**Course Title: Survey of European History From 1850’s to 1945 (HiHM. 2043)**

**CHAPTER ONE**

**1.1. THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA**

Though much of the treaty of Vienna was a compromise between the rival aims and ambitions of the great powers, there was also a considerable degree of general agreement at the congress about its purpose and the principles by which this should be achieved. The statesmen were ready to combine to restore what they thought of as the “ancient public law of Europe”, which had been violated by Revolutionary and Napoleonic France. To this effect the congress adopted the principle of “legitimacy”, that is, those “rightful” rulers who had been deprived of their thrones or territory by the Revolutionary government of France or Napoleon should be restored. However, we can say that the principle of legitimacy was only followed in so far as it suited the great powers to follow it. As one historian put it, “What happened at the congress of Vienna was not that pre-Napoleonic Europe was divided.” The Congress of Vienna that was held from September 1814 to June 9, 1815 in the capital of Austria passed the following resolutions. Austria, Prussia, Russia, and Great Britain agreed that Europe should be restored as it had been before the French Revolution and the Napoleonic conquest. Again, those rulers who had been deprived of their crown or territory by Napoleon were to be restored. Besides, the art treasures looted by France to be restored. Lastly, in order to check future France expansion, Prussia acted as a barrier by organizing the German confederation which replaced the Holy Roman Empire

Territorial interest was the other pressing issue that pre occupied the great powers. For the sake of future peace between them, they accepted the principle of “equilibrium” or balance of power between themselves that is that each should gain roughly the same. Russia in fact gained rather more in extent of territory, because she was already in possession of most of Poland and refused to give it up. Prussia probably gained the most economically and politically valuable territory though this was not realized at the time. An attempt was also made to build a strong barrier to check future expansion by France. This was done by adding territories for France’s neighbors. The congress however, more than any other state in the period, greatly benefited Austria who had a supreme interest in the establishment of international agreement and peace because its empire would be in grave danger of collapse and disintegration without this.

The work of the congress has been criticized for ignoring the great forces of the day that would stir the nineteenth century Nationalism and Liberalism. In addition, the congress was criticized for making territorial changes solely in the interest of the great powers without giving any consideration to the wishes of the inhabitants. The congress was condemned by peoples for it forced them to live under dictatorial rulers even Italians, Poles and others were condemned to live under alien rule. They added that the congress sharply had appeared as a wall against the very desire of the peoples for freedom, national independence and national unity. As a conclusion, one German historian put the Vienna congress as, “though the congress took place twenty-five years after the beginning of the French Revolution, its sprit was pre-revolutionary.”

On the contrary, the other groups of historians rejected the above argument. They argued that the great powers in the Vienna congress would have had more than a human to have anticipated future problems. It was unusual enough to produce an international settlement that remained essentially in fact for almost half a century and that allowed Europe to suffer no general war for a hundred years, as this group confirmed. It is wise to see the view of a contemporary English diplomat to have a clear image about the concern of the congress statesmen. He argued that the French revolutionaries, because of their interest and violence and their determination to sweep away the traditional institutions of church and state and replace them by their new forms of government, would destroy the sense of confidence and security of the people and make them ready to accept tyranny and reaction as the alternative to anarchy and confusion.

In general, these varied views and feelings towards the Vienna congress had their importance in the post-Vienna congress each of them gave away for the appearance of new forces and movements. These were conservatism, Romanticism Nationalism and Liberalism.

**1.2. REACTION**

**1.2.1. CONSERVATISM**

Following the Vienna congress, the period was regarded **as reaction** years of conservatism in Europe. Governments attempted to resist any further change and popular movement. Conservatism grew from opposition of the French Revolution to become what today would be called an ideology, a coherent view of human nature, social organization, political power, and the sources of change that generally justified the status quo. Highly concerned with the limitations of human being the wisdom of established customs, the value of hierarchy, and the social importance of religion, conservatives made a powerful critique of modern society dangerously inclined toward antisocial, individualism, materialism, and immorality.

According to the British conservative, Edmond Bruke, the French Revolution had thrown the French people from despotism to anarchism to (will be treated in the next section which deals with early socialism) in the name of misguided and abstract principles. Bruke distrusted the simplicity of reason as the complexity of traditional institutions could serve the public interest. Burke while attacking the French revolution’s belief in natural rights, he argued that something was natural only if it resulted long historical development and habit. He wrote, “Society is a contract between the dead, the living and the unborn.”

Conservatives also interested in history to show how pain fully civilization had developed and how fragile it remained. The other area of interest in the period for conservatives was Christianitywhich was portrayed as a source of strength and defense for a society against the selfish and prideful nature of humanity. Without it, they argued, society would dissolved in to revolution and hence to anarchy. This view is very well illuminated in the works of a French conservative Joseph de Maistre, who argued that the first task of a society was self-preservation. He claimed that only authority can check the selfish wills of individuals, and authority requires undivided sovereignty, social hierarchy, close links between church and state, and suppression of dangerous ideas.

In general, such views gave conservatism in the period, both militancy and depth. In an attempt to crush revolutions, conservatism highly relied on power while at the same time speaking of the social good and it left little room for compromise. The next discussions, on Romanticism, Nationalism and Liberalism will hopefully further enrich your understanding on conservatism.

**1.2.2. ROMANTICISM**

In its various manifestations, Romanticism was a reaction against much of the thought of the Enlightenment. Two writers who were closely related to the Enlightenment however, provided the immediate intellectual foundations for Romanticism, Jean Jacques Rousseau and Immanuel Kant. Let’s have a look on the former one. What Romantic writers especially drew from Rousseau was his conviction that society and material prosperity had corrupted human nature. In his works, Rousseau portrayed mankind as happy and originally living in a state of equilibrium, able to do what it desired and desiring only what it was able to do. Thus, to become happy again, mankind must remain true to its natural being while still attempting to realize the new moral possibilities of life in society.

Unlike the Enlightenment thinkers who had attempted to drive religion from the rational nature revealed by Newtonian physics, the Romantics saw religion as basic to human nature and faith as a means of knowledge. The Romantic religious thinkers appealed to the inner emotions of human kind for the foundation of religion. An instance of this was ‘Methodism’ which stressed in inward; heartfelt religion and the possibility of Christian perfection in this life. The pioneer of this religion, John Wesley depicted Christianity as “an inward principle ….. The image of God impressed on a created spirit a fountain of peace and love springing up in to everlasting life.”

The other aspect of Romanticism was its glorification of both the individual person and individual cultures. The most prominent thinkers in this case were the Germans Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) and Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). Herder had early resented the French cultural preponderance in Germany. He revived German talk culture by urging the collections and preservation of distinctive German songs and sayings. He opposed both the concept and the use of a “common” language, such as French, and “Universal” institutions, those imposed on Europe by Napoleon. He believed that there were forms of tyranny over the individuality of a people. His writings led to abroad revival of interest in history and philosophy, and gave intellectual foundation for German Nationalism.

Hegel on his part believed that ideas developed in an evolutionary fashion that involves conflict. Several important philosophical conclusions followed from his thinking. One of the most significant was the belief that all periods of history have been of almost equal value because each was, by definition, necessary to the achievements of those that came later. Also, all cultures are valuable because each contributes to the necessary human kind to develop. Generally speaking, there various Romantic ideas made a major contribution to the emergence of nationalism. The writers of the Enlightenment had generally championed a cosmopolitan outlook on the world. On the contrary, the Romantic thinkers emphasized the individuality and worth of each separate people and culture.

**1.2.3. NATIONALISM**

What is a nation and nationalism?

There is no a single definition about a Nation and Nationalism. We can, however, sum up Nationalism as “a sense of belongingness”, and a Nation as a place where a homogenous peoples live within, sharing this license of belongingness. Thus, nationalism has various grounds in accordance with the distinctive features of the area in focus. For the Arabs and the Jewish peoples, the ground is religion. And for the 19th c Germans and Italians, the ground was a language. Let’s begin our discussion by defining a ‘Nation’. In the words of the ex-Russian leader, Joseph Stalin, a nation is defined as, “a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological makeup manifested in a common culture".

On the other hand, a scholar in the area, Anthony Giddiness, defined the concept on the other way around. AS to him, “a nation only exists when a state has unified administrative reaches over the territory over which its sovereignty is claimed". For the sake of simplicity, let’s examine the current Ethiopian state in view of the two definitions. According to Stalin, Ethiopia can never deserve to be a nation as one of the elements indicated by him is missing. On the contrary, as the concern of Giddiness is only the jurisdiction of the state Ethiopia can be a nation. Any how to have a common understanding over the concept, let’s see how the popular dictionary of international relations defines the concept. It reads as follows:

*“A Social group which shares a common ideology, common institutions and customs, and a sense of homogeneity. 'Nation' is difficult to define so precisely as to differentiate the term from such other groups as religious sects, which exhibit some of the same characteristics. In the nation, however, there is also present a strong group sense of belonging associated with a particular territory considered to be peculiarly its own".*

When we come to nationalists, in the past and in the present they contend that political units and ethnic boundaries should coincide. The idea came in to its own during the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries. While the late eighteenth century nationalists traced their origin to the French Revolution, the early ninetieth- century one were the products of the Vienna congress, as their prime purpose was to oppose directly the principle upheld at the congress which legitimate monarchies rather than ethnicity.

Nationalists naturally protested multi-national states such as the Austrian and the Russian empires. They also objected to peoples of the same ethnic group, such as the Germans and Italians, dwelling in political units smaller than that of the ethnic nation. Consequently, nationalists challenged both the domestic and the international order of the Vienna settlement.

The other most important point needs to be discussed is the concept of 'Nationhood'. Nationalists used a whole variety of arguments and metaphors to express what they meant by nation hood. Some argued that eliminating the petty dynastic states and gathering, for example, the Germans in to a unified Germany would promote economic and administrative efficiency. It foes like that nations determine their own careers.

A significant difficulty for nationalism was, and is, determining which ethnic groups could be considered as a nation. In theory, any of them could, but in reality nation hood came to be associated with groups that were large enough to support available economy, that had a history of significant cultural association, that possessed a cultural elite that could nourish and spread the national language, and that had the capacity to conquer other peoples or to establish and protect their own independency. Throughout the century many smaller ethnic groups claimed to fulfill these criteria and could not effectively achieve either independence or recognition. They could and did, however, create domestic unrest within the political units they inhabited.

**1.2.4. LIBERALISM**

The forces of conservatism could not suppress the forces of change, very significantly Liberalists, for Liberalism depended on continuing economic changes which could not be held back, which was the establishment of industrial capitalism.

Liberalism was the legacy of the Enlightenment in its general philosophy and economic ideas and as a political movement it represented the ideas of the 17thc bourgeois revolution in England and the moderate period of the French Revolution.

Liberalism in its broadest sense was rational and anti-authoritarian principle. The 19th c Liberalists found themselves in two major subdivisions.

These were political Liberalism and Economic Liberalism. The political ideology of Liberalism is summed up in two of Newman's the British Liberal thinker, propositions:

*“The people are the legitimate sources of power"*

*“It is lawful to rise in arms against illegitimate princes"*

This political ideology had descended from John Locke, Rousseau and the political ideas of the American and French-Revolutions.

For 19th c Liberals, the term 'people' had a limited meaning. It is very well illuminated in the writings of a French man, Benjamin constant, which read as:

*Those whom poverty keeps in eternal dependence are no more enlightened public affairs than children, nor are they more interested than Foreigners in national prosperity, of which they do not understand the basis and of which they enjoy the advantages only indirectly. Property alone, by giving sufficient leisure, renders a man capable of exercising his political rights.*

The Liberals sought to establish a political frame work of Legal equality, religious toleration, and freedom of the press. Their general goal was a political structure that would limit the arbitrary power of government against the person and property of individual citizens. They generally believed that sovereignty should emanate from the people. The popular basis of such government was to be expressed through elected representative, or parliamentary, bodies. And this government required that ministers be responsible to the parliament rather than to the Monarch. This to be achieved through the device of written constitutions.

The leading personalities behind this movement were the wealthier and educated class of the society. Because of their wealth and education, they highly felt their exclusion from political power was unjustified. To this and, they argued that political appointment should not be by birth, but rather only on talent.

The other wing of the 19th c Liberalism was its economic thought which found its origin in the England's economic growth. The movement made its dogma on the argument of Adam smith's which confirmed that government should withdrew its intervention in the economy which it left to be regulated only by market would bring prosperity. Individuals should be left free from government regulation and control to pursue his own economic interest. Government should limit its function strictly to what the individual could not do for himself-defense, foreign policy and upholding law and order and private property. In short, the liberalist sought the removal of the economic restraints associated with mercantilism or the regulated economics of enlightened absolutists. They wanted to manufacture and sell goods freely. To that end, they favored the removal of international tariffs and internal barriers to trade. Economics Liberals opposed the old paternalistic legislation that established wages and labor practices by government regulation or by guild privileges, nevertheless, when we assess the specific program of the various states’ liberals; we saw disparity as the socio-political conditions differed in various countries.

**1.2. THE PROGRESS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION**

The late 18thc and early 19thc Europe experienced an extensive economic change which shattered the existing socio-political structures. The industrial revolution meant mass production of goods for the first time by power driven machinery in factories and other large industrial plants instead of manual labor.

The industrial revolution created two new classes: industrial bourgeois, the owner of the newly formed factories; and the industrial proletariat, the work force in the new factories deprived of any ownership and control over the means of production and having only their labor to sell for wages. Work previously done by simple hand-operated machines, was now performed by machines which highly required specialization and coal also replaced water and wind as a source of power.

The revolution believed to take place first in Britain around its 1850 and 1780 and spread to Western n Europe and USA between 1780 and 1850s.

**Why did the industrial revolution happen in Britain first and not somewhere else?**

Britain was the first industrialized country in the world. The basic ones were three which combined together effected industrial revolution in Britain. There were:

1. The British Isles is endowed with natural advantage. Its fertile soil, navigable rivers and its abundance raw materials, especially coal, iron ore, tin and copper. Located in between of the Atlantic Ocean and the North Sea, Britain enjoyed easy sea access the prevailing trade routes on both of its sides, added to the presence of natural harbors. In addition, the fact that Britain is an island, it was free from invasion and far from intra-continental war. Consequently, Britain was able to save its resource from the cost of maintaining large and expensive armies.
2. The industrial revaluation was preceded (C.1450-1750) by a period of “Primitive Accumulation of capital”, of its basic features in Britain were:
   1. The dispossession and expropriation of the independent peasants from the land which produced a pool of labor both for capitalist agriculture and later for capitalist industry. Capitalist agriculture way more productive than small peasant subsistence agriculture and provided for a growing urban and industrial population. It also provided the necessary capital for the industry.
   2. Colonial plunder and overseas trade, which was also the case for the other European states, led to a large profits for merchants of which turned in to investment in industries.

