



"A" LEVEL HISTORY REVISION

COMPILED BY:

K. MUTUKUMIRA

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789-1799)

"The influence of the great French thinkers was the most important cause for the 1789 revolution in France." Critically examine this assertion.

Demands: The key issue in the question is to assess whether the great French thinkers contributed mostly to the outbreak of the French revolution. Other factors should also be analysed to come out with a balanced assessment

Introduction

The view that the influence of the great French thinkers was the most important cause for the 1789 revolution is a subject of historical debate. While one can appreciate the role of these French philosophers in stirring up the revolution, it is however incorrect to rank it as the most important cause. Other factors such as the king's incompetence, the financial crisis, the ambitious nobility and poor harvests seem to have played a far much better role in bringing about the crisis of 1789 than the writings of these philosophers.

Side A: Role of the great French thinkers

- brought what D. Thomson calls the 'the revolutionary spirit'.
- their doctrines created an atmosphere of criticism of the Old Order.
- their works created an awareness on the people of the injustice of the Ancien Regime.
- they attacked the caste system, resented the idea of one man being more important than the others.
- they preached the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity.
- they supplied much of the theory which underlay the revolution (D. Richards).
- the philosophers gave cohesion to the discontent and aspirations of widely varying social classes.
- they brought a unifying body of ideas, a common vocabulary. of hope and protest

Side B: Other factors

- Louis XVI's incompetence and intransigence
- influence of Marie-Antoinette
- dismissal of finance controller generals like Turgot and Necker
- institution of autocratic monarchy was no longer corresponding to the needs of the time
- financial crisis

- American war of independence
- the calling of the Estates-General meeting
- ambitious nobility
- poor harvests, cold winter, hail storms led to extreme social distress
- high inflation

Conclusion

To deny that the influence of the philosophies was the most important cause is not to deny the fact that it did play its part in the outbreak of the French Revolution. The philosophers contributed to the crisis but their contribution did not surpass that of Louis XVI's incompetence. Thus, in a nutshell, the view that the influence great French thinkers were the most important cause for the 1789 revolution is an overestimation and a clear demonstration of abysmal ignorance.

“There is little he could have done to avert the revolution of 1789 in France.” Is this a true judgment of Louis XVI?

Demands: The key issue is to assess whether the French Revolution could have been avoided or not by Louis XVI.

Introduction

The fact that there was little that Louis XVI could have done to avert the revolution of 1789 in France is a subject of historical debate. A lot of ink has been spilt over the issue. Some historians tend to exonerate the Bourbon king from any responsibility of failing to stop the revolution by concluding that the revolution was already inevitable when Louis XVI came to office in 1774. Other historians insist that the fact that there was a revolution in 1789 was a result of the policies of Louis XVI which he offered France after 1774. It will be seen in the following analysis that it was Louis XVI who played the major role in precipitating the outbreak of revolution in 1789.

Side A: Contribution of Louis XVI.

Louis could have done something to avert the revolution:

- He was not supposed to continue to adhere to the principle of absolutism which had become obsolete, absolutism angered many people
- The political and social system of France was not an altogether exceptional example of oppression-the conditions also existed in other European states, so it is surprising to find out that Louis XVI could not manage the situation.
- Louis XVI could have devised a more viable form of government to suit the present needs of the people
- The land of France was rich and productive but with Louis' reign commerce and industry lagged far behind that of England.
- Louis was intransigent, weak minded and lacked the skill to solve pressing problems
- The influence of Marie Antoinette worsened the situation
- Louis failed to support his ministers when they wanted to reform the tax system
- Louis was too extravagant e.g. he willingly entered into the American war of Independence
- Louis XVI failed to give a final decision on the issue of voting during the Estates-General meeting in 1789.

Side B: Contribution of other factors.

Louis XVI could have done little to avert the revolution because:

- he had inherited a long tradition of absolutism in France hence was bound to be influenced by the policies of his predecessors.
- the king's power was very much limited in practice in many ways e.g. the Parlement of Paris had power to delay royal decrees.
- royal officials called intendants and local elected assemblies did their best to derail any measures which the king might have decided to offer.
- the king's position was closely bound up with the privileged classes hence it was difficult to break their privileges without threatening his position
- the nobility and the clergy refused to work with the crown to reform France's tax structure.
- the actions of the nobility led to the dismissal of several finance ministers.
- when Louis XVI succeeded Louis XV the French monarchy was already in decadence e.g. debts, empty treasury etc
- the flowering enlightenment thought of 1700s worsened the situation.
- some of the factors were not of Louis's making e.g. poor harvests were caused by bad weather, severe winter.

Conclusion

It is fair to mention in conclusion that contrary to the assertion that there was little Louis XVI has done; in fact there was much that could have been done by the Bourbon king. His failure to support reformist ministers, his expensive intervention on the side of the rebels in the American War of Independence, his weak character and the extravagance of his court and his wife Marie Antoinette, all helped to precipitate the 1789 revolution. Louis XVI should shoulder the larger part of the blame for failing to avert the revolution of 1789.

What contributed most to the crisis of 1789 in France: an incompetent king, ambitious nobility or poor harvests?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the most important factor in the outbreak of the French Revolution. Each factor must be examined and the candidate should show which factor was most important.

Introduction

The 1789 Crisis in France was a result of a combination of various factors and among them were the incompetence of the king, ambitious nobility and poor harvests. These factors played a complimentary role though the incompetence King Louis XVI seem to have played a far much important role than the other factors.

An incompetent king

- Louis XVI failed to solve the financial crisis
- he was extravagant
- he was weak willed, was not able to control the nobility and the clergy
- Entered the American war of independence – lacked a sense of foresight of the consequences of war. The war drained the few remaining financial resources of France as well as imbued the soldiers with American democratic ideas
- He was badly influenced by his wife Marie Antoinette
- he continued to adhere with to outdated principle of absolute monarchy and 'divine right' of kings
- he left the nobility and clergy to continue with their privileges which irked the third estate
- he failed to give a final say on the issue of voting during the estates-general meeting in 1789 and this finally led to the outbreak of the French Revolution

Ambitious nobility

- they were the privileged classes
- they were exempted from taxes
- they influenced the king not to introduce reforms which would remove their privileges
- they vetoed any reforms which the king might have decided to offer.
- they also contributed to an empty treasury because of their extravagance
- their behaviour angered the third estate and contributed to the outbreak of the revolution

Poor harvests

- led to inflation-food prices escalated
- there was hunger and starvation
- there was decline in trade
- decline in standards of living
- forced people to flee to urban areas and this created an atmosphere of resentment on part of the people towards the king.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the incompetence of the king played the fundamental role in bringing about the French revolution in 1789. Louis XVI should have done something to avert the situation but because he was weak and undecided, he allowed the revolution to come. This is not to undermine other factors such as poor harvests and ambitious nobility. These factors worsened the problems which had been created by the king but they played second fiddle to the contribution of Louis XVI.

Why was Louis XVI not able to satisfy the grievances of the discontented groups in France from 1789 to 1793?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for the failure of Louis XVI to solve the problems being faced by different groups. The answer should be aware of the time frame given in the question i.e. 1789 – 1793.

Reasons why Louis XVI failed to satisfy the discontented groups.

- The situation in France** had already deteriorated when Louis XVI came into office. The French treasury had been exhausted by his predecessors. France was in financial constraints. The system of government was already in decadence.
- Personal weaknesses of Louis XVI** – He lacked firmness especially during the Stats-Generax meeting of 1789. His actions from 1789-1793 e.g. the dismissal of Necker, his flight to Varennes, all acted against him.
- The influence from his wife Marie Antoinette** exacerbated the situation.
- He faced opposition from the nobles and the clergy**
- Influence from the outside** e.g. some other aristocratic regimes and émigrés-he thought that he was backed by counter-revolutionaries hence he implemented policies which were clearly against the revolutionaries.
- The financial position of France-Louis** had no money to satisfy everyone, he was in financial constraints-the American war of independence, extravagance of the court, his wife, his predecessors, had all contributed greatly this failure.
- Naturally, Louis XVI** hated the revolution and this made him not to sympathize with the revolutionaries.
- The revolutionary spirit in the people's minds** had grown considerably
- The role of the 'Parlement' of Paris** in thwarting any meaningful reforms by Louis XVI. This 'Parlement' refused to register support to make valid the king's edicts.
- His position as absolute monarchy** was so closely bound up with the privileged classes that if their privileges were broken his own position could have been threatened.

How similar and how different were the policies of the Constituent Assembly and the Directory?

Demands: The key issue is a systematic comparison of the two assemblies, i.e. the Constituent (which is also called the National Assembly) and the Directory. Issues should be compared and contrasted side by side.

SIMILARITIES

- a) The Constituent Assembly practiced a form of democracy. It was composed of the third estate members, clergy and the nobles e.g. Mirabeau. The power under the Directory was not centralized on one person-there were 5 directors and they were helped by 2 councils, the council of the Ancients and the council of 500.
- b) The Constituent Assembly attempted to restore financial stability. It issued some assignats/paper money. Also a measure was passed to nationalize church estates and put them up to public auction. The Directory also found it necessary to issue more assignats but when the value of the assignats was less than the cost of printing, the government authorized the destruction of the engraved plates and the printing press used in printing them. It issued a new paper money in the form of land notes (mandates territoriaux) but this also lost its value and in February 1797 France retired to a metallic currency.
- c) Both reformed the local administration. The National Assembly revolutionised local government by discarding the old units of the royal administration and the old royal officials (including the powerful intendants). The Directory also adopted the same system of local administration which had existed during the National Assembly.
- d) Both persecuted the church. The Constituent Assembly persecuted the church through the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and confiscation of their land. The Directors who were nearly all extremists also began a systematic persecution of the priests. The peasants were still profoundly Catholics and objected strongly to this persecution.
- e) Both introduced military and naval reforms. The Constituent Assembly reduced the high pay of the officers and the low pay of the ranks was increased. Promotion was open to all ranks and the soldiers were elected to senior officers. As a result of these reforms discipline was improved. The Directory also instituted reforms in the army. Under Carnot, armies were raised, and were well equipped and trained. They appointed able generals like Napoleon Bonaparte to lead military campaigns against the enemy.
- f) Both adopted the document of the declaration of the rights of men. The Directory opened with the declaration of the duties of the citizens as well as of the rights of men.
- g) As time moved, both governments became autocratic. The Constituent Assembly in 1791 banned trade unions and strikes were outlawed. This was done to keep the poor in their place and to encourage freedom of commerce. The persecution of the church, press censorship and deportation of journalists by the Directory are all good examples of authoritarianism.
- h) Both adopted a constitution-The National Assembly drafted the constitution of 1791 which however was used by the Legislative Assembly. The Directory also adopted a constitution which had been drafted by the National Convention.
- i) Both were geared to maintain peace and tranquility in France. The constituent Assembly used the National Guard to prevent the mob from committing acts of

- violence. One of the tasks confronting the Directory was that of restoring order in France. They were tired of revolutionary agitations and upheavals. "The Directory established tolerable order and obedience; some progress was made in suppressing brigandage." (R.Ergang)
- j) Both governments did not favour universal suffrage. Despite the declaration of the rights of man, the right of suffrage was granted only to "active citizens" or to those who annually paid taxes to the "amount of three days wages"(R. Ergang). Those who paid less were given no voice in the government. When the Directory took office, to remove the influence of the populace of Paris, the idea of universal suffrage was abandoned and the vote in elections was confined to taxpayers.

DIFFERENCES

- a) The element of democracy was more noticeable in the Constituent Assembly than in the Directory e.g. the Declaration of the Rights of men guaranteed liberty, equality and fraternity. The elements of democracy were very few in the Directory. It was more despotic e.g. press censorship and deportation of troublesome journalists
- b) In the Constituent Assembly, the king was the head of the executive. The Assembly favoured a constitutional monarchy type of government. Under this constitution a hereditary monarchy was preserved but his policies were strictly limited. In the Directory, at the head of the state there was to be no king but The Directorate of five, assisted by two councils. Thus the Directory had a republican form of government.
- c) No religious toleration in the Constituent Assembly. Through the civil constitution of the clergy, the church became a national institution entirely separate from the Papal jurisdiction. Religious toleration was granted by the Directory though all churches had to be self-supporting and independent of the state.
- d) The policies of the Constituent Assembly were geared towards maintaining internal order rather focused on external threats. No external threats yet under the National Assembly. The Directory was facing external threats. It also worked hard to conclude a general European peace.

Which groups benefited and which ones suffered from the changes in the social structure of France during the years 1789-1799?

Demands: The key issue in this question is the identification of the groups that benefited and those that lost as a result of the social changes that occurred in France.

Introduction

The French Revolution of 1789-1799 ushered a new social structure which had both benefits and disadvantages to various groups amongst the Frenchmen. The nobility, clergy, royalists and the monarchy were the main groups which greatly suffered while the third estate gained political mileage. It will be seen in the forthcoming assessment that the French Revolution had indeed profound social changes which greatly affected various groups of people.

- a) The Tennis Court oath saw the third estate gaining political power whilst the first and second estates lost the privilege of separate deliberations.
- b) The abolition of privileges and feudal dues on 4 August 1789 gave the peasants all they wanted e.g. there was less burden of taxation while it is also deprived the nobility and clergy of former privileges. The clergy also lost its land.
- c) The Civil Constitution of the Clergy saw the church and the clergy losing their wealth and influence. The Pope was no longer allowed to exercise his authority through this constitution. Louis XVI also lost his royal prerogative and control of the French society due to the implementation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

- d) City workers had not yet gained the vote or a higher standard of living. The National Assembly exacerbated the situation by passing laws banning trade unions and strikes-two of the great weapons of the working class advancement in later times.
- e) Louis XVI's flight to Varennes resulted in him losing more political power and eventually his life.
- f) The Girondists and the Jacobins were in control of France's destiny. The defeat in 1792 by Austria resulted in the loss of political power by the Girondists to the Jacobins.
- g) The 'Reign of Terror' of the Jacobins resulted in the loss of life of people from the various classes especially the peasants. Political power was largely transferred from the clergy and nobles to the bourgeoisie in the reign of terror.
- h) Under the Directory the upper middle classes were excluded.
- i) Peasants became privileged of the first and second estates were abolished and given some of the property that was confiscated. Declaration of the rights of men made the peasants to be equal to upper classes.

Conclusion

To sum up, it is clear after the above analysis that the bourgeoisie who belonged to the middle class seem to have benefited whilst the clergy and nobles suffered from the changes in the social structure of France. Thus the changes in the social structure of France in the years from 1789 to 1799 had far reaching consequences for various groups of people.

Assess the importance of Robespierre in the French Revolution.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the positive as well as the negative role of Robespierre in the French Revolution.

Introduction

Robespierre, who led the Jacobins and the National Convention from 1793-1794, looms high in the history of the French Revolution. He left a lasting impression on the history of Europe in general and France in particular. His contribution was seen in saving the revolution from both internal and external foes. While his contribution is mostly positive, he also had undermined the progress of the revolution in one way or the other.

