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Part 1:

Everybody Learns the History of Europe
1.1.1 Aims of the participants and peacemakers: Wilson’s Fourteen Points

The Versailles peace conference was dominated by victorious political leaders (USA, France, UK - “The Big Three”) who had differing aims:

1. USA
   a. **Woodrow Wilson** (US Prez) was an idealist who wanted to build a better and more peaceful world
   b. Hoped that his **14 points** would allow for a new political and international world order which he believed that the USA should lead
      i. Self-determination to end the frustrations that had contributed to the outbreak of WWI
      ii. Open diplomacy, world disarmament, economic integration and the establishment of the League of Nations (LON) to stop secret alliances and force countries to work together
   c. Wanted a lenient and just peace
   d. However, there was little support for Wilson’s work and the general sentiment of the US public and also Senate was that they did not want to get further involved in European affairs → policy of isolationism (and rejection of US involvement in the League of Nations)

2. France
   a. **Georges Clemenceau** (PM) wanted a harsh settlement to ensure that Germany would not threaten France again (after being invaded twice before)
      i. Planned to achieve this through economic, military and territorial terms
   b. Was also keen to retain wartime links with the USA and UK and would make concessions to achieve this
c. The French population had high expectations of a harsh treaty as revenge for the suffering of the War. However, the lack of support from the US and Britain for such a harsh policy led the French to compromise, as France also needed its allies in reconstructing the country.

3. UK

a. **David Lloyd George** wanted a less severe settlement that would weaken but not cripple Germany

   i. Loss of German navy and colonies to prevent threat to the naval and colonial supremacy of the British Empire

   ii. At the same time wanted Germany to recover quickly to resume its role as a key British trading partner, which was also critical for the recovery of the British economy

   iii. Also wanted Germany as a strong barrier against Bolshevism (mostly because of the 1917 October Russian Revolution)

b. Under pressure from British public opinion to make Germany accountable for the death and suffering that had taken place. The upcoming elections also lead him to believe that he needed to appease the people to continue his political success.

   i. Quotations: “make Germany pay”, “squeeze them until the pips squeak”.

4. Italy

a. Maximise wartime gains

   i. Was in political turmoil, social unrest and economic shambles by the end of the War and so wanted a good treaty to ensure a smooth Italian recovery

b. Wanted Allies to keep promises in Treaty of London and the Italian representative (Vittoro Orlando?) walked out when he found that no territories were given

   i. Treaty of London (1915-- do not confuse with 1839 Treaty of London) was a secret treaty signed between the Triple Entente and Italy where Italy, who was originally in the Triple Alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary, promised to join forces with the Triple Entente and
wage war against its former allies, in return for territorial gains if the Entente allies were to win the War.

ii. This was not followed through with leading to Italian unhappiness
c. Demanded Port of Fiume in the Adriatic

5. Japan
   a. Maximise wartime gains
   b. Wanted recognition of gains after seizing German island in the Pacific
   c. Wanted the inclusion of a **racial equality clause** to protect the Japanese immigrants in the USA

6. **Germany wishes they were there**
   a. The German government believed that the armistice would be based on Wilson’s 14 points, which offered an alternative to having to face the “total” defeat that the nature of this war had indicated
      i. In reality, the terms of the armistice were tough and designed to remove Germany’s ability to continue fighting, serving as the basis for more permanent weakening of Germany
   b. Defeat came as a shock to the German population, who had been told that they were on the verge of victory
   c. The German Army felt that they could have come to a more favourable conclusion had there been proper cooperation between politicians and army
      i. Placed the blame of the loss on the politicians, creating the “stab in the back myth”
1.1.2 Terms and (Geopolitical, Economic) Effects of the Paris Peace Treaties

The harshness of the Treaty of Versailles (TOV) on Germany in 1919 sparked much debate over whether the treaty was too harsh, calling it a *diktat* (“dictated peace”). German politicians of the time were renamed the “November criminals” and the Germans demanded a revision to the treaty but only a few minor issues were taken up and the treaty was presented again to Germany, who was threatened with an Allied invasion should it refuse to sign.

What were the terms of the TOV, what was the German reaction and were they justified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Article 231: The War Guilt Clause** | • Particularly hated by the Germans as all other countries involved should also bear responsibility for the war  
• Unfair and harsh for the new republic, who was struggling for survival against the Communist  
  ○ War was also not the fault of the new government  
• Germany population felt resentment and anger towards the clause |
| • Made Germany accept full responsibility for the war (based on their flagrant violation of the 1839 Treaty of London-- where Britain were bound to guard the neutrality of Belgium in the event of an invasion) and for causing all the loss and damage to the allies  
• This clause was moral justification for the other terms that were to be imposed on Germany (and legal justification for reparations.) |
| **Disarmament** | • Pre-1914 Arms Race contributed to the outbreak of the war  
• Germany was therefore obliged to disarm to the lowest point compatible with internal security  
• Forbidden to have submarines, an airforce, armoured cars or tanks  
  ○ Allowed to keep 6 battleships and an army of 100,000 voluntary soldiers  
• Demilitarisation of Rhineland with Allied troops to be stationed there for 15 years |
| • Hard for the Germans to accept  
• Army of 100,000 was far too small for a country of Germany’s size  
• Germany was rendered unable to protect herself, which was humiliating for a country with strong military tradition and whose army was a symbol of national pride  
• Incredibly angry at the little effort made by other European powers to disarm → Resentment |
| Territorial changes | Germany treated unfairly  
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Wilson proposed respect for self-determination and wanted opportunities to create states based on different nationalities which was difficult for Europe:  
  ○ Some nationalities were left in countries where they constituted minorities  
  ○ Territorial demands of different powers  
  ○ Economic arrangements related to reparations  
  • Alsace-Lorraine (seized during the Franco-Prussian war) to be returned to France  
  • Saarland, rich in coal, placed under administration of the LON followed by a plebiscite  
  • Germany to be split in 2  
    ○ Creation of new Polish state - Poland  
    ○ Polish Corridor between Germany and East Prussia gave Poland access to the sea  
  • Territory received by Germany from Russian under Treaty of Brest-Litvosk was returned  
  • Anschluss between Germany and Austria forbidden  
  • Germany’s African colonies were taken away as Germany had shown itself unfit to govern subject races  
| • e.g. Germans living in Sudetenland and Austria were not given the chance of a plebiscite and self-determination was not extended to them  
  ○ Ruled by non-Germans  
| • The loss of land also meant a loss of key resources / income from trade  
  ○ The removal of Germany’s iron and coal resources meant that she could not pay reparations and recover  
  ○ e.g. Saar was economically important area. |

| Mandates | Felt that the removal of colonies was hypocritical as they were removed because of the “harsh” nature of German rule, yet, the new colonial rulers were not exactly role models either  
|-----------|---------------------------------------------|
| • Germany’s colonies handed over to LON  
  • Mandate system adopted to ensure that they looked after the people in their care and would be answerable to LON  
    ○ “A” mandate countries - independent in the near future  
    ○ “B” mandate countries - less developed and not ready for immediate independence  
    ○ “C” mandate countries - very backward, returned to original conquerors  
<p>| • Really just a device by which the Allies seized German colonies without explicitly saying they were annexed, under the veil of the mandate system and the League of Nations. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic reparations</th>
<th>Punishment of war criminals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Wanted to make Germany pay for the material damage done to them</td>
<td>● Extradition and trial of the Kaiser and other war criminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the war (Allies)</td>
<td>● Difficult to identify and fine lesser war criminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Proposed to charge Germany for future costs of pensions to war-</td>
<td>● Light sentences (e.g. fine and short terms of imprisonment given out) but important as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widows and war-wounded</td>
<td>concept of “crimes against humanity” was given legal sanction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Total came up to £6.6 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Germany was already having to repair the damage done in their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>● Had spend lots of money in their war efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Had spend lots of money in their war efforts</td>
<td>● Did not have financial capabilities to pay for all damages done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Germany was already so crippled and the reparations would only</td>
<td>● Germany was already so crippled and the reparations would only make recovery more difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make recovery more difficult</td>
<td>● What the fuck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the Germans did have some grounds to be unhappy with the treaty. Some alternative views of the TOV are that:

● TOV was relatively moderate
  ○ Germany had sought huge areas of land from the Allies (and had done so before in the Treaty of Brest-Litvovsk), the Allies showed considerable restraint in comparison
  ○ Deprived Germany of about 13.5% of its territory, 13% of its economic production and about 10% of its population
  ○ France deserved to be compensated for the destruction of its land and industry, and Alsace-Lorraine should have been returned
    ■ German land had not been invaded; French land was
● TOV left Germany in a relatively strong position in the centre of Europe
  ○ Self-determination lead to the creation of new, militarily weak states, leaving a power vacuum in Central Europe that favoured a German expansion in the future
  ○ Central Europe was fragmented, but Germany was not
- Russia remained weak and isolated
- Germany was physically undamaged and its factories were still functional (compared to France’s, which were rendered unusable) leading to them gaining strategic advantages
- Huge reparations bill was not responsible for the economic crises faced by Germany
  - Issue of banknotes was what caused the hyperinflation
  - Could have paid off the reparations, had they raised national taxes
    - Historians such as Ruth Henig believe that the economic reparations were not too harsh, as Germany was fully capable of coping with reparations if she had reformed her financial system and raised taxes to British levels
  - Germany also received financial aid from the US under the Dawes Plan (1924) and the Young Plan (1929), which extended payment period and reduction of reparations
  - Only chose not to pay reparations as a way of protesting against the peace settlement

Conclusion:
The TOV was reasonable. It was viewed as vindictive and unjust as the Germans thought it was and tried to persuade others (quite successfully) of this German propaganda. Britain and France were forced into severe revisions of the terms of the treaty while Germany evaded the payment of reparations or carrying out disarmament. The treaty itself was also unwise in that it annoyed the Germans but did not leave them too weak to retaliate.

The other Allied powers also had much to say about the treaty.
- Many French argued that Germany had not been crippled to the extent of providing France with long-term security, leading Clemenceau to be heavily criticised.
- The US also refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and join the League of Nations.
- The British felt that the treaty was too harsh; Italians felt that the Allies had ‘won the war but lost the peace’.
### Other Paris Peace Treaties (Terms and Criticisms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaty</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Austria, Treaty of St. Germaine (1919) | - The people of Austria-Hungary had already broken away from the empire and were setting up their own states - Austria was now land-locked (with only 25% of its pre-war area and 20% of its pre-war population)  
- Bohemia and Moravia (wealthy industrial provinces) to newly-established Czechoslovakia; Bosnia-Herzegovina and Slovenia to newly-established Yugoslavia; Poland received Galicia; Italy and Romania also received territories  
- Armed forces reduced to 30,000 men  
- Union with any other country prohibited (particularly Anschluss)  
- Reparations to be paid in goods and services to Allies though Austria went bankrupt before the terms were fixed | - Austria was economically very, very weak by 1922 → created a power vacuum in Central Europe → easy target for German dominance  
- Made it difficult to apply principle of self-determination as the ex-Austrian Sudetenland (including border districts of Bohemia and Moravia) was given to Czechoslovakia despite containing 3.5 million German speakers  
- Italy was discontented because it did not receive the Dalmatian coast (and referred to the settlement as a “mutilated peace” |
| Bulgaria, Treaty of Neuilly (1919) | - Bulgaria would lose some territory to Greece and Yugoslavia - West Thrace to Greece (losing outlet to Aegean Sea and access to Mediterranean); Croatia and Slovenia to Yugoslavia  
- Army restricted to 200,000 men  
- Recognise Yugoslavia as an independent state  
- Reparations of £100 million | |
| Hungary, Treaty of Trianon (1920) | - Hungary would come out of this treaty having lost 75% of its pre-war territory and 66% of its pre-war population  
- Ruthenia and Slovakia to Czechoslovakia; Croatia and Slovenia to Yugoslavia; Transylvania to Romania  
- Army restricted to 35,000 men  
- Recognise the independence of the new states of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia and Austria (accepting the disintegration of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire)  
- Reparations to be paid to the Allies | - Hungary suffered economic collapse by 1922 → created a power vacuum in Central Europe → easy target for German dominance  
- Hungary resented the loss of its territories → Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia later formed the Little Entente to protect one another from any Hungarian attempt to regain territories |
### Turkey, Treaty of Sevres (1920)
- Palestine and Iraq as British mandates and Lebanon and Syria as French mandates; East Thrace, Smyrna and Aegean islands to Greece (where a plebiscite would be held); Italy and Bulgaria gained land
- Army restricted to 50,000 men; no air force, restricted to 13 boats
- British, French and Italian troops kept in Turkey
- Straits to become a demilitarised zone
- Reparations to be paid

### Turkey, Treaty of Lausanne (1923)
- The Treaty of Lausanne was a revision of the Treaty of Sevres.
- Return of East Thrace, Smyrna, some Aegean islands, and territories along the Syrian border
- Turkey’s sovereignty recognised over Straits (demilitarised zone)
- Military clauses removed
- Foreign troops withdrawn
- No longer had to pay reparations

### Geopolitical impacts of the Paris Peace Treaties
- Millions of ethnic minority groups were left under foreign rule, thus not fulfilling the principle of self-determination.
  - Sometimes the victors disregarded the principle of self-determination in favour of giving new or smaller nations the economic means of ensuring their stability and independence (e.g. Sudenterland)
  - Many minority groups disliked their new condition, some of which were resolved with plebiscites after 1919, while others led to other crises later on
  - Beginning of independence movements in many colonies e.g. India and China
• New successor states (about 9 in Eastern Europe) had difficulty establishing democratic governments which Wilson hoped would help in the preservation of peace
  ○ Most new countries attempted to adopt democratic constitutions but in practice were not democratic (because the members of these new states lacked democratic tradition and experience).
  ○ Minority groups and racial tensions were reflected on the political stage, contributing to political dissent and the destabilisation of parliamentary governments.
• The treaties revised the map of Eastern Europe, political relationships between countries had to be rebuilt
  ○ States had to review their alliances and diplomatic relations thoroughly which lead to the development of international blocs.
    ■ e.g. The Little Entente (1921), which was an alliance between Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia, with the aim of protecting one another from any Hungarian attempt at annexation. France also sought an alliance with the Little Entente, promising to protect them from such invasions.
  ○ New Europe also remained divided between “victors” vs “defeated”, those who wanted to maintain the peace settlement vs those who wanted to see it revised
  ○ Russia’s new government was not a Bolshevik dictatorship, which was encouraging a worldwide communist revolution
  ○ End of the war saw the decline of powers like Britain and France on the world stage as during the war, and the emergence of the US as a new dominant world power
    ■ Made clear that Britain and France were going to find it had to act on their own in international disputes, who were now not in any position to intervene in Europe in the 1920s
    ■ French and Belgium countrysides were also completely destroyed
Economic Impacts of the Paris Peace Treaties

- Worsened existing economic problems, such as low levels of production, food and raw material shortages, and inflation
  - Germany also suffered particularly badly; Austria, found that they had lost significant industrial land and had to transform their economies to agricultural ones
- The fragmentation of Europe hindered economic recovery
  - To survive economically, successor states also had to set up their own currency and build economic tariffs and barriers which impacted negatively on their economic relations as well as trade within the region
  - Exception: US and Japanese economies, which prospered instead

Social Impacts of the Paris Peace Treaties

- Swept away traditional structures in society
  - Bolshevism in Russia had rid the country of its aristocracy (quite literally) completely
  - Beginning of change for women’s positions in society, gained rights that they did not have before the war, e.g. Suffrage movement in Britain particularly → women could not vote
- Trade unions strengthened due to the role they played in negotiating with the governments during the war to improve the pay and conditions for valuable war workers
- Standards of health and warfare also rose during the war
  - Improved the lives of the poorest citizens
- Spread of diseases and loss of life
  - Influenza epidemic (Spanish flu)
  - Death
1.1.3 Enforcement of the Provisions of the Treaties; US Isolationism

After WWI, the US entered a policy of isolationism. While President Wilson wanted the US to contribute to international peace by participating actively in peacemaking efforts, ratify all Paris Peace Treaties and other documents, establish his 14 Points and join the LON, the Senate thought otherwise. This led to problems with enforcing the terms of the treaties.

- The Anglo-American Guarantee (28 June 1919)
  - During the Paris Peace Conference, the French were concerned about the Rhineland, which was critical to its security against Germany. The French wanted either to territorially gain the Rhineland or to occupy the Rhineland indefinitely, but both were not accepted by the peacemakers at Versailles
  - A compromise was made where Germany kept Rhineland, but it was to be demilitarised for 15 years; in return, the US and Britain agreed to the Anglo-American Guarantee, which assured military aid to France if she was attacked by Germany

- Retreat from the Guarantee
  - However, Wilson hoped that, in the event that Germany attacked France, the League of Nations would be able to take care of the aggression. On the other hand, the British expected the US to provide the most aid
  - However, since the US did not ratify any of the Paris Peace Treaties or any of the associated documents, including the Anglo-American Guarantee, it did not become binding for the US and thus, not binding for Britain either
  - The British were also not keen on providing military aid to France should Germany attack, as it did not want to be dragged into war through military alliances again reminiscent of the war that had only just concluded
Problems with enforcing the provisions of the treaties

- The USA never joined the LON (which weakened it greatly), the LON itself had trouble enforcing the treaties
  - Because of the US retreat from the Anglo-American guarantee, it was not binding for any countries involved in the guarantee to ratify the Paris Peace Treaties
  - Britain and France, weak after the war, often disagreed on issues regarding Germany (and self-interests), often requiring the help of the USA whose policy of isolationism prevented the provision of any aid
- The Germans were angry and constantly demanded a revision to the TOV but only a few minor issues were taken up and the treaty was presented again to Germany, who was threatened with an Allied invasion should it refuse to sign
- Italy also called for revisions on the Paris Peace Treaties in favour of territorial changes for itself as despite being a “victor” country, the territories it received were few compared to the other powers
- Japan was more interested in the racial equality clause, and its own issues with being able to match the other European powers than issues of European peace settlement

The USSR was isolated in the 1920s and really didn’t care.
1.1.4 Efforts at Disarmament (1920-1936)

They tried so hard and got so far

1. The Washington Naval Conference (1921-1922)

Although not immediate, there were increasing observations that pointed to an American-Japanese rivalry for the control of the Pacific Ocean, which was considered a long-term threat to world peace. To stop a needless, expensive and possibly dangerous arms race, the major countries agreed to sign a series of naval disarmament agreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four-Power Treaty</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● US, Britain, France, Japan</td>
<td>● Terminated the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Maintenance of the status quo in the Pacific, where no country seeks further territorial expansion</td>
<td>● Involved small number of nations and could not guarantee international security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington Naval Treaty (Five-Power Treaty)</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● US, Britain, Japan, Italy and France</td>
<td>● France and Japan dissatisfied with ratios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● A ten-year pause in the construction of battleships or battlecruisers, including the immediate suspension of all ship building</td>
<td>● Did not involve any other aspects of military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Naval fleet ratio of 5:5:3:1.75:1.75</td>
<td>● Showed other nations that the disarmament effort was not wholehearted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Destruction of all ships until ratio was achieved</td>
<td>● Discriminatory against Asian power (Japan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine-Power Treaty</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Honestly not that important but it promised to guarantee the territorial integrity of China</td>
<td>● Evident in how the Manchurian Crisis (1931) happened, this was obviously not properly enforced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects and Limitations

● All countries were able to avoid the costs of a naval arms race, at least for a while, and it was a first step towards world disarmament
• However, the agreements were limited to the navies of a few countries, and did not have much impact on an international scale. Furthermore, it failed to include world powers such as Russia and Germany.
• Showed some insincerity in disarming in other aspects.
• Allowed the opportunity for naval escalation in the event of aggression by a third party, particularly in the Pacific.

2. **Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928)**
The General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy, also known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928), was initiated and drafted by the US Secretary of State Frank Kellogg and the French foreign minister Aristide Briand.
• The treaty called for signatory states to solve all disputes or conflicts of any nature by peaceful methods, and only initiate war if it were absolutely necessary for self-defence.
• In August 1928, 15 countries signed the treaty and in the months that followed, this number grew to 63 signatories.

Effects and Limitations:
• 63 signatories is a lot but still not all the countries in the world
• Also resulted in more wars being declared in “self-defence”, and also more undeclared wars.

3. **The First London Naval Disarmament Conference (1930)**
This conference was a revision of the Five-Power Treaty of the Washington Naval Conference (1921-1922)
• Also known as the Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armaments (1930). Very self-descriptive.
  ○ Naval ratio between US, Britain and Japan was modified
  ○ Submarine ratio between these three countries were equalised
4. The Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932-1934)

This conference was aimed at addressing an all-round arms reduction and international disarmament. It failed (as expected) for the following reasons:

- International geopolitical and economic situation was in shambles due to the Great Depression (1929) and the effects of WWI.
- The Conference itself was too ambitious as it aimed to addressing all-round disarmament on a global scale.
  - If a disarmed nation was to be attacked, no other nation would want to help defend it because of its self-interests.
  - Due to the sheer number of countries involved, cooperation and consensus between countries was difficult to achieve (makes you wonder what the UN is doing)

  ➔ The initial disagreements began on the topic of which armaments were to be included in the treaty and which were to be considered “defensive weapons”.

  ➔ Then there was the problem of implementation and verification of adherence to the treaty terms without affecting each country’s self-determination.

  ➔ The French were unhappy as they did not receive any concrete promises from Germany to not attack, should it disarm; Germany insisted on international disarmament and ‘equality of status’ as she was disadvantaged, but France refused.

In January 1933, Hitler became the Chancellor of Germany and thus pulled out of the Conference, while simultaneously leaving the League of Nations. One year later, the Conference ended in utter failure.

5. The Second London Naval Disarmament Conference (1935-1936)

- Japan left to expand its navy
- Then Italy left because of the Abyssinian Crisis (1935-1936)
- This left only France, Britain, and US remaining in the conference, making it fairly insignificant.

**But in the end it doesn’t even matter**

This was due to two main reasons:

1. Conscription and building arms was a way to prop up their economies, especially after the Great Depression (1929) and effects of WWI and there was no way they would stop this for world disarmament
2. Countries needed to establish security against Russia and expansionist Germany (such as France, compounded by the generally growing anti-German sentiment in Europe).
1.1.5 The League of Nations

Aims of the League

- Maintain the peace by establishing a system of collective security and catalysing international disarmament
  - Collective security is the idea that peace can be preserved by cooperation and collective action. The primary principle was that if one state attacked another, the member states of the League would act together to restrain the aggressor, either by economic or military sanctions.
- Encourage international cooperation to solve economic and social problems
- Provide a platform for nations to settle international disputes on a peaceful basis

Internal weaknesses of the LON

- Changing membership
  - Aims of the League reflected the shifting priorities of its leading members
  - More liberal governments became increasingly polarised, right-wing governments within the LON became more aggressive, causing the perceived threat from the USSR to shift to the Axis Powers
- Absence of major powers that would have had a decisive impact on the working and influence of the League
  - The USA was the most important absent major power, whose Senate was concerned that involvement in the League would drag them into further European disputes and conflicts and therefore pursued a policy of isolationism
    - The League lost legitimacy because it was championed by Wilson, and it was essential that the US had to be there to ensure that the League did what it was supposed to do
Weakened the potential of the LON to use collective security, and the power of the LON overall, as it came out of the war the most powerful country (and would have assisted the League economically and militarily)

Highlighted that new organisation and diplomatic peace might be sidelined in favour of old-fashioned agreements and treaties

Other than Japan, the other permanent members of the League were distinctly European, making the League lack the appearance of a “worldwide organisation”

The European powers that lead the LOn were also arguable in decline, making the League look weaker

- The USSR was excluded as the newly established Bolshevik government was regarded as a “pariah state”; they were afraid that they would spread communism to the rest of Europe and felt it expedient to isolate the Soviets rather than embrace them
  - Perceived by the USSR as a “club of capitalists” that worked to protect and promote their interests and respective empires
  - The USSR did join in 1934, but was removed again in 1939

- Germany remained a relatively strong power at the conclusion of WWI as it was militarily defeated in only the west, and not the east
  - It was vital that Germany be included in the LON to work towards the aim of revising the TOV, and its exclusion suggested that the LON was something of a victor’s club
  - Germany was accepted into the League in 1926, after the signing of the Locarno Pact (1925), but left the League again in 1933 after the rise of Hitler

- The absence of the USSR and Germany from the LON lead to their isolation from European politics and the signing of the Treaty of Rapallo (1922)
  - The Treaty of Rapallo was disguised as a trade agreement between Germany and the USSR, but secretly addressed military cooperation
between the two countries and thus indirectly breached the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

- The two countries agreed to establish mutual “most favoured nation status”, which alarmed the Western powers as they wanted to use Germany as a barrier against Soviet communism.
  - Austria and Hungary were also excluded from the League, making it look even more like a victor’s club

- Weakness of the Central European States
  - The LON was dominated by the new smaller states that emerged from the Austro-Hungarian Empire based on the principle of nationality
  - Weak Central European states were politically and economically weak and were unable to support the LON, instead requiring its support

- Born out of the TOV
  - The TOV was hated especially by the Germans, and their hatred carried over
  - LON had to defend the many flaws of the TOV and furthermore enforce the terms of it

- Inherent weaknesses in the Covenant
  - The requirement of unanimity for collective decisions to pass made it difficult for effective and decisive collective action to be taken against aggressor states, much less make any international decisions
  - The LON had no binding military requirements nor its own armed force, and simply depended on its member states to volunteer armed forces when necessary, causing the LON to lack any real influence
  - Membership to the League also was up to each nation themselves, which meant it was easy for nations to join or leave the League, leading to a constantly shifting membership; many states left when the League disagreed with their actions
  - Other structural changes also further undermined the LON:
- In 1923, each member state was given autonomy of choice as to whether they wished to contribute to a fight in the event of a crisis → fucked up collective security

- Failures to strengthen the League
  - Several attempts to strengthen the League were made, but were unsuccessful due to the requirements of unanimity of decisions to be passed and also the dominance of Britain and France as the leading powers
  - The Commission on Armaments presented a draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance (1923) which made wars of aggression illegal and required all members to assist victims of aggression; the document was rejected after British fears of committing troops that it needed for its own security
  - The British and French Prime Ministers jointly proposed the Geneva Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (1924) to the League which lay down a system for mandatory arbitration of international disputes and determining the aggressor in each dispute; this was dismissed by British Conservatives and the US, and thus never materialised.

**Strengths of the LON**

- Had means of influence (though not effective)
  - Moral condemnation where they would declare publicly that a country was wrong and hoped that public opinion would force it to stop
  - Arbitration, would act as a referee between quarrelling nations
  - Trade sanctions
  - Military force (dependent)
### The Audacious Escapades of the League of Nations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Successes</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aaland Islands (small nation) (1920) | • The Aaland Islands belonged to Finland, but the majority of residents were ethnically Swedish and wanted to be under Swedish rule  
• In 1921, Finland decided to claim sovereignty over them. Sweden and Finland took the issue to the League, which decided to respect Finnish sovereignty and leave the Islands under Finnish rule  
• Unpopular decision but accepted by all parties involved |
| Upper Silesia (1921) | • Both Germany and Poland wanted control of Upper Silesia, and important industrial area rich in coal  
• LON decided to conduct a plebiscite to determine which country the area should belong to, and because the results were close (Germany 700k, Poland 480k) the League decided to split the area between Poland and Germany, with Poland receiving half of the population, a third of the territory and more than 80% of the heavy industry  
• Both countries also promised to accept the rights of minorities in their areas  
• The ruling was accepted by both countries |
| Mosul Question (1924) | • Territorial dispute in the early 20th century between Turkey and Iraq over the possession of the former Ottoman Vilayet of Mosul.  
• LON called in for an investigated and recommended that Iraq should retain Mosul, and Turkey reluctantly assented to the decision by signing the Frontier Treaty with the Iraqi government in 1926. Iraq agreed to give a 10 percent royalty on Mosul's oil deposits to Turkey for 25 years. |
| Greek-Bulgarian border (1925) | • After the death of a Greek soldier, a border dispute erupted on the Greek-Bulgarian border, resulting in a Greek invasion of Bulgaria.  
• LON called for an immediate ceasefire, but the Greeks refused. They then threatened sanctions on Greece, after which they complied.  
• An investigation determined that the Greeks were at fault and were to pay Bulgaria compensation for the act of aggression.  
• Though unpopular, Greece accepted the LON’s decision. |
| Social successes | • The efforts of the League to improve social conditions for people were successful  
  ○ International Labour Organisation (ILO)  
    ■ Helped to improve the working conditions of many workers all over the world  
    ■ Advised countries on working conditions and wages  
  ○ Commissions on refugees and human rights  
    ■ Helped refugees of war return home  
    ■ Assisted Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany  
  ○ Health Organisation (later World Health Organisation in the UN)  
    ■ Reduced spread of contagious diseases (e.g. malaria)  
    ■ Introduced vaccines which reduced deaths from diseases |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vilna (1920)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The city of Vilna became the capital of Lithuania after its independence was restored after the war (and had been many centuries before that). However, Poland opposed this and claimed Vilna, saying that 30% of the population was Polish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Polish army seized Vilna, Lithuania appealed to the LON but the Poles ignored all their calls for withdrawal. Before any further action could be taken by the LON, the Conference of Ambassadors awarded Vilna to the Poles outside the LON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corfu (1923)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Italian surveyors, who were part of a delegation of the international boundary commission settling border disputes between Greece and Albania, were killed on the Greek side of the border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mussolini blamed Greece, demanded compensation and demanded that the Greek government execute those responsible. When Greek refused to do so, Mussolini moved Italian troops to occupy the Greek island of Corfu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greece appealed to the LON for the condemnation of Mussolini’s actions. Mussolini refused to cooperate with the LON, threatening to leave the League and demanded the matter to be moved to be discussed by the Conference of Ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Conference ruled in favour of Mussolini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greeks had to pay compensation to the Italians, who only left after this was fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This was a disaster for the League as it failed to cooperate against an aggressive European power. The self-interests of Britain and France also disallowed the LON from condemning Mussolini, who they wanted to keep as an ally against Germany just in case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Conference of Ambassadors**

- The Conference of Ambassadors was set up in Paris in January 1920, consisting of representatives from Britain, Japan, Italy, France and the US (which was only an observer), intended to be an interim League of Nations while it was still being set up.
- However the Conference lingered on until the 1930s, and in doing so affected the League’s legitimacy with its existence.
- In the case of Vilna (1920), the Conference was the body that decided to award Vilna to the Poles; in the case of Corfu (1923), the Conference also ordered Greece to pay the full amount to Mussolini.
- Through these decisions, they circumvented the League and thus undermined its power.
The League’s Mandate System

- **Why establish this stupid shit**
  - Under the League, a ‘mandate’ was a legal status for certain territories transferred from the control of one country to another following the war, or the legal instruments that contained the internationally agreed upon terms for administering the territory on behalf of the League.
  - Article 22 also required nations to help these underdeveloped countries which were ‘not yet able to stand up for themselves’.
  - Each colonial territory of a power in World War I was mandated and placed under the governance of a mandatory nation, which had the responsibility for the wellbeing and governance of those living in the mandated territories and were accountable to the League’s Mandate Commission.
  - Mandatory countries were to give these mandated territories independence once they saw that the mandated territories could sustain themselves.

- **What it actually was**
  - All mandated territories were classified into three categories.
    1. ‘A’ mandates were countries that were to become independent in the near future. These included Turkish territories in the Middle East such as Palestine and Syria which were to be supervised by Britain and France for a limited period of time only.
    2. ‘B’ mandates were countries were less developed and not ready for immediate independence. These included most of Germany’s African colonies, which were given to Britain, France, Belgium and South Africa. Germany’s Pacific colonies were given to Japan, Australia and New Zealand.
    3. ‘C’ mandates were countries that were very backward and directly handed over to the country that had conquered it. This included most of Germany’s Pacific colonies, e.g. Shandung → Japan
• Impact of the mandate system
  ○ The mandate system was one in which each mandatory country had a responsibility to the mandate country and could be subjected to an international body if there was mistreatment.
  ○ Italy was unhappy with the fact that it did not receive any mandates despite being on the victorious side of the war.
  ○ Overall, most mandated territories were unhappy with the system as they were not given independence even after a long period of time.
  ○ This caused many to view the mandate system as “imperialism in disguise”.
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1.1.6 The Ruhr Crisis (1923)

France felt that its security was highly threatened by Germany. Her security depended greatly on the Treaty of Versailles because it kept Germany weak, but the treaty was not ratified by the US, and US signed a separate treaty with Germany. France also depended on reparations to rebuild her economy. Germany, who was economically weak, was potentially unable to pay their reparations (even after the Wiesbaden Accords in 1921, where France agreed to accept reparation payments in the form of industrial produce and raw materials rather than cash) → France >:-(

- Invasion of the Ruhr
  
  In December 1922, Germany failed to pay reparations and requested for suspension of payment for four years. However, France felt that its security was highly threatened and rejected this proposal.
  
  ○ In 1923, France, with support from Belgium and Italy, invaded the Ruhr with the aim of taking reparations payments in kind and by force.
  
  ○ The German Chancellor Wilhelm Cuno initiated a policy of passive resistance as he asked for workers to strike, while promising that they would still be paid.
  
  ○ The German government printed money to cover the expenses, leading to hyperinflation.
    
    - This caused middle class families to be most affected by the crisis, as their savings lost value and economic activities saw a significant decrease in profits.
    
    - This also generated more dissent towards the Weimar policy.
  
  ○ In response, the French imposed a blockade in the area and imprisoned workers who refused to cooperate.
• Impacts of the Ruhr Crisis
  o France lost more than they gained
    ■ Some material gains were made by France.
    ■ However, Britain did not join France in the occupation of the Ruhr; in fact, it opposed any French attempt to dominate Europe and showed interest in German economic recovery.
      ■ This confirmed Britain’s belief that France could not be trusted to ensure European stability.
    ■ Furthermore, Poincaré was attacked by both those who believed that the occupation should have lasted for longer, and also those that believed that the occupation was a risky choice in general.
    ■ France also learnt that it was impossible to impose the treaty terms by herself.
    ■ This also undermined the authority of the League, as a leading member had committed an act of aggression, which was not addressed by the League but rather, had to be solved outside of the League.
  o The German response to the Ruhr Crisis generated political instability, and Gustav Stresemann became the new German Chancellor in 1923, starting the Golden Years of the Weimar Republic.
    ■ Due to the collapse of the German economy, Stresemann called off passive resistance. This was seen as a defeat by some Germans, causing acts of violence to break out in some cities.
    ■ Germany was then placed under martial law, and looked towards the US for foreign assistance to solve the problem of reparations, and initiated negotiations to solve the crisis.