The 17thc England Revolution removed obstacles to the development of capitalism. Government was also committed to this cause. Internally, it gave for its capitalists almost complete freedom; externally, it put state power at the service of developing British capitalism. Here are some outcomes of industrial revaluation.

**1.2.1 ECONOMIC OUTCOME**

The industrial revolution was a stimulus for the growth of economy because growth in one industrial sector stimulated growth in others. Cotton industry, for example, created a large market for the agricultural sector. Benefiting from a large consumer market, cotton industry enabled spinning cotton thread and weaving cloth to be mechanized. Increased textile production accelerated the use of chemical dyes; greater iron production required more coal. A few factories in one place encouraged the growth of others in the same region, where they could take advantage of the available work force and capital; this concentration of production in turn increased the demand for roads, canals, and latter, rail way. All this growth required more capital, and on the cycle went. In continuity, range of industries affected, national scope, and rate of increased.

The growth in industry also increased Europe’s productive capacity to unprecedented and unparalleled levels.

**1.2.2. SOCIAL EFFECTS**

Economic growth on such a scale was accompanied by far- reaching social changes. Even in its early stages, industrialization impinged on all of society, from the state to the family, affecting governmental functions, the nature of work, women’s roles, and childhood.

The family was the basic economic unit pooling in come from various sources and dividing labor in customary ways before the advent of industrialization. For artisans, too the family was often the unit of production, although the division of tasks by sex was usually more explicit, and even small workshops had long tended to exclude women, at least from the better-paid tasks. Working class women and children were accustomed to long hours of labor. The strain on the family in the industrial age came rather from the lack of housing, the conditions of work, and the need for cash, which was compounded by the risk of unemployment.

Adolescents in factory towns, hardened at an early age, were probably more likely to leave home when their pay allowed, and urban conditions made it more difficult for the family to support the aged and the sick. Such factors did weaken family ties, as did at least in the eyes of the upper classes. The common practices for working men and women to live together without the trouble or expense of formal marriage rites. Yet among workers, too, the family survived, and the home remained a special place expected to provide protection for small children, a heaven for wage earners, and temporary shelter for relatives come to seek a job.

**1.2.3. POLITICAL OUTCOMES**

The response to the problems created due to industrialization was a powerful class movement. Initially, the two classes which were the direct out puts of industrialization were in a kind of alliance against their common enemy components of old orders. However, this alliance soon drifted because of the very nature of political and economic theory of liberalism, which showed no interest towards the working class real problems. This was a turning period which confirmed the need for an independent ideology peculiar to the working class that could effectively challenge not only conservatism, but also liberalism, these were early socialisms.

Socialist though offered a radical alternative to conservation and liberal ideologies. The early socialists generally well come to the new productive capacity of industrialism. They saw primarily mismanagement, low wages, misdistribution of goods, and suffering arising from the unregulated industrial system.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**2. THE CRIMEAN WAR**

This session is gives you an experience to see as to how all constraints to the process of nationalism developed step by step. The Crimean war was very significant in making the gravel road less uncomfortable for the Italian and German nationalists in bringing their aspiration into existence.

**2.1. The Crimean War as a road for the German and Italian unification**

The revolutions of 1848, though all suppressed seriously, affected the European diplomatic situation. Many former rulers were replaced by new ones, and the relative strength and influence of the powers was changed so was the old conservative alliance which began to disintegrate, reversibly to the status quo established at the Vienna congress.

The Crimean War (1853-1856) was one of the basic events which created a rift on the long established alliance of conservative circles. It was rooted in the long rivalry between Russia and the Ottoman Empire. Two disputes led to the conflict. First, the Ottoman Empire had recently granted Catholic France instead of Orthodox Russia the oversight of the Christian Shrines in the Holy Land. Second, Russia wanted to extend its control over the Ottoman provinces of Moldavia and Walachia. The Tsar’s (the Russian king) duty to protect Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, furnished the pretext for the Russian aggression. Russia soon responded by threats against Turkey.

Upon rejection of the Russian proposal for recognition as the protector of all orthodox Christians in Turkey, Tsar Nicholas sent his troops in to the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Walachia to force the Sultan to come to terms. Contrary to the Russian demands, however, the Ottoman sultan, expected British and French support, declared war on Russia on 23 October. And this resulted in the destruction of 4000 Turkish sailing ships by the Russian fleet.

The other great powers soon became involved and a war among major European sates resulted. Both France and Great Britain opposed Russian expansion in the eastern Mediterranean, where they had extensive naval and commercial interest extensive naval and commercial interests. Napoleon III also thought that an activist foreign policy would shore up domestic support for his regime. On March 28, 1854, France and Britain declared war on Russia. Also Austria regarded the Balkans as her sphere of influence and did not want Russia to approach the Dan be she preferred abstraction from the conflict. Likewise, Fredrik William IV of Prussia, who viewed entering into a conflict where his kingdom would have to face Russian attack over an issue in which its interests were not involved, remained natural throughout the conflict.

After an ineffective naval raid in the Baltic, the British and the French governments decided that their armies should be transferred to make an attack upon Sebastopol, the great fortified naval base in the Crimea to which the Russian Black sea fleet had withdrawn.

The Franco-British decision was governed by political rather than strategic considerations. They hoped that the destruction of this stronghold and the elimination of Russian naval power in this sea would safeguard Constantinople and ensure the continued independence of Turkey.

Thought the final victory was consumed by the British and the French, both sides had to endure the consequences of being improperly prepared to fight such a war. The problems of communication and supply were formidable. In September 1855, however, after a long siege, the Russian fortress of Sebastopol finally fell to the French and British. Though the neutrality of Austria and Prussia avoided the outbreak of European conflagration and made the Crimean war a limited conflict, it still involved heavy casualties than any other European was between the end of the Napoleonic war and the beginning of the First World War. Nicholas had died and replaced by his son Alexander II that accepted peace treaties to end the war. The total number of deaths in the war had been estimated that the French lost 95,000 men; the British 20,000; the Russians 110,000 and the Turks 30,000.

In March 1856, a peace treaty was concluded based upon four points forwarded by Austria in Paris. The terms of the peace treaty of Paris were imposed upon both Turkey and Russia, though the former was a victorious ally Sebastopol was not to be refortified. The Dardanelles were to be closed to the warships and open to the merchant vessels of all nations. Neither Russia nor Turkey was to have a naval fleet in the Black Sea and navigation of the Danube was also to be free, and an international commission was to regulate traffic on it and make it navigable to the sea. Moldavia and Walachia were to be self-governing Under Turkish Suzerainty and Serbia was to be given the same position. In addition, the powers gave up any right to interfere in the Turkish local affair, which was direct blow to the Russian ambition in the area. In return the Sultan promised to grant his Christian subjects equality with the Muslims. As such, Russia lost her privileges in the Balkans; the Holy alliance crumbled.

Much of the Treaty of Paris was as indecisive as the war itself. This was because, as is common after peace settlements, the victorious powers secured the acceptance of their wishes on paper but afterwards showed themselves not prepared to enforce those treaty provisions by intervention and possible war. This applied especially to the neutralization of the Black Sea, which the victors had regarded first as the most important aim of their war and then as the most valuable part of the peace treaty. In 1870, when Russia took advantage of the Franco-Prussian war to repudiate these Black Sea clauses of the Treaty the British government was not ready to consider military action to stop her. Equally important, because Britain and France had abandoned any idea of intervening to make the Sultan observe his promise of equal treatment for Christians and Moslems in his dominions, the Christians were left without toleration or protection two years after the treaty of Paris, the Christian inhabitants of Jeddah, the port of Mecca in Arabia, were slaughtered together with the British and French consuls and their families.

Nevertheless, the Crimean war and the Treaty of Paris had important consequences, though these were largely, as so often in such circumstance, unintended and unforeseen by the peace makers. One of these was to encourage the growth of Balkan nationalism. New independent states born as the subject races of the Balkans gained freedom with the decline of the Ottomans influence in the region. The other was the war brought a final blow to the principles of the Vienna congress. This was nicely illuminated in the words of the historian Gordon Craig as, “After 1856 there were more powers willing to overthrow the existing order than there were to take up arms to defend it “An instance of this was the feeling of Napoleon III, who had little respect for the congress of Vienna and favored redrawing the map along lines of nationality, which was very contrary to the corner stone of the Vienna congress.

The war also shattered the invincible image of Russia that had prevailed across Europe since the close of the Napoleonic wars. Yet Russia as a great power was not destroyed. However, the lesson of the war for the country was clear. The allies, fighting from a great distance and relying up on only part of their resources, had conducted a local offensive up on a strongly-fortified place which Russia, despite her own vast size and strategic advantages and the weaknesses and miscalculations of the allies, had not been able to repulse. Western European efficiency and industrialization undermined the Russian empire. Thus, the situation compelled the Russian government to think of reforms, more specifically the emancipation of the serfs. As a result, the Russian Tsar Alexander II issued the Edict of Emancipation in 1861- five years after the end of the Crimean war. Similarly, Austria was isolated and left helpless against nationalism and revolution. This was the direct effect of the final demise of the Holy Alliance (an alliance between Russia, Austria and Prussia) because of the failure of Austrian and Prussian government to support Russia.

Generally speaking, for about twenty-five years after the Crimean war, European affairs were unstable, producing a period of largely unchecked adventurism in foreign policy. Foreign policy increasingly became an instrument of domestic policy. The two most significant achievement, to result from this new international situation where the unifications of Italy and Germany.

**2.2. THE ITALIAN UNIFICATION**

For the sake of convenience, this section is divided in to two: the pre-Cavourian period before 1850 and Cavourian period after 1850.

**2.2.1. PRE- CAVOURIAN PERIOD**

As indicated earlier, this part is devoted towards the course of nationalists’ movement before the year 1852. Nationalists’ movements in the Italian peninsula traced its origin in the first half of the 19th c. The role of the Vienna congress (1815) was also important in the Italian life as it made Italy a compensation for the lost territories of Austria everywhere. In the post Vienna congress, national resentment against Austria was probably greater here in Italy than in Germany. Italy had known a high degree of unification and measure of efficient government under Napoleon, and had a larger middle class, at least in the Northern provinces which directly ruled by Austria. To this effect, there were a number of secret societies in the peninsula. Before Italian unification, there were eight scattered Italian states. Nationalists then struggled to unite them under one rule by removing Austria from Italian affairs.

The Carbonari (‘Charcoal burners’) the most prominent of those secret societies in the peninsula, were founded in Naples after 1815. Their grand aim was to overthrow petty Italian despots and to expel the Austrians for the Italian soil. However, the group had a wider variety of members which includes monarchists, republicans, clericals, anti-clericals, conservatives and radicals. As it is easier to predict from its composition the carbonary was not well-organized and almost completely without definite plans to gain its objectives. Consequently, uprisings and out strikes uncoordinated and sporadic one-undertaken by the carbonaries throughout 1817-1821 were fatally suppressed by the petty Italian despots and the Austrians.

The buried hope of the nationalists revived in 1830 with the appearance of Giuseppe Mazzini and Giuseppe Garibaldi in the forefront of the movement. Mazzini became the most important nationalist leader in all Europe and brought new emotional fervor to the cause. It can be seen how Mazzini used his ink to revive the national sentiment of the Italians in the following table.

In 1831, Mazzini founded the “young Italian” society as a means to inspire the people to think not only of their own district, but also to regard the whole Italy as their native country in so long as Austria should be dislodged from the Italian peninsula. In line with this, Mazzini said to his followers, “Never rise in any other name than that of Italy and all Italy.” As one can interpret from the name of his association, Mazzini also attempted to bring the ‘Youth at the head of the insurgent multitude.’ He called upon his followers to discipline themselves and unite it expel the Austrians from Italy without foreign help, so that the several petty despots would collapse and a single national state be created.

Mazzini’s Romantic Idealism, however, proved to be too vague for the demands of the situation. Though he wished his movement to be more constructive and universal than the carbonari, he had little knowledge of practical politics and human nature, and he adopted the same conspiratorial methods and local risings as the secret societies. In 1834, Mazzini and Garibaldi considered that the time for action had come. Taking several hundred supporters to Switzerland, he planned an armed invasion of Savoy, which he was convinced would inspire a popular rising, making possible the overthrow of Charles Albert, who had become king of Piedmont in 1831, and the establishment of a constitutional government able to reorganize resistance to Austria throughout Italy. The attempt was a complete failure. Charles Albert acted with greater severity. Drugs and torture were used to compel arrested conspirators to betray their comrades, and a number were shot Mazzini escaped and had to take refuge in England. Garibaldi was captured and sentenced to death but escaped to South America.

1848 ushered both revival and final blow to the pre-Cavorian nationalistic movement. The news of Metternich’s the Austrian Prime-Minister, downfall brought about fresh resistance to the Austrians. The resistance started in Milan, where after five days of street-fighting, the Austrian force had to withdraw their 20,000 troops from the city. The resistance assumed its climax when Charles Albert declared war on Austria on 24 March and adopted the tricolor of red, white and green, which by this time was accepted as the Italian flag. Charles was able to inflict a defeat upon the Austrians. However, he was not in a position to exploit his victory as he held back his troops to pursue his private territorial ambitions. Wishing to unite all northern Italy under his rule, Charles Albert engaged in negotiating instead of fighting. And this gave enough time for the Austrians to get reinforcement from home that Charles Albert’s force was routed by the Austrians on 23 July. In spite of his defeat, Charles Albert once again tried his best by launching attack on the Austrians-though unsuccessful. This time, he abdicated in favor of his son, victor Emanuel II (r. 1849-1880, who appointed Count Camilo Cavour as his Prime Minister in 1852. With the appointment of Cavour, the Italian Nationalism assumed a new path and heralded the coming of a new era for the Italians.