Side A: Positive contribution

- a) He used the 'reign of terror'/ repression in trying to save the revolution i.e. he executed the enemies of the revolution. When people were killed those remaining decided either to support the revolution or to remain quiet.
- b) He reorganized the army under the leadership of General Carnot. This meant that mob violence was quelled.
- c) He also used different forms of propaganda. This was done by misinforming the people. For instance, their motto was "If one is an enemy of the revolution, one is an enemy of the state." Because of this, people did not want to be seen as enemies of their own state and therefore they were forced to support the revolution.
- d) He introduced moderate reforms eg regulation of bread prices and introduction of technical education.
- e) Robespierre took advantage of rivalries between the allied powers i.e. Austria and Russia, Austria and Prussia vs Britain.
- f) Robespierre also harnessed the resources of the revolution for war time use e.g. the levee en masse.

- g) Robespierre also introduced specialization of labour. Specialized protected the revolution because some were specialized in industries while others were in war and this made the people not to be tired.
- h) He aroused the spirit of nationalism among the soldiers. As a result of being nationalistic, the French soldiers fought with great zeal as opposed to the grand soldiers of the monarchy who were forced to fight.
- i) With the help of the National Convention, Robespierre completed the destruction of feudal regime by establishing a uniform system of weights and measurements.
- j) He also began some educational reforms. He promoted technical instruction by founding the technical colleges. Laws providing for the opening of one or more schools in each canton were passed thereby laying the foundation of the public school system. It was left to the Directory however to carry out these laws.
- k) he was able to make France the dominant power in Europe.
- l) Together with the National Convention, they rendered notable services to the future of France by completing the destruction of the feudal regime, by establishing a uniform system of weights and measures (metric system) which was later adopted by other countries.
- m) As leader of the National Convention, he started the work of preparing a uniform code of law for France (a task which Napoleon Bonaparte was to finish and which he was to gunner the credit)
- n) He created the National Archives, the museum of the Louvre and the National Library

Side B: Negative contribution

- price controls killed industries
- traces of bloodshed and terror-"the revolution was now devouring its own children through mass executions" (D. Thomson)
- many people suffered through his policies

Conclusion

It is clear from the assessment above that Robespierre, the leader of the Jacobins and National Convention, indeed played a pivotal role in the history of the French Revolution. Though he left reminiscences of bloodshed and terror, he also left entries on the credit side of the ledger as R. Ergang has pointed out. In short, the bad aspects of his administration were overshadowed by the good aspects, especially his ability to save the revolution from both internal and external forces.

Why were the revolutionary governments in France from 1789-1799 so short lived?

Demands: The key issue is an analysis of the factors which made the revolutionary governments in France from 1789 to 1799 to have a short life span.

Introduction

France between 1789 and 1799 had various revolutionary governments which had very short life spans because of lack experience while others were simply overthrown by the next government. Both the Constituent Assembly of May 1789 to September 1791 and the Legislative Assembly of October 1791 to September 1792 failed because of inexperience and divisions in the government. The Jacobin rule under the National Convention of 1792-4 was also overthrown because of the consequences of the reign of terror instituted by Robespierre. The last government, the Directory, was overthrown as a result of too much reliance on the army.

National (Constituent) Assembly

- It should be clear from the start that the National Assembly was an experimental government.
- It had inexperienced members e.g. Lafayette who was not sufficiently statesmanlike to direct the revolution.
- The National Assembly passed self-denying ordinances which made them face stiff opposition from the clergy and nobility e.g. the abolition of the noble privileges and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.
- The N.A depended heavily on Mirabeau and his death meant a great loss to the Assembly. He had tried to secure cooperation between the king and the Assembly and his death ended all possibility of reconciliation.
- The N.A failed to deal with urgent problems eg starvation and social and economic distress.
- All this contributed to its collapse

Legislative (Constitutional) Assembly

- It was composed of inexperienced members
- the king still exercised considerable powers and it was greatly opposed by those who favoured a republic ie the Girondists and the Jacobins.
- The L.A had within its ranks people who worked towards its downfall as they felt that it had done nothing enough for the revolution
- The L.A had to carry a difficult constitution that had been proposed by its predecessors
- These factors led to its unsuccessfulness and other factors which included the following helped to make the government so short-lived:
- the non-tax paying citizens were not given the right to vote so opposition came from this group
- most of the leading bourgeoisies and many peasants were satisfied with their gains under the revolution and they supported for a limited monarchy.

National Convention

- there were power struggle between the Girondists and the Jacobins
- it failed to restore order and stability in France
- the Jacobins murdered many innocent people under the law of suspected persons. This murder of innocent people caused a stir and made the government unpopular because they did not like the rule of the guillotine-“The guillotine could not rule forever and public opinion turned against it”
- the Jacobins ruled with the guillotine. A. Ramm notes that the rule of the guillotine could not have been permanent in 18th century Europe.

Directory

- was full of corruption
- relied too much on the army to deal with uprisings
- failed to solve major economic problems e.g. food prices continued to rise, high taxation
- it failed to solve the church question
- There were some personal squabbles within the Directory and the Directors were interested in popularity but lacked ability.

Conclusion

It is clear from the above analysis that the revolutionary governments that ruled France between 1789-1799 were so-short lived because of inexperienced members and were all generally affected by external threats.

Did the Jacobins do more to preserve the ideas of the revolution than the Directory?

Demands: The key issue is a comparative assessment of the policies of the Jacobins and the Directory, coming out with the government which protected the ideals of the revolution more than the other.

Introduction

It is important from the onset to mention that the Jacobins did more to preserve the ideas of the revolution than the Directory. This is not to undermine the role played by the Directory but the Jacobins' role was more significant because it reigned in the period of massive counter – revolutionary attacks especially from the autocratic regimes of other continental European powers. The Jacobins were able to stand against all the pressures to preserve the ideals of liberty, fraternity and equality.

Jacobins preserving the revolution

- use of the metric system promoted equality and fraternity
- uniform code of law-promoted equality of all men before the law
- Declaration of Men's rights e.g. freedom of speech thereby promoting the principles of liberty and equality
- creation of national libraries-it promoted freedom to study any subject of choice
- fighting of counter-revolutionary wars (1792-3) against Austria and Prussia who wanted to stop the spread of revolutionary ideas.
- execution of revolutionary offenders.
- specialization of work-created employment and increased production hence equality and fraternity were enhanced.
- Jacobins dictated wages, prices and trade distribution hence everyone was equal

Jacobins against the revolution

- Rule of the guillotine-revolution devoured its own children through mass executions.
- law of suspects-imprisoned people without trial hence violating people's liberty
- confiscated food from the peasants thus violating the ideals of the revolution

Directory saving the revolution

- ruled by democracy-five directors
- equal taxation
- declaration of man's rights
- brought peace with other states

Directory destroying the revolution

- limited franchise depending on the payment of certain taxes
- corruption increased the financial wars of France
- too much reliance on the army which led to military dictatorship of Napoleon 1
- no religious toleration

Conclusion

To wrap up, it is clear that the Jacobins did more to ensure the survival of the revolution than the Directory though it achieved this through violent means. This is not to undermine the contribution of the Directory but the role played by the Jacobins was more fundamental than the Directory.

“The common people, spurred by a few intellectuals were the real revolutionaries in France in 1789.” Discuss.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the common people (third estate-peasants and bourgeoisie) with the help of the educated elite can be regarded as real revolutionaries.

Introduction

From the onset, it is valid to say that the common people, who were popularly known as the third estate, with the help of the few intellectuals were indeed the real revolutionaries in France in 1789. The third estate, which comprised the bourgeoisie and the peasantry group, played a pivotal role to bring about real change in 1789 France. Their actions were complimented by the few intellectuals who made the grievances known to them. The description "real revolutionaries" should not rest on the common people alone, but must also apply to the nobility and clergy, though this was to a very limited extent.

Side A: The common people and the few intellectuals

- the peasants were highly taxed.
- they were unprivileged.
- they paid tithes to the Parish priests.
- the bourgeoisie were educated but not part of the privileged class.
- bourgeoisie were not allowed to hold important positions in government circles
- The common people with the help of the intellectuals forced Louis XVI to call for the Estates-General meeting in 1789.
- they resented the type of voting which was adopted by the first and second estates hence declared themselves into the national assembly.
- the common people invaded the Bastille to show their anger against the royal despotism of Louis XVI.
- the women, from the common people, marched to Versailles to make their demands known to Louis XVI.
- the common people, now guiding the National Assembly abolished the feudal dues and privileges on 4 August.
- they also formulated the declaration of the rights of man which according to many historians was 'the death certificate of the Ancien regime.'
- the common people in the National Assembly, began to work on a new constitution which was later adopted by the Legislative Assembly
- The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was also created to deal with the clergy
- the efforts of the common people were complimented by the contribution of the intellectuals.
- the few intellectuals stimulated the common person by giving them alternative forms of governments e.g. they praised the way England was ruled
- the intellectuals were the torch bearers, helped the common people to draw up constitutions.
- they criticized the French system of government
- because of contribution of the intellectuals the common people succeeded, thus enabling them to be called real revolutionaries.

Side B: Other groups which can be regarded as real revolutionaries

- The common people were not the only real revolutionaries but also the nobility and clergy
- the lower nobility did not have the same privileges as the upper nobility so they revolted against the government
- the lower nobility did not resist the reforms which were brought by the National Assembly
- Some members of the first and second estates willingly renounced their privileges.
- soldiers were also revolutionaries-they brought the idea of revolution when they came back from the American war of independence.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the common people, with the aid of the few intellectuals were indeed the real revolutionaries in France in 1789 because of the nature of their grievances and the actions they took to eradicate them. However, the role played by other groups such as the nobility and clergy should not be dismissed at face value. Though possessing most of the privileges, some did much to bring positive changes in France.

Was the French Revolution a political revolt against royal despotism?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the causes of the French Revolution. One should assess whether the revolution was a result of royal despotism or other factors.

Introduction

Indeed, the French Revolution was a political revolt against royal despotism in as far as the causes of the revolution were concerned. The kings lacked good leadership qualities, they were despotic and their rule was characterized by deep rooted abuses and evils which many detested, for instance, the use of the lettres de catchets, press censorship, denying people a voice in the government just to mention a few. However, royal despotism was exacerbated by other economic and social factors which must not be undermined.

Side A: Role of Royal despotism in the outbreak of the French Revolution

- the king was an absolute ruler and ruled by divine right of kings
- the king had the right to make alliances, declare war and conclude peace.
- he was the source of law, supreme judge and was the recipient of government revenue
- the king used the hated lettres de catchets and imprisoned people without trial
- he could not be opposed-everything he said was legal. "The thing legal because I wish it", said Louis XV. "The state is myself", stated Louis XVI.
- the king ruled without the interference of the parliament
- the king had power to select and dismiss ministers and he was hostile to any reform like those of Turgot and Necker.
- king confiscated property from people as a way of punishment
- he denied people a voice in the government by the use of press censorship
- he supported the caste system which the third estate did not support.
- he leaned too much on the upper classes i.e. the nobility and the clergy so that he forgot about the welfare of the lower classes i.e. the third estate.
- all the above became the bone of contention among the people, they resented the absolutism of the king which they viewed as highly old fashioned.

Side B: Other factors

NB: It is important to remember that despotism was accepted in the continent of Europe. Countries such as Poland, Prussia, Russia and Austria practiced royal despotism but no revolution mushroomed from these nations. The difficult question for the historian is to explain why a revolution broke out in France alone and not in Poland or say Russia. The answer lies not in royal despotism but on how Louis XVI conducted his affairs after 1774.

- the incompetence and intransigence of the king, Louis XVI
- influence of Mari Antoinette
- revolt of the nobility

- financial crisis
- Natural disasters e.g. drought, severe winter, hailstorms
- poor harvests
- caste system
- influence of the philosophers
- the summoning of the estates- general

Conclusion

In a bid to tie up the loose ends, it is convincing to agree that royal despotism provided the bone of contention in France and the bomb finally exploded as other factors began to appear on the political, economic and social arena. Thus indeed the French Revolution was a result of royal despotism to a very large extent though we must not neglect role displayed by other factors.

“From the fall of the Bastille to the execution of Louis XVI, the résistance to the revolution within France was as dangerous as the threats posed by external forces.” How true is this claim and how successful did the leaders of the revolution deal with each of these dangers?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether internal forces against the revolution can be equated to external forces. Also assess whether the revolutionaries were successful in dealing with the dangers.

Introduction

From 14 July 1789 (when the Bastille fell) to February 1793 (when Louis XVI), the revolution in France faced formidable opposition from both inside and outside forces. Thus, the claim that the resistance to the revolution within France was as dangerous as the threats posed by external foes cannot be doubted. More so, the revolutionaries did commendable work by successfully outwitting some of these threats though they were found wanting at certain times. That the revolution survived up to 1815 when Napoleon Bonaparte was finally defeated at Waterloo, speaks large volumes on the great success scored by the revolutionary leaders.

- the revolution faced internal threats such as the royalist, nobility, clergy, the king himself as well as the notorious Paris mob.
- external forces included the autocratic regimes of other continental European powers, the Comte d' Artois and the émigrés.

Internal forces

The Church

- was against the Civil Constitution of the Clergy
- they were against the National Assembly's confiscation of church property
- the clergy had refused to take an oath that they would uphold the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (CCC).
- The Pope also condemned these ecclesiastical changes
- because of the above the clergy opposed every measure undertaken by the revolutionaries and their presence was real danger to the revolution.

The king and his wife

- resented the loss of absolute powers
- he hated the of a constitutional monarchy
- he was against the CCC

- He conspired with foreign monarchs against the revolution
- he leaked every important information to the enemies of the revolution
- the flight to Varennes-showed his unwillingness to support the revolution
- Marie Antoinette continued to exert pressure on the king urging him to seek for foreign help

The Royalists (king's relatives and friends)

- were disenchanted with the displacement of the king from ruling
- they resented a republic
- they were used to the luxurious court life and the reduction in the powers of the king meant they could no longer be able to enjoy what they used to during the heydays of Louis XVI.
- Thus they supported anyone would want to oppose the revolution

The Nobles

- were indignant over the loss of their special privileges
- they continued to veto meaningful reforms which the revolutionaries might have decided to offer.

The riotous Paris mob and the peasantry

- they felt that they had been betrayed by the revolutionaries
- thus there were some uprisings in many towns and the countryside eg La Vendee, Lyons, Paris etc

External forces

The émigrés

- were a group of nobles who did not accept the changes brought by the revolution, hence decided to emigrate from France to neighboring European countries
- urged foreign monarchs to invade and 'liberate' France from the revolutionaries
- in 1790 counter revolutionary armies were arrayed at Coblenz, Brussels and Turin
- 1791 an émigré army was formed in the Rhineland
- the émigrés were thus determined to overthrow the revolution thus they constituted a threat to the French revolution

Success or failure

- the revolutionary leaders were able to sail through
- the Legislative Assembly leaders threatened the émigrés who remained near the frontiers of France with forfeiture of their lands and with death unless they returned.
- this did not succeed because the king vetoed the decree
- external foes were dealt with through wars in 1792 and 1793
- cruelty of the revolutionaries however sowed the seeds of hatred and division.
- the reign of terror was used to pacify opponents of the revolution

Conclusion

It is important to emphasize in conclusion that internal foes posed a very serious threat to the survival of the revolution just like external foes. The revolutionaries did a commendable work by successfully dealing with the counter-revolutionaries though they had failures here and there.

Discuss the validity of the claim that the rule of the Directory marked the end of the French Revolution.