France’s attempts to support separatist groups in the Rhineland and promote unrest in Germany had failed, and the French economy suffered due to the cost of keeping troops in the Ruhr, causing them to join negotiations as well.
**MURICA, FUCK YEAH**

1. **Dawes Plan (1924)**

   The resolution of the Ruhr crisis came in the form of the Dawes Plan (1924), an agreement between the US, Britain, France and Germany which presented a new schedule for reparation payments.
   - Reduction of the annual amount of reparations, and extended the duration of payments over a longer period of time.
   - Two year delay of payment granted.
   - US loan of 800 million marks to Germany to help her overcome the crisis.

   **Significance of the Dawes Plan (1924)**
   - Breach of US policy of isolationism - showed that the US could not isolate itself from European affairs that easily
   - Seen by Germans as an acceptance of defeat and request for help in rebuilding their economy.
   - Made European economies interdependent and prone to crisis that would easily spread to the other European states due to the flow of capital.

2. **Young Plan (1929)**

   The Young Plan (1929) was designed as a continuation of the Dawes Plan to solve the problem of reparations. It linked European economies to the US even more, and made them become even more interdependent.
   - The total reparations amount to be paid by Germany was cut to a third of its original amount.
   - It further lengthened the time Germany was given to complete its reparations payments.
   - Disallowed sanctions on Germany, withdrawal from Rhineland.
   - Extensive foreign loans to Germany.
1.1.7 Locarno and the “Locarno Spring”
(1925)

What was the The Locarno Pact (1925)?
The Locarno Pact (1925) was a series of treaties signed by Germany, France, Belgium, Britain and Italy, initiated by Gustav Stresemann.

- Germany promised to respect her western borders as set under the Versailles Treaty (1919), and France and Belgium agreed to accept their borders as well.
- France agreed not to invade Germany again.
- They agreed not to attack one another unless in self-defence.
- Any dispute over the terms was to be brought up to the Council of the League of Nations.
- Allied troops were to evacuate the Rhineland in stages and Germany was to join the League of Nations.
- The Treaty of Mutual Guarantee (1925), included within the Locarno Pact, saw Britain and Italy agreeing to defend any country victim of aggression in violation of these terms.

Locarno (im)Pact (1925)? heh

- Germany agreed not to invade or acquire territory from France or Belgium by force.
- France agreed to accept German territorial integrity, and would not also explicitly encourage the separation of the Rhineland from Germany.
- While France gained a British guarantee of protection from German aggression, it was not automatic as any dispute would still be referred to the Council of the League of Nations.
- Even though Germany made agreements on respecting her western borders, she did not make any agreements about her eastern borders as she still hoped for a revision and did not completely accept the Treaty of Versailles.
• It did not benefit France’s Little Entente as it would be difficult for her to fulfil the terms of the Little Entente without invading Germany, which would also break Locarno.
• It represented hope for future European security seeing that Germany was willing to cooperate with the European allies, creating the ‘Locarno spirit’.
• It created a new beginning for Germany and the rest of Europe, which is known as the “Locarno Spring”.

**Reaction to the “Locarno Spring”**
1. Germans were generally unhappy with the Locarno Pact
   • German nationalists resented Locarno as they felt that Stresemann had essentially accepted the War Guilt Clause of the Treaty of Versailles (1919).
   • It was also resented by those who did not want German foreign policy to upset relations with the USSR.
   • Evident in the difficulties Stresemann faced in getting the Locarno Pact (1925) past the Reichstag.
2. The USSR was highly suspicious of the Locarno Pact
   • Lead to the Treaty of Berlin (1926) being signed, reaffirming the Treaty of Rapallo (1922) for five more years.
1.1.8 The Great Depression (1929)

At this point Europe should be completely in tears → 

In 1929, the US financial market collapsed. The position of the US economy as the world's strongest economy, compounded by the economic interdependence created by the Dawes and Young Plans caused the event to become global. The US began to call in their loans from Britain and France, and retracted their loans from Germany, marking the end of the atmosphere of international cooperation.

The Depression also caused social and political unrest.

- Increasing unemployment and low wages led to clashes between right and left political groups and the rise of nationalist governments, which adopted expansionist policies with the aim of gaining more markets and raw materials.
  - Japan had previously been dependent on the textile market, which was hit severely by the Great Depression (as its exports no longer sold). This caused a radical shift to the right, and also an increase in militarism. Lacking in their own raw materials, they looked towards a Pacific expansion for recovery.
  - Germany saw increased support for Hitler and the Nazi Party, which appealed to the middle-classes and those hit by the Great Depression.
  - Italy, which was ruled by Benito Mussolini since 1922, began destroying international peace and adopted expansionist policies.
- Economic protectionism, nationalism and international conflict among the big powers also increased globally.
- Many countries lifted economic sanctions in favor of rebuilding their economies, such as Britain, which also adopted protectionist policies.
1.1.9 Manchurian Crisis (1931-1933)

By 1931, Japan was trying to be a key Asian player in international relations.

- After the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) and World War I, Japan gained many colonies and mandates in the Pacific.
  - This included the South Manchurian Railway, which Japan was allowed to protect militarily using the Kwantung (Guangdong?) Army.
  - This boosted Japan’s power such that Russia nor China could dominate Japan.
- Japan was unhappy with its gains from their participation in the war.
- Japan’s relations with the West also improved after the signing of treaties such as the Washington Naval Treaties (1921), the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) and the London Naval Treaty (1930).

However, the Great Depression saw a collapse of the Japanese economy, which had been over-reliant on exporting textiles for the last century.

- The military resented the government’s decision to cut military spending in favour of disarmament.
- Right-wing sectors of the military applied a policy of self-sufficiency to guarantee raw materials and space for their population based on an expansionist policy. Manchuria was extremely attractive to Japan.
  - Manchuria produced half of the world’s supply of soya beans and had large supplies of coal and iron.
  - Invading Manchuria also meant an expansion of the Japanese market which would help to solve their economic problems.
  - Cheap labour was also available in China.
- Previous conflicts with the Chinese made it an even more appealing decision.
  - During the Chinese Civil War (1927-49), many acts of hostility against foreigners and their interests occurred in China.
○ This included strikes and boycotts against Japanese companies and attacks on Japanese citizens in China, as a result of Chinese nationalism, which was a source of concern for the Japanese.

**Japanese invasion of Manchuria (1931)**

→ On 18 September 1931, the Kwantung Army claimed that a bomb explosion near Mukden was evidence of disorder and invaded the area.

→ There was evidence and reason to believe that the Japanese planted the bomb to cause friction with the Chinese.

→ As a response to the incident, Japanese forces advanced into areas of Manchuria beyond the South Manchurian Railway.

→ China, as a League of Nations member, appealed to the League for help.

→ The League was cautious about developments in Manchuria and held meetings to try and find a solution that would be fair to both the Chinese and the Japanese.

→ The US, though not a member of the League, was invited to send representatives to attend the talks on the situation in Manchuria.

→ The League told the Japanese government to withdraw from Manchuria, to which they agreed; however, the army refused and it thus became clear the the Japanese government was no longer in control of its own army.

→ This prompted the League to assemble a Commission of Inquiry led by Lord Lytton from Britain (the Lytton Commission), and included representatives from the US, France, Germany and Italy.

→ The commission took *13 months* to investigate the incident, interview witnesses and present its findings; meanwhile, the Japanese army continued to move across Manchuria and conquer territory, such that by March 1932, Manchuria had become a Japanese puppet state called Manchukuo, with Pu Yi, the last Chinese emperor, as ruler only by name.
◆ The Lytton Commission produced its report in October 1932. The report concluded that China was responsible for the deterioration of relations with Japan as its internal instability affected Japanese economic interests.

◆ It also condemned Japan’s action of aggression and recommended her withdrawal from Manchuria.

◆ Refused to recognise Manchukuo as an independent state and recommended that Manchuria adopt self-governance while remaining under Chinese sovereignty.

All members of the League had approved the Lytton report by February 1933, with the exception of Japan. Japan believed that it had sovereign right over Manchuria as it was Japan that enabled prosperity in the region. Japan then left the League in March 1933, saying that Britain had traditionally seized force in a similar way, ignoring the new direction in international politics.

**Impact of the Manchurian Crisis (1931-1933)**

1. The Manchurian Crisis and its results was a failure for the League.

   ● The League failed to protect China as Japan continued its fighting on Chinese soil throughout the 1930s.

   ● Japanese expansion improved its economic and strategic position, as Japan gained access to valuable natural resources. Military successes encouraged militarism.

   ● The failure to address Japan’s invasion of Manchuria may have encouraged Mussolini’s invasion of Abyssinia (1935).

   ● It removed Asian representation from the international body.

   ● It showed the ineffectiveness of international diplomacy efforts as Japan did not respect its agreements under the Nine Power Washington Naval Treaty (1921) and the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928).
Why did the League fail?

- The Lytton Commission took too long to prepare their report, such that by the time they were done, Japan had already invaded and firmly taken over power in Manchuria.
- Japan’s trading links lay with the US which was not a League member, making sanctions pointless either way; the US also refused to impose economic sanctions on Japan in the first place.
- The recent Great Depression made members too focused on issues at home and unwilling to impose economic sanctions.
- Britain did not want to risk a naval conflict in the region where they might be outnumbered after Washington Naval Conference.
- The fear of communism, prompted by civil war in China, led many Western powers to reject going to war with Japan, whom they saw as a valuable ally against the spread of communism in Asia.
1.1.10 Abyssinian Crisis (1935-1936)

Pre-1935, the state of Italian foreign policy was in a constant flux.

- After the Corfu incident (1923), Italian foreign policy under Mussolini underwent a great transformation as the country drew closer to the west.
  - Italy joined in the Locarno Pact (1925), signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) and helped to prevent a German attempt at Anschluss (1934).
  - Italy was also asked to join Britain and France in forming the Stresa Front (1935), following Hitler’s announcement of rearmament, to contain German expansion.
- However, later in 1935 Britain signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement with Germany without informing her allies.
  - The new agreement allowed Germany to build a navy that was 35% the size of the British navy, thus revising the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles.

Abyssinia (Ethiopia) was an independent country located in Africa, between the Italian colonies of Eritrea and Somaliland, led by Emperor Haile Selassie.

- In 1896 its army defeated an Italian invasion at the battle of Adowa.
- Mussolini sought to redress this humiliation, obtain overseas territories for Italy and transform it into an imperial power.
- The Great Depression also pushed Mussolini to adopt an aggressive foreign policy aimed at gaining access to raw materials, markets and territory for the growing Italian population. (+ he wanted to use the invasion to distract his people from the impacts of the Great Depression.)

**Wal Wal Oasis (1934)**

In 1934, Italy provoked a clash Abyssinia at the Wal Wal oasis with, near its border with Italian Somaliland. After the clash, Mussolini demanded the Wal Wal oasis and compensation for the 30 Italian soldiers that died in the incident. Selassie looked to the League for help.
→ Surprise. Italy didn’t listen, leading to continuous escalation of the conflict.
→ To prevent this from happening, an arms embargo was placed on both Italy and Abyssinia, in May 1935, but affected the Abyssinian army more than it did the Italian army.
→ Later in 1935, the League declared that any discussion over the conflict would not involve issues of sovereignty over disputed territories; this led to Abyssinia being unable to use the instruments of the League to resolve the conflict.
→ However, Britain and France separately offered Mussolini territorial concessions to prevent a war from breaking out; this was more effective in feeding Mussolini’s ambition than preventing war.

**The Italian invasion of Abyssinia (1935)**

→ In October 1935, Italian troops invaded Abyssinia.
→ Selassie appealed to the League for help.
→ The League declared Mussolini an aggressor and attempted to impose economic sanctions in an attempt to deprive him of necessary goods and force the Italians out of Abyssinia.
→ However, the economic sanctions failed.
  ◆ They took too long to be implemented, and even after implementation excluded valuable goods such as coal, oil and steel.
  ◆ Not all countries respected the sanctions: Japan and Germany completely ignored it and the US only partially implemented the sanctions. (were any of those countries even in the LON at that point??)
  ◆ Britain and France did not want to lose Mussolini as an ally against Hitler. Thus, Britain kept the Suez Canal open allowing Italy to supply its troops in Africa.
  ◆ Mussolini felt that it was unfair that Japan was not punished for its invasion of Manchuria. He was also aware of how important Italy had become as an ally against Hitler, and was prepared to use that in his favour.
→ Signing of the Hoare Laval Pact (1935)
The Hoare Laval Pact (1935)
The Pact was a secret agreement, initiated by Sir Samuel Hoare (British Foreign Secretary) and Pierre Laval (French Prime Minister) to appease Italy.

- They offered Mussolini almost half of Abyssinia, some of which would become under direct Italian control while others, under Italian economic influence.
- They were prepared to compensate Selassie with territory from British Somaliland with an outlet to the Sea.

Details of the Hoare-Laval Pact leaked out the next day and there was public outcry in Britain and France at the double game their governments were playing by combining sanctions with the promise of concessions. It cost both Hoare and Laval their posts.

➔ Meanwhile in Abyssinia, the fighting continued between Italy and Abyssinian troops.
➔ Open confrontation continued to devastate the country, whose military power could not match that of Italy’s.
  ◆ Italian troops also attacked civilians and adopted battle techniques that were not in agreement with international conventions on warfare.
➔ Selassie called for the arms embargo to be lifted so that they could have access to weapons to fight the Italian advance, but nothing was done about it.
➔ Mussolini continued his advance and in May 1936, the King of Italy was proclaimed Emperor of Abyssinia.
➔ The League abandoned economic sanctions.

The Impact of the Abyssinian Crisis (1935-1936)
- Shattered any hopes that either the League or collective security could protect any nation against acts of aggression.
- Caused the dissolving of the Stresa Front and led to tension between Italy and Britain and France.
- Resulted in Italy’s support of Germany with the signing of the Rome-Berlin Axis (1936), which was a military alliance, and abandonment of the League in 1937.
- Caused Hitler’s emboldenment to invade the Rhineland, while Britain and France were too preoccupied with the Abyssinian situation.
Part 2:
20th Century
World History
2.1.1 Causes, practices and effects of World War I (1914-1918)

Long-term causes of WWI

1. Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871)
   - A severe peace treaty (the Treaty of Frankfurt) was imposed and intended to cripple France economically, taking Alsace-Lorraine, and imposing heavy reparations (5000 million marks) and humiliating France. Parts of France were occupied by the Prussian army until this sum had been repaid.
   - Additionally, the King of Prussia was proclaimed the German Emperor in the Hall of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles (very humiliating).
   - The French were absolutely humiliated and there was a strong desire for revenge against Germany, and they wanted to redeem themselves (more inclined to support war against Germany) → French ‘revanchism’.
   - The result was a shift of the balance of power in Europe, where France’s position was undermined, and Germany became a new power. Germany’s new position gave rise to a need to establish their dominance in Europe.

2. Alliances
   Germany were a new state with great economic, military and imperial potential to become a dominant power— but they did not pursue an aggressive foreign policy at first, while under the rule of Kaiser Wilhelm I and Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. Bismarck wanted to create a web of alliances that would protect Germany from future attack and allow them to consolidate their position in Europe, and also mainly sought to:
   - Keep France isolated
   - Stay allied with Russia
   - Prevent the possibility of a two-front war
## Bismarck’s Web of Alliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Dreikaiserbund / Three Emperors’ League** (1873) | - Between Germany + Austria-Hungary + Russia  
- Served to keep France isolated.  
- Fell apart in 1879: Austria-Hungary and Russia came into conflict over events in the Balkans. |
| **The Dual Alliance** (1879) | - Between Germany + Austria-Hungary  
- Defensive treaty - Germany and Austria-Hungary agreed to assist one another if attacked by Russia, and remain neutral if attacked by another European country  
- It limited the possibility of war with other European powers. |
| **Three Emperors’ Alliance** (1881) | - Between Germany + Austria-Hungary + Russia  
- Revised version of Dreikaiserbund / Three Emperors’ League  
- Russia felt isolated—> turned back to Germany.  
- All countries agreed to remain neutral if one was being attacked by the other and  
- would attempt to resolve the Balkan issues.  
- Fell apart in 1885 as a result of Russia and Austria-Hungary’s disagreements over the Balkans. |
| **The Triple Alliance** (1882) | - Between Germany + Austria-Hungary + Italy  
- One of the main alliances involved in the beginnings of World War 1, beginning with the Bismarck’s web of alliances.  
- If any of them was to be attacked by ≥2 powers, the others would lend military assistance to the victim of aggression. |
| **The Reinsurance Treaty** (1887) | - Between Germany + Russia  
- To ensure that Germany and Russia remained friendly (and avoid a war on two fronts) after the failure of the Three Emperors’ Alliance  
- Germany would fail to renew the Reinsurance Treaty in 1890 under Kaiser Wilhelm II’s rule, which allowed for the creation of the Franco-Russian Alliance |

### The ‘New Course’ of German foreign policy (Weltpolitik)
- In 1888, the young and ambitious Kaiser Wilhem II came to the throne.
- In 1890, Otto von Bismarck was replaced by Leo von Caprivi, allowing the Reinsurance Treaty to lapse, creating conditions for the Franco-Russian Alliance (1894).
  - Subsequently, Bismarck’s system of alliances was destroyed - France was no longer isolated, possibility of Germany facing war on two fronts.
• In the mid-1890s, German policy-makers followed *Weltpolitik*
  ○ This policy that looked beyond Europe and into colonialism, which aimed to make Germany a colonial power, with an overseas empire and navy.
  ○ There was an added benefit of distracting Germans from social and political problems at home.
• Britain initially had a policy of ‘Splendid Isolation’ where it did not want to get involved in conflicts between other nations to protect their international trade.
• However, Germany’s implementation of the Naval Laws (1898 and 1900) threatened Britain’s naval superiority and prompting a review of their isolation policy, causing Britain to seek alliances for security.

**Alliance System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance System</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Russian Alliance (1894)</td>
<td>- France + Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Military: Promised mutual assistance if either was attacked by Germany, immediate mobilisation if any of the Triple Alliance mobilised and promised mutual support in imperial disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political: Mutual support in imperial disputes (anti-British)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ended Bismarck’s web of alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902)</td>
<td>- Between Britain + Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Britain had an ally in the Far East (against Russia), allowed the Royal Navy to bring back warships from this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Japan wanted a Western ally against Russia due to conflicts of interest over Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entente Cordiale (1904)</td>
<td>- Between Britain + France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Set a new tone for Anglo-French relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not a formal alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Russian Entente (1907)</td>
<td>- Between Britain + Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Established as a result of The First Moroccan Crisis (1905), which split Europe into two large factions, leading to the fear of the Triple Alliance → Britain, France and Russia wished to complete the Triple Entente with an Anglo-Russian Entente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resolved issues over territories in Persia, Tibet and Afghanistan and reduced British concern over security in India and the Far East.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Triple Entente (1907) | • Between Britain + France + Russia  
  ○ Franco-Russian Alliance (1894) + Entente Cordiale (1904) + Anglo-Russian Entente (1907) → everyone was already allies  
    → Germany felt ‘encircled’, but it was because of their naval expansion that Britain had been forced into seeking agreements with its former colonial rivals.  
    → Europe was divided into two alliance systems: the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. |

The completion of the Triple Entente had several effects:
  • Germany felt ‘encircled’, but it was because of their naval expansion that Britain had been forced into seeking agreements with its former colonial rivals.
  • Europe was divided into two alliance systems: the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente.

How did the Alliance System cause the war?
  • Bismarck’s Web of Alliances showed that Germany had not wanted to wage war from the start - initial alliances were defensive, not aggressive. They sought peace while Germany consolidated her position, not war.
  • Later on, Germany’s policy of *Weltpolitik* drew them into conflict with other countries
    ○ Germany didn’t really have colonies, they were already taken by the other powers and their late entrance to colonial rivalries resulted in conflicts.
    ○ Naval rivalry was an attempt to mount a challenge to Britain, prompting the British to seek alliances with their former rivals.
  • However, the alliance system meant that Europe was divided into two groups, increasing tension between them. The alliance system also escalated and widened conflicts - if a small conflict happened and a country’s allies stepped in, it would escalate into a European war.
  • The alliance system contributed to the immediate cause of the war because it encouraged Germany to give Austria-Hungary the blank cheque.
  • However, it mostly served to escalate the war, not to cause it → shows that countries got involved not because of the alliance system, but because of self-interests.
    ○ Self-interests:
Germany wanted to distract its citizens from the problems at home, thought it would be a good time to go to war.

- Austria-Hungary wanted to go to war and to crush the Serbian threat.
- Russia wanted to support Serbia so as to gain access to warm water ports.
- Britain wanted to prevent an election.
- Also, the alliance system was non-binding; countries were not obliged to support each other/stick together.

3. Imperialism (colonial rivalry)
- Why did countries want to practice colonialism?
  - Economic motives: raw materials, new markets, cheap labour
  - The ‘white man’s burden’ - spreading their light to the savages (the spread of Western civilization was ‘God’s work’ hahaha Heart of Darkness)
  - Dominance/power
    - Link: Nationalism - my country is the best, we are better than your country and we will show it by building a colonial empire that is bigger than yours.
    - Germany and Weltpolitik - wanted to make its influence felt outside of Europe, but most colonies were already occupied by other powers
      - Lead to conflict with those more established colonial powers, like Britain.
      - e.g. The Kruger telegram (1896), a message sent by Germany's Kaiser Wilhelm II to Kruger (president of Transvaal Republic) congratulating him on resisting a British sortie / military attack. The telegram caused huge indignation in Britain, and led to a further inflammation of tensions between Britain and Germany.

How did imperialism lead to war?
- Colonial rivalry brought European powers into conflict over colonies and caused great tension between them. See, Kruger telegram.
4. Nationalism

There were two forms of nationalism:

- When members of a nation place the interests of their nation above everything else - loyal to and proud of their country, believe that it is better than other countries
  - Will to make war: Citizens of each nation believed that in the event of war, their country would win. Thus, the public were supportive of war.
  - Additionally, literature, the press, education portrayed war as short and heroic, and governments were inclined towards war to distract their people from domestic issues.
  - e.g. German aggressive foreign policy (*Weltpolitik*)
  - Link to imperialism: Colonial rivalry: to expand countries’ influences outside of Europe, so they could assert their dominance over weaker and less developed regions in the world.

- Nationalist movements
  - Self-determination: where people who share a common language, history and culture believe that they should constitute an independent nation, free from foreign domination.
  - The Eastern Question: The collapse of the Ottoman Empire (in progress at the moment) would create a power vacuum, raising the question of what would happen to territories under the control of the Ottoman Empire. Most European countries wanted to ‘prop up’ the Turkish regime and try to persuade it to modernize. However, Russia preferred to promote self-governance for the Balkan states, which caused a conflict of interest with Austria-Hungary, which deeply opposed to Balkan independence.

How did nationalism cause the war?

- Very important with regard to the Slavs’ nationalistic sentiments
  - The Slavs in Austria-Hungary wanted independence, looked to Serbia for support. Therefore, Austria-Hungary saw Serbia as a threat. Russia, however, saw
themselves as champions / protectors of the Slavs. This sought to bring Russia and Austria-Hungary into conflict.

- Important factor behind an immediate cause of the war
  - The Black Hand were motivated by nationalism, and wanted to unify all Slavs from Austria-Hungary into a Greater Serbia. Naturally their choice of assassination was Franz Ferdinand, as he was the Archduke (therefore a symbol of Austria-Hungary) and so they **TOOK HIM OUT**

5. Militarism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naval Laws (1898, 1900)</th>
<th>The First Naval Law (1898) increased the number of German battleships; The Second Naval Law (1900) doubled the German naval fleet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Britain saw this as a threat to their naval superiority, began to seek alliances to secure themselves against Germany (link to alliance system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fears over Germany’s rapidly-expanding fleet led to a ‘naval scare’ in 1908-1909, Britain began to build more ships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Naval arms race</strong>: In 1906, Britain launched the HMS Dreadnought, which was far superior to any other battleship and hence rendered all others obsolete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>  However, this potentially nullified Britain’s traditional naval superiority as their numerical advantage over other countries was gone - others could produce the dreadnaughts and compete with Britain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Arms Race | Massive buildup of armaments by the major European powers gave them the ability to go to war—several countries introduced conscription, increased spending on armaments. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War Plans</th>
<th>Each country made detailed war plans in the expectation of war. The military planners believed in swift mobilization and lightning offences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Schlieffen Plan (Germany)</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>  Intended to deal with the implications of the Triple Entente, difficulty of fighting a two-front war- involved the invasion of France by inRussHvading neutral Belgium first. (important as it eventually led to British involvement in the war)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>  Critical miscalculations: did not calculate the impact of marching through Belgium (Belgian resistance, British involvement by upholding the Treaty of London),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
underestimated the amount of time it would take Russia to mobilize.

- Plan R/B (Austria-Hungary)
  - Plans to allocate troops to fight in Russia and Serbia
- Plan 17 (France)
  - High-speed mobilization to capture Alsace-Lorraine, then attack Germany.
- Russia: Plan to attack Austria-Hungary and Germany.

How did militarism cause the war?

The naval arms race saw a change of mood by Britain towards Germany. They began to see Germany as a new enemy threatening them, and this, compounded by the colonial rivalries (Kruger telegram), generated tensions between the two countries and lead to a more anti-German Britain, which was more willing to go to war against Germany.

The increase in armaments might have caused other countries to feel threatened, pressurized to increase their own armaments to protect themselves. It also gave rise to an atmosphere of mutual fear and suspicion.

The arming of countries also made them confident that they could enter war and end up victorious.
Short-term causes of WW1

1. The Crisis Years (1905 - 1913)
   a. 1905: The Moroccan Crisis
      Germany were worried by the new relationship between Britain and France (Entente Cordiale, 1904) and wanted to break it up by exposing its weakness. Germany announced that they would assist Morocco in maintaining her independence, and demanded an international conference to discuss the situation. To Germany’s surprise, Britain supported France - Germany had little support and were forced to admit defeat, only gaining a guarantee of their commercial interests.

   Effects:
   - Completely backfired on Germany - the Entente Cordiale was not broken, but rather strengthened
     - Following the crisis, Britain and France began military talks in 1906 and British foreign policy was redirected to support French interests.
   - Germany were increasingly seen as a key threat to British interests
   - Threat of war ended peaceful relations in Europe as more countries considered war as a possible outcome of the crisis → War Plans
   - Germany did not gain notable concessions in North Africa, which was a blow to German pride, failure of Weltpolitik.

Following the first Moroccan Crisis, the Anglo-Russian Entente (1907) was signed. The Triple Entente was soon to be established, and Germany began feeling encircled, causing them to grow closer to Austria-Hungary.
b. **Bosnian Crisis (1908)**

Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovnia (formally Turkish areas that they had occupied since 1878) which Serbia had hoped to include their “Greater Serbia”. They also provided access to the sea. The annexation was encouraged by Russian Foreign Minister Izvolsky, but Austria-Hungary went ahead with the annexation before he could gain international support for his plan, and his plan was met with hostile reactions either way.

**Effects:**

- Outrage in Serbia, giving rise to nationalistic sentiments
- Russia were internationally humiliated yet again (following its defeat in the Russo-Japanese war) and embarked on a massive rearmament programme in order to retain international influence and domestic political stability
- Further strained relations between Austria-Hungary and Russia
  - Talk of war
  - Ended cooperation in the Balkans between Russia and Austria-Hungary → Balkan situation becoming much more unstable
- Strengthened the relationship between Germany and Austria-Hungary
  - 1909: Germany assured Austria-Hungary that they would mobilize in support of Austria-Hungary if they went to war with Serbia
  - By opting to encourage Austria-Hungary’s expansion instead of restraining them, they became viewed as increasingly aggressive
- Increased mutual suspicion and hostility (between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia).
c. **Second Moroccan Crisis (Agadir Crisis) (1911)**

France sent troops to Morocco upon request of the Sultan, but the Germans saw this as the beginning of a French takeover of Morocco and sent a gunboat, the *Panther*, to Agadir to demand compensation. They demanded the whole of the French Congo, which was too ambitious and assertive and the British assumed that this implied the threat of war. This gave rise to worries that the Germans would acquire Agadir as a naval base, threatening their self-interests. In warning Germany off, they turned the Agadir Crisis from a Franco-German crisis into an Anglo-German crisis. Germany ended up accepting far less compensation, only getting two strips of territory in the French Congo.

**Effects:**
- German public opinion was hostile to the settlement and critical of their government’s handling of the crisis
- Yet another failure to implement *Weltpolitik* (humiliating)
- Further strengthened the Entente Cordiale (1904)
  - Naval negotiations began in 1912
- Increased mutual suspicion and hostility (between Britain and Germany)

d. **First Balkan War (1912)**

In 1912, the Balkan states of Serbia, Greece and Montenegro (encouraged by Russia) formed a Balkan alliance to force Turkey from the Balkans, which it almost achieved in seven weeks. A strong Serbia horrified Austria-Hungary, and though their generals wanted to call for war, there was a danger that Russia would come to Serbia’s support. Britain initiated a peace conference in London, which divided former Turkish lands between Balkan states. Austria-Hungary managed to contain Serbia through the creation of Albania, which was placed between Serbia and the Adriatic Sea.
Effects:
- Resentment, increased hostility and tension between Austria-Hungary and Serbia.

e. Second Balkan War (1913)
Disagreements over the spoils of the First Balkan War (19120 lead to the outbreak of another war in the Balkans. Bulgaria went to war against Serbia and Greece. The Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary, Count Leopold, asked for German assistance, believing that Russia would come to Serbia’s aid. However, the German government urged Austrian restraint. Serbia, Greece and Turkey defeated Bulgaria and imposed the Treaty of Bucharest (1913) which caused Bulgaria to lose nearly all of the land she had won from the First Balkan War.

Effects:
- Serbia was once again successful (even stronger), doubling in size and proving itself militarily. Strong nationalist feeling in Serbia were further encouraged.
- Diplomatic victory for Russia - encouraged them to stand by their ally.
- Austria-Hungary were convinced that they needed to crush Serbia.
- Diplomatic defeat for Germany which drew them even closer to Austria-Hungary.

The 1905-1913 crises marked a deterioration in international relations, exacerbating divisions between the two alliance systems, heightening the general arms race and naval race between Britain and Germany, and increasing nationalist fervour. The aggravated tensions in Europe made future conflict more likely.
Immediate causes of WWI

1. The July Crisis

On 28 June 1914, a 19-year-old terrorist Gavrilo Princip associated with the Serbian Black Hand movement shot the Austro-Hungarian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Bosnia. Austria-Hungary saw this as an opportunity to crush Serbia - Serbia was weak, still recovering from the Balkan Wars, which had caused it to double in size. However, they hesitated, knowing that an attack on Serbia would involve the Russians, and knew that an attack on Serbia would involve the Russians → sought assurance that Germany would support them.

→ 5 July 1914: Kaiser and his chancellor gave Austria a ‘blank cheque’, a German guarantee of unconditional support.
   ◆ By not restraining Austria-Hungary, and giving them the ‘blank cheque’, Germany gave them confidence to invade Serbia.

→ Austria-Hungary wanted to issue Serbia an ultimatum which they thought Serbia were unlikely to agree to (stringent) to justify military action against Serbia.

→ 23 July 1914: Ultimatum sent to Serbia, reply required within 48 hours. To their surprise, Serbia replied promptly, willing to accept all demands except one. This refusal was viewed as a ‘rejection’ and used by Austria-Hungary as an excuse for invasion.
   ◆ The ultimatum came after a delay of a month, suggesting that it was a carefully calculated move (on part of Austria-Hungary) and did not come to Serbia as a shock.
   ◆ Evidence that Austria-Hungary wanted to go to war.

→ 28 July 1914: Austria-Hungary declares part mobilization and war on Serbia.

→ 30 July 1914: Russia orders full mobilization. → Third Balkan War (Serbia + Russia vs. Austria-Hungary)
→ **31 July 1914:** Germany starts military preparations, sends Russia an ultimatum to back down, and an ultimatum to Paris demanding French neutrality (due to the demands of the Schlieffen Plan). France declared that they would follow their ‘own interests’.

→ **1 August 1914:** Germany mobilises fully and declares war on Russia. A-H mobilises but waits to declare war.

→ **2 August 1914:** Germany demands that Belgium lets its forces pass. King Albert asks Britain for help. The cabinet agreed only to defend a ‘substantial violation’ of Belgium. (Treaty of London, 1839: pledged to protect Belgium.)

→ **3 August 1914:** Germany declares war on France.

→ **4 August 1914:** Germany’s plan to take out France involved them marching through Belgium to avoid the heavily-fortified French border. Britain chose to uphold the Treaty of London and threatened to defend Belgium if Germany did not uphold its neutrality.

→ No response from Germany → Britain declared war on Germany →

**BEGINNING OF WORLD WAR 1**

Short version of what is above:

- Guy from Serbian Black Hand terrorist group assassinated the Austro-Hungarian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Bosnia.

- Austria-Hungary gets mad but is cautious as attacking Serbia would get Russia involved, and thus seeks assurance from Germany. Germany issues Austria-Hungary a ‘blank cheque’, the German guarantee of unconditional support.

- Austria-Hungary waits a month, and then issues Serbia a harsh ultimatum.

- Serbia rejects the ultimatum, Austria-Hungary declares war on Serbia. This is followed by the mobilisation of Russian, German, French and British troops. War.
Whose fault was it?

1. **Germany**
   Blank cheque encouraged Austria-Hungary attack on Serbia BUT it is possible that they thought this would keep Russia from getting involved (because Germany and Austria-Hungary would be putting up a strong front to scare Russia away), limiting the war to another Balkan war instead of expanding it into a Great War.