**2.2.2. THE CAVOURIAN PERIOD**

Count Camilo Cavour had begun political life as a strong conservative but had gradually moved towards a moderately liberal position. At first he was temporarily unpopular through his opposition to the wish of the Legislature that Piedmont should renew the war on her own against Austria in 1849, but he quickly made himself known as a clever debater and clear thinker victor Emmanuel made him Minister of commerce and Agriculture in 1850, Minister of the Navy in 1851 and Prime Minister in 1852, a position that, by retaining the leadership of a coalition of moderate liberal parties, he was able to hold until his death in 1861.

Cavour believed that if Italians proved themselves to be efficient and economically progressive, the great powers might decide that Italy could govern itself. To this end, he postulated two goals. First, he wanted to continue the development of Piedmont into a strong modern state. Constitutionally, this included the reform of the civil code and local administration and the extension of the ecclesiastical laws to bring about the abolition of all religious orders except those engaged in preaching, teaching or caring for the sick. Economically it involved the promotion of industrialization and communications. He encouraged trade by making commercial treaties with Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and the Zollverein, and he supported commercial enterprise with government grants, particularly for the construction of railways which he regarded as very important for the progress of the state.

This policy of modernization was essentially a preliminary to the achievement of Cavour’s second aim, which was the extension of Piedmont’s territory and influence in Italy. He believed that under Piedmont’s leadership, Italian unification should be deprived. But he doubted whether the Papal States and the kingdom of Naples could be brought in to a single Italian state. What he believed was possibly the replacement of Austrian predominance in the peninsula by truly in dependent states with an enlarged, progressive piedmont as the strongest and most influential among them. To make piedmont more powerful, he increased the size and efficiency of the piedmontese army and navy, but he thought that it was inevitable that Austria would not be dislodged from Italy without war, but he, unlike Mazzini, was sure that this could only be done with military help from some great power. The prevalent ancient hostility between France and Austria made the former the only power to suit the hope of the Piedmontese.

**How Italy was finally found itself united?**

With the coming of Cavour to the office of the prime minister, no one expected that within ten years Italian unification would largely be achieved. The obstacles against Italian unification were Austria and the weak bondage of nationalist sentiment in Italy. The risings so far had all failed. The peninsula was still divided in to ten separate Italian states every one of which wished to retain its independent existence. There seemed to be no possibility of reviving even the partial measure of Italian Unity initiated by Napoleon I more than 50 years previously.

**By what calculation then Cavour could pass through these formidable constraints that were impossible for the Italian generations for at least 30 years previously?**

In order to face all the constraints successfully, Cavour believed that Italy first should raise its reputation in face of the international arena. To this effect, he found 1855 as good opportunity to bring Italy on the foregrounds of European politics. In 1855, Cavour sent 10,000 troops to the Crimean war on the side of France and Britain. This small but significant participation in the war allowed Cavour to raise the Italian question at the Paris conference. But he was not as successful in the conference as he had hoped to he might be. Piedmont gained neither territory nor an immediate ally. However, his intelligence and political capacity had impressed everyone in the conference to the extent that he gained the sympathy of Napoleon III.

From this time on wards, Cavour was determined to secure Napoleon III as an ally. Within two years of the signing of the Treaty of Paris, Cavour was able to get such an alliance when he met the French emperor in southern France at Plombiere, in December 1858. There they made an alliance which would enable Piedmont take over Lombardy and Venetia from Austria and France was to receive French-speaking Nice and Savoy from Piedmont for its aid against the war with Austria its force. However it was decided that Cavour was to bring the war about in such a way as to make Austria appear the aggressor. He therefore mobilized Piedmontese troops on the border with Lombardy. On April 22, 1859 Austria demanded that piedmont demobilize. This very demand allowed Cavour to claim that Austria was provoking a war. France intervened to aid its ally. On June 4, 1859 the Austrians were defeated at Magenta, and on June 24 at Solferino, Meanwhile, revolutions had broken out in Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Romagna provinces of the Papal States against their rulers. Their rulers were overthrown. Provisional governments were established and then appealed for union with Piedmont.

With the Austrians in retreat and the new revolutionary regimes calling for union with Piedmont, Napoleon III feared too extensive Piedmontese victory. On July 11, 1859 independently concluded a peace treaty with Austria at villa Franca. Accordingly, the two powers agreed that Piedmont should have Lombardy but not Venetia and that the other Italian states should remain as before. Cavour felt betrayed by France, but the war had driven Austria from most northern Italy. So only few months after the treaty of Villa Franca, Parma, Modena, Tuscany, and the Romagna voted to unite with Piedmont.

Again in 1860, there was uprising in Sicily against the existed unpopular government of the kingdom of Naples. Soon the revels invited Garibaldi to lead their struggle. No doubt this event added fuel to the already flaming nationalistic fervor. In May 1860, Garibaldi landed in Sicily with more than 1,000 troops, and in two weeks the Red Shirts (as Garibaldi’s troops were called) occupied Palermo and within two months almost all of Sicily. By September, his forces controlled the city and kingdom of Naples, probably the most corrupt example of Italian absolutism. Garibaldi had for more than two decades hoped to from are publican Italy, but Cavour forestalled him. Cavour rushed piedmontese troops south to confront Garibaldi. On their way, they conquered the rest of the papal state except the area around Rome, which was protected for the pope by the French troops. Garibaldi’s nationalism won out over his republicanism, and he unhappily accepted the piedmontese domination. In late 1860 Naples and Sicily voted to join the northern union forged by piedmont. With this, the kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in March 1861 with victor Emmanuel I as its first king. Now Italy to be a unified whole only would wait a favorable occasion which could enable it to embrace Venetia and Rome within its dominion.

Persian dynamism was the event that gave conclusion to the Italian unification. As a return for its side for Prussia in the Austro-Prussian war, Italy annexed Venetia in 1866. Only five years later, the Italians were able to regain their ancient capital as a result of the defeat of the French army at the hands of the Northern German confederation. Unlike Germany, unification was a paradox in the Italian case as it failed to be followed by suit with progress. The Uneven level of economic realities between the south and the northern part forced most southerners to portray the unification like foreign occupation. In addition, United Italy was poor and overwhelmingly agricultural as compared to Germany, let alone the division of its population due to the popes’ resentment towards Rome’s annexation.

**2.3. THE GERMAN UNIFICATION**

One of the aspects of the Vienna congress was to redraw the map of Germany. The three hundred German states which had made up the Holy Roman Empire, bound by nominal service to the Austrian Hapsburg Emperor, were reconstituted into a loose confederation of thirty nine states. Most remained small, a few were tiny, and there were five sovereign kingdoms: Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, and Württemberg. A Federal Diet to which all states sent representative was established in the free city of Frankfurt. Its purpose was to settle disputes between the German states and, above all, preserve the conservative status quo.

The congress of Vienna had established the confederation to meet the following a practical need: the provision of some sort of a framework to replace the defunct Holy Roman Empire. Though federalism was accepted as the basis for its organization, the German rulers were determined to retain their independence, and the confederation was, in fact, little more than an alliance of practically sovereign states and the Diet an assembly of ambassadors since the German states were thus regarded as free and self-governing they could wage war and make treaties with foreign powers, though the constitution stated that neither must be directed against other members of the confederation. There were no federal laws or executive, no common currency or safeguards for personal rights and no provision at all for economic co-operation or even consultation.

The Austrian chancellor, Metternich, set up the confederation in this form because he believed that it would enable Austria, despite the strengthened position of Prussia, to retain a measure of influence in Germany. Austrian presidency of the Diet provided him with a way of strongly affecting German affairs. Austria could veto in the Diet any attempt to change the constitution of the confederation. France under Napoleon III also reinforced Austria’s policy.

In March 1849, the Frankfurt parliament, alienated by Austria’s obstacle upon German unification, looked to Prussian rather than Austrian leadership. Consequently, the parliament produced its constitution, and shortly thereafter, its delegates offered the crown of a united Germany to Fredrick William IV of Prussia. However, Fredrick William rejected the offer, asserting that kings ruled by the grace of God rather than by the permission of manmade constitutions. On his refusal, the Frankfurt parliament began to dissolve and not long afterward troops drove off the remaining members. With this the German unification was to wait two crude decades.

**What do you know about ‘Zollverein’?**

In spite of its tragic culmination, the Frankfurt parliament was one of the factors in the German unification. The Diet did discuss the possibility of arranging a general German tariff, which would provide for free trade among them and impose a common customs duty upon foreign goods entering the territory of the confederation. Prussia took a lead in making its territory a large free trade area and invited the other members of the confederation to do the same and form an economic union-the Zolleverein in 1818. Austria, as its backward industries required protection, did not join the Zollverein. The consequence of this was Austria gradually excluded from Germany’s economic organization and Prussia became an important country commercially as well as politically. Thus, making Prussia virtual leader of the German confederation, Zollverein played a vital role in the process of building a German state.’

**2.3.1. PRUSSIAN INTERNAL DYNAMISM**

It is obvious that one of the factors which accounted for the unification of Germany was the dominance of Prussia in the German confederation. This in turn was an attribute of Prussian dynamism which began in 1858 with the coming of William I to the Prussian crown.

As discussed earlier, Prussia under Fredrick William’s rule was not ready to be the center of German nationalist hops. Thus, during the reign of Fredrick William, Prussia seemed to be under a government determined to preserve the old order and maintain its position as a separate German kingdom. very fortunate to the German unification, in 1858 Fredrick William was incapacitated by a stroke and died three years later, consequently his brother William, become Regent and then, in 1861, king as William I. The new king was less idealistic than his brother and more of a Prussian patriot. His first concern was to re strengthen the Prussian army. In 1860, his war minister and chief of staff proposed to enlarge the army to increase the number of officers, and to extend the period of conscription from two to three years. The Prussian parliament, created by the constitution of 1850, refused to approve the necessary taxes. The liberals, who dominated the body, sought to avoid placing additional power in the hands of the monarchy. For two years monarch and parliament were deadlocked.

The crisis made the king to realize Bismarck’s conservative reputation and unfailing determination was the only one to settle the crisis. Bismarck was a member of the Junker class (noble land lords), better educated than many and displayed an interest in German unification. From 1851 to 1859, Bismarck served as the Prussian minister to the Frankfurt Diet of the German confederation. Later he became Prussian ambassador to Russia and had just been named ambassador to France when William I appointed him prime minister of Prussia.

When attending the Diet at Frankfurt, Bismarck had realized that some sort of unity was inevitable in the future; but the question still was how would it come? He remained firm in his determination that it should not be under the liberals, who would destroy Prussia as it existed. He saw that their great handicap, which had led to their failure in 1848, was that they had no organized force at their command. Hence his speech to the Diet in 1862 in which he said, “Germany does not look to Prussia’s liberalism, but to her strength, and then, in his best-known words. “The great questions of the day will not be decided by speeches and resolutions of majorities-that was the great mistake from 1848 to 1849-but by ‘Blood and Iron.

**THE ROAD TO UNITY**

Soon after his assumption of chancellorship, Bismarck made his first move to end the budgetary crises with the parliament. He argued that even without new financial levies, the Prussian constitution permitted the government to carry out its functions on the basis of previously granted taxes. Therefore, taxes could be collected and spent despite the parliamentary refusal to vote them. The army and most of the bureaucracy supported this interpretation of the constitution. So he ignored parliament whenever he could and encouraged divisions within the legislature whenever possible. He closed opposition newspapers and manipulated the rest. Promotions in the civil service and judiciary went to those unquestionably loyal; and once confident of his position, Bismarck Spent funds and collected takes without parliamentary, authorization. He therefore set about uniting Germany through the conservative institutions of Prussia. Germany was separated in to thirty nine states. These states were loosely federated. The Bund was presided by Austria. Among German states, Prussia was the strongest of all states. Its king was William I supported by the war minister, Von Roon.

**2.3.2. THE DANISH WAR**

Bismarck’s implementation of his first plan of action was made easy as he was presented with three important developments, which Bismarck used them to serve his own goal with typical opportunism. Austria was to be excluded from a united German state. This goal required complex diplomacy. In order to gain compensation for her defeat in Italy (due to the intervention of Napoleon III), Austria attempted to remodel the constitution of German confederation as it could suit its advantage. To this effect, the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph invited the German princes to meet at Frankfurt to discuss the Scheme. Bismarck taking the weak position of Austrian’s diplomacy and military power in the period persuaded William I not to go, and he princes were not prepared to accept the arrangement without Prussia. With this, Bismarck had shown that Austria could no longer make her stronger in Germany against Prussian opposition.

On the other side of the coin, Bismarck was also working tiresomely towards Russian friendship. When in 1863 Russia repressed a polish uprising with such severity that Austria, France and Britain joined in protest, Prussia supported the Tsar. Because, Bismarck had long believed that Prussia needed Russian friendship if she were to succeed in fashioning Germany as she wished. The Polish revolt further supported Bismarck as it divided France from Russia and at the same time made British suspicious of Napoleon III. The result made it clear that Prussia was now in a better position than at any time since 1815 to establish the position of the German confederation without the like hood of united European action against her.

The resultant situation became apparent during the third development in 1863 when the Schleswig-Holstein question became acute. The two northern provinces of Schleswig- Holstein had long been ruled by the kings of Denmark without being part of Denmark itself. Their populations were a mixture of Germans and Danes. Holstein, where Germans predominated, belonged to the German confederation. In 1863 the Danish government proposed to incorporate these provinces with Denmark, which aroused German opinion indignantly. Bismarck used the situation to assert leadership in German affairs. In an attempt to block any action of German nationalists (those liberalists), Bismarck forged an alliance with Austria (the Austrian only agreed for fear of not to get aloof from German affairs). Denmark was so easily defeated in the summer of 1864 and, contrary to her expectations, received no help from the great powers. Schleswig was placed under Prussian administration and Holstein, surrounded by Prussian troops, under Austrian control, in an awkward arrangement sure to breed contention between Austria and Prussia. It seemed a necessary condition to fight against Austria in order to assure German unification. The Danish war thought it was militarily insignificant it was of great political importance. It showed that Prussia was now able to ignore the German confederation and compel Austria to fall into line with her wishes.