Demands: Assessing whether the Directory fulfilled the aims of the revolutionaries (hence ending the revolution) or did not fulfill them (hence the revolution continued).

- Many historians argue that the French Revolution only lasted until shortly after the reign of terror.
- William Doyle argues that after the purge of the Girondins there were no true revolutionaries left who adhered to the principles of 1789.
- the Directory precipitated the end of the revolution which actually came about due to the Coup of 10 Brumaire, when Napoleon 1 claimed that the only point of agreement in Paris was that the constitution was half destroyed and was unable to save liberty.
- some historians argue that the Directory was not so much the end of the revolution as rather it was counter-revolutionary by its existence. Others do not support this claim saying that the Directory would “wage war on royalism” and “revive patriotism”, although this is hardly an impartial claim.
- Some suggest that the rule of the Directory was counter-revolutionary in that the aim of the coup was the “sovereignty of the French people---security and property,” all revolutionary aims, suggesting that the Directory did not fulfill them.

NB: The rule of the Directory could certainly be said to mark a different phase of the French Revolution in that it deliberately broke away from the revolution of the early 1790s of mob and sans-culotte rule and aimed to have a stable, moderate government not dominated by Jacobin radicals.

However, it could be argued that it was not the Directory which marked the end of the French Revolution but the establishment of the Consular system, which ultimately allowed Napoleon Bonaparte to gain power.

Side 1: Directory ending the revolution (when it fulfilled the aims of the revolutionaries)

- practiced a form of democracy the use of 5 Directors and two councils
- made great efforts to bring financial sanity in France through the introduction of mandates-territoriaux though there was limited success
- it implemented local administrative reforms just like what the National Assembly had done. Old units of the royal administration and the old royal officials were discarded
- took measures to curtail the powers of the church which had been regarded during the Ancien Regime as ‘state within a state’. It followed in the footsteps of National Assembly which had introduced the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.
- implemented military and naval reforms to strengthen the army in order to safeguard the revolution. Under Carnot, armies were raised, and were well equipped and trained. Able generals like Napoleon Bonaparte to lead military campaigns against. Because of these army reforms the revolution was safe from internal and external counter-revolutionaries.
- the Directory also opened with the declaration of the duties of the citizens as well as of the rights of men
- It also adopted the use of a constitution- which had been drafted by the National Convention.
- it was also geared for the maintenance of peace and tranquility in France-it established tolerable order and obedience; some progress was made in suppressing brigandage.
- religious toleration was granted by the Directory though all churches had to be self supporting

Side 2: Directory did not end the revolution (when it introduced policies which were against the revolutionary ideals)

- the Directory abandoned the idea of universal suffrage and the vote in elections was confined to the taxpayers, this was done to remove the influence of the populace of Paris.
- the Directory had very few ingredients of democracy. It was more despotic, for instance, there was press censorship and deportation of troublesome journalists.
- the Directory was full of corruption which was against the ideals of the French Revolution
- the Directory used the army and gave it too much power and for the army there were no boundaries when it came to crushing discontentment.
- they crushed revolts and uprisings with considerable severity e.g. the Coup de tat of Fructidor of 1797 was suppressed to save the revolution at the expense of liberty.

Why did the 'moderate revolution' of 1789 in France not succeed in meeting the demands of the discontented?

Demands: The key issue in the question is an assessment of the reasons why the establishment of the National Assembly could not solve the grievances of the disillusioned Frenchmen.

Firstly, identify the discontented groups

- the lowest classes were becoming mistrustful of the attitude and policies of the bourgeoisie.
- the radical Jacobins-were determined to take the revolution further.
- counter-revolutionaries e.g. Louis XVI, clergy, nobility, émigrés were waiting for their opportunity to restore the Ancien regime with the help of foreign rulers.

Secondly, define the term 'moderate revolution'

- the changes which took place when Louis XVI lost control of events in France to the formation of a new government (national assembly) and its polices, represents the moderate revolution.

Moderate: -not radical

- desired a constitutional monarchy, did not want to do away with the king.

Reasons why the moderate revolution could not meet the expectations of the people.

- not everyone was allowed to vote –only active citizens had the right to vote i.e. male landowners of 25 years and older, whose annual taxes were equal to 3 days wages-this was not accepted by the disenchanted groups.
- they lacked a strong executive authority-the Paris Commune and the Jacobins capitalized upon this to become successful later.
- local assemblies were given extensive powers and central government little control over them. This made it difficult to implement reforms and many abuses continued.
- the government i.e. the national assembly was inexperienced-it was in fact an experimental government which relied on try and error basis hence it was bound to make many mistakes.
- the bourgeoisies were the biggest beneficiaries-they could vote because of the property qualifications. This made it possible for them to dominate the government and impose its wishes against the wishes of the majority of the people. They felt that they had benefited from the changes achieved so far and to them there was no need

for further changes to be effected. Thus they never looked into the demands of the discontented groups in France.

- The actions of the king should be seen as another factor which made it impossible for the moderate revolution to please the discontented. The king continued to veto against meaningful legislations which the government might have decided to offer.

- The August 4 Session had removed the privileges of the upper classes-hence the clergy and nobility were not satisfied and became part of the discontented groups in France.

- the reduction of the king's powers also intimidated the king-hence failed to support the national assembly.

- the ecclesiastical changes especially the Civil Constitution of the Clergy worsened the relationship of the government and the church.

How serious a challenge was the king's position to progressive reforms in France between 1789 to 1793?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the contribution of the king Louis XVI to the failure of progressive reforms. More effective answers should pay attention to the period which is specified in the question (1789-1793). More successful answers should assess how the king's position threatened the failure of progressive reforms and the contributions of other factors.

Side A: Contribution of the king's position

The king's position posed a serious challenge to the progressive reforms because:

- he identified himself with the enemies of the revolution e.g. flight to Varennes.

- he vetoed legislations suggested by the revolutionary governments derailed progressive reforms.

- he conspired with foreign monarchs against the revolution to and this made the revolution to be threatened.

- he failed to give final decisions on the Estates-General meeting led many people to see him as a very weak king and this triggered a series of events which led to the revolution

- submission to bad advice from his wife and the royalists made him to make dangerous decisions.

- he was against the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and this threatened the revolution.

- he resented the reduction of his power and refused to operate as a constitutional monarchy.

- his flight to Varennes had shown clearly that he was not on the side of the revolutionaries.

Side B: Other factors

However, on its own, the king's position could not have seriously threatened the revolution but it was aided by the following factors.

- the rise of republicans

- the émigrés and the threat of foreign invasions

- reaction in the provinces

- food shortages

- the end of censorship allowed extremists to voice their opinion in speeches and newspapers and journals.

- the in fighting between the Girondins and Jacobins made constructive work virtually impossible.

In what ways and for what reasons did the aims of the revolutionaries in France change in the years from 1789 to 1792?

Demands: The key issue is the extent of change in the aims of the revolutionaries from 1789-1792. It is not necessary to deal at length with the background of the revolution except in explaining the aims of the revolutionaries in 1789.

a) Explain the aims of the revolutionaries in 1789.

- the revolutionaries wanted moderate reforms, especially of the fiscal system, demanding an end to privileged and exemptions.
- they were monarchists and not republicans.
- demands for a National Assembly reflected aims for wider participation in government.
- the unpopularity of the Church led to the Civil Constitution of Clergy.

b) The revolution became extreme/radical after 1789 because of :

- the king's actions, including the flight to Varennes
- reaction in the provinces
- food shortages
- the action of the émigrés
- the threat of foreign invasion

c) Ways/methods adopted in showing the radicalism of the revolutionaries

- the end of censorship allowed extremists to voice their opinion in speeches and in newspapers and journals.
- demand for constitution
- republicanism
- Jacobinism-Jacobin clubs were erected
- use of reign of terror
- execution of the king

Explain the nature and extent of the opposition in 1789 to the policies of Louis XVI.

Demands: Assessing the situation in 1789, the kind of grievances, and the degree of opposition whether it was rampant or not.

Side A: The nature of opposition

- many people in France wished to see the downfall of Louis XVI.
- Bourgeoisie demands-were great, opposed the king's policies, utilized the writing of the philosophers.
- peasants demands were also great, affected by drought, hunger, inflation.
- nobility and clergy opposed any kind of reform.

NB: The above demonstrate that the opposition to Louis' policies was so great.

- king was forced to call the Estates-General meeting.
- king in a dilemma at the Estates-General meeting

Side B: However, though there was opposition, it should not be exaggerated.

- not all of the population of France wished to see the downfall of the monarchy in 1789.

- There were many in France who believed that the king was the key to reform because there was no alternative.
- they were moderate and not radicals and thus they advocated for a limited monarchy
- Thus, taking this into account one may argue that the opposition to Louis' policies should not be overemphasized, it was not as hostile as one might want to think.

Did the Jacobins do more to assist or threaten the survival of the French Revolution?

Demands: assessing whether the Jacobins helped in saving the revolution or destroyed it.

Side A: Assisting the revolution.

The Jacobins assisted the survival of the revolution through the following:

- a) Reign of terror protected France from counter-revolutionaries
- b) Use of propaganda to discredit the enemies of the revolution
- c) Levee en masse- increased the military prowess France's army hence able to defend their sovereignty
- d) Committee of public safety redistributed émigré -hence satisfying the idea of equality in wealth.
- e) Revolutionary Tribunal dealt with all those accused of being hostile to the revolution.
- f) Brought prestige to France for victory over other European powers.
- g) Abolished negro-slavery
- h) Protection of the right of the wife to claims towards her husband's property
- i) National system of education
- j) Metric-system of measurements was introduced
- k) Some legal re-organization

Side B: Threatened the revolution

- executed Louis XVI-thus infuriating the autocratic regimes of Europe
- Reign of terror saw the mass executions of Frenchmen mostly innocent people.
- the Representatives on mission-enforced centralization which had had been rejected by the people especially the municipality.
- use of propaganda increased opposition.
- Forced peasants to surrender grain to the government for feeding soldiers- hence losing support.
- Regulation of wages and prices of basic commodities brought hatred.

What can be learned from the Directory (1795-1799) about the achievements and problems of the revolution in France?

Demands- The key issue is to deduce from the work of the Directory the achievements and problems of the French Revolution.

Achievements

- the French Revolution introduced democracy-this was clearly demonstrated in the Directory setting up five directors.
- the revolution observed rights of people such as equality, liberty and fraternity-this was seen in the Directory opening with the declaration of the duties of its citizens as well as the rights of men.
- the French Revolution was able to bring financial sanity to France-the Directory was able to cope with inflation and the continuing fall of the value of money. It issued a new paper

money in the form of land notes (mandates-territoriaux). In 1797 France retired to a metallic currency. Financial stability restored business confidence and promoted prosperity.

- The French Revolution was able to cut the national debt-the Directory did this by adding a new tax on windows and houses to the three direct taxes established in 1790.
- The French Revolution was able to bring peace with other continental European powers by 1799. The Directory did this through signing treaties as well as through the contribution of Napoleon Bonaparte who engaged in the Italian and Egyptian Campaigns.
- By 1799, the French Revolution had established political stability after the turbulence of the reign of terror-The Directory did this through the suppression of internal uprisings.

Problems

- The French Revolution had a problem of trying to quench counter-revolutionary elements from other continental European countries-this was seen in the Directory when it dispatched armies to undertake an attack on Austria and Austrian possessions in Italy (the Italian Campaign of 1796) as well the Egyptian Campaign.
- the revolutionary leaders were always involved in corruption- the directorate was very much corrupt e.g. Barras.
- the revolutionary leaders were not always in agreement-in the Directory there were personal squabbles. There was also lack of harmony between the Directory and the two councils, the council of the five hundred and the council of the Ancients.
- French Revolution faced many internal threats-The Directory faced coups eg the Babouef Conspiracy, the Coup de tat of Fructidor.
- Without the army the French Revolutionary leaders could not have survived-the Directory relied on the army to crush uprisings and coups. It also relied on Napoleon 1 to crush opposition in 1797.
- castigation of the church-showed clearly, that the Holy See and the state had fallen into irreconcilable rivalry.

Why did Louis XVI convene the Estates-General (Stats-Generaux) and why did it not solve his problems?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for the calling of the Estate-General and its failure to solve his problems.

Part A: Why the estates-general was called in 1789.

1. Mention that the Estates-General had last met in 1614. Therefore, the convening of the Estates-General after 175 years was certainly not a voluntary move on the part of Louis XVI. He was forced by events. In fact this meeting was long overdue
2. The major reason was that the long-term problems facing France had reached unacceptable proportions. Most of these problems dated back to the reigns of Louis XVI and Louis XV, for instance,
 - a) on the eve of the revolution, France was so deeply indebted hence was bankrupt.
 - b) Extravagant expenditures had created a financial crisis which needed a national rather an individual solution.
 - c) the influence of the ideas of the philosophers on the third estate had made them politically conscious and dangerous. Louis Xvi could not afford to ignore them and their grievances.
 - d) the above problems were all compounded by a great scarcity of food in the 1780s. A series of crop failures caused a shortage of grain, consequently raising the price of bread. Because bread was the main nutrition for poor peasants this led to starvation. This starvation led to bread riots which put

pressure on the king to convene the Estates-general. Louis XVI gave way to pressure. He recalled Necker as Director-General of finance and ruled that the Estates-General should meet at Versailles in May 1789.

Part B: Why the Estates-General could not solve

1. The Estates-General could not solve the problems presented to it or the grievances because of its composition-had three contrasting groups (the first, second, and third estates)
2. Different beliefs-the first and second estates still stuck to the old tradition or procedure of voting by estate. This would have disadvantaged them and would render any drastic reforms impossible.
3. The two privileged classes failed to appreciate the social and economic developments which the bourgeoisie and even the masses had undergone in the previous 150 years.
4. The king himself was not committed to seeing drastic solutions to the problems, as he supported the traditional procedure of voting by estate, separately.
5. The nature of the problems themselves, would have required solutions which would have meant the sweeping away of the systems of the Ancien regime, which the first two privileged estates were not prepared to accept.

How far was the financial crisis responsible for the outbreak of the French Revolution?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the causes of the French Revolution. As the king of one of the world's largest countries Louis XVI had to deal with many problems.

Side A: Contribution of the Financial Crisis to the outbreak of the French Revolution.

- the most urgent problem facing Louis XVI was the fact that his government was deeply in dept.
- France had been in dept for nearly a hundred years due to over expenditure.
- In 1786, Calonne, the Minister in charge of finance, had informed the king of the need to do something about the finance of the country.
- financial crisis led to hyperinflation, shortage of food, starvation and unemployment which led people in the rural to drift to the urban centers and these hordes of people who became known as the Paris mob.