**Responsibility for war:**
- Blank Cheque: Supported Austria-Hungary so that it would not get crushed by the Entente powers, gave Austria-Hungary the confidence to declare war
- *Weltpolitik* was an aggressive foreign policy that heightened tensions in Europe both imperial tensions and naval
- Kaiser Wilhelm II broke Bismarck’s web of alliance, causing lots of shit to happen after, e.g. failure to renew the Reinsurance Treaty (1887) → Franco-Russian Alliance (1894)
- Use of intimidation and force in the Moroccan Crises raised suspicions and hostility in Europe
- Mobilization, declaring war on Russia, violating Belgian neutrality

2. **Austria-Hungary**
   - Exaggerated the potential threat of Serbia, insistence on an unrealistic ultimatum showed determination to make war.
   - Delayed response to the assassination contributed to the development (escalation of events) of the July Crisis - their response could not be presented as a shock reaction but seemed far more calculated
     - Evidence that Austria-Hungary wanted war

3. **Russia**
   - Supported Serbia, deepening the conflict and possibly giving Serbia the confidence to reject Austria-Hungary’s ultimatum.
● Mobilisation of Russian troops triggered a general European war (if they mobilised, other countries had to mobilise because of alliances)

4. **France**
   - Swept into war - didn’t really want to get involved - but they did want revenge against Germany
   - Gave Russia assurances of support before the July Crisis, making Russia more likely to mobilise

5. **Britain**
   - Did not make its position clear during the July Crisis, which might have deterred Germany from doing what they were gonna do
   - Get involved with war due to low politics: Doves (Lloyd George) vs. Hawks (Asquith, Grey, Churchill) in the British parliament. The Doves wanted peace while the Hawks wanted war, or threatened to resign. This would lead to elections and the British parliament risked a liberal takeover.
2.1.2 Causes, practices and effects of World War II (1939-1945)

**long-term causes**

1. Paris Peace Treaties

| Germany | • TOV: Imposed by Allies upon Germany after the First World War. Its terms satisfied nobody: Too harsh to prevent the Germans from becoming angry, but too lenient to keep them weak/ensure France’s security.  
• Believed that the treaty was extremely harsh and unfair to them, they strongly voiced their resentment—> public opinion in other countries (e.g. Britain, who were supposed to help enforce the treaty) was sympathetic to Germany, less likely to strictly enforce the terms.  
• The Germans were outraged and humiliated. There was a policy of revenge against the Treaty. (They wanted the terms reversed)  
• Outcomes:  
  • Rise of Hitler: the Germans believed that their government (the democratic Weimar government) had stabbed them in the back, associated democracy with the TOV—> turned to extremist politicians who promised to reverse the terms of the Treaty. (One of Hitler’s foreign policy aims was to reverse the terms of the TOV) Germany were resentful, willing to use force to go against the terms of the TOV.  
  • e.g. TOV did not grant self-determination to Germany, yet took all of Germany’s colonies under the excuse of self-determination—> unfair, Germany wanted to take lands with German speakers (nationalism)  
  • Sympathy towards Germany from other countries—> policy of appeasement towards Germany (did not take action when they remilitarized the Rhineland, agreed to give Hitler the Sudetenland—> encouraged Hitler to want more and more |

| LON | • The LON was one of the main outcomes of the TOV, and the failure of collective security was another cause of the war— countries could not work together to prevent countries from behaving aggressively to each other, leading to higher chances of war.  
• The weak LON could not/would not enforce the terms of the TOV (due to self-interest of countries, the Great Depression)  
• Failure to enforce worldwide disarmament: World Disarmament Conference (Geneva 1932)— France would not disarm because they didn’t feel safe against Germany, Germany refused to disarm unless everyone disarmed to the same level—> they didn’t get anywhere. Germany walked out of the conference+LON, began to re-arm (violating the terms of the TOV, but did anyone do anything? no.) |

| Other | • Italy were extremely dissatisfied with the outcomes of the Paris Peace |
| Peace Treaties                                                                 | Conference because they barely gained anything despite their status as a ‘victor’ country—→ Mussolini was inclined to invade Abyssinia, Britain+France were willing to appease Italy with the Hoare-Laval Pact (even though it didn’t actually succeed) → encouraged Hitler even more, showed that the LON couldn’t really do anything against aggression.  
  | • The treaties were extremely short-sighted: left Germany in a relatively strong position; created several new, weak European states and a power vacuum, making them easy targets for German expansion. (They could not help the LON; needed the LON’s help.) |
| Economic Impacts                                                              | • The Peace Treaties linked European economies together, caused them to be interdependent (France, Britain depended on reparations to rebuild their economies and countries)  
  | • Germany depended on the USA’s loans to repay reparations so they could rebuild their own economy/country after the war. (Dawes Plan, Young Plan) |

2. The Great Depression (1929)
Due to the Paris Peace Treaties, European economies were interlinked, the US economy was heavily involved because they were the world’s greatest economic power and largest creditor.
The US financial market collapsed in 1929, affecting economies around the world—Japan, Germany, and all of Europe.
US banks began asking for their money back, so German and other European businesses began to fold→ terrible living conditions, unemployment.
Outcomes:
  • Extremist governments in Europe were on the rise—people began to turn away from democracy and towards extremist parties who promised solutions to their economic woes through remilitarization and conscription to generate industrial growth + military expansion into other lands for new markets and raw materials
  • Rise of Nazi Party, Hitler’s foreign policy aim of gaining lebensraum for Germans and forming a Greater Germany
  • Rise of militarism in Japan, the military wanted to expand in the Asia-Pacific region for new markets and raw materials because they were heavily affected by the Great Depression—had been a heavy exporter of *something*
• Militarization increased— to generate industrial growth and create more jobs for people, several governments turned to remilitarization and conscription→ becoming battle-ready AGAIN

Appeasement: the terrible economic conditions in European countries meant that they were very very unwilling to impose economic sanctions even though they were basically the LON’s only weapon against aggression + meant that military action was completely out of the question (expensive and countries were very tired of fighting after the Great War).

Thus, the LON were basically useless— even Britain didn’t want to fully impose economic sanctions on Italy during the Abyssinian Crisis (1935-36), left the Suez Canal open which helped Italy greatly in accessing Africa. (Self-interest)

This made them turn to the policy of appeasement to solve problems.

US isolation: retreated further into isolation, didn’t want to get involved in European issues any more.

3. Rise of nationalist/extremist governments

Nationalism: countries believed that they were the best and would win war if they entered it + need to show off their power by having more colonies

(Outcomes of extremist governments mentioned above)

• Italy’s nationalism—> Abyssinian crisis
• Japan’s nationalism—> Manchurian crisis
• Germany’s nationalism—> Everything (they wanted the Rhineland, they wanted Sudetenland, they wanted ansschluss with Austria— all of which violated the terms of the TOV. but they got everything they wanted because of appeasement!!!)

Special Extremist Government: Russia (Communism)

Britain and France were so terrified of Russia and Communism that they refused to work with them, preferring to work with each other even though they were bitter long-term enemies. Their fear of Communism actually contributed to their policies of appeasement towards Italy and Germany— they hoped that Italy and Germany would become valuable allies to help them
counter the threat of Communism. (Britain wanted Germany to recover quickly so that she could be a strong barrier against Communism)

**short-term causes**

1. **Alliances**
   - **Non-Aggression Pact (1934)**
     - Germany signed a ten-year non-aggression pact with Poland to secure his eastern border + directly counter the Franco-Polish alliance of 1925 and France’s Little Entente.
   - **Stresa Front (1935)**
     - Agreement between Britain, France and Italy to counter German aggression. (Really useless, didn’t really do anything.)
   - **Anglo-German Naval Agreement (1935)**
     - British agreement with Germany which violated the TOV by allowing Germany a much larger navy than permitted by the TOV→ indicated British acceptance of Germany revising the terms of the TOV + German rearmament.
     - Britain didn’t consult her allies, acted in self-interest to preserve her naval supremacy + felt that the TOV was too harsh + saw Communism as a much greater threat than Nazism→ far more willing to work with Germany than Russia.
   - **Rome-Berlin Axis (1936)**
     - After the Abyssinian Crisis, Italy moved away from Britain + France and drew closer to Germany. Previously (1934), Italy had foiled Germany’s attempt at anschluss with Austria→ this paved the way for anschluss.
   - **Anti-Comintern Pact (1936)**
     - Germany+Japan (Italy joined in 1937)— to use Japan as a force to counter the British+Russians in Asia (use Japan to apply pressure in Asia so Hitler would meet with less resistance in Europe)
   - **Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact (1939)**
○ Hitler and Stalin both wanted Poland. Russia were willing to work with Britain and France, but Britain and France clearly didn’t want to work with them → Russia turned to Germany.

○ USSR would remain neutral if Germany invaded Poland + they secretly agreed to divide Poland between them.
  ■ Germany would avoid the possibility of a two-front war, believed that the pact with the USSR would stop Britain and France from taking action → gave Germany the confidence to invade Poland.
  ■ Hitler still intended to invade the USSR, but this gave him time to deal with the West first.
  ■ USSR would not have to get involved in a war on its Western Front, could focus on the Eastern threat of Japan.
  ■ Gave Stalin time to prepare for war, hoped that Germany’s war on the west would weaken them so the USSR would be the strongest country.
  ■ USSR would get parts of Poland, which Britain and France would never agree to.

2. Britain and France Were Stupid (Self-interest)

Policy of Appeasement: Based on the assumption that Hitler was a reasonable man with reasonable demands. Thus, when Hitler violated the terms of the TOV, they took no action/ tried their best to give him what he wanted.

● Remilitarization of Rhineland (1936)
  ○ Hitler took a gamble, ordered German army to retreat at the first sign of resistance (not fully ready to commit to aggression) but nothing happened → Hitler’s confidence increased.

● Anschluss with Austria (1938)
  ○ Hitler no longer faced opposition — Italy was an ally, Britain were sympathetic and felt that the TOV was not right to separate the two countries. Austrian Chancellor called for a referendum, Hitler sent troops in, referendum was
overwhelmingly in favour of anschluss—> TOV violated, tension in Europe increased.

- **Sudetenland Crisis (1938)**
  - Hitler demanded the Sudetenland because 3.5 million Germans lived in it (excuse: self-determination)
  - Czechoslovakian leader sought Britain and France’s help, and France were bound by a treaty obligation to defend Czechoslovakia if it were attacked by Germany, though France were reluctant to do so. Britain agreed to support the French.
  - Hitler declared that he would fight for the Sudetenland—> tensions increased greatly, Britain and France met with Hitler hoping to avoid war. This led to the Munich Agreement (1938): Britain and France agreed to give Hitler all of the Sudetenland if he promised not to demand any more territory.
  - USSR and Czechoslovakia were not invited to the conference—> showed that Britain + France didn’t really want to work with the Russians, put their self-interests first.
  - BUT in 1939 Hitler invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia—> showed that he could not be trusted and wanted to use aggression to achieve his aims—> tension increased, countries prepared for war.

Self-interest:

Anglo-German Naval Agreement— Britain went outside the LON, Stresa Front— showed that self-interests came first.

Russia wanted to work with Britain and France, but they refused to work with Russia, wanted to work with Italy and Germany against the USSR but that miserably backfired—> Russia turned to Germany (Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact)

**immediate cause**
1939: Chamberlain announced that Britain and France would guarantee Poland’s independence, but Hitler thought that his alliance with Russia + their previous reluctance to do anything would stop them from taking action but

➢ Hitler invaded Poland
➢ Britain and France declared war on Germany
➢ → WAR!!!

Was It Hitler’s Fault?

Intentionalist: Hitler was a planner.

• Mein Kampf: he outlined his goals from the beginning (about wanting Germany to expand in the East)
• Hossbach Memorandum (1940): planning for war (Hitler stated that the key aim of German policy was to secure and preserve the racial community and to enlarge it—showed an inclination for war in the early 1940s because rearmament was nearly complete and that the situation in 1943-45 would be less favorable for war as more countries began to catch up.

• counter: what he planned to do was very different from what he actually ended up doing (in Mein Kampf, he wanted to be allies with Britain and fight the USSR but he ended up allies with the USSR in fighting Britain.

Functionalist: Hitler was an opportunist.

• Hitler saw how weak the British+French were—> took opportunities to violate the TOV as much as he could, but he was willing to withdraw if they took action (e.g. from the Rhineland)— showed that he didn’t really plan it, but saw his chances and took them.

Long-term: Hitler was a long-term planner, but flexible in the methods which he took to achieve his aims.

• Long-term aims: German expansion in the East (not the West— Lorcano Pact guaranteed Germany’s Western borders but not Eastern, showing that Germany still hoped to reverse/violate the terms of the TOV in that area. This was a pact made before Hitler
came to power—> showed that Hitler was continuing long-term German aims, not just his own), Lebensraum, Greater Germany.

- Early on (1933-1936), Hitler played the diplomat— he went to disarmament conferences, made agreements with the British (Anglo-German Naval Treaty)
- Post-1936: begins German rearmament, when its military got bigger Hitler started taking more chances and got away with more and more (anschluss with Austria, takeover of Sudetenland)
2.1.3 Causes and practices of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939)

Long-term causes of the Spanish Civil War

Spain: a nation divided

Regional divisions:

- Spain comprised of the central state, the Basque country and Catalonia
- The Basque and Catalans had their own language and culture and wanted decentralization and independence from Spain
- By the 20th century, they were economically independent and had their own industrialised economies and churches.
- Both these countries wanted autonomy from Spain and they had the support of the republicans

Economic and Social divisions:

- The cities in the north (Barcelona, Madrid, Bilbao) were highly modernized and industrialised, and also significantly richer than the cities in the south
- This created a new urban proletariat and industrial elite in the north
- In the south, the contrast was large. Many peasants worked on large estates called *latifundias*, that were owned by the rich land-owning class.

- Agriculture:
  - Spain’s economy was agriculturally-based; the south of Spain was mainly agricultural. Some peasants in the north owned small plots of land that were economically unviable.
  - Despite some industrialisation in the north, the economy of Spain was mainly agricultural. Yet this agricultural sector did not provide enough work and food for peasants all year round, and lead to the growing discontent amongst peasants.
- Working Class:
  - Workers faced low wages, long hours, unregulated working conditions, poor
housing, little welfare support → growth of trade unions, but the trade unions often competed with each other (e.g. UGT vs CNT) and did not have any real power because employers could always find more labour from the countryside.

○ No legal means to improve situation → workers turned to violent uprising to effect change. (violent conflict between employers and employees, esp. when there were economic problems in Spain)

**Political divisions:**

- As a result of these regional/economic/social divisions, the nation of Spain was deeply divided.
- The rich landowners/industrial elite, Army, Church and the Monarchists lent their support to the Conservatives and Fascists
- The proletariat/peasants, republicans, reformers and the minorities (Basque/Catalan) lent their support to the socialists and anarchists.
- Different political parties:
  - Liberals: did not really achieve anything in opposing the Conservatives, but they did support the revolution that ousted the King in 1931.
  - Spanish Socialist Party (PSOE): grew in urban areas, but had minimal impact
  - UGT (trade union): more visible in organizing strikes and protests in urban areas
  - Socialists: played a significant role in the 1931 revolution, but became divided over the reforms that should take place — divided into two — the more moderate socialists (led by Indalecio Prieto) and the radicals (led by Largo Cabarello)
  - Anarchists: major political group — supported by peasants due to their demand for the redistribution of land. Argued for revolutionary methods, boycotted all democratic processes. (Trade union: CNT — active in organizing strikes and protests.)
  - Extreme Anarchists: Spanish Anarchist Federation (FAI) — perpetrated bombings and assassinations.
The role of the Church

- The Catholic Church was rich and powerful. It bore a heavy influence over the daily lives of everyone in Spain and was deeply conservative.
- Its main support base was the rich landowners and as such, it was seen as both an enemy of change and as a figure of oppression due to its support base.
- Thus, it was greatly resented by all the peasantry.

The role of the Army

- The Army was grossly over-officered, roughly one officer to every hundred men. Also, it was unpopular due to the losses of overseas territories (Cuba and the Philippines), and its brutality. The officer corp was dominated by the upper classes and hence it was very conservative and opposed change.
- Supported by upper and middle classes (who formed most of the officer corps). Generally conservative. ‘Africanistas’ who had served in Morocco were the most traditional and nationalistic.
- This Army that had nothing much to do hence adopted the role of protector of security, law and tradition. As a result of this, political tension was generated by the Army’s frequent interference in home affairs and politics. (especially because the army blamed civilian politicians for the loss of the empire, believed that they had no moral right to govern the country.
- The army believed that it was the protector of the nation (wanted to defend Spain’s historic greatness⇒ against change.) ((and had the right to intervene in politics if a crisis occurred⇒ intervened several times before. BUT they did not act to save the King in 1931, leading to the King’s exile. They also intervened during the Second Republic and in 1936⇒ war.)

Weakness of Government

- Constitutional Monarchy: the King (Alfonso XIII) was the head of state, appointed a prime minister who should have commanded a majority in the parliament (Cortes), which
was elected by the male population.

● Real power lay in the hands of the oligarchs, political power shifted between them.

● Two main political parties (Conservatives and Liberals), but there was no real difference between them. Elections were rigged/decided by corruption, there was no main democratic party

● ⇒ superficial stability but very socially unstable because nothing ever changed—people either became apathetic or opposed to the current government.

**Short-term causes of the Spanish Civil War:**

Political polarisation

In 1930, Primo de Rivera resigned after having failed to solve Spain’s economic problems. Municipal elections held showed a popular support for leftist political parties (republicans, liberals, socialists), hence with no one willing to support the reign of the monarchy left, King Alfonso went into voluntary exile. — His departure marked the start of the *Second Spanish Republic* in April 1931

The left republic (April 1931 - November 1933)

● Centre left party won election, new president was *Manuel Azana*.

● New government declared a new constitution, with the intention of making Spain a “democratic republic of workers of all classes”

● *Azana* was highly anti-church and anti-army

● Undermined the power of the church and separated church and state by removing its control over education in Spain

● Undermined the power of the Army by closing the Saragossa military academy and offering officers early retirement on full pay

  ○ This was a big mistake as it effectively radicalised the army and meant that all those left in the army were nationalist and conservative to the core
○ Also, it was extremely expensive as 50% of the officers took up the government’s offer of retiring on full pay

- Spain was hit hard by the Great depression (yes, that’s right, bet you forgot about *el gran desastre de la gran depresion*) and its agricultural prices, wine and olive exports were plummeting.
  ○ Increasing number of peasants unemployed due to collapsing agricultural industry
  ○ Industrial production decreased too, with iron falling by a third and steel by almost a half
  ○ Minister of Labour, *Largo Caballero*, tried to stop this decline by offering a land distribution programme with compensation for landowners, but the government did not have the money necessary to do this and this benefitted less than 7000 families.

- Civil unrest continued and the government still put them down with great brutality
  ○ Introduction of the Assault Guard in an attempt to produce a left-leaning military force to check the balance of the right-wing army
  ○ However, most of the army still remained loyal to the state and uprisings were suppressed

- Catalonia given its own parliament, which upset the right as they saw this as a move towards independence for the regions and the breakup of Spain

- Each of the new leftist government’s reforms was seen as an attack on right-wing groups
  ○ Right-wing formed a new political party in order to defend the interests of the conservative church and landowners.
  ○ This party came to be known as the CEDA (Spanish confederation of the autonomous right) and was led by *Gil Robles*
  ○ Important to note that CEDA under *Gil Robles* was modelled after Hitler’s Nazi party in Germany

- Fall of the 1931-1933 left-wing government was largely seen as a failure to introduce effective land reforms, but historian *Paul Preston* argues that it was because the right-wing was never going to give the left wing government a chance to succeed.

- They did not do enough to placate the left and peasants, but did enough to anger the right
• **Azana** resigned in 1933 after he lost working class and socialist support.

**The Right Republic (November 1933 - February 1936)**

• In the November 1933 elections, the Republic swung to the right

• Despite CEDA being the largest party in the republic, the President initially resisted giving **Gil Robles** power, however CEDA withdrew support, forcing the government’s hand.
  
  ○ **Gil Robles** was made War minister and 2 other CEDA members were given cabinet posts

• The 2 years that the new Right-wing government came into power were known as the black years
  
  ○ This was because it seemed that the new right-wing government was only keen on undoing all the reforms that the left-wing government had introduced previously
  
  ○ Church control of education was restored and the **Azana’s** key economic reform - the land programme - was halted.
  
  ○ Catalonia tried to declare its independence after CEDA joined the government, but its autonomy was suspended after the Asturian miners’ uprising in 1934
  
  ○ This uprising was crushed using the army, notably, the Moroccan troops or Moors (**Filthy Franco**)

• Widespread use of violence made for a loss of support for the right-wing government, notably the Basques, who now lent their support to the left-wing

• **Largo Caballero** called for a halt to **Robles** and his right-wing actions, likening CEDA to the Spanish Nazi party, and that Spain should seek a more Soviet styled left-wing solution for Spain’s problems

• **Gil Robles** responded by demanding a shift to a more authoritarian approach to controlling the communists in Spain.
  
  ○ This led to the left and centre left groups (**Caballero and Prieto**) being able to find a common ground to enable them to take on the right-wing
Right Republic disintegrated as the political and economic situation deteriorated and was dissolved in February 1936

The Popular Front (February 1936 - July 1936) aka The Second Left Republic aka where the confusion about the Spanish Civil War comes from

Immediate causes

Military rising July 1936

- Victory of the left in the 1936 elections threw the right-wing CEDA into turmoil
  - The murder of José Sotelo (popular CEDA leader) hastened preparations for a military coup 1936 led by junior officers + senior Africanista officers (Franco and Mola included)
  - 17 July: Revolt began with troops in Morocco and spread to military units throughout Spain, but was met with armed resistance from left-wing unions, particularly in rural south, Barcelona, and Madrid.
    - As a result, army was only able to take control of parts of Spain, bringing the country into a civil war.
**Foreign intervention in the Spanish Civil War**

Reasons for foreign intervention

**Britain and France**

- France initially supported the Republic because they didn’t want the Nationalists to win (fear of encirclement by Fascists+strengthening of Germany and Italy’s relations.) but they didn’t fully commit due to domestic concerns-- political polarization, lack of public support for the war meant that there might be a revolt if they fully committed to Spain.
- Signed the non-intervention pact (Non-intervention committee NIC)
- Tried to get involved by not getting involved
- Scared of a European war and was an early forerunner of appeasement
- Domestic concerns → France’s political problems, lack of public support for war
- Weakens the left in Spain as they are unable to purchase arms
- Didn’t do anything about the right/nationalists purchasing arms

**Italy**

- Got involved because of ideological reasons
- Also wanted to isolate France, dominate the mediterranean and have access to the Spanish iron ore
- Improve Mussolini’s popularity at home - win another glorious war
- Sent 75,000 men and resources but put a huge financial strain on its economy

**Russia**

- Involved because of ideology and fear of fascism (Collective security - joined LON in 1934)
  - Saw a potential communist ally in western europe - Spain
- Only country that supported the left and they were the only country that the leftist republicans could purchase arms from
- Needed economic resources → obtained Spanish gold reserves by making the Republicans pay for German aid -- profits - to industrialize
• Didn’t provide the same level of troops and arms as the fascists did for the nationalists
• From 1938, commitment began to reduce → gave up on collective security and trying to
  make allies with Britain

Germany
• Hitler got involved as he saw Franco as a potential fascist ally → wanted to expand the
  reach of fascism in europe
• Wanted to test out their new military tactics
• Airlifted Franco and the moors to the mainland from morocco
• Wanted access to the iron, copper and zinc ore as an indemnity for Germany’s
  intervention in the war

International Brigades
• Made up of men and women from all over the world who wanted to oppose Fascism→
  fought for the Republicans.
• Boosted morale, but did not do much (max. 15 000 at a time, most with little to no
  military experience.)
Impact of foreign intervention

- Britain
  - Non-Intervention Committee (1936)
    - Three key members (those under dictatorships – Germany, Italy, USSR) ignored it completely and provided foreign forces anyway
  - Limited Republicans, tended to favour Nationalists
    - Nationalists allowed to use Gibraltar as their base, compared to their complete prevention of aid going to the Republic
    - Trade agreement with Nationalists (1936) allowing British companies to trade with rebel forces
  - Self-interest of avoiding war – sacrificed Spain to the policy of appeasement to maintain relations with Italy, Portugal, and Germany (which Chamberlain still had faith in)
- France
  - Inconsistent support ending up with it decided to pursue non-intervention together with Britain, dealing a fatal blow to the Republic
    - Support of a large country on the border would have been beneficial
    - Resulted in reliance on Soviet Union: gold reserves, also associated the Republic with ‘Soviet communism’
  - Did not stop citizens from joining International Brigades (mainly French); main centre for coordinating Soviet aid
- Soviet Union
  - Welcomed the NIC, but, following Italy and Germany’s example, didn’t really care about it and withdrew in October 1936
  - Dragged the war out with good purpose
    - Weaken, drain resources of Germany
    - If this developed into a general war, it would be waged far from the borders of the Soviet Union
- Germany
○ German air support helped Franco set-up a beachhead in the south, where the food was grown → crucial to Franco gaining an advantage in the war (economic and strategic benefits)
  ■ Raw materials e.g. iron ore
  ■ Deployment to Spain would give Germany the potential to hamper Anglo-French maritime communications
  ■ Goering wanted to test out his Luftwaffe in live conditions; Hitler wanted to stop the spread of communism
○ Pivotal support important to the outcome of the war, playing crucial military roles at critical times
  ■ Luftwaffe also helped bomb Guernica when it was held by the Republicans → Nationalists taking Catalonia
○ Deterred other governments from getting involved due to their presence
● Italy
○ Strategic advantages
  ■ Involvement would reinforce his pro-fascist stance
  ■ Enhance influence as key Mediterranean power, demonstrate Italy’s might
  ■ Fascist victory → undermine France (and therefore left-wing French influence)
○ Air and naval support helped the Nationalists to secure victory
○ Relationship between Italy and Germany was cemented in Spain
● Portugal
○ Fundamental to supplying the rebels along the Spanish–Portuguese border, provided a base for communications
○ Long-term Anglo-Portuguese relationships deterred Britain from countering its support → benefit for Franco’s troops
**Reasons for Nationalist victory**

**Republican weaknesses**

- Political disunity
  - The Second Republic suffered from serious divisions undermining its war effort and military capacity; ‘civil war within a civil war’
    - E.g. Three-sided conflict between liberals, authoritarian socialists / communists, anarchists
    - Republicans were disunified, trade unions vs republican government → soldiers attached to anarchist/communist groups, government didn’t trust them
  - Large ideological range
  - Divided over primary objective of war → irreconcilable ideological conflict
    - Socialists / communists backed the maintenance of the Popular Front and investment in defeat of Franco
    - Anarchists, ultra-left communists wanted to progress with the ‘revolution’ believing that compromising on this would weaken the war effort
    - E.g. Violent expression of disagreement in Barcelona ‘Mgeay Days’ (1937)
- Poor military organisation
  - Had loyal generals, but lacked middle-ranking officers → provision of inexperienced NCOs at an important level, formed haphazardly
    - Even then the loyal generals, who had potentially valuable experience, were distrusted by the Republic
  - Less cohesive, relied on militias and elected officers
    - Strategies discussed at length, reducing speed and efficiency
    - Encouraged insubordination
  - Anarchist militias and Basques refused to be led by a central command structure
- The Basques would also not provide troops to defend anywhere outside their own territory
  - Poor organisation was exacerbated by geographical locations
    - Different territories operated separately
    - Battlefields were not in range of their air force
- Foreign aid was poor, non-committal
  - The cheating wife, Russia: closest ally, but Stalin was unwilling to commit Russia too fully in case fear of a German invasion
    - Involvement in Spain meant to stiffen the West against fascism
    - After appeasement, he realised this wouldn’t work and lost interest
  - France was reluctant to assist a fellow republic
    - Blum and Daladier kept out of the conflict for fear of alienating important groups in France, e.g. Catholics
  - US kept out to avoid complicating relations with right-wing, pro-Franco regimes in Latin America (important trading partners)
  - Britain was the biggest obstacle
    - Baldwin and Chamberlain hoped to come to terms with Germany, and revive Anglo-Italian relationships
    - Considered communism a bigger threat than fascism (Stalin > Franco)
      - Didn’t support Franco either, Nationalist policies were repugnant
    - Strong case against risking a general European war in support of the Republic, which was increasingly leaning left
    - Placed heavy pressure on France to ban all arms sales to the Republic and also influenced the formation of the Non-Intervention Committee (1936)
- Dwindling finances
  - Initially owned the world’s fourth largest gold reserve, controlled main cities and industrial areas but 😞
- Eventual government orders to banks to maintain neutrality → difficulties in paying through normal international banking channels for arms shipments
  - Workers’ committees and countryside collective farms were assumed to be able to meet the financial needs of the Republic
    - They were wrong
    - Impact of the war and badly-run government → production in Catalan (key area) fell by two-thirds (1936-1939), causing food and raw material shortages
    - High inflation (300%) was also a problem; low wage increase (15%)
  - Impact of Non-Intervention Committee
    - Starved Republic of all credit
  - Conditions of Soviet Union provision of finances
    - Requested that all Spanish gold reserves are transferred to Moscow
      - Wanna guess where this goes (hint: it never goes back)
    - Provided 1,000 aircrafts, 500 tanks; 500-5000 advisors arrived with Stalin’s instructions to ‘keep out of artillery range’

**Nationalist strengths**

- Political cohesion
  - Largely due to Franco’s leadership – overcame internal disputes to balance the different Nationalists groups
    - Carlists: Left question of monarchy open, catered to their demand for legislation favouring Catholic Church
    - Falangists: Allowed to direct propaganda to influence the characteristics of a mass movement that Franco was prepared to allow; close relationships with Italy and Germany also pleased them
    - Army (no ideology) relied on Franco to maintain its position and influence
  - Franco ensured adequate representation of various Interests
First National Council (1937) combined Falangists, Carlists, generals, and others that were prevented from becoming too dominant or radical

- Superior military structure and organisation
  - Systematic method, military academies produced 30,000 trained officers
  - Centralised control of all militias (1936 – from the start!)
    - Imposed rigorous military discipline
    - Developed efficient military administration
  - Battle strategy – unimaginative, but solid
    - Would not launch an offensive unless certain that he could see it through to the end; slow, but good results

- Foreign assistance
  - Vital to Franco’s successes
    - Transportation of Franco’s troops from Morocco to southern Spain leading to success in Andalusia campaign (1936)
    - Sudden increase in Italian equipment boosted Nationalist morale after a series of Republican victories
    - Another massive flow of armaments (1939) allowed Franco to crush Catalonia
  - Troops sent
    - Italy: 50,000 ground troops, 950 tanks, 763 aircrafts, 91 warships
    - Germany: 16,000 military advisers, Condor Legion (latest aircrafts)
    - Portugal: 20,000 troops and permitted passing through border

- Financially okay
  - Business community backed the Nationalists, meaning they were able to purchase arms
  - Series of financial agreements with Italy and Germany solved the problem of Spanish gold reserves being under Republican control
- Italian aid provided was worth $263 million; German arms worth $215 million and in total, Franco might have received $570 million worth of aid from abroad
  - Controlled main food-production areas by 1936; main industrial areas by 1937
  - International trade and credit
    - The USA gave $700 million in credit
    - Significant amount of business done with multinational companies in Western democracies – lots of rubber and oil, from the US e.g. Texas Oil Company, Shell

**Nature of the Spanish Civil War**

- For Spain: ‘Total’ war + civil war
  - Use of propaganda to dehumanize the enemy (despite being from the same country); atrocities committed against their own people
  - Targeted civilians in bombing raids e.g. Guernica
- Moving into modern warfare; new technology
  - Importance of naval and air power
    - Condor Legion lengthened the war, and neither side managed to consistently gain control of the air
    - Control of the sea was significant in maintaining supply routes
    - Land warfare saw attritions and stalemates high casualties,
  - However, land battles did reflect the changing nature of warfare
    - The tactics of Blitzkrieg were evolving, with the application of tanks, artillery and air bombardment to prepare an advance
**Effects of the Spanish Civil War**

For Spain

- **Social**
  - Human cost / casualties
    - 100,000 Republicans killed; about 70,000 Nationalists.
    - Killing continued after war in the ‘White Terror’ (Franco’s Giant Cumming Project in 1939) with a further 40,000–200,000 casualties
  - Concentration camps and prisons
    - Republicans and their sympathizers
  - Seizing of Republican children for ‘re-education’
    - Placed with Nationalist / Catholic families or sent to orphanages to be indoctrinated against the views and actions of their own parents
  - Long lasting divisions and hatred in Spanish society

- **Economic cost**
  - Financial losses, economic problems
    - 10-15% of wealth destroyed
    - Per capita income 28% lower than in 1935
    - High inflation due to fighting of the war, and printing of money to finance it
  - Industrial destruction
    - 70% of Madrid’s factory machinery needed to be replaced
    - Communications systems, including tram network, needed to be rebuilt
    - Everyone is dead, there are no skilled workers + general labour shortage
    - Merchant shipping destroyed
  - Agricultural sector okay though, but remained inefficient, ineffective
    - Franco reversed Republican land reform → periodic unemployment for labourers, landowners refused modernization
  - Britain demanded repayment of debt, Germany wanted money for aid provided
- Debt would remain until after WWI → opportunity for foreign (mostly US, Britain, France) influence
  - No modernization took place for 36 years
- Political
  - Franco dictator
    - Exodus of Spaniards to neighbouring countries, included intellectuals (teachers, lawyers, researchers, doctors and famous writers, poets, artists and musicians)
    - Those that remained had to conform to Franco’s authoritarian, Catholic and conservative views
  - Law of Political Responsibility (1939)
    - Made Republican supporters liable to punishment
    - Allowed seizure of Republican land → vast amounts of land to the state
  - Restoration of the power of the privileged class, control working class
    - Wage cuts
    - Outlaw industrial political activism
    - Employment for Republicans who had escaped imprisonment was impossible
    - Use of Civil Guard to preserve inequalities of social and working system in rural areas
  - Restart of the ‘era of the national church’
    - ‘The Catholic Church enjoyed a degree of state support that was much greater than at any time since the 18th century. Government and church combined to preach order, hierarchy and discipline.’ – Lannon
    - Church took up cause of workers; linked with their movements
- End of Basques and Catalans for autonomy
  - Use of Catalan, Basque and Galician languages was forbidden and all power was centralized in Madrid
  - Suppression and removal of all political opposition → period of political stability
■ More unified than ever until WWII
■ Then Franco got kind of shakey
■ And then died
  ○ Europe shunned Spain until his death (after which democracy was restored)
● For the world
● Soviet Union and communism
  ○ Defeat in Spain undermined international credibility
    ■ Cynical contribution to Republican → divisions in left-wing + disillusioned former supporters of the Soviet Union
    ■ Lost intellectual sympathy in the West
  ○ Accentuated Soviet and German tensions; pushed Soviet foreign policy away from an alliance with Western powers
    ■ Stalin lost respect for Britain and France as allies against Hitler (appeasement, and non-intervention, ultimate turning point was Munich Agreement)
    ■ Began to look towards a Nazi German alliance
● Hitler and Nazi Germany
  ○ Highlighted importance of air and land power
    ■ Effectiveness of applying air cover for ground troops in Blitzkrieg using the Italian defeat at Guadalajara as a point of reference
    ■ Testing of Luftwaffe, bullet-resistance fuel tanks and discovered valuable things, e.g. need for radio contact in armoured vehicles
    ■ Bombing seemed like a better idea (effective, to some extent)
  ○ Brought them closer to Mussolini’s Fascist Italy
    ■ Prevented a reconciliation between members of Stresa Front
  ○ British and French non-intervention + appeasement strengthened Hitler’s position
    ■ Also made Nazi Germany seem capable enough to defend the world from the biggest threat ever, in all eternity, the most evil, the most terrifying, the literal worst, the baddest, terrible-est, communism!!!
• Britain and France
  o Spanish Civil War made them want less war
    ■ Lol
  o Polarized political nature of foreign intervention heightened threat of escalation into a general war and drove up support for appeasement
    ■ Continued pursuit of policy of appeasement and non-intervention actually encouraged Hitler to be more aggressive
  o Communism is still the biggest threat
    ■ Apparently were unable to see the Condor Legion
    ■ Are they blind? Do they have eyes?
• The USA
  o Oh no! War! And death! :^(
    ■ Offered no tangible assistance
  o Strengthening of isolationist sentiment and shunned Spain
    ■ Excluded from the post-war recovery package for Europe, the Marshall Aid

As a cause of WWII
1. It emboldened Hitler by increasing his popularity at home and abroad. □
2. Hitler drew closer to his former enemy, Italy. □
3. Hitler gained practical military lessons that he would later apply in the campaigns of 1940. It was a distraction for Britain and France and pushed the USA further into isolation. □
4. It fostered a new direction for Soviet foreign policy, meaning that there could be no broad alliance in Europe to contain Hitler. □
2.3.1 Germany (1919-1933)

Birth of the Weimar Government

- Pre-Weimar Government: the Second Reich
  - Germany was used to autocratic rule- before the Weimar Republic was started, Germany was ruled by the Kaiser, Wilhelm II.
  - Power was held by the Kaiser + noble landowners (junkers)
  - There was a parliament, the Reichstag, but they had no real power / control over the government

- Fall of the Second Reich
  - WWI: Masses disillusioned by the war. Living conditions worsened- wounds, starvation, death, massive inflation
  - Oct 1918: Naval mutiny at Kiel → generation revolution → Kaiser abdicated, sent to exile in Holland. His departure paved the way for talks between Germany and the Allies → armistice was declared 2 days later
  - Germany’s largest political party were the SPD- they proclaimed Germany a democratic republic and formed a new government.
  - New leader: Friedrich Ebert
  - Period of civil unrest → new leaders had to meet in Weimar because Berlin was full of riots
  - Weimar Republic was formed in 1919, with Ebert elected as president

Immediate Problems: Constitution

- Inherent Opposition (Military)
  - Kaiser abdicated - sent to exile in Holland
  - One of the new republic’s first actions was to sign an armistice with the Allies → seen as treason
Military did not approve of this and spread the rumour that Germany could have continued fighting but had been stabbed in the back by their new politicians → Germans felt betrayed, labelled the new politicians as the ‘November Criminals’

Association with the TOV: the TOV was signed (reluctantly) mostly by politicians who were leaders of the new republic.