**2.3.3. THE AUSTRO-PRUSSIAN WAR**

**Why the other great powers remained silent while Prussia increasingly enlarging itself?**

After his victory over the Danish king, Bismarck’s primary concern was to be sure of Austrian isolation. He was convinced by the conduct of Britain and Russia during the Danish war that they would not intervene in a conflict between Austria and Prussia. This was on the ground that British isolationism had been growing since the Crimean war and had become strongly opposed to interference on the continent’, and there was still Russian sympathy towards Prussia in return for its support of Russia in the polish crisis of 1863. Most importantly, Bismarck secured neutrality from Napoleon III. Side by side Bismarck also concluded a treaty with Italy promising that Italy would get Venetia if it mobilized its troops against Austria if war broke out. Finally, having defeated Austria diplomatically, Bismarck made a move to his subsequent action, to provoke Austria. With an effort to provoke Austria and in fact to have a pretext, Bismarck demanded that the German confederation be reformed by a new and a national German parliament, which would create a new German constitution from which Austria would be excluded. When Austria refused, Bismarck announced that Prussia has as much light to Holstein as to Schleswig; an event which made war was an inevitable.

On June 1, 1866, Austria appealed to the German confederation to intervene in the dispute Bismarck claimed that the request violated the terms of the 1864 alliance. On June 6, he ordered Prussian troops to enter Hollestein. And on June 15, Prussia delivered ultimatum to neighboring Hanover and Saxony: Prussian troops would march through their territories to attack Austria; resistance would mean war with them also. The war broke out in the summer of 1866 and lasted for seven weeks, which at the end led to the decisive defeat of Austria at the Battle of Sadowa. And the war soon followed by the Treaty of Prague on August 23. The treaty was lenient towards Austria as it only lost Venetia it Italy. The treaty, however, permanently excluded Austria from German affairs. And it made Prussia the sole major power among the German states.

Above all, the treaty redrew the map of Germany. The Diet at Frankfurt was dissolved. A new political entity, the North German Confederation, dominated by Prussia, was created north of the river main. The reverberation of Prussia’s victory rolled across the continent. By showing itself the military superior of Austria, Prussia threatened France’s position as the dominant power in Europe; French hegemony had been based in part on antagonism between Austria and Prussia. Bismarck already achieved popularity. But Napoleon was frustrated by the growing power of Prussia. He then determined to resist any further attempt at German unification.

**2.4. THE PARIS COMMUNE**

In 1871 France went into a war with Prussia on which the French force was defeated disastrously. This national humiliation, added to the already economic and social crisis due to the ever widening gap between the poor and the rich, and the prevalent food shortages, instigated the Parisians to get out of strikes. A specific demand was that Paris should be self-governing, with its own elected commune, something enjoyed by most French towns, but denied Paris by a government wary of the capital’s Unruly populace. By this time, the head of the national government was Adolph. Theirs, who had negotiated the details of the peace with Prussia. After doing this, he was faced with the problems of regaining control of Paris, of Convincing the city that the war with Prussia was over and of disarming the National Guard. Adolph theirs has only twelve thousands troops left after the truce to do this against several hundred thousand national guards.

By that time many tens of thousands of Parisians were armed members of a citizens’ militia known as the “National Guard”, which had been greatly expanded to help defend the city. It remained on alert, ready to resist any forcible entry on the Prussians in to Paris. Cannons left over from the siege of were taken to various parts of the city. In the end, it was those canons taken to the working class districts of Paris that made the situation very tense.

The short lived Paris commune quickly became a legend throughout Europe. However, the immediate consequences of the defeat of the commune were disastrous for the French labor movement as a period of sever repression followed the bloodletting of the last week. The Thiers government represented the commune as an attempt by the extremists in the capital to impose a socialist dictatorship upon the rest of the country. This also was held to justify the severity with which its supporters were treaty after its 72 days of defiant existence. The result was that the French socialist movement, through the loss of its leaders, was eliminated from national politics for nearly ten years; but the third Republic gained the support of the peasants and property-owners and all who wanted stability and order in the state. This did much to enable it to develop in a peaceful and constitutional manner and survive the hostility of its opponents during its first uncertain years.

**CHAPTER THREE**

**3. ALLIANCE SYSTEMS AND CRISES FROM 1871-1914**

**3.1. BISMARCK’S ALLIANCE SYSTEM**

It is assumed that the Franco-Prussian war was a turning point in the European history of the 19thcentury. Obviously it marked the end of two centuries of French predominance on the continent of Europe, and hence forward, as her relative economic-strength and population declined the balance of power went steadily against France in comparison with Germany. German victory over France and the resultant reorganization of Europe left all states feeling insecure and distrustful of their neighbors. Equally important, it was commonly believed that French desire for revenge constituted the chief threat to European and might bring about an early war.

After 1871, Bismarck began to insist that Germany was a satisfied power and wanted no further territorial gains, and he meant it. He wanted to avoid a new war that might undo his achievement. Rather he tried to neutralize French resentment by friendly relations and supporting French colonial aspirations. His aim for Germany was security and isolating France from other great powers. Above all, France should not establish alliance with Austria and Russia. He feared this because in 1760, when Frederick the Great of Prussia had made his state a great state, Prussia was attacked by a coalition between France, Russia and Austria. He wished, therefore, to keep France in diplomatic isolation and to prevent any international development that would give her an opportunity to make such an alliance. As a result, he planned to attract both Russia and Austria to his side at the expense of France.

Bismarck’s first move was to establish the Three Emperor League in 1873. It brought together the three great conservative empires of Germany, Austria and Russia. However, the league was little more than an uncertain understanding by which the three rulers agreed to settle peacefully any difference that they might have in the Near East in Order to uphold monarchical solidarity in the face of subversive republicanism and socialism. Therefore, the league soon collapsed in 1875 as a result of Austro- Hungarian and Russian rivalry in the Balkans. In forming the league, neither Russia nor Austro-Hungary abandoned their conflicting aims in foreign policy. The league was like the earlier Holy Alliance. It was vague and made no attempt to settle the difference between the powers. It was therefore, a superficial arrangement which could exist only as long as there was peace and understanding in Europe.

Actually, Russia’s attitude alarmed Bismarck. He feared that if Russia continued to be inspired by Pan-Slavonic ideas, it would provoke an alliance against itself by the Western powers and that this alliance would be joined by Austro-Hungary. Moreover, such a new alliance might take action which would further humiliate Russia and again prestige for itself and in the process would then be in a position to oppose Germany. Thus, in order to check any further Russian aggression and to detach Austria from Britain, he decided to form an alliance with Austro-Hungary. It was called the Dual Alliance of 1879. This was a military alliance, valid for three years and stipulating that if one of them would be attacked by Russia, the other bound to help, and if the attack would be from any power other than Russia, at least to remain in Apparently, Germany had fear of French aggression whereas Austro-Hungary was threatened by Russia. The terms remained secret until 1888 and the alliance was regularly renewed until 1918, but it was bound to be full of danger unless Germany could keep a close, control over Austrian foreign policy.

The alliance was also a departure in European diplomacy. Bismarck regarded the alliance as an arrangement which could be abrogated or replaced whenever occasions arose in the future. He did not intend it to involve Germany more and more deeply in the recurrent troubles in the Near East. Nor did he envisage it as the beginning of the period of the system of alliance in Europe, which was to divide the great powers into opposing groups and counter-groups.

Bismarck believed that monarchical, reactionary Russia would not seek an alliance either with republican, revolutionary France or with increasingly democratic Britain. In fact, he expected the news of the Austro-German negotiations to frighten Russia into seeking closer relations with Germany, and he was right. Russian diplomats soon approached him and by 1881 he had concluded a renewal of the Three Emperors’ League on a firmer basis. The three powers promised to maintain friendly neutrality in case any of them was attacked by a fourth power. Other clauses included the right of Austria to annex Bosnia-Herzegovina whenever it wished and the support of all three powers for closing the Dardanelles to all nations in case of war. This was a great benefit for Germany and Russia since it meant in practice that Russia would not support France against Germany, and Austria-Hungary would not support Britain against Russia.

For the Austrians, however, the renewal of the league did bring nothing new. Austro-Hungary disliked having to come to terms with Russia, its inevitable rival in the Balkans, whom Austria would see always in distrust. Thus, Bismarck sought to pacify Austro-Hungary in a strange way. He turned to Italy, alarmed, with the news of French annexation of Tunisia in 1881. Italy annoyed by France joined the Dual Alliance hence transformed in to the Triple Alliance which was an agreement between Germany, Austro-Hungary and Italy. The result was Italy promised to remain neutral in the event war broke out between Austria and Russia. Since France did not intended to attack either Italy or Germany, Bismarck was prepared to make the terms which pleased Austria because they drew her nearer to Germany and pleased Italy because they recognized her as a great power, but he was still determined not to support Austrian expansion in the Balkans, neither Italian in the Mediterranean. The Triple alliance was renewed for another five years in 1887. Side by side, Bismarck tried to keep on good relationship with Russia thereby prevented Russian alliance with France. Moreover, Germany was in good terms with Great Britain.

Bismarck’s diplomacy was a great achievement, but an even greater challenge was to maintain this complicated system of secret alliance in the face of the continuing rivalries among Germany’s allies. Despite another Balkan war that broke out in 1885 and that again estrange led Austria and Russia, he succeeded. To restore German relation with Russia, Bismarck negotiated the Reinsurance Treaty of 1887, in which both powers promised to remain neutral if either was attacked. All seemed smooth, but a change in the German monarchy soon upset Bismarck’s arrangements.

In 1888 William II (r. 1888-1918) came to the German throne, and came soon at odds with Bismarck. Taking as an excuse a disagreement over domestic policy, the young emperor dismissed Bismarck from office in 1890. Thereafter, he attempted to divert his foreign policies. William II believed that a lasting German Understanding with Russia was impossible and dangerous delusion. He thought that Germany must associate herself completely with Austro-Hungary and that the establishment of good relations with Britain would make this more likely. One of these first actions was his refusal to renew the Reinsurance Treaty. This marked the beginning of a period of fundamental change in the European situation during which Germany found her opposed by the very combination of powers which Bismarck had tried to prevent.

**3.2. FORMATION OF TRIPLE ENTENTÉ**

**After the withdrawal of Bismarck from office, what sort of diplomatic arrangement prevailed in Europe?**

Almost immediately after Bismarck’s retirement, the policy of William freed France from its isolation. To this mess, both William II and the newly appointed chancellor, General Leo Von Caprivi was responsible for the forthcoming political disasters. On one hand, it is believed that the emperor and his new chancellor, neither of whom had experience in foreign affairs, might felt difficulty in the complexity of Bismarck’s diplomatic system that they might want to clarify Germany’s commitment by eliminating the incompatibility Austro-Hungary.

In the meantime, Russia sensed that Germany had followed anti-Russian policy. So it created the Franco-Russian Alliance in 1894. Thereafter, France offered loans to Russia. French investors were encouraged to pour their capital in Russia in order to consolidate the alliance.

As for the British, there was no reason to think that they would soon become friendly to its traditional rivals or abandon its accustomed friendliness towards the German. Because of, colonial rivalries had made the British at odds with the Russians over Constantinople and central Asia and with the French over Africa.

The Irony was, however, the British-long accustomed to finding the French in their way, now began to feel in the 1890s that whenever they hoped to extend their possessions in Africa or the pacific, the Germans were likely to appear as a destructor. The following instances demonstrate this fact. In the Boers war in 1890-91- the Germans sent their sympathy and encouragement to the Boers against the British. Simultaneously, the Germans attempt to launch the Baghdad railway scheme, which Britain perceived it as a threat to its imperial interest in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean, was an annoying to London, where the feeling was beginning to grow that Germany was bent on opposing British interests in every part of the globe. By all odds the most alarming German action and the one most calculated to make a working agreement with the British impossible was, however, the decision to build a battle fleet. The German commander Admiral Alfred Von Tirpitz proceeded in naval building since 1898. All these events combined together initiated are a rapprochement between the British and French government. The Anglo-German naval race urged Britain to ally with France by abandoning its “splendid isolationist” policy. In 1904 both governments reached an agreement called the Anglo-French Entente. It was not a formal treaty and had no military provisions, but it settled all outstanding colonial differences between the two nations. In particular, Britain gave France a free hand in Morocco in return for French recognition of British control over Egypt.

The Anglo-French entente soon received an accretion of strength by the conclusion of an agreement between Britain and Russia. The event that cleared the way for an Anglo-Russian agreement was Russia’s defeat in the Far East during the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05. The fact that Russia appeared from the war weakened, reduced British apprehension about Russian power in the area. The other was both sides felt that the Germans became a real threat to their areas of interests. In August 1907 the Anglo-Russian Entete was born with that the Triple Entete comprised of Britain, France and Russia was created. This arrangement led to the formation of the two armed camps in Europe. This agreement laid the foundation for consistent diplomatic cooperation among Britain, France and Russia. The diplomatic revolution that had begun when the Germans allowed the reinsurance treaty to lapse in 1890 was now complete, and the Triple Entente had come into existence to balance the Triple Alliance.

**3.3. THE ROAD TO WORLD WAR I**

The years after 1907 seemed much more important that it had ever been before to possess allies and much more damaging to lose them. Every government now suffered from recurrent night mares in which it saw itself abandoned by its friends and encircled by a host of enemies; and every government, in its waking moments, strove to strengthen the loyalty of its allies and to avoid even the suggestion of defection. Intent upon this objective, the power not unnaturally lost some of their freedom of action. Their ability to cooperate in dangerous crisis with members of the opposing coalition was limited by their estimate of how their own friends might react, and fear of offending allies was sometimes enough to prevent disinterested action in behalf of the general peace. By the same logic, the ability of the coalition to restrain or discipline its own members by withholding support from moves that did not appear to be in the common interest was rendered imperfect by the fear of defection. These trends were accompanied by two dangerous tendencies which worsened the situation.

In the first place, there was a general increase in armaments between 1900 and 1914. And this resulted in to two serious out comes. Massive armament programs both in the army and navy increased military influence upon policy determination that army and navy officers began to play a vital role in the political decisions. The other was increase in armament led to arm race-particularly between Germany and Britain. Naval in the race-building of the Dreadnoughts-was the main bone of contention between the two rights up to 1914. Therefore, these factors played their own part in the consolidation of the Alliance system, which was basically the result of mutual fear and distrust of each block to one another.