Side B: Other Factors

- However, the finance was not the only problem facing the government
- in the country side mass hunger was coming.
- the mass hunger was caused by freak weather-in 1788 a massive hailstorm destroyed cornfields, vegetable plots, orchards and vineyards all over central France.
- this was followed by drought so that the harvest of 178 was very poor.
- the drought was followed by the coldest winter in living memory.
- rivers froze over, stopping the ground four.
- Blocked roads prevented food from reaching markets and when the snow thawed in spring, floods ruined huge areas of farmland leading to a sharp rise in the price of bread.
- the influence of the philosophers
- the impact of the American war of Independence

- the incompetence of the king Louis XVI
- The ambitious nobility
- the system of government which was despotic

How, and with what results did the Civil Constitution of the Clergy constitute a turning point in the support base of the Revolutionaries?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the contribution of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (CCC) to the progress and effects of the Revolution

- Contribution of the CCC to the progress and effects of the revolution
- one must be aware that ecclesiastical measures were indicative of the dismantling of traditional authority, which characterized the revolutionary period.
 - the system was ultimately organized in the 1790 CCC which coordinated the administration of the church, paid the clergy, cut ties with the pope and made the clergy take an oath of loyalty.
 - The constitution tore France apart with some support for the non-juring priests and others for the constitutional clergy.
 - Counter-revolution gained support.
 - violence and persecution increased ultimately seen in the Jacobin Terror which forced people to support the revolution.
 - Paris as the centre of the Revolution and the Terror did not oppose the constitution.
 - This forced the Royal Family to fear for the monarch.
 - Hence the abortive flight to Varennes.
 - This action led him to be labelled anti-revolution.
 - in turn radicalism grew to the point of the September Massacre of 1792.
 - Counter- Revolution was seen in La Vendee where émigrés and non-juring priests combined.
 - January 1791 the king had vetoed decrees to order the return of the émigrés and that depriving no-juring priests of their offices and emoluments.
 - the constitution of the clergy and its aftermath was also responsible for the involvement of Prussia and Austria to protect the Monarch-the Brunswick Manifesto.
 - Alliance with foreigners also explains the Jacobin Terror to protect the fatherland

NB: Excellent answer should be able to bring out the progress of the revolution in relation to the effects of the CCC. It must see the deterioration of relations to 1793. Be able to point out that up to the CCC, the revolution enjoyed massive support. After the CCC, this support-base shifted dramatically to the counter-revolutionary side. This then explains the use of terror to try and win back support.

“The revolt of 1789 was against a government which was tyrannical, inefficient and insensitive to the needs of the people.” Do you agree?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the causes of the French Revolution. The answer should clearly demonstrate an understanding of the terms tyrannical, inefficient and insensitive and discuss these in line with the situation in France before June 1789.

Side A:

Tyranny-bring out the despotic nature of government in which the divine right of kings led Louis XVI to refuse reforms

-Louis XVI also began to protect privileges

-he dismissed ministers at will. At the Estates-General Meeting the king continued to stand by the 1st and 2nd estates.

-

Insensitive-also takes into consideration governance and privilege

-the government was insensitive to the high taxation which faced the peasants and the middle class.

-the royal family was also considered wasteful and insensitive e.g. Marie Antoinette

-that the king was weak willed also made the government unsuited.

-lack of the ability to make correct decisions plunged France into the American War of Independence.

Inefficient- came to a climax with the bad harvest of 1788.

-government was unable to provide relief to the people.

Side B:

-While generally agreeing with the topic, it must be realized and acknowledged that some of the French people supported the regime of the day.

-the nobility and the clergy were beneficiaries of the system.

-the influence of the philosophers can also be considered either way.

Examine the role of the Paris Mob in the French Revolution.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the role played by the Paris Mob in the French Revolution (1789). The answer should discuss the contribution of the Mob to the radicalism, violence and extremism of the period.

Contribution of the Paris Mob.

-The mob was responsible for the action that led to the execution of the monarch and the coming of the reign of terror.

-Their critical role at the start of the revolution was the storming of the Bastille and the adoption of the tricolour flag.

-By July 1789 the Mob and the Assembly were working together to stop a counter-revolution.

-Pressure from the Assembly and the Paris Mob forced Louis XVI back to Versailles and to accept the Declaration of the Rights of Man.

-The march of the Women was a result of the pressure whereby they demanded a lower price for bread.

-From October 1789 they dominated the revolution especially as the Mob could sit on the gallery of the Assembly.

-They were incensed by the attempted flight to Varennes in 1791.

-The flight also made France more Republican.

-The Paris Mob allied with the Jacobins and the Paris Commune and pushed for extreme democracy through violence.

-They were later controlled and commanded by the Jacobins and France was plunged into the Reign of Terror which ended in 1794 with the death of Robespierre and the establishment of the Directory.

How far, and by what means, were the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity achieved in Revolutionary France in the years to 1799?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the achievement of the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity in revolutionary France. The answer should be able to distinguish between the stages of the revolution, especially the National Assembly (1789-1791), the Constitutional Monarchy (1791-1792), Republicanism (1792-1795) and the Directory (1795-1799). The answer should discuss the above in the context of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789). Examples of the freedoms given as well as those taken away during the course of the revolution are a must.

- the monarchy was at liberty at the beginning of the revolution and by the time of the Jacobins there was a shift to extremism.
- The Reign of Terror demonstrates the violation of these ideals.
- During the time of the Directory there were attempts to restore order.

Why, and with what success, did France engage in a war with Europe between 1792 and 1795?

Demands: The key issue is the explanation of the reasons for the French War with Europe and an assessment of the results of the war. Both external and internal reasons should be discussed.

- War with Europe was partly triggered by the Pillnitz declaration of 1791.
- The flight to Varennes by Louis XVI made him and the émigrés to be considered as traitors, so war against Austria and Prussia was considered a national duty to defend the fatherland.
- War, for France was in line with the Edict of Fraternity in which France offered help to those abroad wishing to gain freedom by overthrowing their kings.
- War was welcomed within France by the Girondins who wanted to discredit the king for supporting the enemies of the state.
- The Right, represented by the Feuillants had supported war in the hope that the position of the king will be strengthened.
- The war which came with the Brunswick Manifesto ended with the treaty of Basle in July 1795.
- Under the direction of the Girondin Ministry the French were initially successful against the Prussian and Austrian forces but were affected partly by the death of Leopold II and lack of supplies.
- Dissension between Austria and Prussia over strategy also worked to the advantage of France.
- French forces led by Dumouriez were successful in November 1792 at Jemappes.
- Reacting to the Edict of Fraternity, the first coalition was formed by February 1793.
- France was able to hold on again as the allies were torn by discord.
- Fortune turned against France with the defeat and desertion of Dumouriez to the Austrians in March 1793 and further defeat by Prussians.
- Between March and October 1793, the success and defeat alternated for the French.
- Allied victory in July led to the guillotining of Austria.
- The contributions of Jourdan and Carnot who became leader of the Committee of Public Safety led to more success in Nice, Savoy, Spain and Toulon.
- Between 1794 and 1795 the French conquered Belgium and went into the Rhine.
- By April 1795 France had re-established her natural boundaries and was willing to make peace with her enemies leading to the dissolution of the first coalition.
- Treaties were signed with Prussia, Holland and Spain.

Which did more to preserve the ideas of the revolution: the Jacobins and the Directory?

Demands: The key issue is the comparative assessment of the Jacobins and the Directory in preserving the ideals of the Revolution. An understanding of the Directory and the Jacobins should be demonstrated and the answer should be reasonably balanced. Answer should show an awareness of success and as well as failures. Both regimes demonstrated these to varying extents.

Jacobins

- the Jacobins' extremism (1793-1794) may have saved the revolution from internal and external opposition and its radicalism prevented an early return to monarchical rule but it divided France and discredited the Revolution abroad.
- They created a dictatorship of a political party and its Reign claimed thousands of lives of the people the French Revolution sought to protect.
- the battlefield they only managed to hold Austrian and Prussian advance.

The Director

- The Directory (1795-1799) lasted longer than the Jacobins.
- It helped to retrieve a perilous economic situation and gained the first significant victories for revolution in France, symbolised by the Treaty of Campo Formio (1797) that saw important gains from Austria.
- However, its conservatism alienated those who saw it as corrupt with the Directors being self-seeking.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE: RISE, DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

"It was his outstanding military ability which brought him to power." How far true is this on the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte?

Demands: The key issue is to assess whether Napoleon's military ability contributed more to his rise or there were other factors.

Introduction

Indeed, Napoleon Bonaparte's military abilities contributed greatly to his rise to power in 1799. He began his military career in 1785 as a sub-lieutenant in an artillery regiment in Bierre. His military career was further enhanced when he took part in capturing Toulon from the British. Successes in the Italian campaign made Napoleon to be well known and this was welcomed by many Frenchmen who were tired of the Directory. However, the contribution of other factors should not be swept under the carpet. They also played their part though to a limited extent.

Side A: Contribution of his military ability.

- he was the officer in command of the troops of the directory.

- he ousted Britain from Toulon in 1795-by this he proved his worth which led him to famous.
- he also ousted the royalists from the streets of Paris in 1795 and by this he restored order.
- he succeeded in the Italian Campaign of 1796-1797 when he demolished the Austrians who later signed a truce which gave Napoleon victory.
- The treaty of Campo-Formio 1797 which he signed after defeating the Austrians at the battle of Rivoli gained him support. This made countries to be compensated e.g. the Netherlands was given the Rhine frontier; France was also enriched and glorified. This made people want him most to be their king.
- he also introduced some military reforms which made him to be so successful in the battlefield.
- Wellington had this to say about Napoleon Bonaparte "his presence at the battlefield made the difference of 40 000 men."

Side B: Other factors

- he had the right connections e.g. friendship with Robespierre's brother helped him to the rank of brigadier.
- Image consciousness-he was an excellent orator who appeared to the deepest loyalties of his soldiers.
- he had little concern for the casualty rates which resulted from his tactics.
- he had no degree of hesitancy
- he also benefited from the weaknesses of the Directory.

Conclusion

It is clear from the above analysis, that Napoleon's outstanding military abilities indeed brought him to power. He was a military genius and earned the support of many people. However, other factors such as the weaknesses of the Directory should not be undermined.

To what extent and for what reasons did Napoleon Bonaparte enjoy support within France from 1799 to 1815?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the extent to which the reforms which Napoleon Bonaparte implemented earned him support from his people.

Introduction

From 1799 to 1815 Napoleon Bonaparte earned a great deal of support from the Frenchmen as a result of his reforms which he offered them. Though he enjoyed the support of the people, he was also opposed here and there because of the autocratic nature of some of his policies though this must not be overemphasized.

Side A: Reasons why Napoleon 1 enjoyed support

- he made an efficient government-he chose men with ability to become consuls and ministers.
- career open to talent-people were chosen/promoted because of ability and not nepotism and this led him to be supported greatly.
- the concordat-made Catholicism the state religion. This was supported by the majority because they were Catholics.
- religious toleration was also granted.
- public works-reduced unemployment and beautified France-many people benefited.

- legion of honour-created ranks and soldiers were promoted according to ability-more support from the army.
- he introduced the Bank of France-people were given loans and industries boosted.
- he made some educational reforms e.g. the creation of the University of France, secondary and primary schools.
- he introduced the Napoleonic codes e.g. the criminal procedure-it created equality because everybody was tried by Jury.
- he helped the agricultural sector-by draining marshes and importing new machinery from countries like Belgium.
- he managed to stop inflation
- his glorious foreign policy earned him a lot of support e.g. countries which were defeated were forced to pay tax to France e.g. Italy which reduced the tax burden on the Frenchmen.

Side B: Policies/Reasons which reduced support for Napoleon 1

- he was a dictator, for instance, when he declared himself to be the first consul-his policies were the very antithesis of the revolutionary principles.
- he introduced press censorship
- in education women were discriminated
- the promotion of Marat also raised eyebrows
- he revived the most hated lettres-de catchets
- his civil code was opposed by women since fathers were given excessive powers
- penal code deprived people of their rights of association.
- his secret police under General Fouché instilled fear among the masses.
- his foreign policy also made people to oppose him-people were conscripted by force into the army and there was restlessness in France.

Conclusion

To sum up Napoleon enjoyed support within France to a larger extent because of his successful domestic policy. However, one must not cast a blind eye on the fact that he was opposed of his insatiable desire to control Europe as well as the fact that some of his domestic policies owed elements of dictatorship eg the lettres de catchets, press censorship and the use of the secret police.

How far did Napoleon 1 from 1800 maintain the principles of liberty and equality?

Demands: The key issue is to assess the extent to which Napoleon 1 managed to maintain the principles of liberty and equality. These ideas include the ideas of equal taxation, presentation in parliament, better administration and removal of corruption. Three were also the “unrevolutionary” ones such as a police force, censorship and arbitrary law. He centralized power in his own hands. Napoleon certainly claimed that his aim was to uphold the ideals, but candidates can also refer to the “unrevolutionary” measures.

Introduction

Many historians have not yet come to an agreement as to whether Napoleon 1 managed to maintain liberty and equality or did not. Some would like to argue that he did not maintain liberty and equality in as far as the use of secret police, press censorship and education system is concerned. However, others argue that he maintained the principles considering elements such as the code

Napoleon. It must be pointed outright that Napoleon did recognize the principles to very limited extent.

Side A: Evidence of maintaining liberty and equality.

- career open to talent-everyone had access to jobs not by nepotism but by ability thus maintaining the ideal of equality.
- public works –maintained liberty because people had access to jobs. The public works also enhanced fraternity among the people as they had the capacity to sustain themselves.
- education-boys had access to education hence liberty was maintained.
- under the Napoleonic codes he introduced trial by jury where offenders were to be tried publicly. By so doing he managed to maintain the principle of equality.
- There was also the uniformity of measurements under this Napoleonic Code and by so doing he maintained the principle of equality since the measurements could no longer favour the first and second estates.
- legion of honour- equality was enhanced because every officer in the army had chance to be promoted
- the Concordat-there was liberty for worship, Catholicism was made the official religion, other religions were also accepted thus enhancing the ideals of liberty and fraternity.

Side B: Evidence of violating the principles of liberty and equality.

- Napoleon 1 violated equality when he appointed people who were loyal to him to rule the new France he had created. People were deprived of their right to vote.
- he excluded females in the education sector thereby violating the principles of equality and the freedom and right to be educated.
- he banned political science subjects like history thereby violating the freedom of those who wanted to follow the political career. He banned these political subjects because he feared the mushrooming of political minds which he considered dangerous to his rule.
- Press was censored during his time and by so doing people were deprived of their freedom of expression, thus liberty was not maintained.
- The Code Napoleon did not maintain the ideal of equality since it gave few legal rights to women and also gave fathers excessive powers over their sons.
- the use of secret police under the command of General Fouché also violated the freedom of speech, movement, association to many citizens.
- the political set up-centralization of power meant people had no liberty to carry out their activities.
- the Concordat- The Pope and the bishops were made state paid servants hence no freedom to carry out their activities.

Conclusion

In a nutshell, it is clear from the above analysis that Napoleon 1 was able to maintain the principles of liberty and equality to a greater extent especially if one considers the Napoleonic Codes which were described as “a summary and correction of the French Revolution” as D. Richards puts it. However, one must not undermine some activities which violated liberty and equality in France from 1804 like press censorship, discrimination of females in the education and the revival of the lettres de cachets.

What did France gain and what did she lose as a result of the career of Napoleon 1?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the work of Napoleon 1 and deduce what the Frenchmen benefited and what disadvantages were accrued from his work.

Introduction

The coming of Napoleon Bonaparte to power in 1799 opened a new chapter in the history of the French Revolution. As a statesman, Napoleon gave to France institutions which in different ways endured to this day. The early revolutionary leaders had failed disastrously in some aspects but Napoleon's work looms very high as seen in the local government, education, finance and the enhancement of the ideals of the French Revolution. Though the Frenchmen gained a lot, one must not undermine the fact that they lost in some aspects.