- The TOV outraged the Germans → saw it as a diktat, were outraged by the losses of colonies, military & blame for war
- Lacked confidence in the politicians who signed it

No real change: from the outside, it looked like a strong working class was pushing out a reactionary government but in reality, the traditional elites (junkers / senior military officials / bureaucratic officials) remained in power, yearned for a return to the authoritarian system

- Undermined the Weimar government from the beginning

**Constitutional weaknesses**

- New democratic republic won the votes of the majority of the Germans
- The Weimar Constitution was now of the most democratic in the world- all Germans had free speech, equal rights and the right to vote
- Major political parties → Social Democrats (SPD), Liberal DDP, Catholic Centre Party
- Coalition government: the Weimar government used a system of proportional representation to elect the Reichstag → made it nearly impossible for one party to gain an overall majority

- Reichstag was made up of many small parties, coalition government had to be formed.
- Different parties had completely different views- they could not agree and were unwilling to compromise → weak, indecisive, inefficient
- Seen by the population as a house of squabbling politicians who were too busy arguing among themselves to govern the country
- State of flux as there were 20 separate governments from 1919-1933
- Germans were disillusioned by democracy, and had a growing desire for authoritarian government
  - The Chancellor and government needed the Reichstag’s support to pass laws, but because the Reichstag was so inefficient, barely anything got done
  - Presidents (elected once every 7 years, could appoint / dismiss Chancellor's and dissolve the Reichstag)
    - Had to use emergency decree
    - Article 48- the President could declare a state of emergency and rule by decree
    - Had veto powers
  - President Friedrich Ebert (1919-1925) and Paul von Hindenburg (1925-1932) both used the emergency decrees, but for different reasons
    - At first, it was intended to support democracy (by using it in times of emergency during economic crises- Ebert used it 36 times
    - Later on it undermined democracy → President's used it to lead the country by themselves
  - Excessive use of decree undermined democracy, showed the Reichstag’s lack of power and the ineffectiveness of the government → Germans began to lose confidence in the Weimar Republic and in democracy
Role of Political Parties

- The Reichstag contained several different political parties, from all ends of the political spectrum- differing degrees of support for the constitution, different aims
- (+) Truly democratic as it represented a multitude of different German views as they voted for the parties whose policies they liked best, not politicians
- (-) Political power was fragmented, there was inter-party squabbling and indecisiveness which made the government look weak. It was also difficult to pass legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left-Wing (wanted establishment of communist or socialist regime)</th>
<th>KPDC (Communist Party of Germany)</th>
<th>SPD (Social Democrats)</th>
<th>DDP (German Democratic Party)</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Centre Party (Zentrum)</th>
<th>Right-Wing (restoration of the monarchy)</th>
<th>DVPC (German People’s Party)</th>
<th>DNVP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formed from a no. of left-wing groups (including the Spartacus League)</td>
<td>• Main centre-left party in the Weimar Republic, moderate socialist party</td>
<td>• Centre-left liberal party, supported by the middle class (lawyers, writers, academics)</td>
<td>• Centre-right national party</td>
<td>• Established to defend Catholic interest, drew support from all classes</td>
<td>• Formed from a no. of right-wing groups (including the German People’s Party)</td>
<td>• Centre-right national party</td>
<td>• Fairly right-wing and authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocated revolution by the proletariat, creation of a Communist regime (following the USSR)</td>
<td>• Drew strong support from the lower-middle class, maintained till the early 1930s</td>
<td>• Lost support after 1920 (19% in 1919 → 1% in 1932)</td>
<td>• Supported by the middle class, mainly businessmen</td>
<td>• Supported parliamentary democracy (strongest supporter)</td>
<td>• Supported by the middle class, mainly businessmen</td>
<td>• Led by Gustav Stresemann (Chancellor in 1923, foreign minister in other governments from 1924-1929)</td>
<td>• Supported parliamentary democracy (but had reservations- ideally wanted the Kaiser restored in the future)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Role of opposition parties
  - In the beginning, the SPD aroused suspicion among left-wing groups by cooperating with the business community, the army, extreme right-wing groups → trying to prevent a revolution, but instead appeared to have betrayed workers (their main supporters) instead of developing a worker-friendly state like Soviet Russia, they created a middle class democracy, dependent on old autocratic institutions
  - Elbert made a deal with the anti-democratic elites → they could keep their positions if they protected the government
  - Left-wing opposition:
    - Communists wanted a radical overhaul of the old institutions → army to be replaced with a citizen’s military + nationalisation of factories, businesses and land, to be controlled by workers
    - Jan 1919: Spartacist uprising (wanted to start an army uprising in Berlin in an attempt to overthrow the government and start a workers’ republic)
      - Mass protests → largely spontaneous uprising → members of Spartacist League tried to take over in the hope that it would turn into a communist revolution
      - Did not have enough support and suppressed by Freikorps
March 1919, March 1920: the Communists made more attempts (in Munich, Bavaria and in the Ruhr respectively) to start revolutions and overthrow the Weimar Republic, and the Weimar government had to use the Freikorps to brutally suppress them.

- Showed that the republic was weak and unstable, faced violent left-wing opposition which only deepened when the Freikorps brutally crushed the uprisings. The government had to depend increasingly on the far right (who also despised them) to suppress the uprisings.

- Ebert overestimated the threat to democracy from the Communists
  - Right-wing opposition:
    - Right-wing resentment of government was rooted in their belief that the Weimar Republic had betrayed Germany (stab-in-the-back myth, association with TOV).
    - Nationalists were outraged by Germany’s perceived decline after the war
  - March 1920: Kapp Putsch
    - Dr Wolfgang Kapp, with Freikorps support, launched a putsch in Berlin to overthrow the government. However, Berlin was a socialist city → unlikely to wholeheartedly support Kapp.
    - The government called for a general strike, workers (who supported the far left) responded accordingly → Kapp could not govern without essential services and the rebellion failed
    - This revolution was undermined by divisions within the extreme right and left’s ability to stop him.
    - Army did nothing → showed where their sympathies lied
    - 12 000 Freikorps marched to Berlin and refused to support the government
    - Although the Kapp Putsch showed that there was still support for the Weimar Republic, it also showed that the Republic was extremely weak → army that was supposed to be supporting the
government did nothing against Kapp → humiliating, the Weimar Republic had to be saved yet again by those who despised it → undermined its long-term stability

- November 1923 (after the Ruhr crisis): Munich Putsch
  - Adolf Hitler viewed the Ruhr crisis as a political humiliation for Germany, wanted to show that not all Germans accepted what the French had forced Germany to do
  - Around 2000 men marched to the centre of Munich and in the ensuing confrontation with police forces → 16 Nazis and 4 policemen were killed
  - Hitler was arrested by the Bavarian police and the putsch failed
  - Therefore, Hitler aimed to undermine the Weimar Constitution from within by winning democratically
  - Showed discontent of the people, instability of the government

Economic Problems
- 1918 disastrous harvest
  - Price increase sevenfold from 1914
- Peace treaties depleted Germany of ¾ of its iron, ¼ of coal and 15% of arable land
  - Reparations that had to be paid at 132 million marks
- Ruhr Crisis (Jan 1923):
  - Germany claimed it could no longer afford the reparations payments required by the Allies → defaulted
  - Thus, French and Belgian troops were sent to the Ruhr (Germany’s industrial heartland) to force payments by collecting the reparations owed to them in raw materials and goods.
  - The government called for passive resistance- told the workers to go on strike, promised that they would continue to be paid, but this backfired → the soldiers killed / expelled workers who resisted, industrial production halted
- Germany had no goods to trade, printed more and more money to pay workers and reparations → hyperinflation
- Economic disaster led to social problems
  - Germans lost all their savings
  - Extreme poverty and unemployment
- Great political disaster → the poor handling of the crisis gave opponents a rallying point to undermine support for government (united in hating the new system because of the TOV and its effects)
- Weimar government particularly lost support from the middle classes.
- Economic collapse, political humiliation, destabilization of the republic, people started to look to extreme solutions

**Social Problems**

- Impact of WWI
  - Over 2.5 million Germans died in the war & approximately 4 million wounded
  - By the end of the Allied blockade in July 1919, 250 000 people died of starvation
  - After the war, there were shortages of everyday goods + unemployment (wartime economy had be moulded back into a peacetime economy)
- Inflation → Germans lost their savings, terrible living conditions → disillusionment, dissatisfaction, desperation
- TOV
  - People saw the TOV as a diktat that had been forced on them
  - Outraged by loss of colonies, territory and population
  - Felt that principle of self-determination had been ignored and that the war guilt clause was unjust
  - immediate lack of confidence in politicians who signed it
**Reasons for survival of the Weimar government**

- **Political**
  - Opposition parties were weak
    - The KPD did not have a strong leader, extremist parties who insisted on war like the KPD or Nazi Party had little appeal
  - Opposition parties were fragmented
    - There was no mass movement against the Weimar Republic → lack of collective resistance (parties fought against each other)
    - Eg. When the Freikorps failed the Spartacists and the left-wing workers failed the Kapp Putsch → government relied on opposition groups to put each other down → failed to seize power
  - Opposition parties lacked popular support
    - There was still strong support for parties supporting democracy, especially the SDP.
    - Many Germans did not support the violent acts of extremist groups. (Eg. Workers in Berlin during the Kapp Putsch)
  - Weimar Republic still had support
    - Ebert’s ruthless measures to crush the communists gained widespread approval because many Germans feared that Germany would go the same way as Russia
    - Many workers continued to support the SDP.

- **Economic**
  - In Aug 1923, Gustav Stresemann’s new government solved the economic crisis-he called off passive resistance in the Ruhr, introduced a new stable currency (the Rentenmark) to solve the problem of hyperinflation
  - Weimar Republic had a few years of relative stability
The Golden Years

- Comparative economic stability, along with massive cultural revival and change in Germany
- Economic
  - Gustav Stresemann’s leadership: took steps to restore German prosperity
    - Dawes Plan 1924: Resolution of the Ruhr Crisis
      - New schedule for reparations payments, reparations reduced, 2 year delay of repayment
      - US loan of 800 million marks
      - Influx of foreign capital → Stresemann could embark on public building
      - Real wages increased
      - Employment increased, strikes decreased, people were happier with the government
      - Government also solved the problem by introducing a new currency → quickly put an end to hyperinflation
  - Young Plan 1929
    - Stresemann further lightened the burden of reparations on Germany and led to the final removal of Allied troops from the Rhineland
    - Total sum to be paid reduced to 37 000 million marks
    - Intended as final settlement → Germany participated in these reparation negotiations for the first time
      - Opposed by many as it showed that Germany still had to pay reparations → nationalist groups mounted a major campaign to force the government to reject the Young Plan using the constitution → did not feel that the Weimar regime had successfully restored Germany’s pride / escaped from association with TOV
• However, Stresemann’s solution was criticized as it was seen as political humiliation, that the Germans were doing what the French wanted
  ■ Government was ordered to cut expenditure sharply to reduce the trade deficit → huge number of jobs cut → resentment
  ■ Unemployment remained a big problem in Germany
  ■ The German economy relied on ‘borrow prosperity’ (heavily reliant on American bank loans), which was a huge problem when the American stock market crashed.

• Political
  ○ Foreign policy under Gustav Stresemann: strengthened Germany’s relations with other countries, leading to even greater economic growth
  ○ Policy of Erfullung Politik
    ■ Focused on improving relations with France and Britain
  ○ Locarno treaties (1925)
    ■ Guaranteed not to try and change Germany’s western borders
    ■ Showed Germany’s willingness to cooperate with other European countries → foreign investment increased
    ■ Paved the way for Germany’s entry into the LON (1926)- greater opportunities for economic cooperation, improved Germany’s international standing
    ■ On the surface, looked like capitulation → gave France a greater sense of security for its Versailles borders → however, Stresemann realized that France must feel secure to allow Germany to recover fully
  ○ Treaty of Berlin 1926
    ■ Signed a treaty with USSR - both public and secret clauses
    ■ Helped to develop good relations between Germany and USSR
    ■ Stresemann used treaty to put mild pressure on the west to improve relations with Germany through fear of Germany getting closer to the USSR
○ Kellogg-Briand Pact
  ■ Germany along with 70 other countries signed the pact renouncing the use of force → no practical effect
  ○ However, Stresemann’s foreign policy was seen as ‘fulfilment’, or compliance with the terms of the TOV, thus it was extremely unpopular with Germans
    ■ Germans did not see huge gains → disappointed with foreign policies

● Social
  ○ Massive cultural revival and change → increasing artistic creativity and sexual promiscuity
  ○ Development of innovative street theatre, satirical cabaret
  ○ Openness to wider international influences (partly due to new foreign policy)-jazz, film, American style consumerism
  ○ the ‘New Woman’- women became empowered (finally life was deeply affected due to war, but the father’s role had often been replaced by the mother’s)
  ○ However, the new influences (jazz, swing) were sometimes Jewish, which was opposed by anti-semitists.
    ■ New ideas / experimentation / role of women alienated the conservatives, who wanted classical culture and saw the new Weimar culture as a symbol of moral decay in their society → strong objections

**Fall of the Weimar Republic**

● Economic
  ○ The Great Depression (1929)
    ■ Wall Street Crash + Stresemann’s death (both in Oct 1929) = disaster
    ■ German prosperity was based on American loans, over-reliant on them → the collapse of the American economy severely damaged Germany’s economy
    ■ American banks wanted their money back, Germany still had to pay reparations
- Many companies were unable to pay their bills, went bankrupt → unemployment, poverty rates skyrocketed.
- Germans were yet again living in terrible conditions
- Popular support for democratic parties waned, people turned to extremist parties who promised to solve their problems with radical solutions
- Weimar’s government constitution made it very difficult to take firm and decisive actions → many felt that democracy was just not working, wanted strong and effective leadership
- Nazi Party, Communist Party (extremist NSDAP / KDP) became extremely popular.
- Government’s bad economic decisions (decision to adopt inflationary measures, then cut the government budget) exacerbated the problem → industrial production fell by 40%, ½ of the workforce was unemployed → German economy was collapsing and people were getting desperate for solutions

- Political
  - Disunity
    - After 1930, the coalition government and the Reichstag became extremely disunited, could not agree on anything
    - SPD, Centre Party were the 2 biggest parties and supporters of parliamentary democracy, but were hostile to each other (Centre Party were gravitating towards the Right)
    - SPD, KPD fought over control of the working class- as unemployment increased, the KPD became more popular- KPD & Nazi Party gained more votes as people felt that democracy was failing them and turned towards extremist parties
  - Rise of Presidential Governments
    - Reichstag came to a standstill as they could not agree on policies to deal with the crisis → von Hindenburg used Article 48 to implement policies to
try to solve the economic crisis (although his policies just made the problems worse)

- After 1930, there was an increased use of Article 48
  - 1929-1932: >100 laws passed by decree, >29 by the Reichstag
  - Emergency decree was used as a way for the President to govern independent of the Reichstag and political parties (presidential govt)
    - Conniving Chancellors
      - Heinrich Bruning (1930-1932), Franz von Papen (1932) and Kurt von Schleicher (1932) lacked the ability to sustain their coalition governments
      - None of them really cared about democracy (Bruning was more of a monarchist) / defending parliamentary democracy → used Article 48 frequently (making them no longer responsible to the Reichstag and overriding the constitutional rights of the people) → democracy had completely failed
      - von Papen was unscrupulous and convincing → when he was replaced by von Schleicher, he decided to engineer his overthrow by convincing Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as chancellor instead
    - Reichstag Fire + Enabling Act
      - Hitler blamed the Communists, pressured the Reichstag to pass the Enabling Act (1933)
    - Reichstag dissolved (Oct 1933)
      - Hitler legally gained complete political powers → dictatorship

**Other Things**

- Unemployment
  - A problem that dogged the Weimar Republic from beginning to end
  - 1919-1923: high unemployment due to post-war situation (crushing terms of the TOV, transition from wartime to peacetime economy)
Stresemann’s policy to cut government spending to reduce Germany’s trade deficit → loss of nearly 750,000 government jobs

- 1929 onwards: unemployment rose sharply during the Great Depression, the government had no idea how to face it

- **Gender**
  - Emancipation / empowerment of women: promise of legal equality for the first time in history
  - Emergence of new German woman (who broke away from the traditional family-orientated, had greater independence and freedom)
    - Because German women had to take men’s roles during the war → family life permanently affected, women became more important as wage earners
  - ‘New Woman’: short hair, penchant for cigarettes and all things American → fierce debate over conservative forces vs liberal, social democratic-minded people
  - Women broke traditional norms by smoking, short hair styles, campaigned for sexual liberation
  - However these changes were largely on the surface level- many women still placed great importance on traditional ideas about women’s roles (conservatism was still deep-rooted)
  - Women progressed, but not far- there was still underpromotion in the workplace + instability of families during economic crisis + fear of moral and cultural decay
  - Ideas of the role of women in society were transformed, old traditions and moral principals eroded (indulgence). But there was still deep-rooted conservatism in Germany

- **Health and Social Welfare**
  - 1918-1929: Many health and social welfare problems as Germany had been devastated after WWI.
  - The Weimar government tried to implement a better health and social system (development of wider public health services + passed laws to assist in disease
prevention + compulsory unemployment insurance scheme for workers + state subsidies to build public infrastructure)

- 1930 onwards:
  - Had to cut spending drastically due to the deep financial crisis → forced to make major cuts in health & social welfare
  - They tried, but ran out of money

- Education
  - Free, universal, 4 year elementary school established.
  - Outlined a democratic vision of education- girls and boys educated on the same basis, teaching of religion and morality made more flexible- wanted to maximise the talents of its post-war generation
  - But the instability of the coalition government meant that most of these policies never came to fruition
  - The idea was there, but they didn’t actually do anything

- Ethnicity
  - 1918-1929: Weimar government created a Gemeinde (community) organization, embracing Jews within the country → peace, aided Weimar republic’s legitimacy
  - 1930 onwards: anti-semitic feelings increased
    - Fuelled by swiftly rising Nazi Party, Weimar Republic too preoccupied to counter this → increasingly isolated Jewish
    - Jews drew closer, leading to a distinct Jewish subculture → get the Jews apart, heightened the hostility

- Religion
  - Church and state were legally separated
  - Church was an important part of Germans’ lives
  - Religion in Germany seemed to be in a decline- Weimar government attempted to deprive the Church of its status and role in education → they were opposed to the Weimar Republic and its institutions, could not accept the terms of the TOV
○ Later on, the Nazis knew they needed the Church backing to gain political power
→ involved themselves in churches, which some turned back to after the perceived decadence and permissiveness of Weimar

● Redistribution of wealth and resources
○ Weimar government introduced a system of subsidies and social help which re-distributed some wealth, but also led to increased unemployment, low levels of labour productivity
○ However, economic crisis and inflation still led to the poor losing money and the rich not losing so much money as they could keep their money in forms that were not cash

● Arts and Culture
○ Republicans saw greater sexual freedom, tolerance and development of mass culture
○ Examples:
  ■ Painting → new objectivity movement, expressionism
  ■ Literature → rise of utilitarianism
  ■ Music and opera → advocated Gebrauchsmusik
  ■ Theatre → Zeit Theatre (theatre of the time)
○ Street theatre developed to take political drama to mass audience
○ German reaction:
  ■ Nazis organized a disruption of performances of “unpatriotic” films and the prominence of Jews during this time was seen by the Right as proof of the harm that Weimar Democracy was creating in Germany
2.2.2 Origins and nature of Hitler’s Nazi Germany

**TL:DR Problems with the Weimar Republic (1919-1933)**

**Political**

- Kaiser abdicated in 1919 → Declaration of a republic
  - Signing of an armistice to end the war (1918)
    - Came as a shock to many Germans, who had been encouraged to believe that Germany would be victorious.
    - Nationalists claimed that the German army had been ‘stabbed in the back’ by politicians when the army could have fought on.
- Treaty of Versailles
  - The terms of the treaty were humiliating to the German public, and sentiments of anger and revenge began to grow.
    - Loss of 13% of Germany’s land, including colonies. Self-determination applied to other parts of Europe while Germany was left with many ethnic Germans living outside its borders.
    - Army was reduced to 100,000 units; the navy, to 15,000; and the air force was completely eliminated.
    - War Guilt Clause + binding to heavy war reparations → humiliation.
    - Restricted military size was considered a loss of a symbol of national pride.
    - Anschluss forbidden.
  - Weimar politicians came to be known as the "November criminals", and the people resented them greatly, lacked confidence in government.
• Aggravated by Weimar foreign policy during the Golden Years where Streseman called for cooperation with the West - seen as an acceptance of the Treaty → dissatisfaction

• *Failed to win the Germans over as a result, who were dissatisfied with them and were therefore open to other forms of government that would actually solve their problems.*

• Continual political threats
  
  ○ The Communists wanted typical communist things. The Spartacus League was an extreme left-wing socialist movement that attempted to overthrow the Republic in 1919.
  
  ■ Sparacist Uprising (1919): workers led by Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht seized control of the government’s newspaper and telegraph offices in Berlin. They were crushed by the Army and the Freikorps (groups of nationalist ex-soldiers who hated the Communists). The two leaders were killed. □
  
  ■ Red Rising in the Ruhr (1920): 50,000 workers in the industrial Ruhr region seized control of the raw materials, mines and factories. They were also crushed by the Army and the Freikorps. □
  
  ○ The Freikorps were volunteer demobilized soldiers who continued to fight for right-wing values.
  
  ■ Kapp Putsch (1920): Having just put down the Ruhr uprising, the Freikorps now joined an attempt to overthrow the Weimar government led by Wolfgang Kapp. 12,000 Freikorps seized control of the main government building in Berlin. President Ebert appealed to the workers to go on strike to resist the Kapp Putsch, this made it impossible for him to rule and the putsch failed.
  
  ■ ‘White Terror’ (1920-1922): When the Freikorps just killed like, 400 politicians.□
  
  ○ Conservative elite was lukewarm / hostile towards the Republic
Germany conservatism and nationalism remained strong and favoured the development of right-wing extremism e.g. Nazism

- Soviet-German relations
  - Treaty of Rapallo (1922) formalized an alliance with Russia
    - Extensive trade agreements – specifically in weapons
    - Renounced all war claims
    - Breach of disarmament agreements made in Treaty of Versailles.

**Constitutional**

- Proportional representation
  - Gave parties seats in the Reichstag according to the percentage of cotes received
    → Created coalition governments with lots of small parties, which hindered the decision making process.
- Constant governmental changes helped weaken support for a democratic government.
  - 14 coalitions between February 1919 – June 1928
- Gave considerable power to the president, elected every 7 years
  - Appointed the chancellor, and there was no choice given to the people.
  - President controlled the armed forces, considered a “Kaiser-substitute” by nationalists
  - Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution gave him the power to rule by decree in an emergency – The Emergency Decree.
    - Ebert was okay. But subsequent chancellors chosen by Paul von Hindenburg (1925-1934) were unable to command a majority in the Reichstag and abused Article 48 to pass measures.
- Grand Coalition (1928-1930) that commanded over 60% of the seats.
  - Enjoyed some stability, mostly because moderate parties were making gains.
  - Political problems were not resolved, but everyone liked to pretend they had.
    - Economic problems worsened
- Increased divisions within the Reichstag leading to the collapse of the 
  Grand Coalition (a breakdown of democracy)

**Economic**

- Ruhr Crisis (1923)
  - Germany was too economically crippled to meet the demands for reparations, so 
    French and Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr. This had catastrophic consequences 
    on the economy.
  - The loss of production in the Ruhr caused a fall in production elsewhere 
    and the unemployment rose from 2% to 23%.
  - Government ordered workers in the Ruhr to meet the invasion with passive 
    resistance, agreeing to pay welfare assistance to them. To meet the demand for 
    this, they overprinted money → hyperinflation.
  - Loss of value in savings, hitting the middle-class families → support for 
    more extremist, anti-democratic parties later.
  - Collapse of tax revenues; rapidly rising prices.
  - Forced the government to search for US loans in 1924 Dawes Plan, 
    making the economy dependent.

- Stagnation of the agricultural sector
  - Improvements in 1925-1929 did not carry over to the agricultural sector
    - Low prices
    - Faced competition from Canada, USA

- Great Depression (1929)
  - Wall Street Crash sent the Germany economy into a crisis as the USA recalled its 
    loans. This created desperate economic conditions in which democracy would 
    break down.
  - End of the Golden Year’s under Streseman as the Young Plan could not be 
    put into action.
■ Growth in industrial production ceased, people in industrial cities would live in the streets.
■ US demand for imports fell, which the German economy was fairly dependent on.
■ Unemployment hit 6.12 million in 1932.
  ○ Bruning making this worse as chancellor (1930-1932)
■ Followed a policy of economic austerity, where they would cut government spending to keep inflation under control and German exports competitive. This increased taxes and reduced unemployment assistance.
■ To get his unpopular policies through the government, he abused Article 48.
  ○ Jewish land owners would continue to demand rent during the Depression, adding to the economic crisis as well as growing ill-sentiments towards the Jewish peoples

Social

■ Impacts of WWI
  ○ 2.5 million deaths; 4 million wounded.
  ○ The Allied blockade in 1919 resulted in 250,000 deaths from starvation.
■ Bavaria had become the epicenter of ideological societies
  ○ Mostly for organizations that had been left disgruntled by the Weimar democracy

The Nazi movement (1919-1933)

Nazi ideology

■ Nationalism
  ○ Primarily anti-Treaty of Versailles, focused on the restoration of Germany to its pre-war glory and blamed Germany’s problems on the Treaty
    ■ Pan-Germanism, belief in superior Aryan race (coincidentally, German)
■ Blut und Boden (blood and soil)
■ Lebensraum in the east
  ● The right of a superior German race to acquire living space (in the east) for its peoples, where Germans will live and work
■ Anti-Semitism was a scapegoat for German problems and also contributed towards Pan-Germanism
  ❖ Blaming the Treaty and also the Jews was a clever method of directing German anger outwards – the public in general was already upset with the ‘diktat’ and Pan-Germanism appealed to their nationalistic pride; anti-capitalism became popular with large industries as capitalism was dominated by Jews at the time.
  ● Socialism
    ○ Supremacy of the state, (Volksgenmeinschaft)
      ■ The belief that loyalty to the state is more important than any other loyalty; people should feel bounded together by blood as a single community
        ❖ Socialist aspect appealed to the workers, who would have their rights defended as part of the ideology
  ● Cult of the leader – Führerprinzip
    ○ The principle that the leader’s will is the source of all political authority; from this developed the ‘cult of the leader’
      ❖ Implied authoritarian rule, which appealed to the conservatives
  ● Also anti-Marxist, anti-feminist, anti-democracy

The NSDAP had a party ideology that appealed to multiple groups of people in Germany – it addressed the needs and fears of the lower class and middle class workers, the conservatives, the elites. It was the only party that managed to present themselves as a national one, cutting across class and interest lines. This contributed to the popularity of the NSDAP with the German voters and this popularity was what the Hindenburg clique needed to implement their policies, leading to the offering of Chancellorship to Hitler and the eventually takeover of Germany by Hitler.
Hitler’s popularity, thanks to ideology, would allow Hindenburg clique to have popular support in changing Weimer Germany into an authoritarian state.

Popular support is intrinsically linked to ideology. Without the appeal of ideology, propaganda will just be an empty rhetoric.

**Development of the Nazi movement (1919-1929)**

- The National Socialist German Worker’s Party (NSDAP) was a right-wing political opposition group that developed in Germany in the early years of the Weimar Republic
  - Refused to recognise the Weimar government, did not participate in elections before 1924
    - Steadily increased membership and influence throughout 1920s
    - 55,000 members by the end of 1923
  - Other things they had:
    - The SA (the brown ones) was created in 1921, and was originally a ‘gymnastics and sports division’ that eventually became a paramilitary force → *street violence might have intimidated people to vote for the Nazis, or created an atmosphere where people wanted a government to restore law and order*
    - The SS (the black ones) was set up in 1925-1926 as Hitler’s personal bodyguard
    - *Völkischer Beobachter (People’s Observer)* was established as a Nazi newspaper
- Appeal of the Nazis
  - Middle-classes
    - Nationalistic views of the party and opportunities it provided for jobs attracted ex-soldiers and Freikrops members
    - New party organizations created for women, students, youth and teachers helped the party direct its appeal to a wide spectrum of society and
increase awareness → opportunity for representation for groups in society, get involved with the Nazis, creating broad based support

- Nazis were seen as the only party able to stand up against the communist, who they disliked because they were in favour of returning all property to the state
- The youth were attracted due to the generational revolt against the Weimar government
- Those from the lower-middle classes, e.g. shopkeepers, clerks, traders, etc., were in a mounting economic distress due to the perceived threat from big capitalist unions, and radicalised → early supporters of right-wing parties
  - Farmers
    - Energetic recruitment in the Weimar’s ‘Golden Years’ for farmers that did not benefit from the economic changes
    - Fear of communist collectivization seen in Russia
    - Protestants in these areas liked them too
  - Big businesses
    - Wanted their money and not communism
    - Liked the Nazi’s ideas of rearmament, would provide business opportunities → common for rich businessmen to donate money to aid Nazi elections

- Hitler’s tactics
  - Hitler campaigned against the Young Plan by joining the Germany National People’s Party (DNVP), further increasing publicity
  - His leadership was great
    - Speeches won lots of votes, convinced Germans that democracy was weak
    - Used the Jews as a scapegoat
- Convinced them that Germany needed a strong single leader to escape from the effects of the depression; promised that he would restore German pride

- Appeal of Hitler’s personality
  - Though complex and narcissistic, he managed to attract loyal, capable leaders because he was a charismatic orator.
  - Great ability to influence people
  - Simplified his speeches, used repetition that had a magnetic and hypnotic effect on his audience
  - Able to exploit discontent and tell his audience what they wanted to hear, making them feel understood
  - Could attune himself to the sensitivities of his conversation partner to give the appearance of being reasonable and accommodating, played people off each other and recognised their weaknesses.
  - *His charisma was key in attracting loyal and capable subordinates, e.g. Goebbels, Goering, Himmler, and Bormann, though his relationships (personally) with them were cold and remote.*

- Nazi tactics
  - Used their campaigns to focus on economic crisis, Treaty of Versailles and rearmament
    - The effects Great Depression fueled support for extremist parties, e.g. Nazis, who mocked the government’s inaction and made promises that they held the key to future prosperity
    - With no specific formula to end the slump, the Nazis promised full employment, subsidies to help German peasants and aid to small-scale traders
    - Stance against communism, rearmament → gained support of rich
  - Propaganda
    - Goebbels’s methods were effective in creating the myth of the Fuhrer
- Used technology, e.g. loudspeakers, films, radio, mass rallies to create the impression of a militant, unstoppable dynamism
  - Used the SA to beat up communists hahaha
- Munich Putsch (1923) was an attempt to seize the Bavarian government, as a preliminary to marching on Berlin (similar to Mussolini’s ‘March on Rome’) carried out by Hitler and Ludendorff.
  - A failure, and both Hitler and Ludendorff were arrested
    - Lead to Hitler’s realization that he would have to seize power through legal methods instead
  - Proved a propagandist success, as Hitler claimed on his trial for treason that his actions had been taken out of patriotic concern for his country
    - Five years in prison, sympathetic right-wing jury, where he wrote *Mein Kampf*

  - Nazism had to prepare the population for war in order to obtain *Lebensraum* (living space) in the east. To achieve this there had to be racial unity, the elimination of Jews, authoritarian control and no tolerance of diversity or dissent.
  - The Jews were behind Marxism/communism and only the Nazis could fight this.

**Rise to power (1929-1933)**

→ Withdrawal of US loans and collapse of export market in 1929
  - Unemployment soared, reaching 6 million
→ Collapse of the Grand Coalition in 1930
  - Five elections in the next three years
  - Chancellors struggled to rule without parliamentary majorities
    - Abused Emergency Decree
→ September 1930 elections
  - Nazis obtained 107 seats (increase from previous 12)
→ July 1932 elections
  ◆ Nazis obtained 230 seats, becoming largest German party in Reichstag
→ November 1932 elections
  ◆ Nazi support declined to 196 seats
  ◆ Communist party (KPD) was gaining power and its huge presence in the streets had the effect of frightening the conservative élite and encouraging them to turn to Hitler.
→ Von Schleicher becomes Chancellor in 1932
  ◆ Difficulties faced by his government (who refused to increase tariffs on food imports) angered influential Prussian landowners, turning them to Hitler
  ◆ Dismissed by 1933
→ Hitler is summoned by Von Papen and Hindenburg to head the government in 1933
  ◆ Called for immediate elections and mounted massive propaganda campaign
  ◆ Reichstag Fire (1933) gave him an excuse to blame the communists
    ● Issued Emergency Decree – given power to search, arrest, and censor ‘until further notice’ and was able to remove political opponents before elections took place
→ March 1933 elections
  ◆ Nazi’s gained 43.9% if total votes casted
    ● DNVP offered Nazi support; deal made with Catholic Centre Party, committing Nazism to protect the Church
    ● Emergency Decree still in effect and was used to expel all communists
  ◆ Passing of the Enabling Act
    ● Destroyed power of Reichstag and allowed chancellor to issue laws without consultation for a period of four years → Hitler’s dictatorial powers
  ◆ Gleichschaltung: A coordination process whereby all German institutions were to conform to Nazi ideals, a removal of groups that might limit his power
Was Nazi Germany a totalitarian state and was Hitler ‘Master of the Third Reich’?

