europe that rural conflicts became subsumed into the fundamental dichotomy of Capital and Labour, even as peasant agriculture remained alive and the landlords remained privileged strata of European societies.

**Check Your Progress 1**

1) What were the main differences between the English and French nobility of the 19th century ?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Can we say that the landed classes disappeared in the 19th Germany ? Give reason.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3) How do you see the role of peasantry in France ?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

## 14.3 THE BOURGEOISIE

The second half of the nineteenth century can be characterised as the age of the bourgeoisie in Western Europe, although in the eastern parts the bourgeoisie having attained its own identity and wealth, was yet to exert its hegemony. In those countries where industrialisation was early and rapid-England, France, Belgium and the Netherlands, Switzerland, Scandinavia- its success was clear and not so tortuous. In Germany and Italy it was slower because of the initial slower transformation of the economic and social structures. In Russia, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Spain the persistence of feudal tenures and in some cases autocratic political structures hindered its rise to power and its consolidation as a class was slower and less effective. In Russia it was to be over thrown before it could successfully challenge the dominance of the landed gentry.

In general throughout Western Europe the wealthiest and the most influential sections of the bourgeoisie were now bankers, factory owners and mine owners, i.e. capitalists, particularly after the 1850's. The merchants lost their eminence as their class gained hegemony. Commercial bourgeoisie was not the same as the old merchants. It became multifaceted, including within its sphere of identity economic and social linkages with varied economic functions. It invested in urban property and land, participated as actors on the political stage. The industrial bourgeoisie was no more confined to the earlier journeymen or owners of small manufacturies whose rise to eminence and wealth depended on the slow accumulation of capital from below. Their sources of income generation included finance and banking, a result of the merger of industrial and banking capital, and the identical interests of finance, banking and the cartelisation and monopolies in economy. It was the ruling class, of equal standing with the landlords.

As industrial wealth became the index of social advance, the middle class in general became more influential. It became common throughout Europe for wealthy men of middle classes to spend fortunes buying great estates, adopting the manners of the aristocracy, even as the landed

classes began investing in urban property. The virtues of the capitalist ethos-individualism, thrift, hard work, competition, use of money power, family, were values basically promoted by this class, and came to dominate industrial society as a whole.

The bourgeoisie also included the professional salaried component that grew with the growth of bureaucracies, the sectors of health and medicine, law and order, education, publishing, printing and mass media, and culture as an industry, with a new system of patronage linked to mass production. All of these were characterised by a democratisation that contributed to their expansion, and an inequality that created the hegemony of the bourgeoisie as a class through them. The higher and the more lucrative positions were held by members of the wealthy strata among the bourgeoisie, and sections of the landed aristocracy separated from land income.

This entire bourgeoisie shared a critical distance from the landed aristocracy and the monarchies in their countries as they grew in strength and significance, and despite the clear differentiation among themselves were united in their opposition to privilege and despotism, and then increasingly even more so from the working classes when challenged as the ruling class. Simultaneously they became part of a composite elite along with the landed gentry in turn increasingly 'bourgeoisfied' as we enter into the 20th century. Everywhere they gave shape to the particularities of nationalism in specific periods and specific areas. With the expansion of education into the 20th century there was infiltration into these positions at the middle level by 'commoners' among the middle classes that contributed members to radical politics throughout Europe, Russia being the outstanding example. Social democracy and the women's movement, which questioned the status quo, were born as a result of these.

The timing of these different stages varied, beginning with England, France, and then Germany, followed by Eastern Europe. The process in Germany and Russia, being later was also faster, more compressed, and the short period of identity formation also entailed relative, if not great homogeneity of the industrial bourgeoisie, and less differentiation between the industrial bourgeoisie and other sections of this class. In the more backward regions of Europe, particularly in Poland, the Czech and Slovak areas, Hungary and even in Russia, the owners of capital, entrepreneurs and managers were often foreign nationals: sometimes Germans and Jews of another area. The bourgeoisie across Europe had differing religious affiliations, Catholic, Protestant, under strong Evangelical influence etc. In Russia the intelligentsia formed a section of the landed aristocracy/bourgeoisie uprooted from its class affiliations in terms of political ideology, in fact to a very great extent opposed to the very system of capitalism which contributed to its birth and growth.

## 14.4 LOWER MIDDLE CLASSES

The lower middle classes formed a definable component of the modern class society, whose numbers increased rapidly with the expansion of services of various kinds under capitalism. Retailing, marketing, distribution, banking and finance – all increased in scale and complexity. The result was greater bureaucratisation of the manufacturing sector as well, and with the expansion of education of schoolteachers, mainly women here.