Side A: Gains

- 1) Local government reforms-created a strong and unified national policy
- 2) Public works-he permanently beautified and enriched France with canals, bridges, and roads and this gave France effective communication. Places of leisure like museums were set up and palaces like Fontainebleau were restored.
- 3) Industry and Commerce-chambers of commerce were created; advisory boards were set up in connection with many manufacturers. He introduced tariffs to strengthen industries and this was a clear benefit to the industrialists.
- 4) He maintained a stable currency-based on gold unlike the old and unreliable revolutionary finance system. He created the bank of France. He encouraged the collection of taxes in the hands of officials in Paris. Corrupt officials were punished. Thus through his finance policy, the Frenchmen benefited tremendously.
- 5) Napoleon also settled the religious matter through entering into a concordat with the Pope. The Frenchmen gained religious freedom.
- 6) Educational changes- many people were given access to education especially the boys.
- 7) The Code Napoleon-unification of French laws –equality before the law was guaranteed for everyone
- 8) The Frenchmen also gained prestige through a successful foreign policy.

Side B: Losses

- 1) Loss of life as result of an aggressive foreign policy.
- 2) The Continental System led to stagnation of trade e.g. tea, coffee and tobacco became unobtainable or expensive.
- 3) Taxes and conscription which he applied completely failed to compensate for all the improvements in other directions that the government had made.
- 4) The formation of the fourth coalition in 1813 weakened the system of government.
- 5) The Frenchmen lost liberty due to the use of the secret police, press censorship and the revival of the lettres de cachets.

Conclusion

To sum up, Napoleon's significant schemes gave to France social benefits of the revolution and on the other hand his plans grew too vast, he began to create his own grave and he France too much in men and money.

“A consolidator rather than an innovator.” Does Napoleon 1 (1799-1815) deserve such an epitaph?

Demands: The key issue is to give a close analysis of whether Napoleon 1's domestic policy were of his own creation (innovation) or he brought together strengthened ideas which had already been practiced by his predecessors i.e. Louis XVI and the revolutionary governments (consolidation).

Introduction

The domestic policy of Napoleon 1 was a compromise of aspects which he innovated himself and others which he borrowed from the Ancien regime and the revolution and then consolidated them for the well being of the Frenchmen. A closer look at the policies of Napoleon would suggest that he was more of a consolidator rather than an innovator. He cemented already existing policies and there is very little evidence of innovation.

Side A: Consolidator

- 1) Adopted a uniform system of weights and measurements which had been established by the National Convention. The National Convention had completed the destruction of feudal regime by establishing a uniform system of measurements and weights.
- 2) Continued with some educational changes started by the National Convention. The N.C had begun some educational reforms. It had promoted technical instruction by founding technical colleges. Laws providing for the opening of one or more schools in each canton were passed thereby laying the foundation of the public school system. Napoleon also made some education changes-he established primary, secondary schools, Lycees. He consolidated the educational system by establishing the University of France which was led by the Grandmaster.
- 3) He continued with the codification of the laws which had been started by the National Convention. He introduced the Code Napoleon in March 1804. This gave a father overwhelming authority on his family and he could temporarily imprison his son.
- 4) Creation of departments which were headed by prefects and sub-prefects of his own choice. This was earlier practiced by the Ancien Regime and later by the National Assembly.
- 5) He revived the use of the lettres in 1810. It was one the linchpins of the rule of the Ancien Regime. Thus Napoleon 1 adopted it to thwart the growing opposition to his rule after 1807.
- 6) Press censorship which was practiced by Louis XVI was also used by Napoleon 1.
- 7) Revival of Catholicism, where he returned churches' ecclesiastical powers through the concordat of 1801. Napoleon was following the footsteps of the Old Order.
- 8) Founding of the museum which was also done by the Jacobins.
- 9) Financial measures-he created the Bank of France. Financial measure were undertaken by the National Assembly, National Convention and the Directory.
- 10) Public works which Napoleon introduced were also implemented by the Ancien Regime.

11) Political set up of France-resembled the Ancien Regime

Side B: An innovator

- 1) Career open to talent-he appointed men into positions according to their ability and not favouritism as the Ancien Regime but this becomes questionable when one looks at the promotion of Marat. It was done because Napoleon was related to Marat which shows that he was greatly influenced by the works of the Ancien Regime leaders who greatly favoured nepotism.
- 2) Legion of honour-whereby membership of the legion came to be a cherished distinction awarded for services in such matters as politics, civil service, local government and art.
- 3) He established the bank of France thus bringing financial sanity.
- 4) Code of Criminal Procedure-he tried people publicly.
- 5) Did not include women in his government, he learned from Louis XVI disastrous for having allowed his woman to have a say in political affairs. He is quoted to have said, "I have no women ruling in my court."
- 6) Formalisation of the executive consul which was responsible for making laws.

Conclusion

To tie up the loose ends, it is to a larger extent watertight to describe Napoleon 1 as a consolidator rather an innovator in his domestic policy especially if one considers the revival of the church's powers. However, one must not undermine the fact that Napoleon 1 was also original in his ideas though this was to a very limited extent.

"A later day benevolent despot." Is this a fair description of Napoleon Bonaparte in his domestic policy between 1799 and 1814?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the domestic policy of Napoleon 1 showing whether he was a kind dictator, a dictator who instituted reforms for the benefit of the people or an unkind dictator.

Napoleon Bonaparte, the man who ruled France between 1799 and 1815 deserve to be classified in the category of the 18th century benevolent despots of Europe because, though a dictator he instituted reforms which benefited the majority of the Frenchmen. His reforms clearly demonstrated that Napoleon's major objective was to please the people though he shared elements of unkindness in some of his policies.

Side A: Evidence of being a kind (benevolent) despot.

- Career open to talent-promoted equality.
- opening of schools showed Napoleon wanted his people to be literate and learned.
- Code of Criminal Procedure-Napoleon showed that he wanted people to be tried fairly and publicly.
- the religious settlement clearly showed that Napoleon was concerned with peace between the state and the Holy See.
- religious settlement also demonstrated that Napoleon desired to please the majority of the Frenchmen because he made Catholicism, the state religion thus pleasing the peasants and other groups who were catholic. He believed

that religion was the 'cement of the social order'. He is also quoted to have said, "A state without religion is like a vessel without a compass", signifying how he valued religion.

- financial reforms especially the creation of the Bank of France showed Napoleon 1's major aim was to make the majority financially stable.
- Code Napoleon-reinstated the fundamental freedoms for the ordinary.
- Political set up-showed Napoleon's desire for order hence peace and tranquility prevailed enhancing the economic development of France as well as people being able to carry out their usual business without fear.
- Public works- Napoleon showed his kindness here because he desired to see many people employed and becoming self-sufficient. He also wanted to make a well developed nation through the public works.
- Industry, commerce and agriculture- Napoleon desired to see the majority not suffering. Hence Napoleon was a kind dictator.

Side B: Evidence that Napoleon was a ruthless dictator

- use of press censorship
- revival of the lettres de catchets
- use of secret police under General Fouché which tortured people.
- discrimination of the girls in the education system
- The Code Napoleon gave too much powers to the father over his wife which violated the principle of equality.
- he gave limited powers to the Pope and bishops became state paid servants hence making them subservient to the state.
- Napoleon did not seek advice to other members-very autocratic in his administration-thus he violated the principle of liberty and fraternity.
- Napoleon sometimes was corrupt and practiced nepotism eg the appointment of Marat was questionable.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is imperative to state that Napoleon 1 was indeed a benevolent despot to a very large extent. He falls in the same category with the 18th century benevolent despots of Europe like Catherine 11 of Russia and Frederick the Great of Prussia who, though despotic, instituted reforms which greatly benefited the people. However, he did show elements of ruthlessness though to a very limited extent.

"A soldier's hatred of disorder." How far was this the guiding principle of Napoleon 1's rule in France from 1799 to 1815?

Demands: The key issue is to assess Napoleon 1's domestic policy showing whether he was a soldier who did not like disorder and anarchy or whether the policies he implemented encouraged disorder in France.

Side A: Napoleon showed that he really a soldier who did not like disorder in France:

- he used a secret police under the generalship of Fouché-this was adopted to quench opposition hence promoting order and stability.
- the political set up-was centralized- Napoleon wanted to oversee everything himself so that order is maintained.
- Press censorship-was designed to remove anti-Napoleonic sentiments which would encourage order and stability.

- Order was also maintained by bringing reforms which would benefit the people so that Napoleon would enjoy support rather than opposition e.g. public works, industrial and commercial improvements and financial reforms.
- in education, Napoleon discouraged the teaching of political science subjects like history and philosophy and this chances for the emergence of revolutionary sentiments.
- the concordat was also designed to bring order by removing strife between the church and the state.
- revival of the lettres de catchets instilled fear in the people so that revolutionary sentiments would not breed.
- Preserving basic freedoms in the Code Napoleon made people to like Napoleon.

Side B: Some of Napoleon 1's policies encouraged disorder and anarchy in France:

- political set up where Napoleon 1 dominated bred hatred because many people felt they were left out.
- press censorship and secret police promoted opposition hence bringing disorder rather than encouraging order-corruption also led to chaos in the state.
- removal of the Pope's powers did not solve the church question hence breeding disorder.
- discrimination of girls in the education sector violated equality and liberty hence promoting disorder.
- giving more powers to the father brought disorder in many families.

Conclusion

After the above assessment it is clear that a "soldier's hatred of disorder" truly the main guiding principle in Napoleon 1's domestic policy. His reforms demonstrated clearly that he was a man who wanted to avoid anarchy and disorder at all costs. However, in the implementation of the reforms Napoleon 1 unwittingly found himself promoting disorder which brought disaster for himself and France at large.

By what means and to what extent, did Napoleon Bonaparte exercise power over other European states during the years 1802 to 1812?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of Napoleon1's foreign policy showing the methods he used in trying to dominate Europe and whether the methods were successful or not.

Introduction

Napoleon Bonaparte, who ruled France from 1799 to 1815 adopted many methods to try and exercise control over other European states. The methods included military conquests and alliances just to mention a few. In most cases the methods only succeeded in the short run but in the long term they were to a larger extent a total fiasco and they contributed greatly to the demise of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Methods used

- 1) Dynastic policy-Napoleon instilled his brothers as kings in conquered territories e.g. Joseph Bonaparte as king of Naples, Jerome Bonaparte as king of Westphalia, Louis Bonaparte as king of Holland. His close friend Bernadotte was made king of Sweden. The dynastic policy was a success

in the short run as Napoleon was able to control these states and to let the Napoleonic legacy was felt everywhere. However, in the long run the policy was a failure as it aroused nationalistic feelings which ultimately undid Napoleon.

- 2) **Military conquests**-Napoleon engaged in military conquests in order to make other European states subservient to him e.g. the battle of Trafalgar with Britain, the battle of Ulm with Austria, the battle of Jena with Russia, the battle of Austerlitz etc. In these battles, he succeeded, but as he continued waging war with other European state he ended up on the receiving end.
- 3) **Taxation**-the conquered states were forced to pay tax to Napoleon eg Italy. The tax burden on the Frenchmen was lessened but created resentment from many European states.
- 4) **Use of treaties**-Napoleon 1 made treaties with other nations where he dominated their terms e.g. treaty of Amiens with Britain 1802, treaty of Tilsit with Russia 1807, Treaty of Pressburg with Austria 1805.
- 5) **Alliances**-were made with countries such as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Russia and Austria but in most cases these alliances were short-lived because Napoleon ended up dominating his counterparts.
- 6) **Continental System**-all states under France were not going to trade with Britain. Napoleon 1 issued the Berlin and Milan decrees and Fontainebleau decrees. The Continental System only crippled Britain to a very limited extent. In the end it was Napoleon who earned hatred and this contributed to his downfall.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Napoleon Bonaparte used various methods. He was very successful with the methods especially up to 1807. However, after 1807, the methods were a disaster. Napoleon 1's aggressive foreign policy became his Achilles heels because the methods he implemented were not accepted by other European nations.

Why did successive coalitions from 1805 take so long to defeat Napoleon Bonaparte?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the reasons that contributed to the failure of the coalitions of Europe to defeat Napoleon in time. The candidate should look at both the weaknesses of the coalitions and the strengths of Napoleon 1 himself as contributing factors.

Introduction

The European coalitions had difficulty in defeating Napoleon Bonaparte after 1805 because of a combination of factors. It was due to both the weaknesses of the successive coalitions and the strengths of Napoleon himself that enabled him to have a long life span that ran up to 1815.

Side A: Napoleon 1's Strengths

- He was a military genius
- His boldness-he did the least expected such as organizing the French forces to face the third coalitions.
- Unpredictability or use of surprise attacks e.g. in battles against the coalition forces. The commanders could not predict his next move which led to heavy losses among the coalition powers.
- he made some changes in the organization of infantry
- he used offensive tactics

- he perfected the army which he inherited
- creation of the army corps
- armies were led by young and ambitious commanders
- creation of schools to instruct the art of war
- Napoleon himself controlled the Grand Army
- centralisation of command was crucial for the implementation of unity of command.
- Napoleon had many resources at his disposal.

Side B: weaknesses of the successive coalitions

- they were not united- e.g. in 1805 the Prussians, who were bitterly jealous of Austria and tempted by Napoleon's promise of Hanover, had kept out of the third coalition of Britain, Russia, Austria and Sweden. In 1807, Prussia and Austria agreed to enforce the Continental system and to join in the war against their ally Britain, which killed the third coalition.
- the allies had no financial and material resources to outclass France. In fact they depended greatly on the resources of Britain.
- most of the countries of Europe had not witnessed an revolution in methods of warfare like what France had undergone through hence their military strategies and tactics were highly old fashioned compared to those of France.

Conclusion

It is fair in conclusion to admit that the successive coalitions of Europe took long to defeat Napoleon 1 because of the rivalry and petty jealousies which kept the divided. Napoleon was able to capitalize upon these weaknesses to defeat them one by one. Thus the European nation could not make a concerted effort and this is what undid them. This, however, is not to undermine the military and organizational strengths of Napoleon Bonaparte himself. His strengths also played an important part though to a limited extent.

“The greatest achievement of Napoleon Bonaparte was a reform of the French law.” Examine this view with reference to the code Napoleon and Napoleon 1's domestic policy.

Demands: The key issue is an examination of the impact and influence of the Code Napoleon and an assessment of other reforms.

Introduction

Historians are generally agreed that of all of Napoleon 1's achievements, the Code Napoleon was one of the greatest because it touched on a wide range of aspects of French life. It provided a legal framework for the country which was progressive and whose influence spread to other countries in Europe and the Americas. However, the Code Napoleon was not a very progressive document because it relegated women to the status of second class citizens. Thus, cannot be said to be the greatest, hence other reforms should be taken into consideration.

Side A: Why the Code Napoleon can be said to be the greatest.

- 1) It provided guidance on aspects of life such as marriage, rights and duties, divorce, parentage and inheritance and property rights. This brought about social cohesion and helped ordinary people to have an understanding of the law.