In the second place, a series of crisis, which came to represent the general feature of International Relation in between 1900 and 1914, together with the division of Europe into two armed camp were responsible to facilitate the ground for the First World War.

**3.3.1. THE FIRST MOROCCAN AND BALKAN CRISIS**

The first of such crises arose over Morocco when France attempted to make Morocco under its sphere of influence and William II visited Tangier and pledged German support in 1905. In an attempt to test the recently signed Anglo-French agreement, the Germans announced that they would assist the sultan of Morocco to maintain his country’s independence, and demanded an international conference to discuss its future. To the amazement of the Germans, the majority of the participants supported France and to end such German threat in the future-the British and French military officials begin consultation.

The second crisis which was useful in testing the alliance was the Balkan crisis in 1908. The crisis was caused when Austro-Hungary, taking advantage of the revolution in Turkey, annexed the Turkish province of Bosnia. This was a deliberate blow to Serbia which had long been hoping to acquire Bosnia. The Austrian move also outraged the Russians who were sympathizers to the Slavic peoples. Nationalists who believed that Russia should defend the interest of Slavs everywhere demanded an international conference. The conference ended in a triumph for Austro-Hungary for it kept Bosnia. But it had unfortunate results because Serbia remained bitterly hostile to Austria, and it was this quarrel which led to the outbreak of war. The Russians, who considered the result of the conference as humiliating to them, were determined to avoid any further humiliation and embarked on a massive military build-up but advised Serbia to avoid war. Any how such failure was a big victory to the Triple Alliance. Despite the fact, secret societies were organized in Serbia that aimed to launch terrorist attacks against Austro-Hungarian officials in Bosnia.

**3.3.2. THE AGADIR CRISIS AND THE BALKANS WARS**

In the summer of 1911, as a result of disorders in Morocco, the French had sent troops in to Fez-the capital of Morocco, presumably to protect foreign residents. A French annexation of Morocco seemed imminent; without a warning the Germans sent their gun boat panther to the Moroccan part of Agadir, hoping to pressurize the French into giving Germany some compensation, perhaps the French Congo. The British were worried in case the Germans acquired Agadir, a possible naval base for threatening Britain’s trade routes. Thus, backed by Britain, the French stood firm, making no major concessions, and eventually the German gun boat was removed. The Germans agreed to recognize the French protectorate over Morocco in return for two strips of territory in the French Congo. The consequence was without any formal treaty, the German naval construction and the Agadir crisis had turned the Entente cordiale into an alliance deface. If Germany attacked France, Britain must defend the French, for its own security was inextricably tied up with that of France.

The second Moroccan crisis also provoked another crisis in the Balkans. Before the dust had settled in Morocco, in fear of further French expansion in the area the Italian government informed the Turkish government that it intended to extended its “protection” over Tripoli and, when the Turks rejected this communication, Italy declared war and invaded Tripoli in September 1911.

The Italian action, in turn, led the Balkan countries to fear that Austria might take advantage of Turkey’s embarrassment to seize what was left of its European possessions. Thus, Serbia, Greece, Montenegro and Bulgaria after forming the Balkan league, in 1912 they jointly attacked the Ottoman Empire easily and turned to the pleasant task of dividing the spoils. This turned out to be rather more difficult that the victors fell out among themselves over the division of Macedonia, and in 1913 a second Balkan war erupted. This time Turkey and Romanian joined the other states against Bulgaria and Stripped away much of what the Bulgarians had gained in 1878 and 1912. In both of the conflicts peace was maintained among the Great powers by the cooperation of Britain and Germany. The consequences were, however, very serious, Serbia had been strengthened and was determined to stir up trouble among the Serbs and Croats inside Austria-Hungary; the Austrians were equally determined to put a stop to Serbian’s ambitions. The German took the Britain’s willingness to co-operate as align that Britain was prepared to be detached from France and Russia.

**3.3.3. THE OUT BREAK OF WORLD WAR I**

On June 28, 1914, Gavrilo Principe, a Serbian nationalist assassinated the Austrian archduke and heir to the throne, Franz Ferdinand, in Sarajevo, Bosnia on a ceremonial visit. The nationalists belonged to a revolutionary movement, young Bosnia, which indeed aimed to liberate Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia from Austria-Hungarian rule. This underground society were also known in the name of “Union of Death”, or better known as the Black Hand. It was also learnt that the Serbian military intelligence chief was giving leadership to the organization. So the assassin was member of this society that provided him pistol.

The response was so swift. The Austro-Hungarian ruling circles believed that war would be a solution to punish Serbia. Soon Austria Hungary sent a harsh ultimatum on 23 July to Serbia. It accused Serbia of harboring terrorist organizations that aimed to deprive the Hapsburgs of Bosnia and their other territories inhabited by south Slavs. Besides the punishment of those implicated, the Austro-Hungary demanded that anti-Habsburg publications and organizations should be suppressed, suspect officers and civil servants purged and that Austrian representatives should take part in a judicial inquiry. Of the demands Serbia accepted some of them which compromised its sovereignty So that her reply on July 25 to Austro-Hungarian ultimatum was very conciliatory. Nonetheless, Austro-Hungary at once broke off diplomatic relations with Serbia and, declared war on 28 July. The Serbian capital, Belgrade, on the following day was bombarded.

The war that broke out on July 28 was a localized conflict between Serbia and Austria-Hungary. The Austro-Hungarians hoped that it would remain so. Contrary to the Austrians expectation, however, the Russians previously so often forced to back off, responded angrily. By ordering partial mobilization; making clear that it was aimed at Austro-Hungary only. And the following day due to some constraints of militaristic organization, announced a general mobilization to create pressure on Austro-Hungary.

Mobilization of any kind, however, was a dangerous weapon because it was generally understood to be equivalent to an act of war. It was especially alarming to the German general staff. Germany was now determined to practice its war plan, i.e. the Schileiffen plan. The plan was designed to attack France by crossing the Neutral countries Belgium and Luxemburg. Within six weeks Germany would break the French and then shifted to the east against the Russians. Thus, on July 31 Germany proclaimed a state of readiness, sent Russia an ultimatum demanding demobilization within twelve hours, and requested France to declare what it would do nothing in case of Russo-German war. The following day, Germany mobilized and declared war on Russia. Convinced this step meant war on the Western front as well, on August 3 Germany declared war on France and invaded Belgium. The next day Britain declared war on Germany. The First World War commenced.

The war turned out to be quite different from what most people had anticipated. It was widely expected to be a short decisive affair, like other recent European wars. However, the Schilieffen Plan failed to achieve the rapid defeat of France. The British and French forces led by General J.Joffere strongly resisted the Germans. Although the Germans penetrated deeply, Paris did not fall, and stalemate quickly developed on the Western front-with all hope of a short war gone. Both sides dug trenches and spent the next four years attacking and defending lines of trenches which were difficult to capture because the increased fire power provided by magazine rifles and machine guns made frontal attacks suicidal and rendered cavalry useless. In Eastern Europe, Russian movement was rapid so half of the German troops were transported against the Russians. But by December 1917, the Germans had captured Poland-Russian territory- and forced the defeated Russians out of the war. Britain, suffering heavy losses of merchant ships through submarine attacks, and France whose armies were paralyzed by mutiny, seemed on the verge of defeat. Russians withdrawal from the war was compensated by the USA that joined the allied powers in April 1917. It boosted the power of the allies. Meanwhile, the Allied powers secured decisive military victories over the central powers. The first country to surrender was Bulgaria and followed by Turkey. On November 9, 1918, William II abdicated his power.

By the late summer an armistice was signed on 11 November 1918, although Germany itself had scarcely been invaded; a controversial peace settlement was signed at Versailles the following year by the German high command that ended the First World War.

The division of Europe in to two armed camps after 1907 corresponded roughly to the process of polarization that was taking place in internal politics and was dividing country after country into two extreme factions. The erosion of the moderate position, the abandonment of the liberal attitude, the flight from the reasonable solutions and indeed, from the very use of the human reason to reach solutions had their counter parts in its diplomatic history. And now in 1914 that idealization of power that characterized so many areas of European thought and activity became complete, and Europe ended its century of progress in an excess of violence from which it never recovered.

**3.4. END OF THE WAR AND PEACE SETTLEMENTS AFTER WWI**

**3.4.1 THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES**

As indicated earlier, the Allied Powers had some problems in arriving at consensus to punish or excuse the Central Powers. France wanted sever and harsh arrangement to ruin Germany economically and militarily so that she could never again threaten French frontiers. Britain on the other hand was in favor of a less sever settlement enabling Germany to recover quickly so that she could resume her role as a major customer for British goods. Germany on her part renounced the lenient ideas of the Fourteen Points and turned aggressive after the Germans ignored this plans and signed the harsh Brest-Litovsk treaty on March 1918, by which Russia was forced to lose many territories, i.e. a third of her population, half of her industry and two-third of her coalmines.

In any case, by June 1919 the conference had come up with the Treaty of Versailles for Germany, and other treaties were also made with Germany’s allies. The Treaty of Versailles in particular was one of the most controversial settlements ever signed and was criticized even in Allied countries. The settlement was found to be too harsh for the Germans particularly in terms of reparations and disarmament.

The Versailles Treaty with Germany had the following terms as important settlements:

1. Germany had to lose territories in Europe. Besides the restoration of Alsace-Loraine to France, Germany was forced to give important territories to Belgium, Denmark, Poland and Lithuania. In addition, Germany’s African colonies and few European territories to be given as mandate territories by the League of Nations.
2. German armaments were strictly limited to a maximum of 100,000 troops and no conscription, no tanks, military aircraft or submarines and only to posses’ six battleships. The Rhineland was to be permanently demilitarized.
3. The War Guilt clause fixed the blame for the outbreak of the war solely on Germany and her allies.
4. Germany was to pay reparations for damage done to the Allies(i.e. France and Britain)
5. A League of Nations was setup, its aims and organization being set out in the League of Covenant.

But the Germans found it too sour to swallow; still they did not have choice rather than signing the treaty although they strongly objected the harsh arrangement. They forwarded their resentments against the treaty and its clauses with their own justifications.

Firstly, the settlement was said a dictated peace where the Germans were not allowed to join the discussion; they were simply presented with the terms and told to sign. Secondly, they claimed that they had been promised terms based on Wilson’s Fourteen Points, but others said that this claim was not valid as the German themselves ignored the plan in January 1918. By November, German tactics caused the allied attitude to harden and Wilson to add two further points: Germany should pay for damage to civilian population and property and should be reduced to virtual ‘impotence’. In the third place, Germany forwarded her objection to her loses of territories in which she entertained a relative victory. The Upper Silesia, an industrial region with a mixed population of Poles and Germans, was given to Poland. But after a plebiscite, Germany was allowed to keep about two-third of the area. Actually, the Germans had more grounds for the objection to the losses of their African colonies which was hardly an ‘impartial adjustment’.

The mandate system in which Britain took over German East Africa (Tanganyika) and part of Togo and the Cameroon, France most of Togo Land and the Cameroon and South Africa acquired German South West Africa (Namibia) was really a device by which the Allies seized the colonies without actually admitting that they were being annexed. Fourth, the disarmament clauses were deeply resented. The Germans appealed that 100,000 troops were not enough to keep law and order at a time of political disturbance to the victor powers which was fruitless.. The other resentment was against the War Guilt clauses which made Germany and her allies responsible for the outbreak of WWI and the subsequent destruction. The last objection to the Versailles Treaty was against the payment of reparation to the Allies. In what so ever conditions, it was evident that Germany and its people were annoyed and prospered economically very quickly and became strong for retaliation.

**3.4.2. THE PEACE TREATY WITH AUSTRIA-HUNGARY**

When Austria was on the verge of defeat in the war, the Habsburg Empire disintegrated as various nationalities declared themselves independent. Austria and Hungary separated, and declared themselves republics. Many important decisions therefore had already been taken before the peace conference. However the situation was chaotic and the conference was to formalize what had taken place.

The Treaty of St. German in 1919 dealt with Austria gave Bohemia and Moravia to the new state of Czechoslovakia; Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina to Serbia; Bukovina to Rumania; Galicia to Poland and some three territories to Italy. The Treaty of Trianon dealing with Hungary again granted Slovakia and Ruthenia to Czechoslovakia; Croatia and Slovenia to Yugoslavia. (Serbia with Montenegro is now what Yugoslavia is). Based on these arrangements and some adjustments on the consent of the people following the end of WWI, more peoples were now placed under governments of their own nationality than ever before in Europe. But there were some anomalies, such as the three million Germans placed in Czechoslovakia (Sudetenland) and one million Germans in Poland (by the Treaty of Versailles), but these were justified on the ground that the new states needed them to be economically viable. It was unfortunate that both of these instances gave Hitler an excuse to begin territorial demands on these countries in 1930s.

So far the treaties left both Austria and Hungary with serious economic problems. Austria was a small republic; its population reduced from 22 million to 6.5 million, and its industrial wealth lost to Czechoslovakia and Poland. Vienna, once the capital of the huge Habsburg Empire was left hopeless surrounded by farming lands which could hardly support it. Not surprisingly Austria was soon facing severe economic crisis and was constantly having to be helped out by loans from the League of Nations. Hungary was badly affected as her population reduced from 21 million to 7.5 million and some of the richest corn land lost to Rumania. Matters were further complicated when all the new states quickly introduced tariffs which hampered the flow of trade in the region in Europe.

**3.4.3 THE PEACE SETTLEMENT WITH TURKEY AND BULGARIA**

Like some other Germany’s allies, Turkey was also to lose territories by the arrangements of the Treaty of Sevres in 1920. Eastern Thrace, many Aegean islands and Smyrna were given to Greece; Adalia and Rhodes were lost to Italy; the Straits were to be permanently open whereas Syria became a French mandate. Palestine, Iraq and Trans-Jordan were given to Britain as mandates. But with the strong struggle of the Turkish nationalists, a revised settlement was made by the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) by which Turkey regained Eastern Thrace including Constantinople, and Smyrna. Turkey, therefore, was the first state to challenge the Paris settlement successfully.

One important result of the Treaty of Severs which was to cause a problem was the mandated territories which were peopled largely by Arabs who had been hoping for independence after their brave struggle against Turks. Nor were the Arabs happy about the talks of establishing a Jewish ‘national home’ in Palestine. Bulgaria lost territories to Greece, Yugoslavia and Rumania by the Treaty of Neuilly in 1919.