Totalitarianism - absolute control by the state.

1. Where a state aims to control all aspects of public and private life wherever possible.
2. State holds total authority over society, attempts to subordinate the individual to the government’s authority.

The general consensus: Hitler’s regime was not a powerful totalitarian state and Hitler was a ‘weak’ dictator, and although the authority of the Führer was never questioned, historians argue that the formation of policy and decisions about its implementation were a matter of guesswork, as ministers and officials sought to ‘work towards the Führer’, and the regime was chaotic.

Intentionalist / Structuralist argument

- Intentionalist: Hitler as the complete master of Germany
  - Clear goals from the start, made all major decisions, ideology was consistent and served as the basis of his policies
    - Articulated his arguments in the Hossbach Memorandum (1937) where he laid down aggressive plans for rapid expansion in the east; Mein Kampf
  - Absolute control over ideology, education, economy, army
  - Monocratic nature of rule - everyone looked to Hitler
  - Lack of opposition from 1934
    - No unions; control over media, one-party state, courts, civil service, bargains with army, church and big businesses
  - Control of powerful security system (police, Gestapo, SS)
  - Far-reaching propaganda machine (press, radio. all forms of art and culture)

- Structuralist / functionalist: Hitler was a ‘weak’ dictator and went with the flow brah
  - Nazi programmes were left unfinished
    - Plans for economic recovery not carried through fully
- Suggested that Germany might be ready for war in 1942-1943 in the Hosbach memorandum (1937) but honestly, rearmament was incomplete and the war economy was in its early stages in 1942
  - Lacked clear goals; decisions were influenced by events
    - Formation of policy and decisions about implementation was guesswork
    - No clear planning / consistent direction, scope of action limited by events and decisions ignored by people - let his cronies do his work for him
  - Hitler’s personality: Lazy, erratic, easily bored (especially economics!)
  - Opted out of government (very often in his summer villa in Bavaria)
    - Set ministers against one another with overlapping duties, e.g. Goering and Goebbels not on speaking terms; Bormann and Himmler despised each other
    - Allowed ministers and mayors to give different decisions and compete for influence - encouraged this, sometimes
    - Permanent confusion over planning, especially in war
2.2.3 Hitler’s consolidation of power

Creating a one-party state (March – July 1933)

- Disbanding political parties
  - German Communist Party (KPD) had been banned under presidential decree, with Hitler using the Reichstag Fire as justification
    - Less extreme socialists were imprisoned
  - DNVP lost its role after it became part of the Nazi coalition, and disbanded
  - Concordat with the Pope concluded political involvement of the Church, leading to the Catholic Centre Party disbanding also
  - Law Against the Establishment of Parties (1933) made it a criminal offence to organize any party outside of the NSDAP
    - The Nazis won like 90% of the vote in the next election in November 1933 because they were the only ones running → took all Reichstag seats

- Centralising the state
  - Nazi infiltration of state (local) governments
    - Seized public buildings and newspaper offices
    - SA violence forced state governments to resign and were replaced by commissioners loyal to the Nazi party
    - Subsequently abolished all German state governments and placed them under control of Nazi governors (Reichstatthalter) and subordinated to the Reich government in Berlin
  - Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (1933)
    - Forced retirement and purging of non-Aryans, Jews and other ‘asocials’ form their positions in administration, courts, education etc.
  - Dissolving left-wing socialist trade unions (1933)
    - German Labour Front (DAF) set up with compulsory membership and employees could no longer negotiate wages and working conditions
- National Socialist Teachers League (NSLB) and Nazi Lecturer’s Association
- Law to Ensure the Unity of Party and State (1933) legally established the one-party state
  - Parallel institutions were still allowed to develop leading to competition between the state and different agencies (sometimes branches of the Nazi Party itself)
    - e.g. Local government the minister-presidents of each *Land* were retained alongside the new Reich governors
  - Though by 1933 most major interest groups had been brought under Nazi control and a one-party state had been created, but it wasn’t 100% secure yet sooo
- Justice system
  - ‘Legal revolution’ ended most of the legal rights established by the Weimar Constitution, all lawyers now under the German Lawyer’s Front
    - Judges had to take an oath of loyalty to the Nazi Party, only judges considered loyal and trained in the ideological foundations of Nazism were appointed
  - People’s Courts and Special Courts
    - Focus on political crimes and treason
    - No juries to deliver Nazi justice more swiftly
    - By 1945, 7,000 out of 16,000 cases tried by these courts resulted in death sentences
- What happened to the Nazi Party
  - Having used the party as an instrument to legally seize power, the Nazi Party was no longer necessary and never became all-pervasive
    - Instead, it was confined mostly to mobilisation purposes
  - Weakened in March 1933
    - March Converts: Many careerists joined which served to weaken the party, members were corrupt and behaved like little Hitlers → loss of popularity
Night of the Long Knives (1933)

- Problems with the SA
  - Often had violent, sometimes uncontrollable behavior
  - Its leader, Ernst Röhm, had ambitions to place himself at the head of a merged SA and army.
    - This would upset the German army, whose loyalty Hitler needed.
  - So Hitler shot his murder husband :( 
  - And also Streser (who attempted to split the party in 1932) and also von Schleicher (former chancellor). Von papen was put under house arrest.

- Confirmation of Hitler’s authority
  - Removal of any internal threats and also to serve as deterrent for future coups
  - Reichstag confirmed Hitler’s powers as having no constitutional bounds, and that authority derived from will of the people (which was what he claimed) could not be challenged
  - Gained the respect of the German army
    - Swore personal oaths of loyalty to Hitler
  - Went well for Goebbels
    - Propaganda-wise, he was able to portray Hitler as a man who had personally saved the country, and this helped in the growing cult of the Führer
    - Left the way open for Himmler’s SS to assume dominance in Germany, while Hitler gained the support of the army commanders

Propaganda

- Ministry for Popular Entitlement (1933) under Goebbels
  - Press control
    - Censorship, Nazi publishers bought up and controlled press, regulated news supply
■ Daily press conferences between editors and Goebbels to ensure that right messages arrived in print – editors were liable for prosecution if they published unapproved material

○ Extensive use of the radio
  ■ Reich Broadcasting Corporation (1933) controlled all broadcasted material
  ■ Important speeches were relayed in public
  ■ The *Volksempfänger* (people’s receiver), a radio set with limited range and no foreign broadcasts were sold cheaply so it became a standard item, with 79% ownership by 1933 → exposure to Nazi views daily, even at home

○ Cinema
  ■ All films were censored and ‘degenerate’ artists forbidden
  ■ Light-hearted entertainment had to conform to Nazi ideological principles.
    • Imagine porn with toothbrush moustaches and swastikas on dicks

○ Culture
  ■ Standard greeting was now ‘Heil Hitler’ salute
  ■ Swastikas everywhere
  ■ Meetings, rallies, festivals, to celebrate Hitler’s birthday and the anniversary of his appointment as chancellor
  ■ Sporting events (Olympics in Berlin!) that provided opportunities to extol Nazism

○ Other things
  ■ Even fucking stamps carried Nazi slogans
  ■ Posters bearing Nazi quotes were put up in offices, public buildings

*While the German people were also subject to a number of other influences, most notably repression, the very ubiquity of propaganda must have played some role in strengthening the regime. Propaganda was, according to the historian David Welch, more successful in reinforcing than in countering existing attitudes. Insofar as it was able to do that, however, it must take some credit for the ease with which Hitler was able to consolidate his rule.*
Force, repression, fear

- Police centralized under Himmler as Chief of Police (1936)
  - SS (Schützstaffel) and its subsection the SD (Sicherheitsdienst), the security service
    - Highly trained, Aryan organisation with extensive powers as a military force and political police
    - Ran and guarded the concentration camps, beginning with Dachau in March 1933.
    - Racial superiority and genetic programmes, controlled labour supplies and factories
    - Had own fighting units to rival the regular army
  - The Gestapo was the state secret police force, established by Goering in 1933.
    - Root out, intimidate opposition
    - Limited numbers and often engaged in bureaucratic work, therefore relied on spies and informers to betray their colleagues, neighbours, sometimes family
- Surveillance
  - Individual was made aware of non-conformity (political, racial, or moral)
  - State employed informants, including ‘block wardens’ who would search homes
- Civil Service Law (1933) and partial courts
  - The law was re-interpreted according to the will of the Führer and the ‘best interests’ of the German community
    - Judges whose political beliefs conflicted with Nazism lost their positions
    - Lawyers were members of Nazi Lawyers Association, required to study Nazi ideology
      - Individuals given trial faced bias
- Concentration camps
  - Not extermination camps, but might as well be
    - Brutal places, long hours, meagre rations
Between 1933-1939, around 225,000 Germans were convicted of political crimes and a further 162,000 were placed in ‘protective custody’ in prison without trial.

**Nature, extent, and treatment of opposition**

- The army was an institution capable of stopping Hitler from realizing his ambitions
  - Left army structurally unchanged until 1938
  - However, Nazification attempts were made through:
    - Adoption of the swastika insignia
    - Nazi training schemes
    - Indoctrination of Nazi ideology
  - Army would come to favour Nazi’s enforcement of law and order and repudiation of the disarmament clauses in the Treaty of Versailles
    - Restoration of conscription in 1935 came with promise to expand the peacetime army to more than 500,000 men → met with favour
  - Some opposition remained
    - Concern over the role of the SS, which had expanded its influence after the destruction of the SA, despite being a ‘domestic police force’
    - Establishment of Waffen SS as a part of the wartime army and expansion of SS-Totenkopf (Death’s Head) caused unease in professional army leadership
  - Dismissal of the Werners
    - Commander-in-chief Werner von Fritsch condemned the pace of rearmament and existence of SS; Fritsch was eventually dismissed on the grounds of alleged (and disproved) homosexuality
    - War General Werner von Blomberg, opposed the plans at the Hossbach memorandum (1937) and was strongly against idea of war against Russia (traditional ally) for Lebensraum; Dismissed, alleging that the woman he had just married was a prostitute
● After the Werners were gone, Hitler became his own war minister in 1938
  ■ Reshuffled army against those who had failed to support his ideas, 16 generals left and 44 transferred → power now consolidated

● Political opposition
  ○ Internal opposition
    ■ Dealt with in Night of the Long Knives (1933), see above
  ○ External opposition
    ■ Communists (KPD)
      ● Almost eliminated in the first year of Nazi rule, any remaining members formed underground cells that sent out shit-talking leaflets
    ● *Rote Kapella* (Red Orchestra): Resistance network gathered information to send to the Russians, broken up in 1942
    ● Many leading Communists left to fight in the Spanish Civil War and was killed; remaining resistance badly compromised by Nazi-Soviet Pact (1939)

■ Intellectuals with strong Protestant beliefs
  ● White Rose Resistance (1942): Hans & Sophie Scholl, university students influenced by Christian beliefs and humanist idealism → openly condemned the Nazi regime’s moral and spiritual values, threw pamphlets in Munich University in broad daylight
  ● Very obviously executed

■ Traditional elites / conservatives mostly supported Hitler
  ● 1938-1939: Small group in the military lead by General Ludwig Beck became deeply opposed to Hitler out of the fear that he was leading Germany into disaster by going to war in Europe
  ● 1943: Resurrection of aforementioned sentiments after defeat in Stalingrad, but the movement was weak because there was no united purpose
• Bomb Plot (1944) failed → 7000 arrested, 6000 executed

• Private opposition
  ○ At home, individuals might read banned literature, listen to foreign news broadcasts, protect Jews and other Nazi victims or even refuse to join Nazi organisations or contribute to campaigns
  ○ Opposition was prevalent amongst the youth
    ▪ The Swing Movement listened to American jazz music - this behaviour tended to be more hormone inspired than politically inspired
    ▪ Edelweiss pirates: working-class youths who formed gangs in response to alienation brought about by Hitler Youths.

Overall, there was very little opposition to Nazi rule in Germany - the Third Reich collapsed due to military defeat, not opposition. Hitler had the sheer majority of German people behind him - this has been explained by propaganda, repression, and the general success of Hitler’s policies both at home and, until 1943, abroad. Germany’s resistance was a ‘resistance without people’.
2.2.4 Hitler’s domestic and foreign policy

**Economic**

Aims

1. To overcome the effects of the Great Depression and restart the economy
2. To achieve autarky so that Germany could have a *Wehrwirtschaft* (war economy)

**Reducing unemployment**

- Unemployment had peaked at 6 million in 1932, but was already beginning to fall by January 1933 due to a general world recovery after the Great Depression (revival of trade cycle, increase in public investment).
- Policies
  - Provided marriage allowances to women to remove them from the market + forced Jews out of work → created more jobs for German men
  - Government infrastructure projects to create work, e.g. reforestation, land reclamation, road-building, construction, subsidies given to companies to hire more workers
  - Reintroduction of conscription (March 1935) → decrease youth unemployment
- Impact
  - Labour shortage by 1939

**Car industry, autobahn**

- Policies
  - *Autobahns* were paid for by the state and built by private companies (provided orders for them)
    - Law for construction of 7000km of *autobahnen*
  - Car manufacturing was made the most important industry – people tempted with prospect of car ownership
People’s Car, designed for everyone to own a car by paying for it in instalments, but never went into full production and only members of the Nazi elite could acquire the models → largely propaganda

**Impact**
- Meant to boost employment, stimulate car production and aid military communications but the surface was too weak for tanks + didn’t create much employment
- Unemployment figures were due to the removal of women & Jews from the workforce and people being put in concentration camps

**New Plan (1934)**
- Introduced because there was inflation and balance of payments deficit (import expenditure > export revenue) → total government control of trade and currency exchange, supported:
  - Increased government regulation of imports
  - Development of trade with less developed countries
  - Development of German trade with central and southeast Europe
- Policies
  - Prioritised imports for the heavy industry, especially armaments industry
  - Suspended Germany’s interest payments on foreign debt, and completely stopped repayment in June 1934
- Impact
  - (+) Trade surplus, industrial production increased
  - (-) No significant increase in exports, efficiency and policy of printing secret government bonds lead to inflation → Germany still needed to import raw materials for re-armament

  ■ Link to autarky :^)
  - 1936: New economic crisis over balance of payments
President of Reichsbank, Dr Hjalmar Schacht (non-nazi) argued that this could only be solved by decreasing government spending on rearmament → countered Nazi plans, opposed by armed forces

_Wehrwirtschaft + Four-Year Plan (1936)_

- Hitler puts Goering in charge of Four-Year Plan to make Germany self-sufficient and ready for war in, guess what, 4 years
  - Regulations controlling foreign exchange, labour, raw material distribution and prices (control imports)
  - Increase agricultural production
  - Emphasis on production of heavy machinery
  - Emphasis on autarky; plans were to be built for production of synthetic materials, e.g. synthetic rubber and fuel → government invested in R&D, armaments production, offered producers increased investment to produce more

- Impacts:
  - (+) Production in some key industries increase; unemployment fell
    - By 1938 German production increased by >100% from 1933 levels
    - Unemployment level fell to 300,000
  - (+) No sign of unrest / dissent, Germany took over Austria and Czechoslovakia → provided much-needed resources for war effort
  - (-) Autarky failed as Germany still had to import 20% of its food and >30% of its raw materials
  - (-) Economy was never prepared for a long war
    - Occasionally there were serious food shortages, alleviated by price controls / rationing

**Impacts of economic policy**

- Overall, there was no clear economic policy
○ Hitler ignorant saw economics as subordinate to politics, accepted any unorthodox economic policies
○ Nazis did not work any economic miracles, nor did they implement anything distinctive
  ■ Recovering like the rest of the world by 1933
  ■ Benefitted from the revival of world trade and injection of public investment
○ No change in economic structure
  ■ Hitler originally claimed that he wanted to build a more modern and less class-ridden Germany society
  ■ When he came to power, he refused to let a political revolution affect the socio-economic sphere
○ Remained capitalistic
  ■ Private property, individual entrepreneurship, economic competition
  ■ Hitler didn’t really care who owned industries, just if they achieved his aims
● Industrialists / big businesses
  ○ Private companies played an indispensable role in the Nazi rearmament programme
  ○ Nazi government pouring massive amounts of money for R&D and expansion of production → pressure to form cartels / monopoly firms to increase efficiency
    ■ 40% of German production under monopoly control in 1933 → 70% in 1937
  ○ Smashing of labour / trade unions was good for them
● Large landowners
  ○ Large landed estates were not broken up
  ○ Hitler as an instrument of the capitalist?
    ■ No. He wasn’t.
    ■ Extermination of Jews (skilled labour) was economically unsound
Sought to destroy the USSR, which is surprisingly a capitalist ally

War was fought on very inefficient and non-economic lines

- Middle class / small businesses
  - Benefitted from persecution of the Jews → more jobs!
  - Unable to compete with big businesses backed by Hitler → collapsed

- Workers
  - Establishment of organisations
    - Schönheit der Arbeit (SdA or Beauty of Labour) was a 1934 propaganda organization that provided better working facilities, canteens that served hot nourishing meals
    - Kraft durch Freude (KdF or Strength through Joy) was a state organization that provided for paid holidays and cruises, sporting facilities → regimented relaxation activities
  - No trade unions → worker’s rights destroyed and could not argue for better wages / working conditions
    - German Labour Front (DAF) controlled all of this, which was very corrupt
    - Pay rises were accompanied by increases in working hours also → no real benefit, really
  - Workers in military industries gained the most, workers in consumer industries struggled

- Small farms
  - Only Aryan German citizens allowed to own farms → discouraged innovation
  - Farmer debt remained
    - Government spent money to clear their debt but most of this money went to large or medium sized farms
  - Protection of German farmers by increasing tariffs on imported food, but price ceilings meant to stabilize food prices undermined farmer’s profits
  - Slow increase in wages of agricultural labours
    - Migration into towns for higher industrial wages
- Resulting labour shortage in agricultural sector, worsened due to conscription → decrease in agricultural production → rise in food prices
- Shortage solved by taking from conquered territories

- Opportunity costs for rearmament (19334)
  - By 1938, the Nazis had devoted 52% of government spending to rearmament
    - Deficit of 432 million marks → bankrupt
    - Solution to this + driven economy overheating was to go to…
  - War!!
    - Excessive rearmament had caused economy to overhead
    - Government forced to go to war to alleviate the economic problems and fear of social unrest (the typical “distract your population from internal problems”)
    - However, German decision-makers did not seem too concerned about an economic crisis and there is no evidence of social unrest → could have been Hitler’s (international) aims that led to war

Overall, Hitler’s war aims meant that Germany’s economic growth did not really benefit the German population. His economic policy was a failure, as autarky was not achieved, and the product was wasteful and disorganized.

**Wartime economy**

**Was Germany ready for war in 1939?**
- Nope
- Unable to concentrate fully on rearmament because he needed to keep up consumer production - probably ready for short *Blitzkrieg* war, but not total war
  - Hossbach Memorandum (1937) aimed to be ready by 1942
Nazi-Soviet Pact (1939) was evidence that Hitler planned to absorb Poland peacefully + use Polish resources for economic buildup before launching into full-scale war

- Failure to defeat Britain (1940) and USSR (1941) → situation the German economy had not been prepared to sustain: long-war

Albert Speer

- Essential in enabling Germany to continue the war to 1945, turned wartime production around despite opposition against other Nazi leaders e.g. Goering, Himmler, Bormann
- Central Planning Board (1942)
  - Role:
    - Set norms for multiple use of separately manufactured parts to reduce unnecessary duplication
    - Provided for substitution in raw materials, ensured development of new processes
    - Increased industrial capacity (sometimes converted existing plants)
    - Placed bans or limits on manufacture of unnecessary goods
    - Set schedules and issued output comparisons
    - Organised the distribution of labour, machinery and power supplies
  - Impact:
    - Maintenance of labour supplies by using foreign workers → sometimes unreliable (they lived on meagre rations), but successful in increasing wartime production
    - Increase in overall armament production by 50% - guns 27%, tanks 25%, ammunition 97%
    - Production peaked despite military losses, defeats, allied bombing raids
- However, Speer was unable to overcome Germany’s inherent disadvantages in the war
  - Bombing and shrinking resources + advance of allied forces caused the economy to crumble by 1945
Social

Aims

1. Volksgemeinschaft (People’s Community / pure German folk community)

Education

- Teaching
  - Centralised under Reich Education Ministry
    - Teachers / professors forced to join Nazi organisations, subjected to ideological training, e.g. Nazi Teachers’ League and Nazi Lecturers’ League
    - Opposition eliminated with Civil Service Law (1933), all teachers were Reich civil servants by 1939
    - No major changes to education structure
  - Anti-academic ethos, crude indoctrination → eliminated many people
    - By 1938, the recruitment of teachers declined
    - 8,000 vacancies, but only 2,500 came out of teacher training colleges

- Educational emphasis, revision to curriculum
  - Believed that the long-term future of Volksgemeinschaft lay with the young → adopted several different approaches to impress Nazi ideology upon youth
    - Indoctrination
    - Strong Nazi emphasis on physical education (be healthy and strong, 5 hours a week minimum)
  - Differentiation between curriculum for males and females
    - Taught girls to be good homemakers and mothers, emphasised home economics, boys to be brave soldiers
  - German history and biology lessons as means to conveying Nazi philosophy
    - Emphasised nationalism, militarism - encouraged a consciousness of the nation and folklore
- Greatness of Hitler and Nazi Party
- ‘Race science’: taught children Nazi racist ideals, e.g. superiority of the Aryans, Nazi interpretation of Darwin’s theory of selection and survival of the fittest
- ‘Jewish’ theses, e.g. Einstein’s’ theory of relativity, banned

By 1940, there was a realisation that academic standards were falling. In universities, over 3000 professors and lecturers had been sacked for political / racial reasons, and number of higher education students had decreased by nearly half from 1933 to 1939.

**Youth**

- *Hitlerjugend* (HJ, or Hitler Youth)
  - Made compulsory by 1939, but avoided by many
  - Aims:
    1. Train boys for war
    2. Train girls for motherhood
  - What they did:
    - Great emphasis on Hitler’s life and achievements
    - Uniforms, competitions, expeditions, sports, musical activities, theatrical production, artistic display
    - Incessant activity and competition penalising the weak or uncommitted
    - Values of honour, discipline, self-sacrifice encouraged; contempt for moderation, intellect and sensitivity
    - Encouraged youths to spy on parents, report aberrant attitudes
  - Late 1930s
    - Growing emphasis on military drills in training
    - Waning enthusiasm seen in poor attendance at weekly parades
  - Opposition to *Hitlerjugend*
    - Generally well-received, however, the regimentation was disliked by some
■ Rise of limited opposition from youths (late 1930s) in the form of illegal youth groups, e.g. Edelweiss Pirates, Swing Movement → either apolitical, loosely organised, had unclear aims

Difficult to gauge effect of Nazi youth policies, but willingness of millions of youth to fight for the Nazi cause when war broke out suggests some degree of success. Extra youth activities sapped energy and educational performance declined.

Women and family

• *Kinder, Kuche, Kirche* (Children, Church, Kitchen)
  ○ Nazi ideology and *Volksgemeinschaft* were utterly opposed to social and economic equality of women
  ○ Ideal woman had blonde hair, blue eyes, and was homely (opposed to the slim and beauty-obsessed career types)
    ■ Believed that the duties of women were as mothers, supporting their husband, and community organisers; not to be involved in politics / paid employment and home was their domain
    ■ German’s Women Enterprise (DFN), Nazi Womanhood (NSF) formed to increase anti-feminist ideology
  
• Stay at home!
  ○ Forcing them out of employment
    ■ Nazi Party excluded women from senior party positions
    ■ In 1934, married women were forced out of careers in medicine, legal profession and civil service, declared ineligible for jury service, ‘could not think logically’
  ○ Discrimination in education
    ■ Only 10% of university entrants were female → shortage of professional and technically experts in late 1930s led to relaxation of policy
  ○ Law for the Reduction of Unemployment (1933)
- Provided generous, interest-free loans to encourage them to withdraw from work
- Employment of women fell from 37% in 1933 to 31% in 1937, but this was reversed due to pressures of WWII

- Encouraging motherhood
  - Family and marriage
    - Closure of birth control centres, abortion made illegal unless necessary for eradication for ‘genetic defects’
    - Only genetically pure were allowed to procreate - required certificate of ‘fitness to marry’ before a marriage license could be issued
    - ‘Unproductive’ marriages could be ended in 1938; couples found cohabiting after their marriage were banned and sent to concentration camp
  - Increase of maternity benefits
    - Income tax allowances for dependent children raised
    - Large families enjoyed concessions on school fees and railway fares
    - Prolific mothers given medals

- Lebensborn (Life Springs Programme)
  - State-run brothels were Aryan women were impregnated by SS men
  - Goal of raising the birth rate of "Aryan" children via extramarital relations of persons classified as "racially pure and healthy" based on Nazi racial hygiene and health ideology

- Reversal of policy
  - Labour shortages
    - Shortage of technical and professional exports relaxed educational discrimination
    - Labour shortage in 1936 during rearmament plans → women drawn back into factories
  - Impact of the war
- Introduced compulsory agricultural labour service for women (1939)
- Allowed women aged 16-45 to be conscripted in war effort

Nazi policies towards women were contradictory - claimed to promote importance of family values but encouraged independent youth that placed the party above the family; extolled conventional morality and importance of marriage, but permitted illegitimate births, easier divorce, and advanced compulsory sterilisation for those with genetic defects. The reversal of policy in 1936-1939 encouraged what had originally been discouraged.

**Religion**
- The Protestant Church
  - Background
    - Germany was 58% Protestant in 1933
    - Strong tradition of respect and cooperation with the state
    - Both supported traditional values (e.g. family) and were anti-semitic, anti-communist → supported the Nazi ideology
  - Relationship with the Nazis
    - Growing tensions between the two - Church encouraged love and cooperation; Nazis focussed on hate and struggle
    - Did not officially condemn Hitler’s atrocities (e.g. Night of Long Knives, concentration camps) → failed to carry out a sustained sense of human and civil rights
    - Nazis aimed to control the Church hierarchy, weaken its influence, replace Christianity with a Nazi religion
    - Effective opposition / resistance lay in the hands of individuals like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who were barely able to restrain the regime
  - Reich Church (1933)
    - Set up with the aim of coordinating the Protestant churches under the authority of a Reich bishop
Pastors wore SS/SA uniforms, sought to glorify strength, violence, war

Opposition from members of the Protestant Church → Pastor’s Emergency League (organised resistance group) broke from Reich Church in 1934 to form the Confessional Church

Protestant Church now split in three - ‘official’ Reich Church, German Christians (pro-Nazi), and the Confessional Church (oppositional)

Shift from direct persecution to attempts to curb its activities in 1934

Confessional schools abolished, religious teaching downgraded in schools

*Hitlerjungen* activities took up time on Sundays to hinder their attendance on Sunday services / other Church activities

The Catholic Church

Background

- Germany was 32% Catholic in 1933
- Came to terms with Nazis

Concordat (1933)

- Vatican recognised the Nazi regime
- Promised not to interfere in politics
- State promised not to interfere in Catholic Church, which would keep its control over its education, youth, and communal organisations

Violating the Concordat (1933-1939)

- Propaganda insulted clergy, Catholic practice to encourage anti-Catholic sentiments
- Closure of Catholic schools (almost eliminated by 1939), Catholic organisations and societies removed

Pope Pius XII (1939)

- Failed to condemn Nazism outright, tolerant of regime → faced post-war accusations of collaborating with Nazism, and criticism over the failure of opposing the Holocaust

Neo-Paganism (hahah what)
○ German Faith Movement
  ■ Pagan movement that embraced Nazi beliefs, including *Blut und Boden* (blood and soil) ideology and rejection of Christian ethics
  ■ Particularly strong amongst SS
  ■ Influenced policy, e.g. banning of carols and plays (1938), replacement of Christmas with Yuletide during war years

Overall, the Churches almost completely surrendered to the Nazi political leadership, despite some opposition from the breakaway Confessional Church and some individual clergymen (see Niemoller, Bonhoeffer). Christianity as a whole was not affected - Church attendance remained steady, even increased in war years.

**Arts / culture**

- Nazi view of art
  ○ Perceived as media for reinforcing Germans’ shared statehood and race
  ○ Despised modernist styles of the Weimar era, looked to exploit ‘traditional’ art
    ■ Unadventurous, of high moral standing
    ■ Dominated by Aryanism, glorified mythical past
  ○ Main themes
    ■ Blood and soil
    ■ Anti-feminism, e.g. the ‘Gretchen Myth’
    ■ Anti-semitism in all aspects of composition, performance, and present in the themes of literature and film
    ■ Order and return to classical tradition, underpin Nazi notions of superiority of the state and permanence of the Reich
- Goebbebebebel
  ○ Goebbels was the Minister of Propaganda and Popular Enlightenment, imposed rigorous censorship on all art forms, encouraged those with suitable propaganda messages
○ Burning of the books (May 1933)
  ■ Physically destroyed works associated with jews, Bolsheviks, and
    ‘Negroes’ + anything ‘decadent’ and ‘un-German’
○ Volksempfanger (people’s receiver)
  ■ Mass-produced radio found in over 70% of German houses by 1939
  ■ German classical music, light entertainment and traditional Germanic
    tunes and songs e.g. Wagner, whose music was appropriated for Nazism
● Fine arts, music
  ○ Great German Art exhibition
    ■ Basically an annual propaganda pageant
    ■ Reich Kulturkammer (Reich Chamber of Culture) ensured only arts
      ‘suitable for the masses were permitted → suppressed talent
  ○ Expulsion of many artists / voluntary exile
    ■ Composers Schoenberg, Hindemith and Kurt Weill all left the country
  ○ Banning of works
    ■ Jewish composers, e.g. Mahler and Mendelssohn
    ■ Removal of modernist paintings
    ■ Prohibition of American jazz, foreign dance-band music, or Niggermusik
  ○ Increased popularity of art exhibition as attendance was subsidised and
    encouraged through Hitlerjungen and other organisations
    ■ Wagnerian Bayreuth Festival (minority interest → popular festival)
○ Reich Film Chamber
  ■ Film was a useful popular diversion - propagandist + ‘shared experience’
    of relaxation, community-building
  ■ Some films lacked subtlety in their message, e.g. The Eternal Jew
  ■ Cinema showed newsreels before main picture, admission restricted to
    beginning of programme → all filmgoers sat through a certain amount of
    propaganda
Individual creativity and inspiration was lost in the interests of *Gleichshaltung* and the desire to use culture as a propagandist tool. Music suffered the least, while other forms of art were reduced to fake posturing. After the war, artistic expression in West Germany picked up where it had left off after the Weimar Republic, as if the Nazi era had never existed.