- 2) He established a uniform legal system for the country which helped to solve the problems of selective administration of justice. The establishment of a uniform legal system was very important and other countries in Europe and South America embraced the idea. Therefore, it is safe to say that Napoleon 1 gave France and the world a great base for a progressive legal system. In this regard the Code Napoleon outlived Napoleon 1 which is evidence of its impact and influence.
- 3) The Code Napoleon re-enforced the gains of the revolution such as freedom of the individual, freedom of work and conscience, equality before the law, eradication of feudalism and secular character of the state. D. Richards quotes one historian who is said to have referred to it as a "summary and correction of the revolution." Napoleon 1 had seen positives in the revolution and decided to make them part of the French legal framework. This guaranteed people some of their basic and fundamental human rights. The Code ratified the land settlement of the revolution giving legal status to the new and holding patterns. This helped to reduce land conflicts between the new owners and those who held it before the revolution.
- 4) Impact on the family-the father was given more powers and revived the patriarchic authority of the male in the family. Civil marriages were made compulsory and divorce was criminal offence or insanity. This helped to create social discipline that was necessary to build strong families and a strong nation.
- 5) Code and labour relations-strokes were forbidden in and effort to promote increased productivity in manufacturing industries.

Side B: However, the Code Napoleon was not very progressive because:

- 1) The issue of compulsory civil marriage undermined the authority of the Church in family affairs. This angered the church which did not accept the new role of the state in the family issues. It is therefore evident that the Code Napoleon created misunderstandings between the church and the state. In a country where the majority of the people were catholic, the code Napoleon was viewed with contempt.
- 2) The Code Napoleon did not recognize the importance of women in society. Husbands could sell their wives' properties while there was the equality before the law between men and women.
- 3) The Code was bourgeoisie oriented because in labour it carefully guarded the interest of the employers. In labour issues or disputes it discriminated against the wage earner.
- 4) Other achievements to be considered include the following:
 - the Concordat of 1801
 - the reforms in education
 - career open to talent
 - public works which created employment and developed France.
 - Public administration

"Napoleon Bonaparte's downfall was inevitable." How far do you agree with this assertion?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the conditions leading to the fall of Napoleon 1. The answer should acknowledge both the good and negative prospects of Napoleon 1.

Side A: The inevitability of his downfall

- by and large the qualities which brought Napoleon to success were those that guaranteed his eventual failure.
- his ambition, egoism, sense of destiny and single minded determination helped him to achieve remarkable success both at home and on the battlefield.
- his undoing was that he did not know when to stop.
- his military success led to self belief that in turn made him to ignore advice.
- he concentrated too much power on himself such that his generals could not lead effectively as was the case in the Peninsular War.
- As a statesman, he failed to make lasting treaties. He not only wanted to destroy his enemies at war front but also on the peace table e.g. Austria faced humiliation at Luneville (1801), at Pressburg (1805) and again in 1809.
- In seeking their revenge the Austrians had played a crucial role in the battle of Nations and to them Vienna was a sense of victory. As long as Napoleon was still on the throne, peace was impossible. He refused offers in 1813.
- Nationalism also became a force that was too powerful for Napoleon to resist. Prussia rallied behind Russia which had resisted Napoleon's Moscow Campaign.
- Defeat for Napoleon was inevitable because right from the start Britain was a constant opponent whose material resources enabled her to fight and subsidise the allies. Napoleon had no chance at sea as the battles of Trafalgar and Waterloo demonstrated. The Continental System also demonstrated the naval supremacy of Britain.

Side B: Argue that there were in fact achievements along the way.

- if these achievements had been properly handled, would have resulted in the mastery of Europe and his downfall would not have been inevitable.
- his victories at Ulm, Austerlitz, Jena and Friedland won him support from the people.
- successes in domestic policy also cemented his rule.
- his domination of Europe by 1807 had greatly secured his position as emperor of France.
- dynastic policy did contribute to his survival though it was in the short run.

Compare the contribution of Prussia and Russia to the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Demands: The key issue is a comparative analysis of the contribution Prussia and Russia made to defeat of Napoleon 1.

PRUSSIA

- Prussian resistance was revived by an element of patriotic resentment, together with fears as to their future in Napoleon's Europe.
- This resulted in a programme of French style reforms led by Stein and Hardenberg designed to strengthen the State in readiness for the earliest opportunity to fight back.
- The military reforms of Prussia introduced universal military service, with training in a professional army.
- This raised a large army for Prussia.
- Prussia also opened a second front for France thus stretching Napoleon.
- The reforms also made Prussia a useful ally.

RUSSIA

- The growing rift between Napoleon and the Tsar was due to the impact of the Continental System and territorial disagreements over the future of Turkey, Poland Sweden.
- Napoleon launched an invasion in 1812.
- He was defeated by space and time.
- Russian forces simply withdrew before Napoleon and his lines of communication became extended.
- The Tsar used the scorched earth policy, whereby Russian peasants and troops destroyed villages and crops as they fell back.
- No food for Napoleon's troops was left behind.
- Winter finished off the French troops.
- Only 30 000 men re-crossed the Niemen River in December 1812.
- Thus the contribution of Prussia and Russia was significant to the eventual downfall of Napoleon in 1814.

"It was more the weakness of the Directory than the character and ability of Napoleon that led to his rise to power." Discuss.

Demands: The key issue is an explanation of the reasons for the rise of Napoleon 1. The answer should be aware of both the weaknesses of the Directory and those reasons emanating from Napoleon himself.

Side A: Weaknesses of the Directory

- show an awareness of the circumstances of the establishment of the Directory.
- It inherited the problems of the National Convention and so remained weak as it tried to grapple brigandage, the desire for peace abroad, the need to reconcile the church to the state among other things.
- The Constitution of the Directory did not make it strong either.
- it was further weakened by conflicts between the Republicans and Constitutional Monarchists.
- Lack of agreement led the Directors to allow a coup in 1797 with the support of Napoleon.
- This was to protect them from the royalist threat.
- Fears from the Directors again in 1799 allowed Sieyes to plot with Napoleon the coup of Brumaire.
- Besides weaknesses in government, the Directory failed to address economic issues.
- Further it was considered corrupt so much that by 1797 the people wanted a strong government capable of bringing peace, order and security.
- The weaknesses of the Directory helped Napoleon to the forefront.

Side B: Napoleon's own strengths

- He was effective as a general as seen in the Italian Campaign and in Egypt.
- People saw him as a hero, who always came to the rescue of the Directory when there was a crisis e.g. in 1795, 1797, and again in 1799.
- As a man, he was ambitious and calculating and used people to his advantage.
- In 1799, it was Sieyes and his brother Lucien who helped him to come to power in a coup d'Etat.

Critically examine why Napoleon 1 was defeated by the Fourth Coalition in 1814?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte. The answer should consider the long term and short term causes.

Long Term Causes.

- the effects of the Continental System
- Britain's naval and financial power.
- the size of the French Empire, which had become too large to be intact.
- the rise of nationalism especially in the Peninsular War involving Spain and Portugal.
- the military reforms in Prussia added to the strength of the allies.

Short Term Causes

- the disastrous Moscow Campaign of 1812.
- the formation of the Fourth Coalition in 1813 comprising Russia Austria, Prussia and Britain.

NB: Good answers should exhaustively discuss the reasons, emphasizing the military techniques of each side and showing how they contributed to victory.

**VIENNA, CONGRESS SYSTEM AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
1815-1848.**

“On balance, the successes of the Congress of Vienna outweighed its failures.” Discuss this verdict.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the effectiveness of the terms of the Congress of Vienna. The success or failure of the congress can be measured according to what it purported to do, its aims.

-The statesmen at Vienna aimed to, among other things, achieve a balance of power, and prevent resurgence of another Napoleon, and to ensure and maintain peace in Europe.

Successes

- the balance of power was largely achieved though territorial adjustments and rewarding the Allies who had fought against Napoleon 1 might have upset others.
- the allies' commitment to the fair balance of power can be seen in the Polish-Saxony issue when Russia and Prussia made extravagant demands which were likely to upset the balance of power. The other powers, namely Poland, Austria and France were prepared to go to war against such claims, and the two had to back down. This was a successful defense of the balance of power.
- The issue of preventing future French aggression was also generally successful although this was temporally interrupted by Napoleon's escape from Elba (the so called hundred days). He was however successfully defeated by the Allies which was a noble success.
- The creation of barrier states around France was meant to prevent future aggression from her, and this worked to a large extent.
- The fact that there was no major war for over 40 years until the Crimean war of 1854 is clear evidence of the success of policies which came out of Vienna.
- there was also the birth of the Concert of Europe-to maintain peace
- the abolition of the Slave Trade was another success.
- free navigation on international rivers was guaranteed

- the principle of legitimacy was fairly carried out e.g. the Bourbons were restored in France and Spain, the church's powers were also restored, the 39 German states remained intact
- the use of written constitutions to France and some German territories were granted.

Failures

- The settlement has been criticized for failing to pay attention to the dynamism of nationalism and liberalism especially by bringing people of different nationality together e.g. union of Belgium and Holland.
- the Congress of Vienna was dominated by the four major countries. In other words the fate of small states was determined for them by the big powers.
- legitimacy was not always applied in areas where it conflicted with Great Power interests.
- the great powers were too reactionary
- the Vienna Settlement created material for future disputes.

“Self-interest was the guiding principle in the Congress System rather than common interests.” Discuss.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the aims and conduct of the Congress System from 1815-1827.

- the idea of a Congress System was conceived in the Quadruple Alliance of November 1815. This is not a question on whether or not there was a Congress System, but that view can be referred to in passing. Candidates should not wholly focus on the Vienna Settlement, although reference to it is acceptable.
- The idea of a concert of Europe was Castlereagh of Britain. In this system the great powers, Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia pledged themselves to meet in Congresses to promote their common interest and discuss any important matters affecting Europe.
- The Congress System also aimed at upholding the terms of the Vienna Congress for the next 20 years, they also agreed to prevent a Bonaparte from ascending to the throne of France and to work together to prevent future French aggression.
- However, the Congress System had a short life span because it soon became clear that the powers had different views as to its purpose. It soon became clear that the powers had few, if any, common interests.
- Instead, each power was after furthering its own self-interest. Hence it is largely true that self-interests dominated the Congress System and not common interest. This caused division and suspicion from the onset. This division became more apparent as the danger of another Napoleon loomed.
- The Holy Alliance powers who happened to be absolute monarchs i.e. Austria, Russia and Prussia were different from Britain, a constitutional Monarch. The Holy Alliance powers wanted to use the system to suppress the revolution in any country from their own benefit. The British were opposed to unilateral intervention in the domestic affairs of other nations. They feared that revolution in other countries would affect their own empires where absolute and repressive rule was common.
- The differences can be seen in the following Congresses: Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), Verona (1822) and St Petersburg (1825).
- Self interest was also seen on the issues of the Barbary Pirates and the Slave Trade. Alexander 1 was opposed by Castlereagh on his suggestion that an international fleet be stationed in the Mediterranean Sea to stamp out piracy. Castlereagh was opposed by other powers on his proposal that a naval force be

formed to search ships for slaves. Britain opposed intervention in Spain by the Holy Alliance powers because she had vested economic interests there.
-Thus, self-interest was the guiding principle in the Congress rather than common interest.

‘Great power politics rather than principles governed the actions of the peacemakers at Vienna.’ Discuss.

Demands: the key issue is assessing whether the plenipotentiaries at Vienna looked after themselves or they considered wider issues (concerned with other people's interests)

Side A: Evidence within the terms of the treaty of powers acting in their own interest.

- 1) Russia gaining Poland.
- 2) Britain gaining various naval bases: It has been argued by historians that it was proper for Britain and Russia to be given what they wished because the two did more than anyone else to defeat Napoleon. A lasting peace would be one that satisfied Britain and Russia.
- 3) The principle of Containment of France-self-interest: Great powers feared future French aggression. However, this was also in the interest of the whole of Europe as well.
- 4) Legitimacy-this was to strengthen the barrier against France (self-interest)
- 5) Compensation-applied in the interests of the Great powers: Although this was the case, it was necessary to create a peace that was as satisfactory to everyone as possible.
- 6) Balance of power-It preserved the status quo in the interests of the great powers. However, the fact that no one power was dominant was in the interests of peace.

Side B: The Great Powers also considered wider Issues e.g.

- Slave trade
- peace was guaranteed
- free navigation on international Rivers

NB: The powers did act in their own interests but there a lot of evidence to suggest that they were trying to create a lasting peace as well.

How far did the Vienna Settlement lead to the suppression of nationalism?

Demands: The key is an assessment of the part played by the Vienna Settlement in the suppression of nationalism as well as acknowledging that there were also other factors.

Side A: Role of the Vienna Settlement in the suppression of nationalism

- Mention that the Vienna Settlement played its part in the suppression of nationalism but there were other factors.
- acknowledge that foreigners ruled many Europeans after 1815 e.g. Poland under the Russians and Prussians, Italy and Germany under Austria, Norway under Sweden.
- Mention the role of the Congress system (a direct result of the Vienna Settlement especially in Italy)

-Metternich used the German Confederation created by Vienna to crush nationalism in the German states in 1819.

Side B: Other Factors for the failure of nationalism

- the lack of national feeling across much of Europe at this time (nationalism in its embryonic stage)
- the weakness of nationalist movements themselves.
- However, we need to appreciate that there were also nationalist successes, that the Vienna Settlement did not completely lead to the Suppression of nationalism e.g. in Greece and Belgium.
- Also the Great Powers would not uphold the principles of Vienna if they felt it was not in their interests.

NB: The Vienna Settlement did play a significant role but there were other factors to consider.

How much attention did the Congress of Vienna pay to the principle of nationality?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Vienna Congress recognized Nationalism in its settlement or not.

- Start by defining the term “nationality” i.e. the ideas of the power of the state
- acknowledge that nationalism was still in its infancy stage though now being observed e.g. there was in Germany cultural nationalism, nationalism in Germany was still mainly confined to the universities in 1815 but already given practical reality by the Prussian war of liberation against Napoleon 1; similar liberation movements in Spain where nationalism was more liberal than in Germany; Napoleonic rule also awakened nationalism in Italy.
- Representation at Vienna-demonstrates that Vienna did not pay attention to nationality-smaller countries were not represented.
- Union of Belgian and Holland-not really against nationalism because few Belgians were concerned. It was Dutch mismanagement of Belgians which caused the national revolution in 1830.
- The German Confederation-a step towards unification but not prospects of unification in 181; whatever the congress had done, because Germany was still very divided.
- Italy-only Piedmont and the Papal States were not handed over to foreign rule-a clear frustration of nationalist sentiments, which Napoleon’s influence there had stimulated.
- The transfer of Norway, from Denmark to Sweden- a good example of the Congress’ arbitrary treatment of various peoples in its rearrangement of the map of Europe-but Norway had no national tradition.
- Poland was ‘liberated’ but with the foreseeable result that it fell under Russian influence. Here in effect, if not intention, was the Congress’ greatest frustration of nationality.

Conclusion

- The Congress of Vienna was moved more by pragmatism than principle, so though it did often flout the ideals of nationalism (as of Liberalism), this was hardly a conscious decision. The main principles followed were legitimacy and balance of power.

How far true is the assertion that “the Congress System as it operated from 1815-25 was an instrument by which the strong oppressed the weak”?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Congress System was used by the strong powers to oppress the weaker ones or it benefited all people.