The lower middle class, though highly stratified, can be divided into two main groups – the classic petty bourgeoisie of shopkeepers and small businessmen, and the new white-collar salaried occupations, mostly clerks but also commercial travellers, schoolteachers, and certain shop assistants. The most dramatic increase was among white-collar employees like clerks, sales people, secretaries, and low ranking bureaucrats. In Britain by 1911, 42 percent of all commercial clerks were employed in manufacturing. In the period 1882 to 1907 salary earners rose from 7.0 to 13.1 percent of the labour force, while the Employees category in France rose from 772,000 and 5 percent of the workforce in 1876 to 1,869,000 and 9.3 percent of the work force in 1911. In Russia too with the rapid pace of industialisation there was a considerable increase in their numbers.

The most immediate feature of these two different groups was in their strikingly different market situations, although in subjective terms they often came to see themselves together at least in some ways. To begin with, they did not see themselves as working class, and were particular about maintaining this distinction and underlining the non manual nature of their work. The second element drawing together these two groups was that they shared a similar position of marginalisation in relation to the bourgeoisie. Their status was precarious in relation to other groups. Their greatest fear was that economic adversity would force them back to their

working class origins, which they made every effort to distance themselves from. The other side of the need for job security was the fear of the sack, particularly in the times of the down swing in economy.

They stood for the broad features of the capitalist economy, strongly defended the right to private property and their goals were to aspire to bourgeois status and climb higher in the social ladder. They did not agitate to overthrow the bourgeois social order or to challenge the right to private property, even as they suffered the consequences of increasing concentration of production and trade, and lost out badly in the ensuing competition. In the labour market too their situation was precarious.

As the lower middle classes operated in a local context their actual social experience tended to make them find individual rather than collective solutions to their problems. In the course of their work and every day life they also came into contact with a wider range of social groups than the working class. Their class consciousness was, therefore far less developed than that of the working classes or the bourgeoisie and they acted collectively to a much lesser degree, the case of Germany being a bit exceptional in this regard. In terms of jobs railways and post offices which had very large networks and were impersonal were the exceptions. It was to some extent a result of their status consciousness and disdain for the working classes as well.

The local context of their operations also made them less open to change, less able to cope with change and in many ways more conservative politically and in terms of culture than the bourgeoisie.

This strata of society was particularly vulnerable in Britain, as much due to their inability to mobilise politically as to the nature of the British political structure, the House of Lords, the nature of politics in the lower house and Parliament as the main vehicle through which political change was effected in Britain. The sense of individualism was also far more developed in Britain than on the Continent.

## 14.5 THE WORKING CLASSES

The dichotomy of capital and labour determined the character of the working classes of Europe. The composition and experience of the working classes was quite varied. Industrialisation may have reduced the barriers between the landed classes and the wealthy middle classes, but it sharpened the differences between the middle class and the labouring sections. This is one of the reasons for their emerging as a political and social class despite their varied composition.

The city and social life reflected the strong division of the rich and the poor. They had different spaces in the city to live in, and the amenities and the facilities were quite different, very much as it is in our country today. By the end of the nineteenth century new construction techniques began to change the face of the cities. Multistoried apartments and office buildings came up. Sewers, sidewalks and electric lights, cafes and department stores, parks and boulevards, concert halls, public libraries, all changed the picture of industrial towns as smoky, crowded, dirty tenements with chimneys as dominant part of landscape. But all this was for the rich, as were the drives to suburban dwellings owned by them. The labouring poor had their crowded one-room dwellings in which two or three families may live, taking shifts to sleep, little sanitation, poor transportation and great insecurities. While the railways and new seaside resorts changed the concept of leisure for the well to do, the only trips made by the poor were in the course of their migrations for means of livelihood. The lower class activities like fairs, cock fighting, pubs etc. began to be looked down upon by the former commoners, now the privileged middle classes.

Throughout Europe the working class remained stratified and differentiated well into the 20th century as mechanisation did not come all of a sudden and not to all the industries at the same time. Within the cities there were skilled artisans who saw their pre-industrial skills replaced by machines, others who prospered in the first half of the century as mechanisation in another process created greater demand for their product. The classic example is the disjunction between mechanisation in the spinning and the weaving processes in the earlier stages of industrialisation Some of the skilled trades remained at a premium long after mechanisation. Other skilled jobs emerged precisely out of large-scale industries. Skilled craftsmen, domestic workers, tailors, laundrymen, print workers, masons and other construction workers, post and telegraph workers, railway men in a variety of jobs, miners, and unskilled and skilled factory workers coexisted in

all cities. New additions in the form of former peasants came with the growth of factories on a widespread scale to complement second and third generation workers. In Russia particularly the peasant link remained strong and contributed hugely to the militant character of the working class movement there. Women and children contributed a new dimension to the composition of the working class. There were distinct variations in living styles and wages, giving rise to a labour aristocracy. Till the 1850's factory workers were still a minority in the work force even in England, after which their numbers grew rapidly. The pace of increase in their numbers was complementary to the fast pace of industrialisation in the countries that industrialised later. In France the skilled craftsperson retained greater significance for a longer period.