**Treatment of Minorities**

- Jews
  - Why people hated the Jews
    - Anti-semitism was the central policy of *Volksgenmeinschaft*, but anti-semitism had already been embedded in German society
    - Jews were a minority (<1%) but they held a disproportionately large amount of economic power and a lot of them were lawyers, doctors, editors, writers, etc
    - Scapegoats for everything → Great Depression, killing Jesus, rapid industrialisation and urbanisation
  - Why the Nazis especially hated the Jews
    - Aryan > Jews
    - Believed that the Jews were destroying their culture
    - Many prominent communists were Jewish (e.g. Trotsky, Lenin, Zinoviev) and they were seen as a link to communism

Measures taken against the Jews (gradualist anti-semitism)

→ 1933

- Hitler announces official boycott against Jewish shops and professional services
  - Not widely supported, dropped due to domestic and international opposition → ineffective

→ 1934

- Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (1934)
• Removal of all Jewish peoples from government posts, classified them as non-Aryans, Hindered their occupational lives
• German cartels took over Jewish businesses → Aryanised
  ◆ Subsequent laws in 1934 banned them from other professions and the media
  ◆ Violence towards Jewish peoples
    • Uncoordinated, unofficially carried out by SS
→ 1935
  ◆ Nuremberg Race Laws (1935)
    • Reich Citizenship Act deprived German Jews of all civil rights
    • German citizenship from those with 1 or more Jewish grandparents was removed
    • Jews not allowed to marry Aryans
→ 1937
  ◆ Measured taken to remove Jews from professions and businesses (Aryanisation)
  ◆ Propaganda depicting Jews as ‘polluters’ of the Aryan race increased
  ◆ Jewish children were humiliated in schools
→ 1938
  ◆ Clear radicalisation of Nazi anti-semitism
    • All Jewish property had to be registered
    • Jews not allowed to take their assets out of Germany → did not leave, not many countries willing to accept them
    • Over 15,000 Polish Jews in Germany were expelled
    • Banning of Jews from commerce
    • Forced to have Jewish forenames e.g. Israel or Sarah
    • Carried identity cards and internal passports
    • Restriction of social life - not allowed to go to cinema / theatre
    • Mandatory wearing of Yellow Star of David
  ◆ Night of Broken Glass, Kristallnacht (November 1938)
    • Thousands of Jewish homes, shops and synagogues destroyed
• > 100 Jews killed and 25,000 sent to concentration camps
• Instigated by a 17-year-old Polish Jew assassinating the German legislation secretary in Paris → Hitler pulled back the police to allow the attack on Jews, ordinary citizens were involved

◆ Post-Kristallnacht
• Jewish students expelled from schools
• By December 1938, Jewish businesses were closed and sold off, all Jews in skilled jobs were sacked

→ 1939 onwards (WWII)

◆ Up to 1939, Nazis forced to Jews to migrate
• Almost 150,000 did, but around 300,000 stayed on, hoping that the persecution might eventually lessen

◆ Invasion of Poland (September 1939)
• Placed 3 million Jews to the German empire
• Jews placed in ghettos, forbidden to change residence, subject to curfew and compelled to perform labour service

◆ Madagascar Plan (1940)
• Plan to relocate the Jewish population of Europe to the island of Madagascar → abandoned after defeat against Britain, as they lost control of the seas
• Left millions of Jews stranded and facing death through malnutrition, hard labour - mass shooting carried out during the German advance into Russia in June 1941

◆ Wannsee Conference (January 1942) → The Final Solution
• Jews gassed in concentration camps created at Auschwitz, Chelmo, Majdanek and Treblinka according to social goals of ethnic purity and cleansing
• Scarce resources were diverted to facilitate this Holocaust despite them struggling with the war
- Approximately 6 million Jews were killed

- Asocials
  - Reason for persecution
    - Hitler was convinced of the need to maintain a racially pure and healthy
      Germanic master race (the Aryans, as usual)
    - Law Against Dangerous Habitual Criminals (1933)
      - Rounding up 300,000-500,000 beggars and tramps
      - Young given work permits
      - ‘Work-shy’ sent to concentration camps, made to wear a black triangle,
        could also be sterilised since ‘social deviance’ was considered genetic
    - Work-Shy Reich (1938)
      - Another big round up of 10,000 tramps
      - Sent to Buchenwald, few survived
  - Reich Central Agency for Struggle Against Juvenile Delinquency (1939)
    - Youth concentration camp set up in Moringen near Hannover in 1940
    - Youths subjected to biological + racial examination, those considered
      unreformable were sterilised
  - Community Alien Law (1940)
    - Those considered deficient in mind / character treated like youths above
    - Plan abandoned because of the war

- Black Germans
  - >400 sterilised due to compulsory sterilisation programmes in 1933

- Homosexuals
  - Failed to meet Nazi ideals (creation of Aryan offspring) → 15,000 sent to
    concentration camps over blame of lowering birth rates
    - Total imprisoned was over 50,000
  - Any member of the SS who was thought to be a homosexual was sent to a
    concentration camp to be killed
○ Wore pink triangles, castrated, subjected to medical experiments

● Jehovah’s Witnesses
  ○ Believed that they owed their allegiance to God and God alone → refused to swear an oath of allegiance to Hitler (problematic to the Nazi regime)
    ■ Given chance to renounce religion / convert to mainstream Christianity
    ■ Those who did not were marked with purple triangles and sent to concentration camps

● Biological outsiders
  ○ Eugenics Law (1933)
    ■ Compulsory sterilisation of those with specified hereditary illnesses
    ■ >350,000 sterilised and forbidden to marry fertile partners
  ○ Euthanasia Programme (1939)
    ■ Originated from a propaganda campaign to devalue people with mental / physical disabilities as ‘burdens on the community’
    ■ Did not fit in with Nazi stereotypes of pure Aryan race (e.g. physically fit, obedient mind to serve the Reich) → seen as a strain on resources
    ■ 72,000 people had been murdered, and a secret programme ‘14F13’ had led to the gassing of 30,000-50,000 in concentration camps

● Roma / Gypsies
  ○ Nomadic, did not have regular jobs → seen as racially undesirable
    ■ Over 220,000 were sent to concentration camps
    ■ Subjected to medical experiments carried out by Josef Mengele

The Few Good Things that Came Out of Volksgemeinschaft

● Eintopf (one pot meal) campaign
  ○ Germans encouraged to eat a single one pot meal on Sundays
  ○ Also encouraged to donate money to a welfare programme

● Winter Relief Campaign (1938)
  ○ Provided 9 million with monetary support
Foreign

Overview of 1933-1936

- Continuity and revisionism (attempting to revise parts of the Treaty of Versailles)
  - Hitler played the diplomat because Germany was still recovering from the impacts of the Great Depression
  - His own domestic political position was not yet secure
  - German armed forces were still weak; rearmament had not yet commenced
- Revisionism was a success by 1936

Timeline of 1933-1936

➔ 1933: League, isolating France
  - World Disarmament Conference (1933)
    - Hitler pulled out, then pulled out of LON
    - Seen as reasonable by some, particularly Britain, as France seemed to act unreasonably and refused to disarm to the level of Germany / let Germany rearm to France’s level
  - German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact (1934)
    - Undermined France’s Little Entente, a defensive system of alliances with Eastern European states including Poland → designed to put pressure on Germany’s Eastern Frontier and deter a future invasion of France
    - Hitler was seen as a reasonable statesman; France came off as petulant
➔ 1934-1935: First attempt at Anschluss, Stresa Front
  - Failed attempt at Anschluss (1934)
    - Attempted coup by Austrian Nazis was backed by Hitler
    - Mussolini supported the independence of Austria → placed troops at the border to prevent this → alienated Britain, France but lead to failure of Anschluss attempt
  - Stresa Front (March 1935)
• Hitler announced that Germany had an air force again, reintroduced
  conscription → formation of the Stresa Front between Britain, France, and
  Italy to resist further moves by Germany to overturn the Treaty of
  Versailles without negotiation

◆ Anglo-German Naval Agreement (June 1935)
  • Anglo-German Naval Agreement allowed expansion to 35% of the British
    navy → violation of the Treaty of Versailles
  • Failure to discuss this agreement with France / Italy → decline of the
    Stresa Front

◆ During the Abyssinian Crisis (October 1935)
  • Hitler offers support to Mussolini, Britain and France (reluctantly)
    opposed his actions → Italy leaves Stresa Front, moves closer to Nazi
    Germany

→ 1936: Gettin’ gainz

◆ Remilitarization of the Rhineland (March 1936)
  • League’s weak response to Manchurian / Abyssinian Crisis → encouraged
    Hitler to send German troops into Rhineland (demilitarised zone, violated
    Treaty of Versailles) though Germany was not strong enough to fend off
    opposition
  • Persuaded troops to retreat at first sign of opposition, but there was none
    as Britain had persuaded France to take no action → strengthened Hitler’s
    resolve to increase aggression

◆ Rome-Berlin Axis (November 1936)
  • Signed with Fascist Italy as the two countries had been cooperating since
    July 1936 in assisting the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War
  • Establishment of alliance removed opposition to Anschluss

By the end of 1936, Hitler had overturned most of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles relating to
Germany’s western borders without facing significant opposition → Hitler felt that he could turn
his attentions to winning lebensraum in the east
Overview of 1937-1939

- The road to war
  - Germany was in a stronger position
    - Rearmament well under way
    - Economic crisis (negative balance of payments) mainly over
    - Four-Year Plan (1936) progressing well, producing results
    - Anti-Comintern Pact (1936) signed between Germany and Japan was joined by Italy in 1937

Timeline of 1937-1939

➔ 1937

- Hosbach Memorandum (November 1937)
  - Hitler laid plans to get Germany ready for conquests in Eastern Europe by 1943-1945, included plans for Anschluss and seizure of Czechoslovakia even if it provoked war with Britain and France
  - Intentions encouraged by Chamberlain, who declared that Britain would support legitimate revisions to Germany’s borders with Austria and Czechoslovakia as long as they were carried out peacefully

➔ 1938

- Second attempt at Anschluss (March 1938) → Succeeded
  - Used Austrian Nazi Party to bring about a crisis, ‘solved’ by sending in German troops
  - No opposition by Britain or France
- Munich Agreement (September 1938)
  - Germany, Italy, Britain, France; USSR and Czechoslovakia were not included in the discussions (the USSR because they had a mutual assistance treaty to protect Czech independence)
  - Agreed that the Czech government should hand Sudetenland to Germany in exchange for it being Hitler’s last territorial demand
Nazi Germany increased its population, added significantly to its industrial and agricultural resources without having to take up arms; Czechoslovakia's ability to resist future aggression was greatly reduced, former border defences were in German hands

→ 1939

◆ German Invasion of Czechoslovakia (March 1939)
  ● Hitler ordered it
  ● No opposition from Britain and France, what are they doing
◆ Pact of Steel (May 1939)
  ● Germany and Italy → strengthen their military alliance
◆ Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact (August 1939)
  ● Germany and USSR signed this ten-year non-aggression pact with a secret clause to divide Poland between them
  ● Ensured that Germany would not have to fight a two-front war
◆ German Invasion of Poland (1st September 1939)
  ● Convinced that Britain and France would not honour their guarantee of Polish independence (announced in 1939), Germany invaded Poland
◆ Declaration of war (3rd September 1939)
  ● Britain and France finally took action
  ● Hitler was surprised at → faced a war that he had not anticipated

Historiography

● Hitler was a master planner (intentionalist / orthodox) and master baiter
  ○ Statements in Mein Kampf, Hossbach Memorandum showed that he followed a consistent policy of wanting to wage war
    ■ Reversal of Treaty of Versailles
    ■ German status as a world power
    ■ Lebensraum
    ■ Greater Germany
■ Expansion towards the east
  ○ But he ended up allies with Russia, and fighting Britain despite opposition against
    Communism and admiration towards Britain → not according to plan
■ Hitler was a gambler (revisionist / structuralist)
  ○ Foreign policy improvised, made most of external opportunities as they arose
    ■ Remilitarisation of the Rhineland where he was prepared to withdraw, but
      no one interfered, so he didn’t
  ○ Was just responding to internal economic problems
    ■ Rearmament would increase employment and win the support of the army
    ■ Made Germany look strong (especially in contrast to the Weimar years) →
      strengthening of Hitler’s position
  ○ Possibly had long-term aims, but was flexible in achieving them
2.3.1 Origins and nature of Mussolini’s Fascist Italy

In which Mussolini is not yet around (pre-1919 Italy)

Problems with liberal Italy before 1914

- Italian politics
  - *Risorgimento* nationalist movement succeeded in creating a unified and independent Italy but had several underlying problems leaving the process incomplete.
  - Politics was dominated by liberals that were afraid of the influence of the left (socialists, anarchists, republicans) and the right (church), restricting voting to 2% of the adult population
    - German resentment at this restriction, aggravated by corruption
    - *Transformismo*: Politicians making deals with one another to alternate political control due to lack of mass parties and party discipline → undermined parliamentary democracy before 1922.
- Regional divisions
  - Italians felt more loyalty towards their own town or region that towards the national government
    - Poor communication in mountain ranges hindered development of national identity amongst population
    - South was neglected due to lack of railway and road
  - Social and economic inequalities
    - Fertile lands were part of large estates (*latifundia*) owned by a small minority of wealthy landowners, vast majority of population was extremely poor
South was poorer than the northern central areas, due to geography and climate. Poverty in these regions often lead to conflict between the wealthy landowners, farmers, peasant sharecroppers, and rural labourers.

- Establishment of industry in the north, eg. Flat car company (1899) created a large industrial working class, a sizeable lower-middle class and a powerful class of rich industrialists and bankers → clashes between employers and employees drove them to join socialists and anarchists or emigrate to the USA.
  - *Terra irredenta* or ‘unredeemed land’ (areas previously inhabited by Italian speakers but ruled by Austria-Hungary), which many Italians wanted to reclaim.
    - eg. Trentino and Trieste in northern Adriatic
    - Looking at Germany’s example, many Italians hoped unification would enable Italy to join the top tank of European powers by establishing its own empire.
    - Italy faced defeat in Abyssinia (1896) and pressed for a more aggressive imperial policy

**Impact of WWI and peace treaties (1914 - 1919)**

Italy remained neutral in WWI as the Entente nations promised that they would grant Trentino, Trieste, along with other territories.

- The Treaty of London
  - Italy promised to join the war on the side of the Triple Entente
  - *Associazione Nazionalista Italiana (ANI)* was Italy’s first right-wing nationalist party, formed in 1910. It supported war against Austria as a way of gaining the *terra irredenta*. The ANI grew close to Mussolini’s Fascist Party, and merged with it in 1923.
- Involvement in WWI
• War did not go well for Italy, they were ill-equipped and ill-supplied
  ■ Poor military leadership lead to the Italy fighting a costly war of attrition
  ■ Italian officers often sacrificed thousands of lives needlessly- in all, over 600,000 Italians were killed, about 450,000 permanently disabled, and a further 500,000 seriously wounded
• Economic impact
  ■ To finance its involvement, the government had borrowed heavily from Britain and the US, causing national debt to rise from 16 to 85 billion lire.
  ■ They also printed more banknotes, causing rapid inflation between 1915 to 1918, destroying the savings of the middle class, rental incomes for landowner, and wages for workers.
  ■ Economic situation worsened at the end of the war when war industries closed down with the demobilisation of 2.5 million soldiers, giving rise to high unemployment
  ■ The war deepened economic divisions between north and south Italy, where the north was able to pass on inflation to the government while the agricultural south was hit badly
    • The government promised reform to limit the appeal of Bolshevism, which, not surprisingly, did not come
• Peace treaties and the ‘mutilated victory’
  ■ Italy did not gain as much as expected. It received no African territory, or even Flume and northern Dalmatia
    • Vittorio Orlando’s (the Italian prime minister) inability to secure all of Italy’s territorial expectations at Versailles was used by Mussolini and their fascists in their campaign to demonstrate the weakness of the Italian government.
    • Italian nationalists were also disgusted by the terms of the peace agreements, accusing the liberal government of allowing Italy to be humiliated and cheated
In which Mussolini begins to try (1919-1920)

Emergence of new parties

- Italian Popular Party (Popolari) was a Catholic political party
- Italian Socialist Party (PSI)
  - Economic problems resulting from the First World War caused great discontent among industrial and rural workers, moving this party into a more revolutionary position
  - *Biennio rosso* (‘the two red years’)
    - The surge of unemployment in 1919-1920 lead to a wave of militant action from the industrial workers
    - In many areas, especially in the north, socialists seized control of local government. To industrialists and landowners, it seemed like a communist revolution was about to begin.
    - The government, headed by Giovanni Giolitti, didn’t do much, believing that the workers were not a threat and that militancy would soon decline, encouraging the employers and landowners to make concessions.
      - The lack of government action would lead many middle and upper classes to view that the government as dangerously incompetent.
- Arditi (‘the daring ones’)
  - Demobilised and unemployed officers and troops who hated the liberal political system which they felt had betrayed their wartime sacrifices by failing to obtain the land promised to Italy.
  - Many formed across Italy, with increasing use of weapons to attack socialists and trade unionists whom they regarded as enemies of the Italian nation.
- Fascio di Combattimento (‘the combat group’)
  - In March 1919, Mussolini - himself as a member of the Arditi - tried to bring these disparate groups together → Fascio di Combattimento
○ They intended to bring together nationalists and socialists, publishing the *Fascist Programme* in 6 June 1919 combining various left and right-wing demands.
○ These nationalists, syndicalists, artists and ex-servicemen were eventually united by their common hatred of the liberal state

**Gaining support**

When elections for seats in the Italian government were held using a system of proportional representation for the first time, not a single member of Mussolini’s Fasci di Combattimento was elected. He was really sore over only winning like, less than 2% of the Milan vote.

- **Fiume**
  ○ Gabriele D’Annunzio led 2000 armed men into the city of Fiume, an area Italy had sought but not received in the peace treaties. In open defiance of the liberal Italian government and the Allies, they ruled the city for the next 15 months.
  ○ This bold action inspired Mussolini, who adopted some of D’Annunzio’s tactics, e.g. black shirts, their Roman salute, and using parades and balconies for speeches
- **Unrest of biennio rosso** boosted the Fasci
  ○ Offered to send action squads to help factory owners in the north and landowners in Po Valley and Tuscany, who were pleased to give money to these groups in return for the violence against the left
    - Burnt down offices and newspaper printing works belonging to the socialists and trade unions in northern and central Italy
    - Made attempts to destroy the influence of peasant leagues.
  ○ The growing alliance with industrialists, bankers and landowners who would finance the building of a mass base for the Fasci among the middle and lower-middle classes, who feared a socialist revolution.
    - However, their support lacked belief in any coherent political ideology and rather supporter violence and hatred of the socialists.
In September 1920, factory occupations (in the north) + agrarian strikes and land occupations (spreading towards central Italy) + socialists winning control of 26 out of 69 Italian provinces → increased the fear of upper and middle classes of a communist revolution who then turned to the Fasci, who provide successful in suppressing leftist action.

• Mussolini
  • Realised the potential (political, financial) opportunities offered by a more organized use of Fasci action squads.
  • Privately reassured Giolitti and other liberal politicians that talk of a fascist revolution was not to be taken seriously, and as a result, was allowed an electoral alliance for the national elections to be held in May 1921
    ▪ During which, fascist violence continued, and 100 socialists were killed
  • The surrender of D’Annunzio’s Fiume to government military action increased support for the Fasci, and also removed a potentially powerful rival for him.

In the May 1921 national elections, the Fascists won 7% of the vote and taken 35 seats, with Mussolini now a deputy (and all other deputies from the right-wing). The socialists remained the largest with 123 seats; and Popolari with 107.

• Positions in parliament gave fascists an image of respectability as well as a foothold in national politics.

Mussolini then announced, “Fuck Giolitti.”
Mussolini tries harder and succeeds in with his efforts (1921-1922)

**Political instability (1921-1922)**

- Aimed to convince the industrialists, landowners and the middle class of several things:
  - That the liberals were finished as an effective political force
  - That there was a real threat of socialist revolution
  - And that the fascists were strong and determined enough to take necessary action, to restore order and dignity to Italy
- 1921-1922: Weak coalition governments
  - Collapse of the coalition formed between the Popolari and Giolitti, created after Mussolini denied him fascist support.
  - Followed by three weak coalition governments, none of which managed to take effective action against industrial struggles and political violence.
- Appeal to political elites, conservatives
  - During *benio rosso*, the police and army officers often turned a blind eye to fascist violence, sometimes even providing them transport. This attitude changed and the police managed to disperse over 500 fascists at Saranza, north-west Italy
    - Easy dispersal was evidence that the fascists were a party unable to impose law and order.
    - Growing worries of alienation of the conservative elites, and subsequent unification of anti-fascists.
  - Fascist Programme (1919)
    - Aimed at increasing fascist support among conservatives, especially since the new pope, Pius XI, had blessed the fascists’ banners
    - By the end of 1921, many shopkeepers and clerical workers were now in support of the fascists.
  - Dual policy throughout 1922
The local *ras* still continued to endorse the violence of action squads, and the dual policy was required to avoid a split in his party. He made it known to the conservatives that he had no intention seizing power with violence.

Street fighting in areas under fascist control resulted in the police supporting the fascists, as the socialists looked as if they might win.

- Trying even harder
  - A dispersal of a general strike called by the fascists in July 1922 impressed the conservative middle classes
    - This led to renewed contract between Mussolini and the former liberal prime minister to discuss the possibility of the fascists entering a coalition government
    - Used this incident to prove that the socialists were still a threat and, more importantly, a threat that only the fascists could stop.
  - In September, Mussolini declared he was no longer opposed to the monarchy.
    - Further increase fascists’ respectability

- Partito Nazionale Fascista (PNF)
  - Pact of Pacification signed between the moderate socialists and main trade union organization → Angered the *ras*, who were then outmaneuvered when Mussolini resigned, and then persuaded the Fasci members to reform into the PNF.
  - In 1921, Mussolini was able to persuade the Fascist National Congress to elect him as leader. He then ended the Pact of Pacification and ordered all branches to organize action squads.
    - Mussolini could now present himself as the clear and undisputed leader of an organized and united political party

*The March on Rome (October 1922)*
The *ras* made it known that they would march to Rome and seize power, with or without Mussolini’s support.

Mussolini thus needed to appease his more militant supporters (and also intimidate the liberal government into making more concessions) through his participation.

On the night of 27 October, fascist squads took over town halls, railway stations and telephone exchanges across northern Italy. The following day, prime minister Luigi Facta persuaded the king, as commander-in-chief of the army, to declare a state of emergency.

Mussolini was to be arrested.

But he wasn’t.

The King, Victor Emmanuel III, changed his mind, refused to sign the papers authorising martial law. He then asked the conservative Salandra to form a government who advised the king to appoint Mussolini as prime minister.

- Mussolini owes this chum a lot. More than his fascist militia.
- Claims that he refused to sign the declaration of martial law because he could not depend on the army’s loyalty to him, though assured that if faithful, would be able to disperse the fascists. (Historians question his motives, though)

Mussolini accepts the post on 29 October 1922

- Whatever the king’s motives, Mussolini had become prime minister by legal, constitution means- assisted by the fascist violence on the streets

He then took a train to Rome (his metaphorical ‘march’ at the head of the fascist columns), where he partied with the other fascists in the streets of Rome.
2.3.2 Mussolini’s consolidation of power; end of regime

By 1922, Mussolini was prime minister, but still not the head of the fascist government. He began to take steps to increase his power over both the state and his own party.

1922- 1924

- Early Moves
  - In November 22, Mussolini delivered his first speech to parliament, where he
    - Made a veiled threat about the strength of the fascists (300,000 members)
    - Spoke of the desire to create a strong and united Italy
    - Requested emergency powers to deal with Italy’s economic and political problems, which he was granted, by the deputies, including ex-prime ministers Giolitti, Saladra and Facta.
  - Appointment and establishment of new councils
    - The liberal Alberto de Stefani’s was appointed was finance minister. His economic policies, which entailed the reduction of government controls on industry and trade and cutting tax, appealed to the industrials and shopkeepers.
    - The Fascists Grand Council was established to be a supreme decision-making body in the party, which only Mussolini had power to appoint people to.
    - Formed the regional fascist squads into a militia, the National Security Guards (MVSN), which swore loyalty to Mussolini, not the king. This would be useful against anti-fascists and also considerably reduced the power of the ras.
- His announcement that no serious measures would be taken against tax evasion won the support of wealthy companies and individuals; the employer’s organization pledged its support for him.
- In 1923, the small Nationalist Party (a member of the coalition) merged with the Fascist Party, giving them additional paramilitary forces.
  - The Vatican
    - Mussolini announced measures that included renouncing atheism, making religious education compulsory, banning contraception and punishing swearing in public places, prompting the Pope to withdraw support for the Poplari.
  - Winning the April 1924 Elections
    - Acerbo Law: A new electoral law that gave the party or alliance that won the most votes two-thirds of the seats in parliament, as long as the percentage was no less than 25% of the votes cast → Fascists gaining total, legally acquired, control over Italian politics
    - The Corfu Incident → More support
    - Ceka: Secret gang of thugs meant to terrorise anti-fascists in Italy and abroad → :)”
  - Matteotti Crisis (1924)
    - In May 1924, Giacomo Matteotti (socialist) called fraud on the election results, and then he was killed. By the Ceka. And people found out. Which caused Mussolini’s support to deteriorate.

**1925-1928**

- Roberto Farinacci
  - Mussolini assumed ultimate responsibility for Matteotti’s murder. Nonetheless, he made it clear that, rather than resigning, he would continue to rule Italy- by force if necessary
- In 1925, his buddy Farinacci took over while he fell ill. Farinacci launched a new wave of violence, and purged the PNF of members and local leaders who were considered insufficiently loyal.

- Local government and kissing his own ass
  - When he recovered, he imposed a series of laws to control the press, fascist only.
  - Elected mayors and councils of towns and cities were replaced by appointed Fascist officials known as podesta, conservatives drawn from traditional landowning and military elite, excluding the militant fascists over power.
  - Then he banned meetings by opposition parties
  - In December 1925, Mussolini started getting control in central government. He declared himself ‘head of government’, assumed the power to issue decrees without parliamentary approval, making him responsible only to the king. Then there was a new law saying that the king had to get Mussolini’s personal approval for ministerial appointment.

- Creating a one-party state
  - After a failed assassination attempt on Mussolini in October 1926, he expelled all non-PNF deputies and banned their parties from the Chamber
    - Trade unions were outlawed
    - The Special Tribunal, a new court, was established to deal with political offences and carried the death penalty.
    - OVRA was a secret police force charged with suppressing political opponents.
  - Changed the electoral system so that only men aged 21 and over who belonged to fascist syndicates, ensuring that Italy remained a one-party state.

- Other less important things
  - In 1925, he set up OND, a national recreational club, hoping to increase the acceptance of fascist ideology. Many Italians enjoyed the subsidized activities (increasing his support base) but local organisers tended to ignore the indoctrination aspects.
○ The process of *l’inquadramento* was the use of agencies and networks to lead to party contact, hoping to increase the membership of the party. Did not dramatically increase membership.

  - eg. Welfare agencies during the Great Depression providing extra relief; the women’s fasci, to help run them.

○ The Romanita movement portrayed fascism as a revival of, and a return to, ancient Roman civilization to build up the prestige and popularity of Mussolini.

A bunch of shit happened from the late 1920s-1940. Then, Italy’s entry into WWII in 1940 led to increase opposition to Mussolini, and his downfall in 1943.

Mussolini was eventually captured and shot by partisans in 1945.
2.3.3 Mussolini’s domestic and foreign policy

Domestic policy

Economic

- Aims
  - To help Italy achieve greatness by increasing its land area (reclamation), having a strong currency, and striving for autarky.
  - To achieve a corporate state in which a partnership would exist between the state and private economic enterprise in the form of “corporatism”.

- Key policies adopted
  - Battles
    - Battle Over the Southern Problem
    - Battle for Grain
    - Battle for Land
    - Battle for Births
    - Battle for the Lira
  - State Intervention
    - Job-sharing schemes
    - Using public money to prevent the collapse of banks and industries
    - Setting up of the Institute of Industrial Reconstruction (IRI)

- Degree of success (largely unsuccessful)
  - The Battle for Grain did not achieve its aims (increasing grain outputs to reduce foreign imports, enabling Italy to be self-sufficient in wheat)
    - Placed too much emphasis on the production of wheat, causing the misallocation of resources
    - Italy now had to import olive oil
    - Export of fruit and wine also declined
○ Battle of Land managed to reclaim only The Pontine Marshes (limited success). The farming itself, financed from public funds, created work for the unemployed. Just a little bit.
○ Battle of Lira overvalued the Lira → Italian exports expensive → decline in exports (e.g. cars) → unemployment
  ■ Undermined free trade and traditional finance policies adopted by Mussolini.
  ■ Recession worsened the effects of the Great Depression
○ Battle for Births unsuccessful (birth rate declined instead of increasing)
  ■ One third of Italy’s paid workforce remained female despite women being encouraged not to take paid employment
○ Likely that the state interventions were unsuccessful also
  ■ The IRI eventually helped in the formation of huge capitalist monopolies by selling off parts of industries it controlled to relevant larger industries (still under private ownership) → unsuccessful in achieving corporatism

Religious

• Aims
  ○ Reconciliation between state and church
    ■ Long history of disputes
    ■ Good relations would provide stability and security for the state and also allow Mussolini to focus on establishing control over other more important aspects of the state e.g. economy, education, foreign policy
    ■ Beneficial to the church → Fascist state able to enforce religion
• Key policies adopted
  ○ Restoration of Catholic education in state primary schools (mostly to encourage the papacy to end its support for the Popolari)
  ○ Lateran Agreements (1929)
- Granted Vatican City sovereignty under the rope, who would recognise the Italian state, and its possession of rome and other formal papal states
- Cash money as compensation for the loss of Rome
- Concordat: Defined the role of Catholicism in the fascist state. Catholicism would be the sole religion of the state, Catholic education would be made compulsory, Church marriages would be granted full validity. Divorce without church consent was barred.

- Degree of success
  - Mussolini gained support of the church, originally a long-time enemy of the government, who supported him as *Il Duce*. The church also emerged strengthened.
  - Overlaps in interests between the church structure completely intact if not strengthened, aiding the church in its inevitable opposition in the future. While Mussolini was able to win the support of the church in the short term, he was never able to fully control it.
  - Non-believers had Catholic education forced onto them, which was considered a suppression of basic human rights.

**Racism and anti-Semitism**

- Aims
  - Mussolini claimed that ‘prestige’ was need to maintain an empire, which required a clear ‘racial consciousness’ that established ideas of racial ‘superiority’
  - Though he did dismiss anti-Semitism as ‘unscientific’ but the attitude changed, I guess.

- Key policies adopted
  - Charter of Race (1938)
■ Manifesto claimed to offer a ‘scientific’ explanation of fascist racial doctrine, based on the fact that Italians were ‘Aryans’. Jews were therefore not Italian.
■ Implementation of racial laws and decrees that excluded Jewish teachers and children from all state schools, banned interracial marriage, and restricted ownership of property (large companies, or landed estates)
■ Expulsion of foreign Jews, including those with citizenship

- Degree of success (largely unsuccessful)
  ○ Never fully implemented; Italians ignored policies, strongly opposed by the pope and other senior fascist.
  ■ Any extreme forms of racial persecution was carried out by the German Gestapo and SS.

**Propaganda**

- Aims
  ○ Propaganda was used in the hope of creating an obedient nation that would be unable to threaten his authority or oppose his policies. This would give him a free rein to do as he wished.
- Key policies adopted
  ○ Creation of a personal dictatorship over a party dictatorship
  ○ State controlled newspapers
  ○ L’Unione Cinematografica Educativa (LUCE)
  ○ Education system and youth propaganda
- Degree of success
  ○ Media control and censorship was not so successful
    ■ Although a state radio was set up, there was only one set up for every 44 people in Italy (Britain had 1:5 and Germany 1:7) and the independent Vatican Radio still managed to broadcast. Similarly, though the Fascists
tried to establish control over newspapers, the Fascists papers never had more than 10% overall circulation.

- However fascist propaganda found success in Italy in various forms. Public address systems set up in cafes, restaurants and various other public squares ensured that Italians were constantly hearing Mussolini’s speeches.
- All public events such as mass rallies and meetings were consciously turned into political theatre, with full use being made of lighting and music. This not only added to the theatrical impact of Fascist propaganda methods, but also helped to create a modern image for them.

○ Attempts at regulating films, plays, music radio programmes and books were not successful as the traditional liberal culture proved too strong for the fascists to control.

○ Education reforms failed to widen their support base
  - Their concentration on traditional, classical education (especially in the early years of fascism) and introduction of exams made it hard for children to progress to secondary school → this alienated ordinary people whose children were struggling to progress academically and caused to a narrowing of the Fascist support base.

○ There were many loopholes which allowed school children to escape indoctrination of fascist ideals
  - *Opera Nazionale Balilla* (ONB) was made compulsory for all children aged 8-21, which carried out political indoctrination and physical training. However, 40% of children managed to avoid membership of these groups.
  - Private and Catholic schools tended not to enforce membership and children who failed to qualify for secondary school avoided indoctrination in school.
  - There was large contempt for fascist ideas and even some resistance to it in the universities.
Propaganda that portrayed Mussolini as a youthful, energetic leader to convince Italians that he was a hero (with catchphrases, even) were not completely successful due to the presence of the church and monarchy, which undermined Mussolini’s image as an all-powerful leader.

- Highlighted in the Spanish Civil War and WWII when people’s unhappiness with the fascists reached its peak
- It was successful in the short term, making Mussolini popular with sectors of society.
- In the 1930s, Mussolini ended up being convinced by his own propaganda and embarked on an ambitious foreign policy even though Italy wasn’t in a position to deal with a war especially after being ravaged by the Spanish Civil War.

Women and birth rates

- Aims
  - To increase the Italian population to enable Mussolini to amass a large army capable of restoring the former glory of Italy (conquer a large empire similar to that of Rome).
  - More specifically, he wanted to boost population from 40 million to 60 million by 1950.
- Key policies implemented
  - Rocco Criminal law (1932)
    - Banned contraception, sterilization and abortion
    - Also increased husband’s authority over wife in legal and financial terms
  - Restriction of female employment
    - To 10% of jobs (1933) and even in private firms (1938), hoping to encourage women to stay at home and contribute to population growth and look after the family
○ Taxation policies to encourage large families
  ■ Rewarded pregnancies and gave maternity benefits
  ■ Bachelors had to pay extra taxes while couples with 6 or more children
    were granted tax exemption
  ■ Newlyweds were given cheap railway tickets for their honeymoon. (LOL)
○ Homosexuality was outlawed in 1931.

● Degree of success
○ Policies were mainly unsuccessful. Despite the campaign to boost population,
  birth rates dropped throughout the 1930s and 40s
○ Women formed a third of the workforce as more men were hauled into arms
  industries
○ These policies were repressive towards Italian women as a whole and did not
  succeed in encouraging people to boost population.

**Impact on social classes**

● Industrial
  ○ In 1925-1926, workers lost their independent trade unions and their right to strike,
    while employers were able to manage their companies without either interference
    from the state or opposition from their employees.
    ■ Wage cuts (by about 10%)
    ■ End of the eight-hour day and extension of the working week
  ○ The standard of living and the general quality of life for most Italians, especially
    the working classes, declined under fascism.
  ○ Unemployment rose after the Great Depression, public work schemes had little
    effect.
  ○ Old-age pensions and unemployment and health insurance were introduced, and
    education expenditure increased significantly. However, these improvements did
    not make up for the loss of wages and poor working conditions.
• Peasants and agricultural workers
  
  ○ Situation in rural areas worsened under Mussolini, whose policies benefited landowners rather than peasants and agricultural workers.
    ■ In 1922, a law was introduced to split the large estates and redistribute the land, but this was carried out.
    ■ Agricultural wages dropped by 30% in the 1930s.
  
  ○ Rural workers attempted to emigrate towards the USA, and when immigration quotas were reduced, ended up in the slums of Milan, Turin and Rome.

• Lower-middle classes
  
  ○ Small business owners were hit hard by the Depression and by Mussolini’s economic policies
  
  ○ Those who entered the Fascist Party enjoyed prosperity, with benefits, as well as the opportunity to increase their income through corrupt means.

• Industrialists and landowners
  
  ○ Benefited the most, with the Viodoni Pact (1925) and Charter of Labour (1927) increasing their power and control over workers, who couldn’t defend themselves.
  
  ○ The IRI offered them financial assistance even during the Great Depression, and could pass on their debts to the government.
  
  ○ High unemployment in rural areas allowed landowners to cut wages.

Foreign policies (not really)

Aims

1. Mussolini wanted to establish a modern Roman empire in the Mediterranean.
2. A successful foreign policy might distract Italians from domestic problems
3. Mussolini was disappointed with the small territorial gains from WWI, and the humiliating and ‘mutilated peace’ of the TOV.
4. Fascist ideology preached national glory.
How he do what he do

- 1920s: Mussolini tries to achieve foreign policy aims by diplomacy, and is cautious
  - Corfu incident (1923)
    - Mussolini listens to the League, and under pressure from Britain and France, withdraws after receiving compensation from Greece
  - Pact of Rome (1924)
    - Signed between Italy and Yugoslavia, granting Italy the long-disputed Fiume.
    - Significant boost to Mussolini’s internal prestige
  - Locarno Treaty (1925) + Kellogg- Briand Pact (1928)
    - Believed they would help in the reversal of the TOV
- 1930s: Mussolini becomes friends with Hitler, and begins pursuing a more aggressive foreign policy
  - Preventing Anschluss attempt (1934)
  - Abyssinian Crisis (1935-1936)
    - Full invasion of Abyssinia, as revenge for a previous Italian attempt at annexation
  - Rome-Berlin Axis (1936) and Spanish Civil War
    - Mussolini supported Franco with troops and equipment, much like Hitler, bringing the two dictators closer together
  - Munich Conference (1938)
  - Pact of Steel (1939)
    - Formal military and strategic alliance between Italy and Germany
  - Entrance to WWII, where they suffer heavy defeats in North Africa


**Successes and Failures**

- The 1920s diplomacy generally boosted Mussolini’s image, as they were portrayed as amazing successes internally through the use of propaganda.
- Involvement in the SCW can be considered as a success even though the Italian military suffered huge losses
  - Boosted Mussolini’s prestige, spread of further fascism in Europe (rise of Franco) and contributed to the creation of the Rome-Berlin axis, which was an alliance between Germany and Italy.
- Mussolini did fail to reverse the effects of the TOV.
- The Abyssinian Crisis was a failure, as it brought huge costs and they gained nothing economically from the invasion. This would affect their performance in WWII, later.