Introduction

The above claim is valid to a greater extent. There is a lot of evidence from the actions of the great powers from 1815-1825 that demonstrate the idea that the strong powers were using the Congress System to suppress the demands of the weaker nations. This, however should not be taken for granted because the strong powers at times used the Congress System for the benefit of the weaker nations.

Side A: Evidence of oppressing the weak.

- the Congress System was dominated by the four Great powers Russia, Austria, Prussia and Britain-so it had a dictatorial stance right from the beginning.
- smaller states were not invited thus their interests were suppressed.
- exemption of France in the Quadruple alliance shows that the great powers were after oppressing a weaker nation, France, who had been defeated.
- Holy Alliance-was designed to crush revolutionary sentiments in Europe hence oppressing the weaker revolutionary groups.
- Metternich did not want to give either democracy or nationalism since it would destroy his ramshackle Austrian Empire composed of Italians, Czechs, Poles, Germans among many, thus the powers of the smaller nationalities were undermined.
- The great powers except Britain favoured intervention in 1820, they signed a protocol to suppress revolutions in Spain, Portugal and Italy hence depriving the revolutionaries of their rights to gain their total independence.
- January 1820 military revolt broke in Spain and King Ferdinand VII was made prisoner until 1823-the great powers intervened-a clear evidence of oppression.
- July 1820 revolution in Naples-Metternich crushed it-this was done to protect the interests of Austria in Italy hence oppressing the weak.

Side B: Not always oppressive

- the Congress System was conducted in the interest of peace which would benefit everyone.
- France was accepted as a great power-no larger indemnity was paid; army of occupation was removed.
- made sure that the Slave Trade was abolished.

Conclusion

It is clear from the above analysis that the Congress System was indeed an instrument by which the Strong oppressed the weak. The rights and independence of smaller states like Spain, Italy and Germany were disregarded. This was done in order to safeguard the self-interests of the major powers.

To what extent did the Congress System (1815-1827) show that the great powers had more differences than common interests?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the great powers during the Congress System had more differences compared to their common interests or aims.

Introduction

The Congress System during the years 1815 to 1827 greatly showed that they had more differences than common aims. Castlereagh of Britain opposed the ideas of the other great powers. Britain went against the interventionist policy of the Russia, Austria and Prussia because she was a Constitutional monarchy while the other great powers were autocratic monarchs. Although they agreed in some aims like in 1818, when they agreed in the re-armament of France, their congresses were characterized by more differences than common interests. This caused the Congress System to collapse.

Side A: Evidence that the Congress System was characterized by more differences.

- reaction of other powers to the formation of the Holy Alliance-Britain and Austria did not take it seriously.
- scheme of disarmament by Russia at Aix-la-Chapelle was opposed.
- opposition of an allied army to be put in Belgium by Castlereagh.
- the idea of the formation of an international fleet was opposed greatly.
- the idea to stamp out the Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean was not received well by Castlereagh.
- refusal of Britain to sign the Troppau Protocol of 1821.
- Castlereagh and Metternich refused Alexander's idea of intervening in support of the Greeks against Turks in the Greek Revolt.
- Other powers did not agree with Alexander when he decided to suppress a revolution in Spain.
- France did not find support when she intervened in Spanish revolt of 1821.

Side B: Evidence of common aims.

- in 1815 by the Quadruple Alliance, all powers agreed to meet regularly.
- Holy Alliance-they agreed to rule according to peace, justice and charity although this was not taken seriously.
- In 1818 at Aix-la- Chapelle all powers agreed to the rearrangement of France.
- the powers agreed to take France as Great powers.
- They agreed that Jews should be protected.
- Fair treatment of Napoleon at St Helena.
- Britain and Austria decided to intervene quickly in the Greek revolt.
- the powers aimed at upholding the terms of the Congress of Vienna for the next twenty years, they also agreed to prevent another Bonaparte from ascending to the throne of France and to work together to prevent future aggression.

Conclusion

After the above analysis, it is clear that the great powers had more differences than common interests. These differences made the end of the Congress System inevitable. However, it is also important to note that the powers were

all eager to maintain peace and tranquility and this is clearly observed in the absence of any major war for forty years.

“The Congress System was doomed from the start.” Discuss.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Congress System showed any weaknesses during its initial period or it fell because of other factors which came later.

Side A: Evidence that it was doomed from the start.

- No agreement in the Quadruple Alliance. Britain agreed with the basic principles of maintaining the settlement of 1815 and to prevent the return of a Bonaparte on the throne but she never agreed with the principle of intervention in the affairs of other states.
- No seriousness in the signing of the Holy Alliance.
- Distrust amongst the Great Powers. After admitting France into the Quintuple Alliance, The Great powers secretly renewed the old Quadruple Alliance as a safeguard against her.
- Aix-la-Chapelle-Alexander 1 proposed his schemes but was blocked by Austria and Britain-showed the powers were not united.
- Different forms of governments-Britain was a constitutional monarchy hence was likely to be sympathetic to liberal and nationalist revolts. Others were autocratic hence wished to crush the liberal revolts.
- Congress System never captured the sympathy of European public opinion because it did not represent the interests of the small powers.
- the great powers were too reactionary hence were to find problems with the forces of change.

Side B: Evidence that the Congress System was doomed later

- Despite the above differences the Congress System surged on-had common agreements e.g. all major powers wanted to maintain peace and tranquility in Europe.
- It was doomed later because vital matters arose e.g. the Spanish, Italian and Greek revolts which presented difficulties to the powers. Also the Spanish colonies on which Britain could not possibly agree with other powers was another bone of contention among the powers.
- the rise of George Canning damaged the existence of the Congress System.

“The Congress System failed because the leaders of Europe were terrified of revolution.” Discuss.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether fear of revolutions by the great powers led them to make haste decisions which ultimately led them to make blunders hence contributing to the failure of the Congress System or there were other factors which led to the collapse of Congressional Diplomacy.

Side A: Evidence that the powers were terrified of revolution

- the powers were afraid of the upsurge of nationalist revolts all over Europe hence made them to intervene in the affairs of other. This created a lot of opposition especially from Britain which destroyed the Congress System.
- Adoption of the interventionist policy-evidence of being terrified by the revolution. Britain opposed this which led to the ultimate collapse of the Congress System.
- Alliances formed e.g. Holy Alliance and Quadruple Alliance were basically for the purpose of intervention hence were not taken seriously by other powers.
- Secret renewal of Quadruple Alliance show that the powers still feared the outbreak of another French Revolution-this created elements of distrust which made it virtually impossible for the great powers to work together leading to the ultimate collapse of the Congress System.
- The Troppau Protocol-showed that the great powers feared revolutions-this however did not receive the support of Britain and other revolutionary governments hence failure of the Congress System.

Side B: Other factors which led to the failure of the Congress System.

- different forms governments-Britain a constitutional monarchy and other powers were autocratic.
- lack of unity among the great powers.
- desire to defend self-interests
- the rise of George Canning who was totally against the system and openly declared that, "Things are coming to a wholesome state again. Each man for himself and God for us all." Thus Canning destroyed the Congress System.
- the Congress System did not take smaller power interest into account.

Can the years from 1815 to 1848 in Europe be justifiably termed the "age of triumphant conservatism"?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the period 1815-1848 in Europe showing whether the forces of conservatism (continuity) succeeded (triumphed) over the forces of change. If conservatism succeeded, then the period can be termed the age of conservatism.

-Identify the forces of conservatism e.g. the makers of the Vienna Settlement, the Holy Alliance, autocratic monarchs, and the separate governments of the German and Italian states. The forces of change included the oppressed weak nations of Europe.

Side A: Successes of the conservatives

- 1) France-Louis XVIII survived because he was shrewder than many of his supporters. He selected his new ministers from more moderate elements White terror of 1816 by the ultras instilled fear in many people. The ordinance of St Cloud in France resulted in the French revolution of 1830 but though the revolution succeeded, the throne was occupied by another conservative.
- 2) Italy- 1821 an army of Croats and Hungarians organized by Metternich marched south through Italy and suppressed the revolt in Naples and replaced Ferdinand as an absolute monarch. In March 1821 Austrian troops entered Piedmont and put down rapidly the rising. Metternich now followed up this operation by establishing large garrisons at Naples, Alessandria, Ancona and Florence, he also covered the whole country with a network of police spies. Risings were put down easily because of the weakness of the rebels and the unlimited support of Austria from the Great Powers eg

Alexander, the Bourbons etc. Thus, the forces of continuity again succeeded in Italy.

- 3) Germany-Metternich introduced the Carlsbad Decrees in 1819-the press was to be strictly censored, student associations and forms of political gatherings were prohibited. Police officials were appointed to watch over activities in the universities. Austrian ascendancy in Germany was thus guaranteed.

NB: Thus in Germany and Italy Metternich was able to on his own power of intervention hence forces of conservatism triumphed.

- 4) Polish Revolt-1830 the poles rose against the Russians but by September 1831 the Russian army suppressed it. The Polish revolt failed because the peasantry did not join, the middle class was still too small to constitute a significant factor, not united within their own ranks and cholera which first hit Europe. Forces of continuity again succeeded in the Polish revolt.
- 5) Russia-Alexander in his last years began to mistrust liberal experiments and after 1820 he adopted a far more conservative attitude towards the press and universities. In 1822 he forbade the existence of all secret societies. His successor, Nicholas 1 was more conservative. Nicholas began to carry a complete suppression of liberal activities. There was a rising of the Decembrists who wanted Nicholas to use the constitution in 1815. Nicholas suppressed the rising, hanged five leaders and others sentenced to forced labour or to exile in Siberia. Conservatism here triumphed over change.
- 6) Italy 1831- February 1831 a revolt broke in Bologna-Metternich send his troops south where the revolts were swiftly crushed-conservatism had succeeded.
- 7) Germany 1831- revolt was inspired by the Polish example. Local rising imposed constitutions on the rulers of Brunswick, Hanover, Saxony and Hesse-Cassel- but it was shot-lived. Metternich was able to suppress them.
- 8) 1848 revolutions in Italy, Germany and Austria-revolutions were crushed by forces of conservatism.

NB: It is indeed true that the forces of conservatism triumphed over the forces of change.

Side B: Forces of change had also some successes over forces of Conservatism

-In 1821 the rebels succeeded, constitution was granted under Donna Maria.

-In the Greek revolt, the sultan of Turkey granted Greece autonomy.

-in 1830, Charles X was removed and replaced by Louis Philippe.

-in 1830 the Belgians shook off Dutch control and devised a form of government that was to be the envy of liberals throughout Europe.

-In Switzerland, a series of demonstrations caused the cliques to make great constitutional concessions.

-conservatives were not always united; there were the constitutional governments of the west and the autocratic powers of the Holy Alliance.

-Metternich was really only effective in central and eastern Europe.

-not only successful in political spheres but also economic and social changes e.g. growth of population-caused peasantry to move to towns; industrialization caused towns to grow e.g. Paris, Lyons, Toulon, Marseilles, Berlin, Vienna etc -the advent in many towns of peasants speaking their own dialects led to the rise of nationalism.

-railway development

-the enhanced position of banking on an international scale

-socialism-audacious doctrines emerged; an intoxicating air of romanticism blew e.g. poets, philosophers

“A period of change and reaction.” How valid is this view on the period 1815-1848 in Europe?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the developments in the period 1815-1848. There is need to understand the period before 1815 and bring in comparisons whenever possible. One is supposed to look at whether there were new transformations or whether there was resistance to political reforms as well as economic and social ones.

Definition of terms:

Reaction-response/action to a certain event-especially a return to an earlier condition; **retrograde** (directed backwards) tendency/opposition to progress.

- 1) **Examine the changes.**
 - explain that the French revolution and the Napoleonic Wars had a great impact on post 1815 Europe.
 - in fact the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the Vienna Settlement heralded new era-it was a turning point/it opened a new chapter in the history of Europe.
 - mention the changes and give examples e.g.;
 - there were political, economic and social changes after 1815.

Political Changes

- The period was an era that was influenced by the ideas of freedom and equality.
- It was a period that saw the demands for constitutions.
- it was a period that challenged autocracy and absolutism.
- Also liberal and nationalist ideas spread eg the Spanish revolts of 1820 demanded the constitution of 1812.
- Revolts in Naples and Sicily 1820
- mutiny of the army at Piedmont in March 1821 which led to the abdication of Victor Emmanuel
- in Germany, limited constitutions were granted by the rulers in Bavaria and Baden in 1818, and in Württemberg in 1819.
- revolts in Portugal 1821-which demanded a constitution
- the Greek Revolt
- nationalism manifested in 1830 in Poland and Belgium.
- in 1830 in Italy and in Germany there were violent protests by liberal groups against authoritarian rule.
- in France, Charles X abdicated after the July revolution 1830.

Economic Changes

- There was industrialization which brought with it the factory system, the evils related to it.
- Furthermore there was the growth of a powerful middle class which demanded more at the expense of a poor working class.

Social Reforms

- socialist ideas grew in France and by 1848 Karl Marx and Frederick Engel had produced the communist Manifesto.

- 2) Examine the response of the different governments to the changes above both at national and international levels e.g. revolutions were put down throughout in the 1820s, 1830s and 1848.
- reactionary tendencies of Metternich and the Russian Tsar Alexander eg the Carlsbad Decrees 1819 in Germany ie Metternich drew up a serie of decrees to be imposed throughout the of Germany eg the press was to be strictly censored, the student societies and other forms of political gatherings were prohibited, police officials wer appointed to watch over activities in the universities.
 - emphasize that the reaction was sometimes too harsh and it forced people into extreme.

NB: Thus the assertion in the question is true to a large extent.

Explain and account for the appearance of revolutions in 1848 Europe.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for the outbreak of many revolutions in 1848 Europe. This is not a question on the causes of all the revolutions of 1848. It asks rather which causes were common to most or all of those revolutions and what factors there were which encouraged the spread of revolution.

-Mention that the revolutions occurred in France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, and Switzerland.

-Some of the common causes include:

- 1) Revolutionaries in different countries often thought of themselves as attacking the same thing: the 'system' symbolised by Metternich.
- 2) Nationalism-many desired to free themselves from foreign dominations.
- 3) Revolutionary ideologies developed an international flavour-e.g. Communist Manifesto for workers of the world to unite; liberalism, socialism and anarchism all had an international flavour. Paris was especially influenced in this.
- 4) The example of Paris was all the greater because of the growth of communication, telegraphs and railways (though the latter also helped to move troops and so to repress revolutions)
- 5) Economic factors common throughout Europe.
 - beginning of industrial revolution broke up old monopolistic methods of economic regulation (guilds).
 - Only in Britain and Belgium (where revolutionary discontent was limited) was the economy sufficiently advanced to guarantee employment in mass producer industries.
- 6) There was an economic crisis throughout Europe during 1845-6, with inflation causing severe unemployment in 1847-48 especially among the artisan handcraft classes e.g. the hand weavers of Silesia and Britain.
- 7) There was agricultural failure especially in the Balkans, Habsburg lands, Poland and Ireland.
 - the dramatic rise in food prices had great negative impact on the people.
- 8) So there was no need to blame, as contemporaries liked to do, international conspiracies. Apart from the common problems facing different countries, the nature of the pre-1848 regime throughout Europe was such that the revolution was bound to be contagious.