The industrial revolution destroyed the traditional world of the new factory worker. The new worker was now entirely dependent on a cash wage, subjected to a totally different work rhythm dictated by the factory discipline and the machine. Working conditions were terrible, often hazardous. Cut off from the security and larger family they felt extreme dislocation and alienation. Social life for them centered on the pubs and cheap cafes. Women and children were largely employed for unskilled tasks, in equally appalling conditions, because lower wages could be given to them. Unemployment was a dreaded reality.

At a general level the new industrial working class bore the brunt of the early industrial growth. There are innumerable descriptions of the working conditions and working class which point towards misery, long hours of work (15-16 hours, later 12 hours), unending grind and terrible behaviour by the supervisors, all of which industrialisation in its earlier stages meant for the working class, and led to a series of spontaneous worker riots in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Later as wages improved with legislation and expansion of the industrial economy, and as a result of the unequal economic relationship with the colonies, the working class became aware of the dichotomy of Capital and Labour, and of the contradiction between themselves and their employers, which gave rise to a variety of class expressions.

## 14.6 POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Class experiences gave rise to class-consciousness on the part of the different sections of society, which was expressed through differing political affiliations. Throughout Europe the landed classes struggled against the loss of their preeminence through a variety of political formations- Agrarian League in Germany, The House of Lords in England, the United Nobility in Russia, and so on. Apart from that they supported right wing parties, Church Parties, and all forms of protectionist policies favouring agriculture. They also came to terms with the trappings of democracy seeking to defend their interests through democratic institutions and practices. The peasantry, contrary to the popular perception of them as uniformly conservative, gave strong evidence of protest against immediate and local factors. They also had a variety of organisations, and expressed their interests through the use of and demand for education and other facilities. In Russia they demanded all that and became an inseparable part of the revolutionary movement.

The bourgeoisie expressed its political consciousness initially through representing the general demands of society against privilege and despotism. Increasingly it began to give specific form and content to its class interests through promoting economic policies opposed to agriculture and landed aristocracy and through gaining dominance in the representative institutions. Although ideologically it stood by liberalism, in practice it supported and initiated centrist and right wing parties as well to counter the working class pressure. You would read more about it in the chapter dealing with the state and political formations.

The working people were the first to challenge the capitalist order. Theirs is a story that began with food riots and machine breaking and evolved into varied forms of organised protests that assumed great political significance. Working class protests were sometimes a response to the immediate conditions of life. At other times they were part of a general revolutionary social unrest, and implied changes in political structures and state forms. They formed trade unions and the trade union movement grew well into the 20th century. With the growth of socialist ideas the working class movement also became linked with social democracy and gave support to the social democratic parties. In Russia the working class movement played a major role in overthrowing the capitalist order.

**Check Your Progress 2**

1) Who can be described as the bourgeoisie ?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What were the common perceptions shared by the white collar workers and the classic petty bourgeoisie of shopkeepers and businessmen ?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3) Can we say that the working class in Europe was not stratified at all ? Give reasons.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4) How did class experience manifest into class consciousness ?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

## 14.7 LET US SUM UP

In this Unit you saw :

- how in Europe with the emergence of capitalism landlords and the peasantry were integrated with the economy in different ways,
- how in some countries the dominance of landed interests continued to shape the society and economy,
- how in some countries this dominance of landed interests did not allow the emerging bourgeoisie to attain an independent identity or hegemony,
- how in the ultimate analysis the newly emerging classes had to struggle politically to attain a new consciousness.

## 14.8 KEYWORDS

**Junkers** : The big landlords of Germany who continued to exercise a powerful sway in the industrialising Germany.

**Yeomans** : The small land holders of Britain who were gradually forced out of commercialisation and enclosures.

**Mechanisation** : The process of getting technology into the operations of industrial and agricultural economies.

## 14.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

**Check Your Progress 1**

1) See sub-section 14.2.1 and 14.2.2. You may highlight how the influence of the French nobility was more persistent.

2) See sub-section 14.2.3. No they did not. In fact they became stronger.

3) See sub-section 14.2.5. You could talk about both its conservative and radical thrusts.

**Check Your Progress 2**

1) See Section 14.3. You can describe the newly emerging industrial classes and its critical distance from the landed classes.

2) See Section 14.4. You can describe the way they differentiated themselves from bourgeoisie and the working class.

3) See Section 14.5. You can talk about the slow advent of mechanisation.

4) See Section 14.6.