In conclusion it is possible to say that this collection of peace treaties were not a conspicuous success. It had the unfortunate effect of dividing Europe in to states which wanted to revise the settlement, and those which wanted to preserve it. The USA failed to ratify the settlement and never joined the League of Nations; this in turn left France completely disenchanted with the whole thing because the Anglo-American guarantee of her frontiers could not now apply. Russia was ignored. Italy felt cheated because she had not received the full territory promised to her before. All this tended to sabotage the settlement from the beginning, and it became increasingly difficult to apply the terms fully.

**3.4.4 THE LEAGUE OF NATION**

One of the important developments following the conclusion of the First World War was the establishment of the League of Nations with a grand objective of curbing future wars. The League of Nations was formally established on 10 January 1920 the same day that the Versailles Treaty came in to operation. With its headquarters at Geneva in Switzerland, one of its main aims was to settle international disputes and so prevent war from ever breaking out again. Not only it achieved valuable economic and social work, such as helping thousands of refugees and former prisoners of war to find their way home again but also solved a number of minor international disputes during the 1920s.

However, during the early 1930s the authority of the League was several times challenged, first by the Japanese invasion of Manchuria (1931) and later by the Italian attack on Ethiopia (1935). After 1935 respect for the League declined as its weaknesses became apparent. In Germany’s dispute with Czechoslovakia and Poland which led to the Second World War, the League was not consulted and it was unable to exert the slightest influence to prevent the outbreak of war. After 1939 it did not met again and it was dissolved in 1946-a total failure, at least as far as preventing war was concerned.

The League of Nation is usually considered to be the contribution of President Woodrow Wilson of the USA. In addition Robert Cecil of Britain, Jan Smuts of South Africa and Leon Bourgeois of France put forward detailed schemes as to how such an organization might be set up. The League had two main aims:

1. To maintain peace through collective security: If one state attacked by another, the member states of the League would act together, to restrain the aggressor, either by economic or military sanctions.
2. To encourage international cooperation in order to solve economic and social problems.

Its operations were conducted through its different organs. The General Assembly met annually and contained representatives of all the member states with one vote. Its function was to decide general policy; it could for example propose a revision of peace treaties and it handled the finances of the League. The council was a much smaller body which met more often, at least three times a year, and contained four permanent members Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and four other members to be elected by the Assembly for periods of three years. Its task was dealing with specific political disputes and discussion had to be unanimous. The permanent court of International Justice was another organ based at The Hague and consisted of 15 judges of different nationalities. It dealt with legal disputes between states. The secretariat on its part was concerned with paperwork, preparing agendas, and writing resolutions and reports for carrying out the decisions of the League. In addition, there were a number of commissions and committees to deal with specific problems. The main commissions were those which handled the mandates, military affairs, minority groups, and disarmament, while there were committees for international labor, health, economic and financial organizations, child welfare, drug problems and women’s rights.

As indicated earlier, the League had inherent problems and was proved to be inefficient to perform its purposes. As major obstacles and challenges, some factors are mentioned. In the first place, the League was associated with the Versailles Treaty and as a result people considered the organization to be another benefit of the victorious Allies. On the other hand, a serious blow came to the organization in March 1920 when the United States Senate rejected both the Versailles Settlement and the League. Many Americans wanted to follow a policy of isolation and feared that membership of the League might cause them to enter another war. Similarly, Germany was not allowed to join until 1926 and the USSR became a member only in 1934, which indicated that for the first few years, the League was without the three most important powers.

In its peace keeping, it was expected that the League would operate as follows: all disputes threatening war would be submitted to the League and only members which resorted to war, thus breaking the covenant would face action by the rest; the council would recommend ‘what effective military, naval, or air force the member should contribute to the to the armed forces.’

With its limitations and weaknesses, the League continued to exist and member countries were prepared to retrain from aggression and accept the League’s decisions between 1925 and 1930. But the decline of the League was aggravated with economic crisis which began in 1929. It brought unemployment and falling living standards to most countries, and caused extreme right wing governments to come to power in Japan and Germany and as well as Italy, they refused to keep to the rules and pursued a series of actions which revealed the League’s weakness.

The Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and Italian aggression of Ethiopia in 1935 were the final proofs of the League’s failure to meet its aims. The real explanation for the failure of the League was simple; when these aggressive states defied it, the League member, especially Britain and France, were not prepared to support it either by decisive economic measures or by war.

There were serious weaknesses in the Covenant making it difficult to ensure that decisive action was taken against any aggressor. It was difficult to achieve unanimous decisions; the League had no military force of its own. The continued absence of the USA and the USSR plus the hostility of Italy made the very much a Franco-British affair. And the failure of the World Disarmament conference (1932-3) which met under the auspices of the League was a disappointment. The Germans asked for equality of armaments with France, but when the French demanded that this should be postponed for at least eight years, Hitler was able to use the French attitudes as an excuse to withdraw Germany from the conference and later from the League.

**3.5. THE GREAT DEPRESSION**

Although a number of efforts were made to improve international relations, the fragile balance existed as long as there were no aggravating situations. But with the collapse of economic property suddenly, all the old hostilities and suspicions surfaced again and authoritarian regimes which were prepared to risk aggression came to power.

Obviously, after WWI, American investors and businessmen dominated the world. But, September 1929 the buying of shares at the Stock Exchange in Wall Street, New York, began to slow down and people rushed to sell their shares before price fell too far. By 24 October the rush reached panic proportion and share prices fell dramatically; thousands who had bought their shares when prices were high were ruined. And this disaster is always remembered as the Wall Street Crash. Its effect spread rapidly and so many people in financial difficulties rushed to the banks to draw out their savings that thousands of banks had to close. Similarly, as demands for goods fell away, factories had to close and unemployment rose alarmingly. The great boom had suddenly turned in to the great depression which rapidly affected not only the USA but also foreign countries all over the world and so that it became known as the World Economic Crisis. However, the Wall Street crash did not cause the depression; it was just assumptions of a problem whose real cause lay much deeper.

It had soon become clear that most European governments would be unable to continue making payments on World War I debts. Ever since the early 1920's, British statesmen had been urging that the United States forgive all or part of what was owed by her wartime allies, proposing that they in turn remit some or all of the payments due them from Germany as reparations. The American government had rejected this proposal, but in 1931, faced with the depression, President Hoover relented and arranged for a one-year moratorium on both debt and reparation payments. Seeking reelection in 1932, he dared not repeat the experiment. Some of the debtor states were forced to default. In the end all but Finland did so, and the result was not only to embarrass the governments involved but also to strengthen isolationist feeling in the United States.

Eventually almost all the affected states sought solutions for their economic problems in independent, nationalistic action. Seeking a commercial and financial advantage over other countries, the British abandoned the gold standard and devalued the pound in 1931. Through agreements reached in a conference held at Ottawa on July 21-Aug. 21, 1932, they also abandoned the tradition of free trade and established preferential tariffs for the Commonwealth. The American government deserted the gold standard in 1933 and in the same year caused the failure of the London Monetary and Economic Conference by declaring that it would not join in an agreement to stabilize exchange rates.

Fascist Italy adopted more drastic measures, instituting rigid economic controls and creating jobs by enlarging the armed forces and accelerating weapons production. Germany, which was ruled after January 1933, by the National Socialist (Nazi) dictator Adolf Hitler, went even farther in the same directions. The community of nations envisioned in the Paris peace treaties dissolved into anarchy of jealous states seeking national advantage and national self-sufficiency.

The financial collapse of 1929 triggered the Great Depression in American although there were other underlying domestic causes. American industrialists were producing too many goods for the home market to absorb aided by increased mechanization and as the 1930s approached, unsold stocks of goods began to build up. There was also a misdistribution of income. The enormous profits made by industrialists were not being shared evenly among the workers which showed that there was not enough buying power in the hands of the general public to sustain the boom. On the other hand, exports began to fall away partly because foreign countries were reluctant to buy American goods when the USA put up tariff barriers to project her industries from foreign imports.

The economic crises affected people outside the USA because American businessmen stopped investing abroad even stopped buying from abroad. Many states, especially Germany, were severely affected as their prosperity depended to a large extent on loans from America. As soon as the crash came there were no further loans, and the Americans called in short-term loans they had already made. By 1931 most of Europe was in a similar economic plight. The depression had political results too. In many states including Germany, Austria, Japan and Britain right wing governments came to power, when existing regimes failed to cope with the situation. Much more dramatic and fate-full was the rise of Hitler to power in Germany. The Depression affected the course of political events directly and decisively in Germany.

A Western type republic had been established with the adoption of the Weimer constitution in 1919. During its first years, the new republic had to face Communist Uprisings in Bavaria and Ruhr. The instability persisted through 1923 when French and Italian forces occupied the Ruhr because of the reparations dalliance. Like socialist ministries elsewhere, the ministry in Germany was undermined by dissension over how to cope with unemployment and other problems created by the Depression. The Left favored increased unemployment relief while the Right insisted on retrenchment a balanced budget which was supported by most communists. The government of Germany led by a left-center coalition led by the socialist Chancellor, Herman Muller and its cabinet, was forced to resign in March 1930 and from then in, Germany was ruled by parties of Center and Right.

**3.6. INTERNATIONAL SETTINGS FROM 1930s TO 1939**

This period is of crucial importance in world history because it culminated in the Second World War. Economic problems caused conducive atmospheres to evaporate. International affairs were dominated by the three major aggressors: Italy, Germany and Japan whose extreme nationalism led them to commit so many acts of violence and breaches of international agreements that in the end the world was Plunged in to the ordeal of total war.

Three major powers had been dissatisfied with the outcome of World War I. Germany, the principal defeated nation, bitterly resented the territorial losses and reparations payments imposed on it by the Treaty of Versailles. Italy, one of the victors, found its territorial gains far from enough either to offset the cost of the war or to satisfy its ambitions. Japan, also a victor, was unhappy about its failure to gain greater holdings in East Asia.

The authoritarian governments of Germany, Italy and Japan all had agendas of nationalistic aggression. They were prepared to move wherever they saw fellow nationals living outside their borders or where they could establish dominance over other peoples and thus became imperial powers. Japan moved against Manchuria and later other areas of Asia. Italy invaded Ethiopia. Germany sought union with German speaking peoples in Austria and Czechoslovakia and then sought to expand throughout Eastern Europe.

**3.6.1. Adolf Hitler in Germany**

By far the most ominous event of these depression years was the emergence of Hitler in Germany. A psychopathic personality, he rejected all conventional moral standards. In his book Mein Kampf and in later speeches he had disclosed his abhorrence of such concepts as equality and majority rule, his hatred of Jews, his belief that "Aryans were a "master race entitled to dominate others, and his conviction that the state had a right to use any means to achieve its ends. He had also set forth his views on foreign policy. He held that Germany should expand in order to bring within it all Europeans of German nationality. Saying also that the German people needed *Lebensraum* (space for living), he indicated that it was to be found in Eastern Europe. At the same time he declared that Germany had to have a final active reckoning with France. His words showed that he desired German hegemony over Europe.

The Weimer Republic in Germany was born in 1918 from the defeat of imperial army and the hopes of German Liberals and Social Democrats. Its name was derived from the city in which its constitution was written and promulgated in August 1919. While the constitution was debated, the republic headed by Social Democrats accepted the humiliating terms of Versailles Treaty. Throughout 1920s the government of the republic was required to fulfill the economic and military provisions imposed by the Paris Settlement. And this condition opened the way for nationalists and military figures to blame the young republic and the Socialists for the results of the conflict. More than in any other country, in Germany the desire to revise the treaty was closely related to the desire to change the mode of domestic government.

The Weimar constitution was a highly enlightened document. It guaranteed civil liberties and provided for direct election by universal suffrage of the Reichstag and the president. On the other hand it also contained some crucial structural flaws that eventually allowed it to be over thrown. More important was ministers were technically responsible to the Reichstag but the president appointed and removed the Chancellor, the head of the cabinet. In addition the law allowed the president in an emergency to rule by decree which showed that the constitution permitted the possibility of presidential dictatorship. Behind this new constitutional façade, much of the old Germany remained unchanged. The bureaucracy, the judiciary and the policy survived intact. In the universities, the most undemocratic and anti-Semitic faculties and fraternities continued untouched on the ground of academic freedom.

The social and economic turmoil following the French occupation of the Ruhr and the German inflation gave the newly emerging party an opportunity for direct action against the Weimar Republic, which seemed incapable of providing military or economic security. By this time, because of his immense oratorical skills and organizational abilities, Hitler’s personality dominated the Nazi party. On November 9, 1923 Hitler and a band of follower attempted unsuccessful *coup detat* after which Hitler was put in to prison. Hitler used the trial to make himself into a national figure. In his defense he condemned the republic, the Versailles Treaty, the Jews and the weakened condition of his adapted country. During his brief imprisonment, Hitler wrote Mein Kampf (“My Struggle”) and at the same time he decided to seize political power by legal methods. After few months’ imprisonment, he was released.

In foreign affair, the Weimar republic pursued a conciliatory course. Stresemann full filled the provisions of Versailles Treaty even as attempted to revise it by diplomacy. He was willing to accept the settlement in the west but was determined, if sometimes secret, revise it in the east. He aimed to recover German speaking territories lost to Poland and Czechoslovakia and possibly to unite with Austria, chiefly by diplomatic means. The first step, however, was to achieve respectability and economic recovery.

It was unfortunate that the outflow of American capital from Germany that began in 1928 undermined the economic prosperity of the Weimar Republic. The resulting economic crisis brought parliamentary government to a halt. In 1928 a coalition of Center Parties and the Social Democrats governed and there was no problem until the Great Depression. But after the Depression the Coalition partners differed sharply on economic policy. The Social Democrats refused to reduce social and unemployment insurance. The more conservative parties on the other hand insisted on a balanced budget. The coalition then dissolved in March 1930. The overall results of this chaos were that the Weimar republic was transformed in to a presidential dictatorship.