Overall failure to achieve his foreign policy aims, and Italy could not compete with the other powers anyway.
Part 3: Options
3.1.1 Alexander II (1855 - 1881)

Why was it considered necessary to emancipate the serfs?

There was an increasing need for modernisation in several aspects of the Russian Empire: economic, military, and social. Alexander II saw that one of the best ways to achieve this modernisation was to emancipate the serfs.

Economic

- A lack of labour necessary for industrial development
  - There were 53 million serfs in the Russian Empire, making up about 90% of the population. However, these serfs were often tied to their land, and thus unable to move to the cities to work in factories as labour.

- No incentive for trade
  - Serfs were allowed to trade, as an addition to farming. However, as their landowners would often raise the rent for the serfs that were trading well, effectively taking their profits from them. As such, there was no great incentive to make profit through trade.

- Debt
  - Agricultural stagnation left the serfs unable to pay taxes, and by 1855 they owned about 54 million roubles to the state.
  - Landowners were similarly falling into increasing debt as old-fashioned agricultural practices failed to produce a large enough grain surplus for export. This, combined with the fact that the population had doubled since the early 19th century (increasing domestic consumption accordingly), left a majority of landowners in debt.
  - All this debt contributed towards the government’s debt.
Military

- A need for the reformation of the Russian army
  - The Crimean War made it clear that there was a desperate need for the reorganisation of the Russian army. War broke out as a result of a Russian expansion into the Balkans and the Middle East, which threatened the Ottoman Empire, British, and French. The war, which began towards the end of Nicholas I’s rule (dying 1855), was left to be handled by Alexander II.
  - The Russian army faced a defeat in Sebastapol against British-French forces as a result of incompetent fighting combined with a cholera outbreak, and subsequently, lost naval supremacy as a result of the Treaty of Paris (1856).
  - Russian forces also suffered from inadequate transport and communications, as well as outdated and inferior equipment handled by unqualified personnel.

- Long conscripts and tradition
  - 25-year conscripts and the maintenance of a large peacetime army were taxing on the government budget. Serfs were also freed if they survived the army, which would cause an end to serfdom in several more generations so Alexander II thought “Hey, I might as well set them free before they do it themselves.”
  - Additionally, Serfs that had undergone military training (though not necessarily completing their conscription) could not be sent back to their communes as they feared that they would instigate uprisings, which were already happening frequently. Thus, an emancipation was necessary for the sake of internal and external security.

Social

- Poor humanitarian standards for a Western power
  - Serfdom was essentially slavery. Slavery is morally wrong. Westernisers believed that for Russia to become a worthy Western power that achieved social and industrial progress, serfdom had to be abolished.
How was emancipation carried out, and with what results?

* Peasants = serfs

- Stages (a.ka. how they had planned to implement emancipation)
  - For privately owned serfs:
    - **Stage 1 — Freedom**
      - Personal freedom (could marry, run businesses, set up law courts, travel without interference, etc) however they had to continue to work for their landowners, for 2 years.
    - **Stage 2 — Temporary obligation**
      - Continue to work for landowners until ready to pay rent
      - Could ask to ‘redeem’ land from their landowners, the size of which was negotiated between the serfs and landowners and came with their house
    - **Stage 3 — Redemption operation**
      - Payment for their ‘redeemed’ land allotments, in 49 annual payments, with a 6% interest charge — payment went towards the local mir, which exercised control over the serfs after emancipation
      - Landowners were compensated for land lost to the peasants, based on a very high valuation of the land
      - Serfs had to remain within the mir until their redemption payments were completed, where they worked communal open fields.
    - **For the other serfs:**
      - State serfs were granted the same terms, but the transition period was 5 years instead of 2, and they generally received bigger plots of land allotments.
      - Household serfs got no land, just freedom.
Evaluating the successes and failures of the emancipation (really depends on what criteria you look at this from — in this case, it’s from the perspective of the peasants).

- **Successes**
  - The emancipation was a nominal success
    - On paper, at least 40 million peasants were liberated and serfdom was abolished.
  - Enterprising or hard-working peasants benefited from the emancipation
    - There were some who purchased additional land through further negotiations with their landowners and others who were able to purchase the land allotments from peasants who were leaving the countryside.
    - Peasants who left the countryside sold their land allotments to other peasants / back to their landowners, forfeiting mir rights, and thus being able to move to the city and obtain regular employment with reasonable wages.
    - Formation of kulaks, a sub-class of wealthy peasants, were able to produce a surplus for sale and exports.
  - Short-term successes
    - Immediate objectives of emancipation achieved: a reduction in peasant uprisings, and also the abolishment of serfdom without violence or a rebellion.
  - Long-term successes
    - If emancipation didn’t improve peasants’ living standards in the short term, it did lead to at least 85% of former serfs becoming landowners within 20 or so years of the reform.
• Failures
  ○ Failure to meet expectations of the peasants
    ■ The peasants were largely disappointed in the nominal nature of the emancipation, and the long duration of land redemption. This gave rise to peasant discontent.
    ■ There was a total of 647 peasant uprisings following the edict, most notably being the Bezdna massacre (a violent uprising ending in an execution)
  ○ Problems with implementation
    ■ The immediate impact of the emancipation was that there was a practical problems of implementing the reform at local level. Russia is big. Alexander II quickly realised that he didn’t have the administration capabilities to efficiently carry out the emancipation.
    ■ Also, the process was dependent upon the support of the nobility, it was often slow and carried out in a way that favoured the landowners over the peasants.
  ○ Issues with the land allotments (bad for the peasants, good for the landowners)
    ■ Landowners would inflate the prices of the land (which was often poor; good land they kept for themselves) using the compensation payments form the peasants to write off their debts and invest in businesses in order to increase their own wealth.
    ■ Land allotments were therefore unfavourable to peasants — they were maid to pay redemption payments way above the actual value of the land, and received less land than they owned by right. Peasants that hadn’t previously worked the land also didn’t receive any land at all, according to the terms of the Edict.
○ Worsened wealth and living standards of the peasants
  ■ The mir that exercised a considerable amount of control over the peasants, was almost (if not more) oppressive as that of the former landowner. For example, the mir was able to banish peasants to Siberia.
  ■ Undermined the personal freedom granted in the first stage of the Edict — e.g. even though freedom to travel without interference was technically granted, they required passports issued by the mir which was internal and difficult to get. Personal relationships were also regulated as much as before.
  ■ Additionally, the mir tended to be backwards looking in terms of perpetuating traditional farming techniques, preventing the transformation of former serfs into landowners as they had to resort to old-fashioned, low yield techniques.
○ Failure to bring about economic modernisation
  ■ Stuck with redemption payments, the peasants didn’t have much money to spare for anything else. One of the original goals of the Edict hoped that the emancipation would increase the spending power of the peasants, transforming them into a new class of consumers, in order to boost the Russian economy. This didn’t happen.
  ■ The mir also held peasants to their land and prevented them from leaving their villages to go to the cities to work in factories. Thus, there was no labour force needed to boost economic modernisation.
○ Undermining the social structure
  ■ The social status of landowners often depended on the number of serfs they owned, and the emancipation would cause them to lose this. In emancipating the serfs, Alexander the II lost the backing of his traditional supporters who lost status and wealth because of him.
■ Alexander II also forgot to consult the landowners before declaring the edict (haha) so they felt betrayed that the Tsar had diminished their social importance

■ Serfdom is deeply rooted in Russian history, and there was a fear from traditionalists that the emancipation would bring about instability and chaos.
Alexander II’s further reforms
Since serfdom was essential to the functioning of the Russian state (before 1861) in pretty much every aspect of the country, the abolishment of serfdom lead to demands for more reforms in order to function effectively without the serfs.

- Local government
  - It was considered necessary to reform the local government after the nobles lost legal and judicial control over the serfs. Several changes were put into place:
    - 1864: Establishment of the zemstva, consisting of elected councillors representing the local landowners, town dwellers, and peasant members of rural communes.
    - 1870: The duma, who similar elected councils set up in towns and cities to provide municipal self-government.
  - Provided opportunities for local political participation in ways not previously possible, and there was a natural incentive for the local professionals to look after their own affairs, providing services that the peasants originally didn’t have.
  - Very effective at a local level, with local knowledge enabling them to do a good job, promoting public health and welfare, improving hygiene, literacy, mortality rates and the environment.
  - Limited capacity to implement radical change, as many aspects of local government (e.g. taxes, appointing officials, law and order) remained with provincial governors who were appointed by the tsar and the police.
  - Voting system was based on property qualifications, and heavily weighted towards local landowners which made it easy for the conservative nobility to dominate the assemblies.
  - Tsar refused to consider creating an elected national assembly, against his belief in autocracy. His opposition to this had great support from landowners, who thought national representative body would remove their authority.
• Army
  ○ Forced conscription compounded by the effects of the Crimean War resulted in low morale within the military. Weapons and technology were also outdated compared to other Western countries, resulting in inefficiency. Alexander II appointed Milyutin as the Minister of War, who used the Franco-Prussian War as a model for what could be done by a modernised army.
    ■ Conscription was now open to all classes, serving duration reduced from 25 to 15 years, soldiers could return home.
    ■ Promotions granted by merit and improved training, resulting in well-trained soldiers in every province. Literacy improved due to army education campaigns.
    ■ Army divided into 10 regions, and performed well in a Russian victory against Turkey (1877-1878).
  ○ Milyutin's reforms made the army more civilised and efficient - training and discipline no longer included brutal punishments, and shorter services meant that the army was no longer a 'life sentence'.
  ○ Still too much red-tape, bureaucracy, and officer classes remained largely aristocratic and retained its old-fashioned values.
  ○ Reforms were not enough and Russia also failed to keep peace with other Western Powers. They would face a defeat in the Russo-Jap War (1904-1905) and will later be obliterated by Germany in WWI.

• Legal
  ○ Before 1864 the courts in Russia were very corrupt and bribery was common. Staff were not legally trained, and were sometimes illiterate. Administration was slow, inefficient, socially discriminatory and corrupt - summed up the court system as "no grease, no motion".
■ The legal system was replaced by one that more closely resembled the
Western system of justice, with defence lawyers, juries, and staff were
provided with proper legal training etc.

○ Procedural changes included equality before the law (defendant's rights were
taken into account, accused were now granted defense lawyers), juries were now
present and chosen by new local government and appeal courts were set up.

■ The 1878 Vera Zasulich case saw a violent revolutionary acquitted against
the wishes of the minister of justice.

○ Changes to personnel included judges that were better trained, better paid and
given security to tenure to establish independence from the government. They
were also instructed to consider each case on merits and disregard precedents.

○ Lawyers were trained by new independent bar, which meant the growth of an
educated elite generally predisposed to more liberal ideas.

○ Political radicals were not given the opportunity for a fair trial, and were still
subject to arrest without a cause. Government permission still required for several
things: juries could not handle cases involving treason or cases involving
government officials. Alexander II also insisted that all reforms be curtailed after
the 1878 Vera Zasulich case.

○ Peasants had to be tried in special courts outside the new system, their cases were
withdrawn from the crown courts to special tribunals.

○ The police remained powerful and acted outside the law, especially the Third
Section, punishing people without trial.

○ A shortage of trained lawyers meant that the reforms were slow to take effect, and
the overall spread of the legal system was slow to implement in the empire.

○ Since an independent judiciary was essentially in conflict with the policy of
autocracy, there was a long delay in applying this reform measure, only to be
curtailed in 1878.
• Economic
  ○ Geographic problems, backwards social and political structures and a massively expanding population made the economy backward and stagnant. With the nobility and clergy (upper class) exempt from direct taxation, peasants carried the tax burden resulting in a reduced internal demand for goods. Russia also lacked the entrepreneurial middle class that had driven industrial revolutions elsewhere in Europe. There was also an over-expenditure on military, consisting of 62% of the government budget.
    ■ Government intervention was needed to channel investment along the right paths and so Reutern was appointed as the Minister of Finance.
  ○ The government invested capital into projects, e.g. transport, and between 1861-1880, the railway track grew from 1000 miles to 14000 miles, government invested capital into projects, e.g. transport.
  ○ Improvements in heavy industry: a 16 fold increase in coal production, 10 fold rise in steel, and 50% rise in iron from 1860-1876
  ○ Founding of the state bank in 1860, making it easier to raise money for business enterprise; extended credit facilities and made loans more available for the people, Jews were allowed to trade.
  ○ Budgeting and auditing procedures for all government departments. Tax-farming was abolished, with a removal of middle-men 'skimming' tax money.
  ○ Loans and other things established favoured the upper class. One area that saw little reform was the government's taxation policies - the peasants were still forced to bear the heavy burden of the poll tax, which the gentry were exempt from and which rose by 80% over Alexander's reign.
  ○ Though steps were made towards industrialisation and economic modernisation, the rate of development was still slow and fragile, as it either depended on foreign investments or good harvests.
Education and censorship

- Education was limited to the upper classes and there was harsh censorship, with books and newspapers all submitted for evaluation by the government. Because of this, peasants suffered from massive illiteracy.
  - Golvonin was made Minister of Education and gave the zemstvas the job of providing primary and secondary education.
- Students from poor families now had better access to education, between 1861-1881 the number of primary and secondary schools had increased fourfold.
- Schools were more easily opened, and much freer and opened to children of all classes and religions. Village schools were no longer controlled by the Church.
- Russian newspapers could discuss international and domestic policies, information and ideas could be circulated freely via newspapers.
- University Regulations in 1863 (University State) gave universities autonomy in educational matters and exempted their libraries from the censorship laws, and scholarships were set up and by 1881 which removed the exclusivity of education to nobles who were able to pay. Women were now allowed into university.
- The spread of education led to a growing demand for newspapers, books and magazines. By 1855 there were 140 magazines in circulation, and in 1865 Alexander issues a decree which relaxed the harsh censorship laws put in place by his father.
- After an assassination attempt on the Tsar in 1866, Golvonin was replaced by the more reactionary Tolstoy, who kept a tighter reign over the secondary school curriculum.
- Editors of newspapers which offended the government, as well as political dissidents, could still be tried in special courts and did not have the right to speak in their own defence, e.g. the radical journal The Contemporary was banned in 1866.
Growth of opposition under Alexander II’s rule

- The reforms implemented by Alexander II led to greater political opposition, where the conservatives were displeased at the radically liberal policies he had implemented, and the liberals pushed for further reform. Alexander's reforms had raised hopes which he could not fulfil without undermining the autocracy, in particular calls for a national assembly (parliament) and a written constitution defining and limiting the Tsar’s powers.

- His reactionary impulses in the later years of his rule encouraged the growth of radical extremism against the state, as they came after the political atmosphere had been opened up to Western liberal ideas and lesser censorship, resulting in a demand for fundamental changes to Russian autocracy.

- A new intelligentsia emerged as a result of his reforms and became involved in active opposition to the Tsar and his regime. This resulted in his assassination by radicals in 1881.

Was there a tsarist reaction in the later years of Alexander II’s rule?

- Following an assassination attempted in 1866, Alexander replaced the liberal Golvonin, with the conservative Tolstoy. He would clamped down on the universities' independence and introducing tougher entrance requirements. There was also less freedom of the press and greater censorship.

- The Secret Police ("Third Section") were given greater powers to arrest and clamp down on radicals, and by the 1870's the country's prisons were full and an estimated 150,000 opponents were exiled to Siberia in Alexander's reign.

- Nonetheless, he did give into a reformist demand of a national assembly (parliament). Ironically then, Alexander II was assassinated by radicals just as he had conceded further, and potentially far-reaching, liberal reform for Russia.

* Can probably argue that he was a reactionary all along, and that his liberal reforms were just to reinforce his autocracy, instead of undermining them.
3.1.2 Policies of Alexander III (1881 - 1894) and Nicholas II (1895-1917)

Backwardness and attempts at modernisation

Despite the economic advances made during Alexander II’s reign, Russia still lagged behind Western Europe. Alexander III would appoint three finance ministers during his rule.

- Indicators of backwardness
  - Relative lack of capital for investment
    - Landowners suffered after Emancipation - hardly kept out of debt and had limited remaining capital to invest in industry
    - Emancipated peasants were even poorer than before because of the redemption payment terms
    - Lack of middle classes for investment / direction / expertise
  - Remained heavily agricultural and in primary industries
    - 90% of economy was still in the agricultural sector
    - Inefficient farming methods under strict control of mir
    - Grain was the whole economy, basically
  - Poor infrastructure and transport system
    - Unable to transport any raw materials / goods
    - Russia’s huge size made internal economic development impossible
    - Underdeveloped banking system, lack of middle class
  - Low industrial output
    - Due to late / low modernisation compared to the rapid pace elsewhere
    - Doubling population size → increased pressure on economy (1881-1914)
Alexander’s Finance Ministers

- Nikolai Bunge (1881-1887)
  - Consolidated banking system; created Peasants’ Land Bank (1882)
  - Introduced tax laws that reduced tax burden on peasants

- Ivan Vyshnegradsky (1887-1892)
  - Aims
    1. Obtain budget surplus to finance government investment in economy
    2. Achieve this through a reduction of import expenditure, increase in taxes, driving up grain exports, etc.
  - Reforms
    - Encouraged foreign companies to invest in Russian businesses by offering them financial incentives, e.g. bonus payments
    - Negotiated foreign loans → expand cash reserves
    - Raised direct taxes on the Russian population (haha Bunge) → expansion of rail network and increase oil production in Baku and coal in Ukraine
    - Mendele’ev Tariff Act (1891): imposition of highest tariffs (33%) in Russian history on importing coal and oil to protect domestic industry + contribute to government budget
  - Outcomes
    - Obtained cheap loans from France (1888), essential in rebuilding technologically deficient Russian military + building of strategic railways for military transport
    - Successful - Grain exports increased by 18%, achieved budget surplus by 1892, balanced budget, gold reserves and a strengthened rouble
    - But of course he funded much of the surplus by selling grain abroad, this caused a famine (350,000 dead!) in 1891-1892 that led to him being sacked haha
Sergei Witte (1892-1903) ＊＊＊

- Aims
  - Realised the root of the problem behind the lack of economic modernisation was the absence of the middle class (of industrialists and factory owners) to drive the modernisation
  - State intervention policy: government to provide initial drive for industrialization rather than the middle classes / domestic and foreign businesses

- Reforms
  - Foreign investment / involvement
    - Placed Russian rouble on gold standard to stabilise it → made easier to trade with Russia, less risky, increased investment activity and inflow of foreign capital
      - French and Belgian investment rose from 98 million roubles in 1880 to 911 million in 1900
    - Foreign management of industrial enterprises transformed heavy industry
      - New Russia Company, under management of a Welshman, became the largest producer of big iron and railway tracks in the Empire
      - Baku oilfields + foreign capital → growth of oil-refinement sector
  - Development of railways
    - Private railway companies acquired to build new state-owned, long-distance lines
      - 60% of network state-owned, railway coverage expanded from 14,000 km in 1860 to 53,000 km in 1901
    - Government gained revenues from freight charges, passenger fares
    - Made accessible more Russian raw materials, e.g. linking Baku to Batum on the Black Seas → increase export of Baku oil
    - Reduced cost of transporting grain → huge export growth
Connection established between Central European Russia with Vladivostok with the Trans-Siberian Railway → opened up western Siberia for migration, good for troop transport

○ Increasing industrial output
  ■ Rapid industrial expansion (especially heavy industries)
    • Coal: 200%; steel: 700%
    • Achieved self-sufficiency in petroleum products
  ■ Increased consumer and domestic good industries
    • Textile industries grew to 40% of industrial output in 1910
  ■ Increase in number of industrial workers from 1 to 3 million by 1897, enacted law to limit work hours → improve working conditions

○ Increased commercial and industrial tax (again)

● Impact
  ○ (+) Massive increases in industry
    ■ Oil production in Baku rose by 1000% between 1883-1900
    ■ Economy grew at 8% a year in the 1890s, fastest of all European countries
    ■ Long-term: economy continued to grow even after setbacks in 1900s at ~6% a year, Witte set development firmly in motion
  ○ (-) Remained an agricultural economy, pretty backward still
    ■ Lagged behind Britain and Germany (~70% industrial output) with only ~30% of national production coming from the industry
    ■ Productivity still low in the agricultural sector, produced half as much grain per acre compared to Western European countries
  ○ (-) Peasant unrest
    ■ Seizure of grain + periods of famine (1891-1892 and 1902) following bad harvests → lots dead, worsened peasant situation
    ■ Allowed mir to remain powerful, peasants still did not gain from their emancipated status → >:((}
- Increase in tax rates → increase in peasant uprisings (troublesome as they consisted 90% of the population) + lesser disposable income to drive up consumer demand
- More professionals increasingly demanded political change through provincial *zemstva* and town *dumas* → reforms had broken down old social structure + provided forum for politics
  - (-) Human cost of railway construction did not warrant benefits
    - High number of deaths working in harsh conditions between 1891-1904
    - Railway was single-track, overall rail coverage minimal, inefficient, kind of half-finished
    - Migration did not increase very much
  - (-) Dependence on foreign capital
    - French loans, 20% annual government spending to service debt
    - Vulnerability
  - (-) Creation of urban proletariat
    - 4% in 1897 → 12% in 1914
    - Poor working conditions (e.g. low wages, long hours despite law, bad living conditions) + lack of trade unions → increasingly political

Witte had achieved more than previous finance ministers, and his reforms strengthened Russia leading up to WW1 in terms of military transport (railway) and capital investment. However, the industrialisation and economic growth he brought about had been at the expense of the people, who saw little improvement (and sometimes worsening). Indirectly, Witte’s policies link to the 1905 and 1917 revolutions as a major factor in creating discontent among the proletariat and also the peasants.
Nature of Tsardom

Alexander III (1881-1894)

- Background
  - Abrupt succession in 1881, after Alexander II’s assassination
  - Unprepared for Tsardom (which was originally his brothers until 1865, when he died); as Tsarevich, he was aided by the conservative figure of Pobedonostsev
- Highly conservative, reactionary
  - Reversed liberal reforms of Alexander II (father)
    - Blamed his father’s assassination on his reforms
    - Lived in constant fear of revolutionary action, staying far from St. Petersburg in his castle at Gatchina - nature of his rule can be simplified as a reaction to his father’s assassination
  - Konstantin Pobedonostsev (1827-1907)
    - Procurator of the Holy Synod, also his tutor and essential in instilling importance of autocracy in Alexander III and had considerable influence on the overall
    - Right-wing conservative, Slavophile, nationalist, anti-semitic
  - Early evidence of conservative reaction
    - Execution of the Narodnaya Volya (People’s Will) terrorists responsible for his father’s assassination; 10,000 suspected revolutionaries arrested and / or exiled
    - Manifesto of Unshakable Autocracy (1881) rejected the liberal reforms of his father in favour of ‘unshakeable autocracy’, summed up reforms to be taken. Pobe’s influence was clear in the document - strong belief in Autocracy, Orthodoxy and Nationality
  - Evidence against conservative reaction
    - His finance ministers and their economic progress, namely Bunge’s Peasant Land Bank (1882); Vyshnegradsky’s budget surplus
Reforms (1881-1894)

- Changes to cabinet, prominent figures
  - Nikolai Ignatiev appointed as Interior Minister (1881) to carry out nationalist, reactionary policy - responsible for Jewish programs and the highly anti-semitic May Laws (1882)
  - Dmitri Tolstoy brought in after Ignatiev (1882-1889), was a strong supporter of autocracy, backed nobility, regulated peasants and prepared the unpopular counter-reforms
  - Mikhail Katkov, editor of Moscow News (1863-1887) aided in the dispersal of the government’s ultra-conservative policies / message

- Repression
  - Statue on Measures for the Preservation of Political Order and Social Tranquility (1881, repeatedly renewed till 1917) for the eradication of ‘vile sedition” - revolutionary areas put under ‘extraordinary security’ where suspected revolutionaries were subject to arrest, interrogation, imprisonment, exile, and had no right to legal representation
  - Statue on Police Surveillance (1882) extended power and size of the Okhrana (secret police network)
  - Banning or surveillance of public gatherings, schools, universities, etc.

- Countryside / local government
  - Introduction of new noble position - land captains (1889), nobility with power to override zemstva elections and local courts, had total authority to root out local sedition
  - Changed constitution of zemstva to favour nobles and adjust influence, replaced municipal council members with state employees
  - Electorate Laws (1890-1892) to reduce popular vote in rural and urban elections once again to favour the nobility
  - Banned peasants from leaving the mir to extend the control and influence they exerted over individual peasants → attempt at controlling countryside
○ Judicial changes

■ Partial reversal of Alexander II’s reforms - dismissal of judges, establishment of ‘closed court sessions’ where no observers or reporters were permitted (a return to traditional non-Western rulings)
■ Jurors required property and educational qualifications → nobility
■ Elimination of local magistrates, shifted local judicial powers to land captains

○ Education

■ Increased censorship in schools, universities, newspapers, books
■ Removal of independence of universities granted to them by Alexander II (1884), forced to undergo government inspection with professors chosen by the state
■ Only upper classes were eligible for higher education
■ Raising of school fees to exclude peasants
■ Increased number of elementary schools, but fell under control of the Church → lessons had constant indoctrination to ensure religious observance, and since Pobe believed that education of peasants was a waste of time they taught them minimal knowledge
■ Censorship Committee (1882) with power to close offending publications, ban and required presentation of all published material for review before they could be released to public

○ Russification

■ Strict suppression of multi-ethnic groups so as to remove the ‘instinct of nationality’ which could ‘serve as a disintegrating force’ (Pobe’s words)
■ Removed separate languages and cultures of 40 million non-Russians (60% of population) by enforcing use of Russian language and forbidding languages (e.g. Ukrainian and Belarussian); banning of ‘foreign’ literature and forced religious conversions from Lutheranism to Orthodoxy
- Reorganisation of senates to diminish influence, e.g. Finish Senate in 1892, later abolished in 1899
- Harsh repression of uprisings of ethnic peoples e.g. Uzbed district (1886)
- Members of nonconformists sects were not allowed to hold government positions, e.g. Roman Catholics
  - Anti-semitism
    - Established ‘Pale of Settlement’ in southern and western Russia to confine the Jews to this one area
    - Encouraged anti-Jewish pogroms (first instance 1881) and attacks on Jewish communities → from 1881 to 1884, 200 communities with high concentrations of Jews experienced violent outburst
    - *May Laws* (1882) disallowed Jewish purchase of property and living in rural areas → forced into ghettos and large town or villages
    - Quota on Jewish education, banning form civil service, forced deportation
    - You’d wonder why 20th century Russia had a disproportionate number of Jewish revolutionaries, e.g. Trotsky, Lenin, Zinoviev etc.

With the help of his crony Pobe, Alexander III’s reforms were largely to strengthen autocracy and return to traditional structures, as a reaction to his father’s assassination which he believed was caused by his pursuit of moderate reform. Overall, he was largely a conservative reactionary in terms of social and political reform, though economically was more a reformist like his dad.
Nicholas II (1894-1917)

"His character is the source of all our misfortunes." - Witte

"He’s a sad man; he lacks guts." - Rasputin

"... completely mediocre and brainless... he was not fit to run a village post office." - Trotsky

- Background
  - Also tutored by Pobe and as a result believed in the morally right, God-given nature of autocracy
    - In his coronation speech made known that he would “devote all [his] strength, for the good of the whole nation, to maintaining the principle of autocracy just as firmly and unflinchingly as it was preserved by [his] unforgettable father”
    - Believed that democracy would bring about the collapse of the Russian empire - ideologically incapable of accommodating the new middle class
  - Received little political training, lacked experience for leadership - unprepared
    - Fickle; unwilling to engage in politics
    - Disorganised, stubborn
- His wife, Tsarina Alexandra was similarly obstinate
  - A strong believer in autocracy, she urged him to stand firm and avoid making concessions that she thought would weaken the monarchy despite the changing social and economic conditions in Russia
  - She was unpopular herself, due to her German heritage
- Problems faced
  - Economic modernisation was desirable, but also a threat to the regime
    - Working class was volatile, discontented, and were a bigger threat than peasantry due to their high concentration in central areas → increasing pressure for political change
    - Educated workforce read political literature → receptive to political ideas, challenged government
    - Poor working conditions brought about deep resentment → unrest
  - Peasantry
    - Have been kicked around for essentially, all of Russian history, freshly wounded by the failure of emancipation in 1862 + mir → uprisings
- National minorities, impact of Russification
  - Suppressed an alienated 60% of their population → increasing number of uprisings and protests from national groups seeking freedom and autonomy in their parts of the empire
  - Jewish ‘Bund’ (Unions) - revolutaries
- Political opposition
  - :^)
Growth of opposition movements

Liberals

- Grown significantly after government reforms in Alexander II (1864)
  - Zemstva had given locals a small degree of autonomy → councils were effective, and created a class of people familiar and skilled in local politics
  - Took a more organised form at the start of the 20th century
    - Union of Liberation (1903) - demanded economic and political reform
- Main beliefs
  - Lobbied for extension of freedom and rights
    - Self-determination for national minorities
    - Sometimes the extension of zemstva to regional / national level
  - Major opposition to tsarism: free elections, parliamentary democracy and limitation of tsar’s powers
- Methods
  - Believed in nonviolent reform
  - Political channels through zemstva, newspapers, meetings and reform banquets
- Support
  - Not a large popular base, few active supporters outside Moscow, Petrograd, etc.
  - Middle-class intelligentsia, e.g. doctors, lawyers
  - Progressive landowners, industrialists and businesses

Revolutaries (Populism and the People’s Will)

- Main revolutionary movement in late 19th century, would give rise to formation of the People’s Will and Land and Liberty groups
- Main beliefs
  - Believed that peasants in Russia could help develop their own form of socialism
  - Life based around cooperation and sharing in peasant communities (small scale)
  - Avoid capitalism, “evils” of industrialization
● Methods
  ○ "Go to the people"
    ■ In 1874, they went into the villages to spread the idea of social revolution, but they achieved very little; peasants were generally distrustful and hostile towards the Populists and reported them to the police
● Support and timeline and splitting
  ○ Lobbied for support of ordinary people, while they themselves were wealthy intellectuals (dubbed “Narodiks”)
  ○ In 1874 the government placed over 200 populists on trial - 153 acquitted and the rest were given light sentences
  ○ The remaining Populists formed into a violent group, Land and Liberty
    ■ Vera Zasulich shot and wounded Trepov (Governor of St. Petersburg)
    ■ Put on trial, acquitted by a jury despite her obvious guilt, and the shocked Alexander II would curtail most judicial reforms as a result
  ○ After another unsuccessful attempt on the Alexander II’s life, Land and Liberty broke up into the Black Repartition (which, despite it’s name, favoured peaceful evolution) and the People's Will which...
    ■ Favoured violent revolution → created revolutionary tradition
    ■ Attracted to nihilism of Bakunin, who argued for the complete annihilation of all institutions and all forms of authority (e.g. state, family, religion and morality)
    ■ Passed a death sentence on the Tsar and made four unsuccessful attempts on the Tsar's life within the year before they blew him up at the Sunday Parade

**Socialist Revolutionaries**
● Formed in 1901, loose organization accommodating groups with a wide variety of views
  ○ Lacked central control and coordination
  ○ Split between moderates and radicals (supported extreme terrorism)
• Main beliefs
  ○ Hope for revolution with the peasants, who would fuel a popular uprising to overthrow the tsarist government and replace with a democratic republic
  ○ Accepted development of capitalism and growth of proletariat, but believed that peasantry could skip the capitalist stage and move straight to rural socialism
• Methods
  ○ Agitation and terrorism, assassinated officials
• Support
  ○ Peasants and industrial workers (who recognised the SRs as the party that supported their aims)
  ○ Attracted intellectuals that wanted to make contact with masses
  ○ Peasants recognised the SRs as party that represented them, even though they could not read their leaflets, as they believed they would ‘return the land to those who worked it’

The Marxists

• Background
  ○ In the 1880s, it seemed to some Russian intellectuals that there was no hope of a revolutionary movement developing amongst the peasantry
  ○ Turned to theories of Karl Marx - optimistic theories that saw progress through development of industry + growth of working class
• Main beliefs and methods
  ○ Believed in action in achieving socialism, organised strikes in factories among the working class

kind of like santa but everyone gets coal
### Marxist Stage Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Progression to next stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Feudalism | ● Absolute monarchy  
○ Dominant aristocracy controlling masses  
○ Serf (work on estates, owned) → merchant → knight → lord → king  
○ Tied to some form of religion e.g. Christianity, Orthodox Church | ● Influence of the merchants would increase as they accumulated wealth  
● Conflicted with the old powers (usually the nobility) → power struggle  
● He who controls factors of production rules and the money making class comes to power |
| Capitalism | ● Democracy with rights, freedom  
● Means of production controlled by the bourgeoisie  
● Exploits the proletariat (long working hours, bad conditions) | ● Exploitation grows with capitalism  
● Wealth is not shared equally  
○ Large share goes to the bourgeoisie  
○ Small share to the proletariat → anger  
● Revolution led by the middle class |
| Socialism | ● Everybody is equal  
○ Government made up of workers (from the proletariat mostly)  
○ Small group of workers dictate how the government is run (resource allocation)  
● Industrialised, collectively-owned  
● No classes, everyone has equal entitlement to what is produced | ● The decreasing need for a government due to the lack of competing classes causes a shift to communism |
| Communism | ● Complete elimination of social class or any form of government, leadership  
● Everyone is equal where no one is in control, no one is in charge  
● Resources are distributed according to the needs of the people  
● Contribution by people to the state and society without any personal gain |  |

**Marxist-Leninism**

- Revolution to be accomplished by small group of highly professional, dedicated revolutionaries needed to develop revolutionary consciousness of proletariat
- Believed that the proletariat should develop a revolutionary government of its own alliance with poor peasants - combination of bourgeois and socialist revolution
Social Democrats (SDs)

- Background
  - Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (1898)
  - Disputes about party direction
    - Encourage trade unions to improve working conditions of workers
    - Or, focus on revolutionary tactics and preparation of working class for the revolution
- Main beliefs
  - Both parties accepted the main tenets of Marxism but were split over the role of the party → split into Mensheviks and Bolsheviks
- Support
  - Mainly working class
    - Bolsheviks attracted younger, more militant peasant workers who liked discipline, firm leadership, simple slogans
    - Mensheviks tended to attract different types of workers and intelligentsia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mensheviks</th>
<th>Bolsheviks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadly based, and take in all those who wished to join</td>
<td>Made up of small number of highly disciplined professional revolutionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more democratic, allowing members to have say in policy making</td>
<td>Operate under centralised leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged trade unions to help working class improve their working</td>
<td>System of small cells so it would be more difficult for police infiltration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believed in long period of bourgeois democratic government where workers would develop class and revolutionary consciousness → socialist revolution  