What did the 1848 Revolutions in Europe had in common?

Demands: the key issue is an assessment of the common features of the 1848 revolutions. There is need to illustrate the points with specific examples from Europe during this period.

1. The revolution occurred a generated after the great settlement of Europe
2. They were all protests against the 1815 Vienna settlement
3. All revolutions were inspired by the revolution in France and Italy .Italy seemed to be greater storm center than France.
4. the revolution were pre-eminently central Europe events there was no revolution in the U.K and Belgium (west) ,Poland and Russia (east) – revolutions happened in the only slightly industrialized centers of Germany ,Switzerland , Italy and in the predominant agrarian and peasant countries of the Balkans.
5. The revolutionary mood was conditioned by unprecedented growth of population.
6. Revolutions were also conditioned by economic developments in transport and industry.
7. Revolutions were in origins and impetus the work of towns.
-It was London and Birmingham, Paris and Brussels, Rome and Vienna and Budapest that set the pace.
8. Revolutions were led by intellectuds e.g. universily professors, Journalists, poets e.t.c
-Events in German were termed the revolution of the intellectuals
-poets like Lamatine and Petofi, journalists like Mazzini and Kossuth , historians like Palacky Dahlmann and Balcesco brought to the movements their romantic academic and intellectual flavour.
-They lent inspiration and infuse nationalism – but were men of ideas rather than spokesmen of armies .Their successors were to Learn this lesson ‘Poets make bad politicians
9. Then ultimate Face of the revolution lay in the hands of the peasants
Once peasants gained what they wished far they wished for they lost Interest in further revolutionary activity
10. Events of 1848 demonstrated that nationalism and liberalism were The most potent forces in Europe politics.

Why was 1848 a year of revolutions and why were these revolutions not more successful than they were?

Demands: assessing the reason for the outbreak of the 1848 revolutions and the reason for their failures.

Introductions: point out that a series of events as 1848 is caused by many Interlinked factors. These can be categorized as political, social and economic.

- a. explain the social changes that Europe had gone through since late 18th century. Discuss the consequences of industrialization .
- b. Analyse the impotence of the economic crises of 1846 -1848 to show that it exacerbated existing social and economic tensions.
- c. discuss the spread of the ideas of liberalism and nationalism. Link to the bulk of European society was extremely disconnected with the status quo. Emphasize that the established rulers of Europe were not prepared to solve this discontent. Explain the impotence of the July revolution elsewhere.
- d. Discuss the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions.

- Disunity between the revolutionaries was crucial in Italy and Germany
- In Germany and Austria the established autocratic rulers were never deposed.
- Once they had recovered their nerve, they were able to use force to put down the revolutions.
- The lessening of the economic crisis revealed the differences in aims between the middle class leaders and the mass who supported revolutions
- Britain never gave any aid to the revolutions while Russia actively helped the Austrians to put them down.

Conclusion.

Mention that the changes of the previous half-century coupled with the particular circumstances of 1846-1848 provides the key to understand why there were so many revolutions in 1848

Stress also that divisions of interest between the respectable middle class and the workers explain why these revolutions were not more successful as they were.

To what extent should the revolutions of 1848 be explained in social rather than political terms?

Demands – assessing the causes of the 1848 revolutions showing which were more important political, social and economic.

The revolutions should be dealt with a group rather than country, but as you discuss each cause do not forget to point out the differences between countries.

- 1) Mention that the instigators and leaders were mainly motivated by political aims while their inarticulate followers (masses) were motivated by social pressures.
- 2) Liberalism as a political explanation: the middle classes aspired to for political power after the British example; frustration with the narrowness of the franchise under Louis Philippe; concern for economic opportunities, the promotion of railway, the desire for basic freedoms (speech, conscience etc) especially strong in the German states; the ideas of Mazzini.
- 3) Nationalism as a political explanation- various national movements in Europe. Distinguish the cultural, linguistic, romantic nationalism from middle-class economic and bureaucratic nationalism.
- 4) The alienation of the intellectuals: the explanation of education and of professional training (as in law and medicine), without a corresponding expansion of employment opportunities for professionals, provides another political explanation.
- 5) Also 1848 saw the birth of political anarchism and the cult of violence. This led the middle class to desert the revolution.
- 6) As Marx realized, 1848 was also a social phenomenon e.g. "The June Days in France"
- 7) But the main support for the revolution comes from those classes beginning to be left behind by industrial development and unable to compete with factory operatives; Louis Blanc and "the right to work", handloom weavers of Silesia, the Artisan Congress demanded the restoration of guild controls over

production; a clear clash between these social interests and those of the political revolutionaries of Frankfurt who desired free trade.

8) The peasants as a social factor- the state of serfdom in Europe; the failure of the Potato crop in the 1840s caused starvation and suffering, e.g. in Ireland and Galicia.

10) The economic depression throughout Europe in 1847, the recovery in 1848 undermined the revolution, this suggests that while politics provided a focus, the social condition of the people mainly explains what happened and accounts for the initial force of the revolutions.

Why did the Congress System last no more than ten years?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the weaknesses of the Congress System which contributed to its short life span.

Introduction

The Congress System had a short life span because of the inherent weaknesses within it. From its inception, the Congress System showed that it was doomed, its downfall was inevitable. Great power politics rather principles governed the actions of the delegates at every congress and it was this that undid what seemed to be a good system if it had been properly followed.

The reasons for the collapse of the Congress System

- different ideologies-some wanted to stop revolutions
- They distrusted each other for instance France was admitted later she was viewed as a possible enemy.
- differences over the policy of intervention in the domestic affairs of other states. Britain was against intervention while Austria, Russia and Prussia favoured the policy of intervention.
- there were no common aims e.g. at Aix-la-Chapelle, Alexander's suggestions were rejected for example, disarmament and the formation of an international army. Also Britain did not help in the suppression of revolts in Spain; she did not attend the Congress of Troppau and Laibach in 1820 and 1821.
- Different forms of governments hence they could not agree on one thing e.g. on the terms of the Holy Alliance. Britain was a Constitutional Monarch and was thus bound to be sympathetic to revolutions while other powers such as Austria, Russia and Prussia were autocratic and thus hostile to revolutionary cause.
- Smaller powers were not represented like the Sultan and the Pope.
- they tried to suppress nationalism of which Napoleon 1 had raised this spirit and it could not be suppressed.
- The contribution of Canning of Britain-was greatly opposed to the Congress System. He destroyed the system by openly refusing to participate. He remarked "Things are coming to a wholesome state again, each man for himself and God for us all."

Conclusion

After the above analysis one should clearly note that the Congress System did not last for a long time because the great powers had different ideologies. They could not agree on one thing. Distrust and self-interests were always evident in their congress. The situation was exacerbated by the coming to power of George Canning who damaged and ultimately killed the system. Thus, the Congress System could not last no more than ten years because of various factors.

“The Vienna Settlement reflected the triumph of the reactionary forces in Europe.” How fair is this verdict?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Vienna Settlement was turning the clock back to the pre-1789 period or it was being conservative and innovative in its dealings

Definition of terms.

Reactionary- returning to a former state- in this case those who wanted to rewind the clock back to the pre-1789 period were reactionary.

Conservative- maintaining the present situation- maintaining the status quo.

Innovative- starting new things/reforms which had never been introduced before.

Introduction

It is important to note from the onset that what was discussed at Vienna in 1815 showed that the plenipotentiaries were eager to rewind the clock back to the pre-1789 period. This is what they mostly achieved. It is therefore largely true that the Vienna Settlement reflected the triumph of the reactionary forces in Europe. However, one should not sweep under the carpet the idea that peacemakers were also conservatives and innovators those this was to a limited extent.

Side A: Triumph of the reactionary forces

- restoration of legitimate rulers i.e. the restoration of the Bourbons in France, Spain and Naples.
- The Pope's powers were reconciled i.e. Catholics were made more independent.
- peace was restored
- some countries occupied by France were liberated
- property claims were met hence reviving the powers of the nobility and clergy
- restoration of the balance of power
- free navigation on major rivers which had been taken by Napoleon 1

Side B: Other forces especially conservatism and innovation-these were also noticed at Vienna.

- abolished the Slave Trade-innovation
- maintained the 39 German States which were brought by Napoleon 1-conservatism
- creation of buffer states-innovation.
- Rewarding victors and punishing the losers- innovation.
- Use of written constitutions in France and some German territories-conservatism.
- The birth of the concert of Europe – innovation.

Conclusion

Although the delegates at Vienna maintained what was there and made new arrangements, it is clear to greater extent that the forces of reaction had triumphed over the forces of conservatism and change.

“The Settlement reached at the Congress of Vienna (1815) was dominated by the fear of future French aggression.” Do you agree?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the outcome of the Vienna Congress was determined by the fact that the powers feared future French aggression or there were concerns.

Side A: Fear of future French aggression

- creation of buffer states along the French frontiers e.g. Belgium and Holland were united in the north east, Prussia in the east and Piedmont in the north.
- reduction of the French army
- putting an army of occupation in France
- reducing the French frontiers to those of 1790.
- France was supposed to pay a war indemnity, about 7 000 000 Francs.
- the principle of legitimacy was designed to put rulers in France who would check growing revolutionary spirit.
- maintenance of a balance of power was designed to reduce France's military powers as well as domination of Europe.
- compensation was designed to strengthen those powers which had been previously defeated by France so that in future they would be able to stand their grounds in a possible future attack by France.

Side B: Other concerns at Vienna

- restoration of peace-Europe had experienced 20years of chaos and bloodshed.
- fear of revolutions in other smaller states-thus they ignored the two "isms" in Spain, Portugal, Italy and Germany which had been aroused by Napoleon Bonaparte.
- abolition of the Slave Trade in France, Spain, Portugal, Sweden and Holland.
- They laid down the doctrine of international rivers- e.g. the Danube and Rhine were set free for commerce and navigation.
- General amnesty-the émigrés were allowed to return to their home countries especially those who ran away from the Napoleonic wars.

Whose interests were best served during the period 1815 to 1825 by the Congress System?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Congress System served the interests of the great powers or the smaller powers.

Side A: Interests of the Great Powers were served by the Congress System.

- start with the Vienna Settlement briefly-great powers were only interested in themselves e.g. balance of power, compensation.
- Holy Alliance-it wanted to serve the interests of the great powers i.e. to rule according to Christian principles of charity, peace and justice. Refusal of Britain, Austria to take it seriously is evidence that they wanted to safeguard their own interests.
- Quadruple Alliance- served the interests of the victorious powers. The alliance was designed to do away with French aggression. The secret alliance following the admission of France was designed to protect the great powers against future French aggression.
- Aix-la- Chapelle- Alexander's proposal of an international army was designed to protect the interests of Russia especially against the revolutions.
- Troppau-the Troppau Protocol signed by Prussia, Russia, and Austria that they would intervene was designed to protect the great powers from revolutions.

- Intervention by Austria in Naples, the Joint Naval force across the Atlantic to bring rebellious colonies of Spain and Portugal were also designed to stop revolutions thus serving the interests of the great powers.
- Laibach- Great powers agreed to intervene to stop revolution-again serving their own interests.
- Verona-France's intervention in Spain served the economic interests of France
- Britain's non-intervention policy was designed to safeguard British economic interests because this would have promised peace in Europe.

Side B: Interests of smaller powers were also served though to a limited extent:

- crushing of revolts promoted peace where everyone would operate peacefully.
- Holy alliance's emphasis to rule with Christian principles would have benefited the minority.
- meetings of property claims showed that the Congress also serve the interest of the minority.

Discuss the claim that the Congress System during the years 1815-1825 showed that the relations between the major powers were characterized more by distrust than by common aims.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Congress System had elements of distrust or common aims.

Side A: Evidence of distrust

- Britain, Austria and France were not serious with Alexander's Holy Alliance though they signed it-they did not trust the Tsar.
- the secret alliance against France after signing the Quintuple Alliance showed lack of trust on France by the other great powers.
- Britain's refusal of an international army proposed by Alexander showed that she feared Russia ascendancy in Europe.
- British opposition to Russian and Austrian policy of intervention in the affairs of other nations.
- refusal of Britain to sign the Troppau Protocol.
- Austria and Britain's rejection of Russian intervention in the Greek Revolt showed that the tow did not trust the motives of the Russians.
- Britain's threats on going to war against France when she wanted to intervene in Latin America.

Side B: Evidence of common aims.

- all agreed to the idea of a concert of Europe suggested by Castlereagh during the signing of the Quadruple Alliance.
- all agreed to uphold the terms of the Vienna Congress for the next 20years.
- all agreed to prevent the ascendancy of another Bonaparte to the French throne thus ultimately containing future French aggression.
- the removal of the army of occupation in France was achieved without any conflict.
- all agreed to readmit France into the Quadruple Alliance to make it the Quintuple Alliance.
- all agreed that the Swedish debts to Denmark should be paid
- A fair treatment of Napoleon 1 at St Helena was guaranteed.
- Protection of the Jews in Europe was also agreed at Aix-la-Chapelle.
- they all agreed to maintain peace and tranquility in Europe.

How far is it true that in the reorganization of Europe the Congress of Vienna attempted to return to the conditions of the pre-1789 period?

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of whether the Vienna Congress wanted to rewind the clock back to the pre-1789 conditions or introduced new changes or were conservative.

Side A: Evidence of restoring the pre-1789 period.

- the restoration of the French boundaries to those of 1790.
- restoration of legitimate rulers in France, Naples and Spain.
- the suppression of nationalism and liberalism.
- restoration of peace.
- restoration of the church's position.
- adoption of the principle of balance of power.

Side B: Evidence that they introduced new changes and maintain the status quo.

- doctrine of international rivers-free navigation on major rivers.
- abolition of the Slave Trade
- containing future French aggression.
- rewarding the victors and punishing the losers.
- general amnesty

Critically examine the view that the end of the Congress System of 1815-1825 was inevitable.

Demands: The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for the failure of the Congress System in Europe.

Side A: The end of the congress system was inevitable

- there were major differences between Castlereagh and Metternich on the purpose of the system e.g. Castlereagh wanted it to act as instrument which would guarantee the territorial arrangements made at Vienna. Castlereagh wanted the system to act as way of maintaining the balance of power. Metternich viewed it as a license to intervene in the domestic affairs of other nations.
- there were a series of congresses but no Congress System-e.g. the duration between congresses was not fixed, there was no agreement among the powers as to what the congresses were for.
- The Congress System lacked permanent organization –no organizational or administrative structures to organize and coordinate the diplomatic activities of Europe.
- the major powers lacked consensus on important issues e.g. when Spain faced rebellions in her colonies, some powers e.g. Austria and Russia wanted to help Spain but Britain did not agree.
- the Congress System never captured the sympathy of European public opinion. It was dominated by aristocrats like Metternich and Alexander 1.
- Britain's position on continental affairs weakened the Congress System-she began to withdraw from any commitments that would entangle her in unnecessary continental wars.

Side B: Not inevitable the claim suggest:

- collapse of Congress System was not apparent from the start.
- initially the major powers showed some level of commitment e.g. they were able to hold four congresses which showed that they had wanted the system to work.
- the end of the Congress System became inevitable later with the rise of George Canning whose attitude damaged the moral solidarity of Europe and injured the Congress System.

-