The economic down turn and the Parliamentary deadlock worked to the advantage of the more extreme political parties. In the elections of 1928 and 1930, the Nazi won 12 and 107 seats respectively. And some time after a third election, Adolf Hitler became the Chancellor of Germany on January 30, 1933. His coming to power followed legal procedures. All the proper forms and procedures were observed. This was important because if permitted the civil service, the courts, and other agencies of government to support him in good conscience. Hitler promised the people security against communists and socialists and an uncompromising nationalist vision of a strong Germany. Hitler’s supporters were on their part suspicious of business and giant capitalism.

The Japanese conquest of Manchuria was a rude challenge to the status quo in the Far East, but even more upsetting was Hitler’s threat to the status quo in Europe. Before this time the French system of alliances had dominated the continent with little difficulty. The more diplomatic and less hostile foreign policy of Stresemann had now been replaced by Hitler’s aggressive policies and the comfortable situation was drastically altered when Hitler became Chancellor in 1933. In addition to the international disorder, Germany was having a totalitarian regime. Hitler called his new order the Third Reich. He claimed to represent the absolute sovereignty of the German people.

**3.6.2.The Fascist Dictatorship in Italy**

One of the victors' stated aims in World War I had been “to make the world safe for democracy”, and post-war Germany adopted a democratic constitution, as did most of the other states restored or created after the war. In the 1920s, however, the wave of the future appeared to be a form of nationalistic, militaristic totalitarianism known by its Italian name, fascism. It promised to minister to people's wants more effectively than democracy and presented itself as the one sure defense against Communism. Benito Mussolini established the first Fascist dictatorship in Italy in 1922.

The new state of Italy was far from being a great success in the years before 1914; the strain of the First World War on her previous economy and the bitter disappointment at her treatment by the Versailles Treaties caused growing discontent. Between 1919 and 1922 there were five different governments, all of which were incapable of taking the decisive action that the situation demanded. In 1919 Benito Mussolini founded the Italian Fascist party which won 35 seats in the 1921 election and he formed a government in October 1922; he remained in effective power until July 1943.Gradually Mussolini took on the powers of a dictator and attempted to control the entire way of life of the Italian people.

The first authoritarian political experiment in Western Europe that arose in part from fears of the spread of Bolshevism occurred in Italy. The general term fascist was derived from the Italian fascist movement of Benito Mussolini (1883-1945) which has been used to describe the various right-wing dictatorships that arose between the wars.

Post war Italian politics was a muddle. During the war the Italian parliament had virtually ceased to function. Ministers had ruled by decree. Many Italians on the other hand felt that Italy had emerged from the war as less than a victorious nation, and had not been treated as a great power at the peace conference, and had not received the territories it deserved. After the war, like other countries, Italy suffered from the burden of wartime debt and from acute post war depression and unemployment and as result social unrest spread. In the countryside land seizures took place; tenant farmers refused to pay rents; peasants burned crops and destroyed livestock. In the cities great strikes broke out in heavy industry and in transportation.

In 1919 the first post war election was held under a law that added propositional representation to the universal male suffrage introduced in 1913. The Socialists and Christian Socialist Party made an impressive showing. Again in 1921, in the wake of popular disturbances, new elections were held. Liberals and democrats, moderate socialists and the Catholic Popular Party (Christian Socialist) were all turned in large number by Mussolini’s fascist movement. In October 1922 the Fascists, dressed in their Black Shirts, began a march on Rome.

The Black Shirts mobilized for a threatened coup and began to converge from various directions on the capital and Mussolini remained at a safe distance in Milan. The Liberal Democratic Coalition Cabinet had viewed the events of the past two years with disapproval but at the same time with satisfaction that the Black Shirts were serving a useful national purpose by suppressing trouble makers on the left. The cabinet made belated but in effectual gesture to save the situation by an effort to have material law declared but king victor Emmanuel III refused to authorize using the army against the marchers. The cabinet resigned in protest and Mussolini was named premier. Technically, Mussolini had come in to office by legal means. But behind the legal façade of his assumption of power lay the months of terrorist disruption and intimidation.

Mussolini had not really expected to be appointed prime minister. He worked carefully to consolidate his power. He was successful because of the impotence of his rivals, his own effective use of his office, his power over the masses, and his sheer ruthlessness. On October 23, 1922, the king and the parliament granted Mussolini dictatorial authority for one year to bring order to the lower level of government. In the election of 1924, the Fascist won a great victory and complete control of the Chamber of Deputies. They used the majority to end legitimate parliamentary life. A series of laws passed in 1925 and 1926 permitted Mussolini to rule by decree. In 1926 all other political parties were dissolved, and Italy was transformed in to a single party dictatorial state.

Mussolini once in power wanted Italy to be great respected and feared. But he was not sure how to achieve it. In addition he wanted the revision of the 1919 peace settlement and for that end he agitated a lot. Until 1934 his policy was determined by rivalry with the French in the Mediterranean and the Balkan. On the other hand, Italians feared that the weak state of Austria along the north eastern frontier of Italy might fall too much under the influence of Germany. For both problems mentioned above, Mussolini tried to deal mainly by diplomatic means.

Accordingly, he attended the Locarno conference (1925) though he was disappointed when the agreement signed did not guarantee the Italian frontier with Austria. Besides friendly atmosphere with Greece, Hungary and Albania, Mussolini cultivated good relation with Britain. Moreover, Italy became the first state after Britain to recognize the USSR and signed a non-aggression pact with her in 1933. Mussolini tried to bolster up Austria against the threat from Nazi Germany by supporting the anti-Nazi movement.

After 1934, Mussolini gradually drifted from extreme suspicion of design on Austria to grudging administration of Hitler’s achievements and a desire to imitate him. Eventually Mussolini recognized that it was more important to make friendship with Germany than with Britain and France, and the more he fell under Hitler’s influence the more aggressive became.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**4. THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION**

**4.1. INTRODUCTION**

Sometime before the outbreak of the First World War, Russia was in a serious problem. Its Tsar, Nicholas II (1894-1917), insisted on ruling as an autocrat but had failed to deal adequately with many problems in the country. The March Revolution in Russia was neither planned nor led by any political faction. It was the result of the decline of the monarch’s ability to govern efficiently. Military and domestic failures produced massive causalities, widespread hunger, strikes by workers and disorganization in the army. The first overthrew the tsar and set up a moderate provisional government. The provisional government itself was overthrown by the Bolsheviks revolution in October 1917 because it was not better than the tsar. Thanks to the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky the Bolsheviks (now calling themselves communists) survived and Lenin was able to begin the task of leading Russia to recovery until his death in 1924. All these points will be discussed in this unit.

Obviously, by the Russo-Japanese war of 1904/05, Russia was defeated. Social unrest and criticism of the government had reached a climax due to this humiliation. In the same year a general strike had burst out forcing Nicholas to make concession (the October Manifesto) including the granting of an elected parliament (Dumas). However, when it became clear that the Dumas were ineffective, political unrest increased and culminated in Two Revolutions of 1917.

Despite the fact Nicholas had survived the 1905 attempted revolution only because his opponents were not united as a result of the absence of central leadership and his willingness to compromise. Tsarism was having a breathing space in which Nicholas had a chance to make a constitutional monarchy to satisfy people demanding moderate reforms. On the other hand he seems to have had very little intention of keeping the spirit of the October Manifesto, having agreed to it only because he had no choice. The First Duma (1906) was not democratically elected; the system was rigged so that land owners and middle classes would be in the majority. Even so, it put forward far reaching demands including confiscation of large estates. The second Dumas (1907) suffered the same fate in which peasants and urban workers were deprived of their rights to vote.

The Third and Fourth Dumas were much more conservative and therefore lasted longer, covering the period 1907 to 1917. Although the Dumas criticized the government on occasions, they had no real power, since the tsar controlled the ministers and the secret police. The first two Dumas were dismissed without provoking another general strike because the revolutionary impetus had subsided for the time being while the last two resulted in the 1917 Russian Revolution

**4.2. THE TWO REVOLUTIONS**

In the early March 1917 strikes and worker’s demonstrations erupted in Petrograd (St. Petersburg). The ill-disciplined troops in the city refused to fire on the demonstrators, and the tsar abdicated on March 15. The government of Russia fell in the hands of members of the Dumas, who formed a Provisional Government composed of constitutional democrats with western sympathies.

Mobs seized public buildings, released prisoners from jails and took over police stations and arsenals. The new Provisional Government was just as perplexed by the enormous problems facing it as the tsar had been, and in November a second revolution took place which removed the provisional government and installed the Bolsheviks (the Soviets). The provisional government was a bourgeois which favored reforms up to a certain point. In fact it did proclaim freedom of speech, press, and assembly; it declared an amnesty for political and religious offenses; recognized the legal equality of all citizens without social religious or racial discrimination; and passes labor legislation including the eight-hour day. Despite this reform record, the provisional government never sank roots in the country.

The period between March and November, 1917 was a time of struggle for power between the Provisional Government and the Soviets. In this struggle the provisional government was fatally handicapped because from the beginning, it refused to consider the two things that most Russians wanted (peace and land). But the government could not immediately withdraw from the war to bring peace because Russia had certain commitments to her allies. At the same time, the redistribution of land had to wait a constituent assembly that would be truly representative of the people and would have the authority to decide on such a basic issue. These arguments were sensible and understandable. But this opened a vacuum for the Soviets to agitate the people against these statements of the Provisional Government.

The origin of the Soviets goes back to the 1905 Revolution when workers elected councils, or soviets to coordinate their struggle against Tsarism. Although suppressed at this time, the Soviets had proven their value as organs for agitation and direct action. They had precisely that quality which the provisional government lacked- intimate rapport with the masses.

Very naturally, the Soviets reappeared with the crisis precipitated by the World War. Because of their origin and composition, they had none of the provisional government’s idea of waiting for election before proceeding with peace negotiations and land distribution. Without hesitation or reservations they gave voice to popular yearnings, and in doing so attracted more and more mass support. The Soviets were soon appearing in the villages and in military units as well as in the cities.

At the beginning, the delegates elected to the Soviets were predominantly Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. The Bolsheviks remained insignificant until the return of Lenin from Switzerland in April 1917. Lenin promptly issued his famous “April Theses” demanding immediate peace, land to the peasants and all power to the Soviets. But his idea faced challenges from Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks.

The new provisional government led by Kerensky cooperated with the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries in order to withstand Lenin and his Bolsheviks. Kerensky declared that his objective was “to save the revolution from extremists.” Kerensky tried many options to work against the Bolsheviks. But unfortunately, he could not attract the support of the military men and other conservatives. They regarded him as a weak, loud-mouthed politician and demanded that he take immediate steps to crush the Soviets. When he refused to do so, a certain general Kornilov staged an army revolt against Kerensky with the objective of freeing the government from Soviet domination. In this occasion, the Soviets took advantage and emerged dominant. In general, as remarking points, there were a number of factors that led to the fall of the provisional government and to the rise of the Soviets. To mention:

1. The Provisional Government decided to continue the war (WWI) against the will of the society
2. Kerensky delayed the meeting of a Constituent Assembly which he had promised and did nothing about land reform and this condition lost him support on all sides.
3. In the midst of general chaos, Lenin and the Bolsheviks put forward a realistic and attractive policy to the Russians. Lenin demanded all power to the Soviets, and promised in return an end to the war, all land to be given to the peasants and bread to the poor.
4. The government had to share powers with the Petrograd Soviets, on elected committee of worker’s and soldiers’ representatives’ which tried to govern the city.
5. The Petrograd Soviets took the crucial decision to attempt to seize power. Leon Trotsky made the most of the plans which went off without a problem.

However, the easy victory of the Bolsheviks did not mean that they commanded the support of all the Russian people or even the majority. This was demonstrated by the composition of the Constituent Assembly that was finally elected on November 25, 1917. The Socialist Revolutionaries won 370, Bolsheviks 175, Left Socialist Revolutionaries 40, Cadets 17, Mensheviks 16, and national groups 86 from the total 700 seats. But the Assembly had only one chance to make a meeting in Petrograd on January 18, 1918. The Assembly was dispersed by the Bolsheviks and never met again.

The next major problem for the Soviets was how to withdraw from the war. In November 1917, Trotsky broadcast to all belligerents a radio message inviting them to conclude an immediate armistice. The Allies rejected the idea of the Soviets and as a result the Soviets decided to negotiate with the Central Powers separately. Accordingly, in March 1918, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed between Russia and the Central Powers that denied Russia much of its population, territories and Industries. Therefore, Russia dropped out of World War I and the new Bolsheviks rulers proceeded to organize the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its effects were still felt in all parts of the world.

On the other hand, by April 1918, armed oppositions to the Bolsheviks were breaking out in many areas in Russia leading to a civil war. Until 1921 the new Bolsheviks government confronted massive domestic resistance. A civil war erupted between the “Red Russians supporting the revolution and the “White” Russians who opposed the Bolshevik triumph.

The situation was complicated by foreign intervention to help the Whites with the excuse that they wanted a government which would continue the war against Germany. When intervention continued even after the defeat of Germany, it became clear that the aim was to destroy the Bolshevik government which was now advocating world revolution. The U.S.A, Japan, France and Britain sent troops to help the Whites. However, led by Trotsky, the Red army eventually overwhelmed the domestic opposition. By 1921, Lenin and his supporters were in firm control.

From early 1921 Lenin had a difficult task of rebuilding an economy shattered by the First World War and then by the civil war. The different discontents from various sections of the society seem to have convinced Lenin that a new approach was needed to win back the flattering support of the peasants. And as a result, he put in to operation what became known as the New Economic Policy (NEP). The New Economic Policy as a temporary compromise encouraged private ownership smaller factories, private trade and to some extant such capitalist incentives as bonuses and price rates although the heavy industries were under state control. Gradually the economy began to recover. Lenin saw NEP as a return to a certain amount of private enterprise until recovery was assured; his long term aim remained full state control of industry and of agriculture (through collective farms).Actually there were recurrent food shortage for few years.

Russia was now the World’s first CommunistState with power held by the communist party and no other parties were allowed to participate in the political power. In March 1921 Lenin banned groups who criticized his policies within the party and during the rest of that year about one-third of the party members were ‘purged’ or expelled. However, in May, 1922 Lenin had his first stroke and after this he gradually grew weaker suffering two more strokes until he died in January 1924.

The success of the Communist was attributed to some important factor:

1. The whites were not centrally organized and they lost the support of many peasants by their brutal behaviors and because peasants feared a white victory would mean lose of their newly acquired land.
2. The Red Armies had more troops plus the inspired leadership of Trotsky
3. Lenin took decisive measures, known as war communism, to control the economic resources of the state.
4. Lenin was able to present the Bolsheviks as a nationalist government fighting against foreigners.

**4.3. JOSEPH STALIN AND THE BOLSHEVIKS**

With NEP of Lenin, after 1921 the countryside became more stable, and a secured food supply seemed assured for the cities. Similar free enterprises flourished within light industry and domestic retail trade. By 1927 industrial production had reached its 1913 level. The revolution seemed to have transformed Russia in to a land of small family farms and privately owned shops and businesses.

However, the NEP had caused sharp disputes within the Politburo, the highest governing committee of the communist party. The partial return to capitalism seemed to some members nothing less than a betrayal of sound Marxist principles. In 1922 Lenin suffered a stroke and never again dominated party affairs. With the death of Lenin in 1924, two factions started an intense struggle for leadership of the party. One was led by Trotsky and the other by Joseph Stalin who had already became General Secretary of the party since 1922.

Each faction wanted to control the party but the struggle was fought out over the question of Russia’s path towards industrialization and the future of the communist revolutionary movement. Trotsky speaking for the left wing urged rapid industrialization and looked to voluntary collectivization of farming by poor peasants as a means of increasing agricultural production. Trotsky further argued that the revolution in Russia could succeed only if new revolutions took place elsewhere. The right wing faction opposed Trotsky. In the mid 1920s this group pressed for the continuation of Lenin’s NEP and a policy of relatively slow industrialization.

Stalin was the ultimate victor in these intra party rivalries. Stalin’s power lay in his command of bureaucratic and administrative methods. He was neither a brilliant writer nor an effective public speaker. Between 1923 and 1927, he supported the moderate right wings because he needed their support to defeat his chief rivals for supreme power-most of who like Trotsky, were member of the left opposition. In 1927 Trotsky was expelled from the party, and a year later he was forced in to exile abroad. Now Stalin was able to push the Soviet Union further to the left.

Through 1928 Lenin’s NEP had steered Soviet economic development with the support of Stalin. Private ownership and enterprise were permitted to flourish in the countryside to ensure enough food for the workers in the cities. A few rich farmers, *Kulaks*, had become prosperous. During 1928 and 1929 they and other farmers withheld grain from the market because prices were too low. Food shortage occurred in the cities and caused potential unrest.

The goals of the NEP were no longer fulfilled. Sometime during these troubled months, Stalin came to a momentous decision that Russia must industrialize rapidly to match the economic and military power of the West. Agriculture must be collectivized to produce sufficient grain for food and export and to free peasant labor for the factories. This program which basically embraced Trotsky’s earlier economic position, unleashed a second Russian revolution.

Stalin’s decision to industrialize rapidly and to move against the peasants aroused internal political opposition because they were departures from the policies of Lenin. In 1929 Stalin forced Bukharian, the fervent supporter of the NEP and his own former ally, from the Politburo. Sometime in 1933 Stalin began to fear that he would lose control over the party apparatus and that effective rival might emerge. And this resulted in the Great Purges from 1934-1938 when many important and potentially dangerous personalities were removed.

The trials and purges astonished observers from outside the Soviet Union. Nothing quite like these phenomena had ever been seen. The scale of the political turmoil was also unprecedented. The Russians themselves did not believe or comprehend what was occurring. In effect, the purges created a new party structure absolutely loyal to Stalin. The “Old Bolsheviks” of the October Revolution were his targets because they knew how far Stalin had moved from Lenin’s policies.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**5. EVENTS LEADING TO WWII**

Some of the salient features of Japanese militarism may be revealed by a comparison with Nazi Germany. Both countries were late developers with elitist academic bureaucracies and strong military traditions. Both had authoritarian family systems. The parliamentary systems of both were more shallowly rooted than those of England, France, or United States. Both were stricken by the Great Depression and sought a solution in territorial expansion, justifying it in terms of being have-not nations. Both of them persecuted socialists and then liberals. Both were modern enough in their military service, schools, governments, and communications to implement authoritarian regimes, while their values were not modern enough or democratic enough to resist their antiparliamentary forces.

But the differences between Japan and Germany were also striking. Despite the contrast between its small educated elite and the rest of the population with only a middle-school education, and despite the cultural split between the more traditional rural areas and the Westernized cities, Japan was more homogenous than Germany. The political process during the 1930s was also different. In Germany parliament ruled, so that to come to power the Nazi had to win an election. They were helped by the combination of the Great Depression and a runaway inflation that destroyed the German middle class and the centrist parties along with it. But in Japan’s constitutional system, the Diet was weaker. Control of government was taken away by the authoritarian leaders. The process by which the two countries went to war was also different. In Germany the Nazi rose as a mass party, created a totalitarian state, and then made war. But in Japan there was neither a mass party nor a single group of leaders in a continuous control of the government moreover, in Japan it was not the totalitarian state that made war as much as it was war that made the state totalitarian.

By 1938 it was clear that the nations had fallen in to two opposing camps as they had before the First World War. On one side were the democratic governments headed by Britain and France; on the other were the totalitarian powers. Japan occupied Manchuria and Italy annexed Ethiopia in violation of the covenant. The League of Nations failed to give assistance to the victims of these outrages; and this marked the end of its influence over international affairs. When Germany, Italy and Japan withdrew their membership, the League had no further value as a bulwark of peace. Then Germany began to tear up the Treaty of Versailles by openly announcing her intention to rearm and sending her soldiers in to the Rhineland. And as the totalitarian powers drew together in to an alliance and built up their military machines, Britain and France at last began to increase their armaments.

The Axis leaders accused the democratic countries that they hold most of the world’s territory and wealth while the Axis powers were denied sufficient living space (Lebensraum) and raw material. Both Hitler and Mussolini denounced the League as a body which existed only to perpetuate this arrangement. The democratic countries still looked back to the Treaty of Versailles and the numerous non-aggression pledges to preserve the peace in Europe. They still had faith in conference and arbitration to settle international disputes. On the other hand, the Axis powers had left the postwar period behind them. They were looking ahead to scrapping the treaties and establishing a new order which would create a Greater Germany, a modern Roman Empire, and a Greater East Asian ruled by Japan. Italy and Japan had conquered backward countries, unable to defend themselves. Germany was also preparing herself to reach beyond her boarders to seize the lands of her nearest neighbors.

In the years that had passed since 1919, many forces had worked to brink of war. It was not solely that the Axis powers had fallen in to the hands of ruthless and aggressive leaders; the world situation had been growing steadily worse. The peace settlements began to crumble almost from the date when the treaties were signed and as time went on there was a gradual shifting of power in Europe. As the energy and foresight of the democracies dwindled, the vigor and purpose of the Axis countries increased.

In the first place the Allies, which had stood together during the conflict, differed and fell apart? There was dissatisfaction among them over the treaties. Italy was angry that she had not received a large share of the Ottoman Empire and bore a special grudge against France, her rival in the Mediterranean. France felt insecure and blamed Britain and the United States for not agreeing the safety of her eastern boarder against the enemy. The United States rejected the treaty of Versailles and made a separate peace. Britain and France soon disagreed over reparations and the invasion of the Ruhr. The League of Nations, which many politicians had hoped would be the great bond among the nations, had failed. It had been handicapped from the start, since the united states had refused to join and Russia and Germany were not invited until later. Moreover, the League had no armed forces to enforce its authority. When the test came, it did not prevent war in Manchuria, Ethiopia or Spain.

One of the main obstacles to peace was the economic and financial breakdown which led to the Great Depression. In all countries the depression was primarily due to the mass destruction of wealth, the collapse of peacetime industry and trade, and the enormous costs of the war, which entailed vast borrowings, piled up debts, and destroyed credit. These effects of war became apparent long after the fighting had ceased.

Unfortunately, the powers, instead of cooperating to find some general solutions to the problem, had sought relief in strictly individualistic policies; each country went its own way without realizing how its own fortunes were bound up with those of others. The United States, the largest creditor nation, returned to its policy of isolation. It wished to collect its debts, but raised its tariffs, so that other countries found it difficult to sell their goods.

The right of nations to self-determination which the peace makers had urged as a means of satisfying suppressed people, turned out to be the causes of many problems. No boundaries could be drawn which would include in one state only its own nationals. The most serious minority problem was that affecting the peoples of the former German and Austria-Hungarian empires. Asserting that these countries had been denied the right granted to others, Hitler reached out together Germans back in to the Reich and made this his excuse for his first move in creating a greater Germany.

Although, in 1936, Hitler promised to respect Austria’s independence, he had been secretly promoting the growth of the Nazi movement in that country. On March 9, 1938, he finally issued an ultimatum to president Miklas, demanding that he name a new chancellor, acceptable to Berlin, or German troops would move in to Austria. To avoid bloodshed, the Austrian chancellor resigned, but as soon as a Nazi official had taken his place he invited German armies to enter Austria. Nazi troops poured across the border, and on March 12, Berlin declared Austria a part of the Reich.

The Anschluss, or union of Germany and Austria, had great strategic significance, especially for Czechoslovakia, one of the bulwarks of French security. The Czechs were now surrounded by Germany on three sides.. It was democratic and pro-western and it had been created as a check on Germany and was allied both to France and to the Soviet Union. It also contained about 3.5 million ethnic German who lived in the Sudetenland near the German border. The Germans in Czechoslovakia supported by Hitler agitated for privileges and autonomy within the Czech state. Hitler’s intention; however was not to improve the lives of the Sudetenland Germans but to destroy Czechoslovakia.

**5.1. APPEASEMENT OF THE ALLIES**

Hitler once he annexed Austria known as the *Anschluss* March 1938. The next country to be occupied was Czechoslovakia particularly the Sudetenland which contained three million Germans. When the Czechs refused to Hitler’s demands, the British prime Minister, Chamberlain who was anxious to avoid war at all costs, took up Hitler’s invitation to a conference at Munich (September 1938) at which it was agreed that Germany should have the Sudetenland, but no more of Czechoslovakia.

Appeasement was a policy followed by the British and later by the French to avoid war with aggressive powers such as Japan, Italy and Germany by giving way to their demands provided that these demands were not too unreasonable. From the mid-1920s until 1937 there was a vague feeling that war must be avoided at all costs, and Britain and sometimes France drifted along accepting the various injustices made on Manchuria, Ethiopia and other areas. Moreover, the origin of appeasement can be seen in British policy during 1920s with the Dawas and Young Plans which tried to conciliate the Germans, and also with the Locarno Treaties and their significant omissions. But appeasement reached its climax at Munich where Britain and France were so determined to avoid war with Germany that they made Hitler a present of Sudetenland and so set in motion the destruction of Czechoslovakia.

The appeasement policy at that time was debated in different views. The appeasers were convinced to the rightness of their policy just by giving important explanations. According to some people Italy and Germany had genuine grievances. Italy had been cheated at Versailles Treaty and Germany was treated very harshly. Therefore Britain should react with sympathy and with regard to Germany, try to revise the most hated clause of Versailles. In addition, since the League of Nations seemed to be helpless, chamberlain believed that the only way to settle disputes was by personal contact between leaders. The other factor for appeasement was fear of communist Russia especially among British conservatives. Many British politicians were willing to overlook the unpleasant feature of Nazism in the hope that Hitler’s Germany would be a guarantee against communist expansion westwards; in fact many admired Hitler’s drive and achievements. The other was that economic co-operations between Britain and Germany would be good for both; if Britain helped the German economy to recover, the internal violence would die down.

Above all, what motivated the British politicians and leaders to be patient against the aggressors was that there was a belief that Britain ought not to take any military action in case it led to a full-scale war which Britain was totally unprepared for. Again the USA was for isolation and France was weak and divided. In the meantime, Chamberlain speeded up British rearmament and the longer the appeasement lasted the stronger Britain would become and the more this would deter aggression. This appeasement had a profound effect on the way international relations developed. But some historians believe that it convinced Hitler that Britain and France were weak and he became bold to start the Second World War.

In annexing Bohemia and Moravia, Hitler no longer appealed to the tights of self-determination, but now boldly asserted that the Germans needed more living space, and that he intended establishing a new order in central Europe. The Allied powers were at least thoroughly alarmed. They finally saw that Hitler intended to lay hands on any country that his heart desired. There were already signs that Poland was to be the next victim on his list. Led by Chamberlain, Britain and France turned against the policy of appeasing Hitler and prepared to meet him on his own ground. On March 31, 1939, the two countries announced that they would support Poland if she should be forced to fight to keep her independence. On April 15, Great Britain made a Treaty of Mutual Assistance with Poland similar to the Franco-Polish treaty. This was soon followed by guarantees of aid to Greece and Rumania. The powers wished to include Russia in this series of protective arrangements, but Poland and Rumania objected to any agreement that would permit Soviet troops on their soil. Turkey also made pacts of mutual assistance with Britain and France.

Hitler matched the moves of the Allies by renouncing his non aggression pact with Poland and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935. On May 22, 1939, Germany and Italy made an alliance, pledging each other military and economic aid in case of war. Mean while the Allies knew that to help Poland according to their promise, they must be supported by Russia. But on August 23, 1939, came the announcement that the arch-enemies Russia and Germany had made a Nonaggression pact, in which they pledged themselves not to attack each other and to remain neutral in case either became involved in a war with a third power. This desertion on the part of Soviet Union at a moment when war seemed ready to break out stunned the Allies. The whole strategy of Britain and France was upset, for Hitler was now safe on his eastern boarders and could turn the full of his armies against the west.

On the morning of September 1, 1939 German troops marched into Poland, Planes bombed Polish cities, and Hitler announced that Dazing had been reunited to the Reich. Britain and France at once notified Berlin that unless the German forces were withdrawn from Poland, they would go to her aid, and on September 3, Britain and France declared that they were at war with Germany and the Second World War had begun.

Why did war break out? Was it Hitler or the appeasers to be blamed? The debate still continues about who was responsible for the Second World War. The Versailles Treaty has been blamed for filling the Germans with bitterness and the desire for revenge. The League of Nations and the idea of collective security have been criticized because it failed to secure general disarmament and to control potential aggressors. The world economic cases have been mentioned, since without it Hitler would probably never have come to power.