Job of the party to bring socialist consciousness to the workers and lead them through the revolution - critics warned that a centralised party would lead to a dictatorship
3.1.3 The 1905 Russian Revolution: Causes and Aftermath

Long-term causes

- Economic, social
  - Emergence of new working class
    - Grievances over poor working conditions
    - Wanted more political power
    - Militancy was evident in strikes throughout 1890s
    - Failure to properly organise Okhrana-run trade unions
  - Changing nature of civil societies
    - Nobility had lost their power, influence
    - Peasants entering liberal professions, becoming landowners, merchants, a new class of businessmen (*kulaks*)
    - Increasing local involvement in politics
    - In rural areas were still suffering periodic famines, population problems putting pressure on land - poverty, high taxes (Witte’s policy)
  - Economic depression
    - Series of poor harvests from 1897-1901 → unemployment, unrest, starvation and violence in countryside
    - Economic slump in 1902 and international monetary crisis → difficulties in negotiating foreign loans, tax income at home declined
    - Slowing economic growth, now 1% in 1899, made worse by the strikes and worker unrest in factories → urban working class :

- Political
  - Leftover impacts of Russification
    - National minorities wanted more autonomy and independence
- Increasing opposition
  - Alienated intelligentsia - students against censorship, middle-classes wanting political representation or some form of elected national assembly
  - Revolutionaries, e.g. SDs and SRs, taking shape and gaining support

Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) - Catalyst

- Causes
  - Russian expansion into the Far East as a response to the dissolution of the Chinese Empire for resources, markets and Port Arthur (warm-water port)
    - Extend Trans-Siberian Railway into Manchuria
  - Tsarist regime seeking war as a convenient way of diverting attention from domestic problems (economic disaster in 1904)
    - "Short victorious war" would unite the people and dampen revolutionary feelings → gaining support for regime
    - Underestimated Japanese military power
  - Growing tensions between Russia and Japan
    - Negotiations between the two countries had proved impractical
    - Territorial disputes in Korea and Manchuria

- Course
  - 1904
    - Battle of Port Arthur (February 1804)
      - Surprise attack by Japanese
    - Blockade and Siege of Port Arthur (February-April 1904)
      - Japanese seized Port Arthur
    - Battle of Yalu River (May 1904)
      - Removed perception that Japanese would be an easy enemy
      - Russia was unable to match Japanese military power
    - Battle of Yellow Sea (August 1904)
      - Heavy losses to Russian troops and battleships
1905

- **Battle of Mukden** (February 1905)
  - Major defeat for Russians (90,000 dead)
  - Decisive land battle

- **Battle of Tsushima** (April 1905)
  - Naval campaign was the decisive factor in determining outcome
  - Russian fleet was virtually annihilated, losing 8 battleships, ~5,000 men; Japanese had minimal losses, three torpedo boats
  - Only three Russian vessels escaped to Vladivostok, the rest were either sunk or captured
  - Forced Russians to sue for peace

- **Treaty of Portsmouth** (August 1905)
  - Significance of defeat for Tsar Nicholas II
    - Suing for peace and the treaty was humiliating
      - Though terms of peace were lenient, the whole affair was catastrophic for image of tsarist regime → eroded image of the Tsar, seen as incompetent
      - Asian victory usurped European racial and military superiority
    - Acted as catalyst for the meltdown in 1905
      - Worsened economic plight of peasants and workers by causing fuel and food shortages, unemployment, inflation etc.
      - Waste of precious resources
    - Strengthened opposition
      - Justified opposition claims that government was ‘irresponsible, reckless’
      - Felt that those who encouraged the Tsar in his purpose for going to war betrayed their Sovereign as well as their country
      - Opportunity to take advantage of the general dissatisfaction to set the government and the masses against each other
**Bloody Sunday (9 January 1905) - Immediate Cause**

- **Course**
  - Father Georgy Gapon led unarmed demonstrators marched towards the Winter Palace to present a petition to Tsar Nicholas II
  - Set off peacefully in the morning, but upon reaching the Winter Palace were fired upon by soldiers of the Imperial Guard
  - More than 150 killed
- **Demands made by protesters (surrounding working conditions, radical demands but not aggressive)**
  - An 8-hour day and freedom to organize trade unions
  - Improved working conditions, free medical aid, higher wages for women
  - Elections to be held for a constituent assembly by universal, equal, secret suffrage
  - Freedom of speech, press, association and religion
  - End of Russo-Japanese War
- **Outcomes**
  - Repercussions of government action
    - Showed disregard for ordinary people and the state, would stop at no violence and no treachery → undermined the state, brought into question of autocracy and legitimacy of Tsar
  - Change in attitude of the Russian people toward the Tsar
    - Romanoff dynasty began to become odious among the working men in Russia → public outrage, series of massive strikes spreading quickly
    - Illusion of a benevolent autocrat who was going to listen paternally to the demands of his subjects was gone forever
      - Peasants especially no longer distinguished the Tsar from other bureaucrats and held him personally responsible for the tragedy
    - Breaking of the social contract between the Tsar and people → delegitimized the position of the tsar and his divine right to rule
  - Start of the active phase of the 1905 Revolution
Course of the 1905 Revolution

➔ January-February

◆ Bloody Sunday (9 January)
  ● Strikes spread to other cities and towns
  ● Censorship collapsed, newspapers → hostile towards government

◆ Assassination of Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich (4 February)
  ● Tsar’s uncle, agreed to give new concessions
  ● Published the Bulygin Rescript (5 February) promising the formation of a consultative assembly, religious tolerance, freedom of speech (in the form of language rights for the Polish minority) and a reduction in the peasants' redemption payments.

◆ Formation of factories committees to represent workers
  ● Economic demands > political

◆ Ultra-nationalist movements
  ● Right-wing groups and the Black Hundreds were staunch supporters the Tsar and opposed any retreat from the autocracy of the reigning monarch
  ● Launched attacks on people deemed to be anti-government

➔ March-May

◆ Defeat at Battle of Mukden (10 March)
  ● At home, police were becoming increasingly ineffective - citizens formed militias or vigilante groups in order to protect themselves from criminals

◆ Series of Zemstvo Congress meetings (April-May)
  ● Asked for popular representation at national level
  ● Civil freedoms, universal adult suffrage

◆ Battle of Tsushima (14 May)

➔ June-August

◆ Increase in incident of peasant disturbances
  ● Demanded land, end of redemption payments and reduction in rents
• Not coordinated movement, largely spontaneous and a response to the
economic distress including food shortage during the summer
• Seizure of land, grain, animals, attacks on landlords and refusal to pay rent

◆ Mutiny on the Battleship Potemkin (14 June)
  • Harsh conditions for the navy, low morale following recent naval defeats
  • Mutiny - crew killed several officers and seized ship, sailed to Odessa
    where amongst the strikes and tumults they invited radicals on board
  • Tsar ordered troops to open fire indiscriminately → killed ~2000, brought
    Odessa back under control and forced surrender of mutineers

◆ Universities granted autonomy (27 August)
  • Focal points for political meetings

◆ Treaty of Portsmouth (29 August)

➔ September-October

◆ Increasing labour unrest
  • Moscow railway strike → spread to other areas of Russia as other railway
    workers joined it → general strike, attracting support from industrial /
    urban workers (two million involved in total)
  • Opposition groups united in demanding radical change
  • Middle-classes supported the strikes and gave money
  • Regime afraid to retaliate with violence

◆ Formation of Kadets (12-18 October)

◆ Formation of St. Petersburg Soviet (13 October)

◆ October Manifesto (1 October)
  • Written by Sergei Witte and Alexis Obolenskii, presented to the Tsar
  • Followed the demands of the Zemstvo Congress
    ○ Granting basic civil rights
    ○ Allowing the formation of political parties
    ○ Extending the franchise towards universal suffrage
    ○ Establishing the Duma as the central legislative body
• Signed on 17 October, citing his desire to avoid massacre (and realising that there was no military to pursue other options)
• Proclamation of Manifesto → demonstration of support and collapse of strikes in St. Petersburg and elsewhere, but also violent backlash from conservative elements of society e.g. right-wing attacks on liberals

⇒ November-December
  ◆ Russian liberals satisfied, prepared for upcoming Duma elections; conservatives denounced elections and called for armed uprising to destroy empire → tensions
  ◆ General strike by Russian workers (5-7 December)
    • Government sent in troops → street fighting, artillery used
    • > 1000 dead, parts of cities in ruins
    • Final struggle in Moscow, where the Bolsheviks had taken control and strikes were common → failed, surrendered, and uprisings ended

Reactions to the October Manifesto
• Divided the revolutionaries
  ○ Together they had presented a formidable opposition to autocracy, destroyed unified front that had made the opposition so formidable
• Nick II abhorred its restrictions upon his powers - backtracked with *Fundamental Laws*
  ○ Dismissed the First and Second Dumas when they proved "unsatisfactory" to him
    ■ Who were unable to pass laws without his agreement
  ○ Altered election statues (violating the constitution) to ensure that more nobility would be elected to future Dumas
    ■ Third and Fourth Dumas, while more lasting, still quarrelled with the Tsar and his government over overall direction of the state
• Introduced too suddenly → confusion
  ○ Most provincial authorities did not understand what was happening, and many lacked sympathy for the new course of policy
  ○ Regions that had already been in tension were thrown into a frenzy by it
Why did Nick II survive the 1905 Revolution?

- Revolutionary groups
  - Fairly disorganised, incoherent aims
    - Peasants, workers, middle-classes failed to combine to provide a coordinated opposition → ineffective
  - Left lacked leadership
    - Lenin - on vacation (London); Stalin - on forced vacation (Siberia)
  - Uprisings tended to be spontaneous, uncoordinated

- Loyalty and use of army, despite munities
  - Promised them better living conditions, better pay
    - A good portion manage to be swayed by this
  - Revolution crushed through the use of the army, quite violent
    - Brutal suppression of the revolutionary groups, instead of exile, where the Tsar just decided to kill everyone (fail-safe method, I guess) → eroded the image of the Tsar as a 'father figure' of Russia
    - Though, effective in bringing the populace back into line and beating them into submission → re-established government control across Empire
  - Brutal suppression scared the middle-classes, who feared continued violence
    - Now wanted the revolution to stop and return to authority and order

- *October Manifesto*
  - Divided the liberals and socialists
    - Liberals wanted political reform and movement towards constitutional democracy - satisfied and wanted out; socialists wanted a social revolution

- Solving economic troubles
  - Witte offset the cost of war and falling tax revenues by securing a huge loan
    - From the French
    - Stabilised the economy and gave the government money to pay for its functions ~1 year, and also wages for the army
  - Concessions made by Nick II to cancel redemption payments
Peter Stolypin (1906-1911)

- Background
  - Prime Minister + Minister of Interior
  - Strong supporter of autocracy and disliked revolution, disorder

- Objectives:
  1. To feed the rapidly growing population and avoid the cycle of famine and revolt
  2. To create strong conservative peasantry who would support the regime

Early contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stolypin’s Abilities</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stolypin’s Abilities</td>
<td>Known for his ability to enforce laws in the countryside by means of an efficient police force and strict surveillance methods.</td>
<td>Protection of autocracy while introducing reform which doesn't really work tbh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had a vision for the transformation of Russia and that his reform proposals were ‘more feasible and more likely to lead Russia out of the abyss than any other’.</td>
<td>Contradictory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very good at hanging people: Counter-revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Restoration of order in 1906 | Setng up field court martials in 1906 to crush peasant uprisings | Lots dead - government executed 2390 people on charges of terrorism |
Stolypin’ relationship with the Dumas

- (+) Wished to work with the Duma to push through reform programme
  - Made efforts to understand the Octobrists which helped his reforms
  - Able to work with the more moderate centre parties to achieve progress in his social and economic reforms
- (-) Restructuring of the vote to favour the bourgeoisie in order to force the Duma to become increasingly conservative (only 2% to proletariat)
  - New electoral law that would keep socialists and radicals out of the Duma
  - Alienated liberals
    - Duma opposed parts of his reform, threatened resignation to force Tsar into pressuring the Duma → worked, but made him unpopular with both Tsar and Duma
    - Left disliked his policy of repression; right saw his reform policies as undermining the principles of autocracy and power of gentry in the countryside
  - When elections for the third Duma were held in October 1907, only around 3.5 million Russians – out of a population of more than 135 million – were eligible to vote
- (-) Repeated dismissal of the Duma
  - First and second Dumas were too liberal and pushed for reforms against the Tsar so he requested their dismissal / suspension
    - Dumas were against the introduction of the zemstva in western provinces → feared they would lose autocracy
  - Only prepared to work with Duma on his own terms
    - Second Duma would not do his bidding, changed electoral system to create one that was more amenable
- (-) Loss of regime's legitimacy
  - Overuse of the army in the counter-revolution
  - Asking peasant army to kill peasants
● Agrarian reforms
  ○ Positive outcome
    ■ Increased freedom for the peasants regarding their land: Peasants allowed
to leave the mir, consolidate strips of land into blocks and farm privately
    ■ Government would help aspiring kulaks with banking facilities, loans and
assistance for purchasing machinery or livestock.
      ● Increased subsidies to raise productivity of peasants as well as
encouraging migration
    ■ Land bank was established to ensure that land was allocated fairly and
efficiently, cancelled redemption payments, gave peasants freedom
      ● Peasants worked for profits but not for the landlords of communes
      ● Created new class of peasants with vested interest in the status quo
        (trying to preserve the autocracy of teh Tsar)
    ■ Resettlement schemes
      ● Siberia → major agricultural centre for dairy, cereal production
      ● Cities → upper labour force
  ○ Negative outcomes
    ■ Treatment of the Duma would undermine the idea that reform within the
existing system was possible
      ● Abuse of Article 87 to implement agrarian reforms
      ● False sense that regime was firmly back in control and didn’t need
reform itself → structure of the government lagged behind
changing political landscape in Russia
    ■ Dissolution of the communes that had not redistributed the land
    ■ Peasants in the city would become part of the proletariat (revolt)
    ■ Alienation of conservative peasants by destroying traditional mir

Unfortunately the time required for change was 20 years and he was assassinated after 7, in
1911, putting an end to the reform.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Main events / achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>● 478 Kadets</td>
<td>● Deputies demanded increased powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(April 1906 -</td>
<td>● 94 Trudoviks</td>
<td>● Little in practice achieved though there were fierce debates on a range of issues, e.g. civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1906)</td>
<td>● Sympathetic to liberals</td>
<td>rights, amnesty for political prisoners, land ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Tsar claimed Duma unworkable and dissolved it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>● Overwhelmingly left (Trudoviks, Mensheviks, SRs)</td>
<td>● Left and right-wing deputies attacked each other, debates frequently ending in brawls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb 1907 -</td>
<td>● Right-wing groupings had increased their number</td>
<td>● Left-wing deputies attacked Stolypin and his land reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1907)</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>● Duma cooperated with the government over famine relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● 44 Octobrists</td>
<td>● Government claimed Menshevik and SR deputies were subversive and, amid disorder, dissolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>● Right-dominated</td>
<td>the Duma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nov 1907 -</td>
<td>● 154 Octobrists</td>
<td>● Electoral system changed restricting franchise; reduction of peasant and working class vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1912)</td>
<td>● 147 Rightists</td>
<td>● Relations with government were more harmonious now that the Duma was biased towards the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Kadets,</td>
<td>● Stolypin able to work with them and put through land reforms despite some opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trudoviks and other parties filled the rest</td>
<td>● Law on universal education passed aiming at minimum four years compulsory primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Similar to Third Duma</td>
<td>● Steps taken to modernise army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nov 1912 -</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Justices of the Peace were restored, replaced hated land captains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1914)</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Developed progressive national health insurance scheme for workers (sickness, accidents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Some tension - Lena Goldfields Massacre heralded in industrial unrest and strikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Some reform of Orthodox Church, reducing state control and broadening education in church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Progress in education, increased teacher’s salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Discussion on health of people, reduce drunkenness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Duma, together with Stolypin’s ruthless suppression of opposition, helped to marginalize the opponents of the regime’s position after 1905. However, the Tsar’s negative attitude towards the Duma e.g. Fundamental Laws, alterations to electoral system, showed his lack of commitment and a reactionary stubbornness that hurt the regime.
3.1.4 The February and October 1917

Russian Revolutions

* Long-term causes of February + October 1917 Revolutions are the same as in 1905

The impact of the First World War (1914-1918) on Russia

- Military Defeats
  - Poor leadership that disregarded welfare of soldiers → low morale
    - Large number of soldiers who were made up of peasants, little skill
    - Quality of leadership poor, no experience of fighting or expertise
    - No clear command structure or war plan
  - Heavy losses at the start of the war, driven back → angry homefront
    - Blamed the Tsar → The Tsar went to the front to take charge in September 1917, but they suffered even greater losses
  - Unable to deal with wounded

- Breakdown of distribution system
  - Railways were overloaded, bottlenecks at Moscow
    - Signalling system had collapsed, trains left stranded on lines due to engine failure → unable to transport supplies, equipment
    - War materials available where they were not needed

- Poor conditions at home
  - Strain of equipping and feeding millions of soldiers strained the Russian economy and revealed its structural weaknesses
    - What little materials were sent to war front, leaving even less for workers
    - Loss of raw materials to the war caused factories to close and workers to become jobless, brought about inflation, food shortages, fuel shortages
- Grain shortage - peasants not selling as governments would not pay higher prices, the conversion of factories → military work left little domestic goods for peasants to spend money on
  - Overpopulation → deterioration of living standards
    - Influx of German refugees
      - High number of deaths, if not resulting from the war, coming from the high frequency of domestic strikes / militancy
- The Tsarina and Rasputin
  - Tsar had departed to the front, believing that that was where he should be - had to leave someone in charge, so he left Alexandra and Rasputin behind
    - Alexandra was super unpopular and out of touch and felt like an ‘outsider’ due to her German heritage, fairly reclusive from politics
    - Rasputin was not quiet about his sexual prowess, bragged about his power over Alexandra - rumours of an affair between him and Alexandra
    - Rumours of Rasputin and Alexandra in an illicit sexual relationship associated the regime with terrible imagery
  - Ministers replaced by Alexandra either at her own will or Rasputin’s advice
    - Corrupt, unpopular Alexander Protopopov appointed as Minister of Interior (1916-1917) → zemstvas announced that they would not work with him, because his food plans were atrocious and he was too
  - The Tsar's leadership and decision making was questioned with greater criticism
    - Support for him hemorrhaged
- Failures to reform
  - Nick II refused to make any changes to the government and opted to retain autocracy → >:^(/
    - A constitutional monarchy could have lifted pressures from the Tsar
    - Concessions could have been made to a group called the ‘Progressive Bloc’, which called for a ‘government of public confidence’ - let them run the country
Short-term causes

➔ Bread
   • Harsh winter of 1916 → they weren’t toasty enough, tensions and frustrations built within cities, exacerbated by poor conditions at home
     ● Shortage of basic necessities → people were baguette-ing angry
   • So the government decided to ration bread
     ● They wouldn’t roll with this
   • International Women's Day started fine, and a group of women took charge of a protest through Petrograd with flour power
     ● Managed to persuade men from the highly politicised Putilov engineering works to join them and others to join them→ get bready to crumble
   • Over the next three days, demonstrations grew and got whey out of hand
     ● Demands for bread great to demands for the end to the war and the Tsar
     ● They wanted rye-form

➔ Bolsheviks
   • Though there was no central political party in charge (with all main leaders either abroad or in exile) socialist cells, the Bolsheviks were active in spreading protest and getting the workers out onto the streets using their red flags and banners
   • The Soviets: Action of the Bolsheviks prompted the formation of a socialist party to represent the interest of the workers
   ● Soldier mutiny
     ○ Soldiers were facing large number of deaths at the front, so instead of going to the war front, they decided to join the protests
       ■ The Tsar heard of the revolts in Petrograd and ordered the troops to shoot the crowds on Sunday, February the 26th
       ■ The crowds became more hostile and the revolution had begun
Course of the 1917 February Revolution

→ 27 February
   ◆ Entire garrison and police had joined the revolution
   ◆ Petrograd falls
   ◆ Duma discusses Tsar’s involvement, decides end of support → Provisional Government created

→ 2 March
   ◆ Tsar Nicholas II abdicates

Provisional Government and Dual Power (Soviets)

- Weaknesses of Provisional Government
  ○ Saw itself as a temporary body, refused to make any long-term decisions
  ○ Divisions among the provisional
     ■ Different parties had various perspectives and sought to vote against the opposition → government to came to a standstill
  ○ Power limited by Soviets
     ■ Despite having power over government affairs, the Soviets controlled influential areas e.g. railways, telegraph stations, soldiers, power supplies, factories in Petrograd
  ○ Liberal - passed laws allowing freedom of speech, press, and dismantled Okhrana
     ■ Gave political parties ample opportunity to recruit new members → more opposition to the provisional government and no one to combat revolutionary activity (due to lack of Okhrana)

* If you haven’t caught on yet, St. Petersburg → Petrograd during WWI because it sounded too German (the ‘-burg’ and the end) and I guess, Petrograd was more Russian.
• Problems facing the Provisional Government (April-August 1917)
  ○ World War I
    ■ Provisional Government consisted of Mensheviks and SRs, and any moves taken regarding the war would associate these parties with the conduct of war and risked losing support
    ■ Responded to British and French pressures to launch an attack on the Eastern Front with the *July Offensive* (16 June 1917)
      • Lasted 3 days (wow!) and quickly turned out to be a severely miscalculated offensive made by the Provisional Government → disaster. Hundreds and thousands of soldiers dead
      • Loss of support while the Bolsheviks gained the support, promising the end of the war
    ■ Immediate reaction were the *July Days* (3-7 July 1917)
      • Armed uprising consisting of up to 500,000 workers and sailors, occurred in Kronstadt
      • Marched to Petrograd and demanded an end to the provisional government, Provisional Government responded by sending in loyal Russian troops to dismantle the rebellion
      • Tried to blame the Bolsheviks for the affair, but their reputation was equally damaged → temporary decline in growth for Bolshevik support
  ○ Land
    ■ Significant unrest in countryside - peasants still land-hungry
      • Wanted Provisional Government to legitimise their land-seizure
      • Provisional Government failed to understand peasant demands, wanted landowners to be compensated, which the peasants disagreed with
      • Collapse of central authority meant that there was no one to stop them from taking it
○ National minority demands
  ■ Caucasus region, Finns, Poles wanted autonomy, etc.
  ■ Ukraine had valuable farmland and was near to the front, but was
demanding self-government → Provisional Government made concessions
    ● First step towards the breakup of Russia
○ Deteriorating economic situation
  ■ Food shortages, unemployment, high prices still
  ■ Under industrialist pressure not to interfere / fix prices → moderate
socialists in Provisional Government found themselves unable to meet
needs of natural supporters, workers

**Kornilov Affair (26-30 August 1917)**

● Background
  ○ A revolt (or coup d’etat) led by **General Lavr Kornilov** and his soldiers in hopes
of overthrowing the Provisional Government
  ○ **Alexander Kerensky**, the leader of the Provisional Government (and also the
same person who appointed Kornilov) panicked and requested help - from the
Bolsheviks
    ■ Bolshevik Red Guard (militia trained in secret by the Bolsheviks)
appeared to the streets, with Kerensky supplying them
    ■ Kornilov and his men were unprepared for a Bolshevik confrontation →
failed to reach Petrograd because of the Bolsheviks, mutinies and
sabotaged railways

● Outcome
  ○ Kerensky and the Provisional Government’s reputation had been irreparably
damaged - demonstrated military weakness, lack of loyal supporters even within
    ■ Mensheviks, SRs seen as incompetent
    ■ Kadets distrusted by the masses, soldiers revolted - disloyal
  ○ Bolsheviks were perceived as saviors of Petrograd and were now armed
Course of 1917 October Revolution

→ 10 October
   ◆ Bolshevik Central Committee votes that “armed uprising is inevitable, and that the time for it is fully ripe”

→ 24 October
   ◆ Revolt in Petrograd
      • Bolsheviks led forces in uprising in Petrograd against Kerensky and Provisional Government
      • Trotsky distributes arms to Red Guards → systematic capture of major government facilities, key communication, installations and other vantage points with little opposition
      • Fairly bloodless

→ 26-27 October
   ◆ Assault on Winter Palace
      • Entered the Palace at 2 a.m., met with little resistance and was able to arrest remainder of the government → transfer of power to Bolsheviks
   ◆ Resistance outside Petrograd
      • Bloody fighting in Moscow → truce
Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924)

- April Theses (16 April 1917)
  - Highlighted various points
    - Called for a worldwide socialist revolution
    - Land reform to the peasants
    - An end to the war
    - An end of the cooperation with the Provisional Government
    - Urged Soviets to take power
- Propaganda
  - Ideas presented in April Theses were highlighted in effective propaganda in the form of simple slogans
    - “Bread, Peace, and Land” - memorable
    - Many people turned to the Bolsheviks in response, especially the workers
- Calling for end of cooperation with Provisional Government, end of ear
  - No other political party promised an end to the war → made the Bolsheviks unique as this was a point that appealed to all social classes
  - Became the main focus of opposition against Provisional Government, people who wanted Soviet power turned to the Bolsheviks to satisfy this aim
- Marxist ideals → Marxist-Leninism
  - Claimed that Russia was ready for a revolution, and that it should happen now, because the Provisional Government was weak, and by the end of April the Bolshevik party had planned a revolution thanks to persuasion of Lenin
- Leadership
  - Strong, determined leadership, forced through key decisions
    - e.g. April Theses and plan for October Revolution plan
    - Bolsheviks were better organised than the other parties as a result
  - Great rhetorical skills that inspired many → support
Leon Trotsky (1879-1940)

- Chairman of the Petrograd Soviets in 1917
  - Worked with Lenin and persuaded him to postpone the date of the revolution
    - Allowed time to persuade the Soviets that they were seizing power in their name → workers would accept that the revolution was happen, and not interfere - it was only until after Lenin closed parliament did the workers realise that they had been tricked
    - Large influence in Petrograd, controlled things such as the bridges and railways which would become very valuable to the Bolsheviks
  - Excellent orator, inspired masses
- Key role in the military
  - Organising the Red Army and takeover

Nature of the 1917 October Revolution

- Popular revolution
  - Inevitable result of class struggle
  - Lenin’s leadership was vital in direction and decision-making
  - Working classes were inspired, and Lenin lead them with the Bolsheviks against the weakness of the bourgeoisie
- Coup d’état
  - Power seized by small group of revolutionaries i.e. Bolsheviks
    - System that grew out of this was inherently tyrannical
    - Political views would be imposed on unwilling Russian majority
  - Had limited popular support
    - Evident in November 1917 elections where they won less than a quarter of the seats in the Constituent Assembly
- Revisionist view
  - A popular revolution at first, then "hijacked" by the Bolsheviks who betrayed the people by imposing a single-party dictatorship, suppressing the people
3.1.5 Lenin’s Russia (1917-1924)

**Problem solving 101 with Lenin**

- Political opposition
  - Early attempts at wiping out opposition
    - Closed down newspapers of the centre / right, and socialist press
    - Denounced and outlawed parties, e.g. Kadets
      - Remaining Kadets beaten to death
    - SRs and Mensheviks sent to prison
  - Establishment of the *Cheka* (1917) alternatively known as the *Extraordinary Commission for the Combating of Counterrevolution and Sabotage*
    - Instrument of terror
    - Killed any suspected opposition
  - Abolished legal system, encouraged class warfare
    - Pitched proletariat against the bourgeoisie
    - Anyone deemed a bourgeois was liable to be arrested
  - Purged civil service unless loyal to Bolshevik cause
  - The Whites - main opposition during Russian Civil War (1917-1923)
    - Weak and uncoordinated, composed of various groups with differing loyalties from the right to the left
    - Common goal of ‘anti-Bolshevism’ but still lacked coherency
- Pressure to form government
  - Lenin had intended for the Bolsheviks to rule alone
    - Saw that an alliance with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries could be claimed as peasant representation
    - Stole their *Decree on Peace* from them → solved land over crowding, peasant unrest, gained peasant support and increased crop production (and revenue)
○ Constituent Assembly
  ■ Elected by the people in the first free elections, could claim to be legitimate body of rule; Bolsheviks didn’t win that many seats
  ■ Lenin let it run for a day, and then shut it down claiming redundancy
  ■ He also shot at anyone who came back

● Economic crisis
  ○ Russian economy was not in a good place in 1917
    ■ Following the war, inflation had gone up 400%
    ■ Factories that were shut down during the war had to be rebuilt
    ■ Many men were sent to the war which diminished the work force

○ Workers’ Decree (1917)
  ■ Outlined minimum wage, limitations on workers' hours, and the running of factories by elected workers' committees
  ■ Consolidated Bolshevik support amongst the working classes in the cities, where they had taken power

● Problems with ending the war
  ○ Decree of Peace (1917)
    ■ Announced Russia's withdrawal from the First World War without "payment of indemnities or annexations" - ignored by Western Allies
    ■ Russian front was dissolving, soldiers were going home and the Germans were not free to walk into Russia → forced into separate peace with Germans (that would stain their image and undermine worldwide revolution abroad)

○ Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (1918)
  ■ Difficult negotiations by Trotsky over a few months
  ■ Marked final withdrawal of Russia from the war in a ‘shameful peace’
  ■ Humiliating terms - took away territory including a quarter of its population and industry, 90% of coal mines, and other resources
  ■ Caused splits in Bolshevik party
Russian Civil War (1918-1921)

- **Colours**
  - Reds
    - Fought for Bolshevik form of socialism
    - *Workers’ and Peasants’ Army* formed from Kronstadt sailors, Red Guards, volunteer workers and soldiers from former imperial army
  - Whites
    - Loosely allied forces with an ‘anti-Bolshevik’ view
    - Deep divisions, not uncommon for there to be in-fighting
  - Greens
    - Non-ideological peasant armies fighting to protect their communities from requisitions or reprisals carried out by third parties - response to *War Communism* (1918-1921)
    - Often deserters from the other armies

- **Causes**
  - Alienation of other socialist groups
    - Mensheviks, SRs, liberals and other conservative right-wing elements in society - made clear that Bolsheviks wanted to establish a one-party state,
    - Suppression of left-SR uprising with Cheka (July 1918) → mass arrests
  - Involvement of the *Czechoslovak Legion*
    - Volunteer armed forces composed predominantly of Czechs and Slovaks, significantly enlarged by Czech prisoners of war and deserters from the Austrian army
    - Fought together with the Allied powers during World War I, requested Allies to rescue them from their campaign in Siberia due to mistrust of Bolshevik forces → clashes along the Trans-Siberian Railway with the Legion taking control of large portions
    - Substantial white forces involving anti-Bolsheviks and Cossack warlords (peasant group with strong military tradition) began to form around them
○ Initial anti-Bolshevik uprisings
  ▪ Local Cossack armies e.g. Don Cossacks, Siberian Cossacks, that had declared their loyalty to the Provisional Government
  ▪ *Volunteer Army in Novocherkassk* organised by Cossacks and Tsarist officers of the old regime → resistance, with some success in capturing areas, e.g. Rostov
  ▪ *The Leagues of Mohammedam Working People* involving Russian settlers and natives sent to work behind the lines had led numerous strikes in industrial centres
  ▪ Muslim elites formed autonomous government in Turkestan, *Kokand*, which lasted several months because Bolshevik troops were far away

- Course
  ➔ 1918
  ◆ January: Red Army established
  ◆ March: Treaty of Brest-Litovsk
  ◆ May: Czechoslovak Legion captures parts of Trans-Siberian Railway
  ◆ June: Execution of Tsar and family
  ◆ November: Admiral Kolchak (White) takes Omsk
  ➔ 1919
  ◆ February: Reds take Kiev
  ◆ March: Kolchak crosses Urals, met with Red Army
  ◆ July: Reds lose several generals to Denikin (White) - Trotsky criticised
  ➔ 1920
  ◆ February: Capture of Kolchak, executed
  ◆ May: Polish army invades and takes Kiev
  ◆ August: Red Army defeated by Poles outside Warsaw
  ◆ November: Defeat of last surviving White general
  ➔ 1921
  ◆ March: *Treaty of Riga* (1921) - peace with Poland
Reasons for Bolshevik victory in Russian Civil War (1918-1921)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths of the Reds</th>
<th>Weaknesses of the Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Strong leadership + Trotsky</td>
<td>● Poor leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ As War Commissar, Trotsky was energetic, passionate, organised</td>
<td>○ Treated their own men with contempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Able to turn the <em>Workers’ and Peasants’ Red Army</em> into an effective fighting force</td>
<td>○ Little regard for their well-being → desertions high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Brought back former Tsarist officers, held their families hostage to ensure loyalty</td>
<td>● Ill-disciplined forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Rushed to front using special train to give forces his support</td>
<td>○ “I can do nothing with my army - I am glad when it carries out my combat orders” - Anton Denikin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Tough discipline - death penalty used frequently in the case of retreat</td>
<td>○ Vodka, cocaine, brothels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Instilled belief that the revolution would end if the Red Army was defeated</td>
<td>● Political disunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unified force</td>
<td>○ Made up of different forces with different aims and beliefs - lacked direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Trotsky reorganised hierarchy of army so that there was a single, unified command</td>
<td>○ Generals did not trust each other and would not work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Coherent political view</td>
<td>○ Lacked the cohesion needed to match the Reds, unable to develop political strategy → infighting common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geographical advantages</td>
<td>○ Lost support of nationalist (and separatist) groups when they tried to restore Russian empire with pre-1917 borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Held central area, e.g. Petrograd and Moscow (railway hub, better transport of men and munitions to the front)</td>
<td>○ Lost support of peasant armies when they stated that land reform would be cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Controlled main armament factories</td>
<td>● Geographical disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Large population of central areas were conscripted to fight</td>
<td>○ Scattered around central areas in small numbers → difficulties in communication, coordinating attacks of different White armies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support</td>
<td>○ Reds controlled telephone links, had no method of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Peasants were inclined to support them because Lenin legitimised their right to land - supplied the main body of soldiers</td>
<td>● Failure of foreign intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Red propaganda was effective, sent messages that Whites would take away land from peasants and were supported by ‘foreign invaders’; Reds offered wonderful new society for workers and peasants</td>
<td>○ Half-hearted supply of weapons and ammunitions (they weren’t organised enough to use them anyway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Propaganda opportunity for the Reds - ‘foreign invaders’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Green army was apolitical, did come into conflict with Whites and Reds but not so much

**War Communism (1918-1921)**
● Problems facing the Bolshevik government on the domestic front
  ○ Rapid economic deterioration in 1918
    ■ Decree of Land and Worker’s Decrees had handed over control of land to peasants and control of factories to the workers → falling apart
    ■ Workers’ committees incapable of running factories
      ● Acute shortages of raw materials
      ● Industrial output shrank in Bolshevik areas
      ● Inflation, falling rouble value
    ■ Peasants would not supply food to central areas
      ● Wanted to be left alone after gaining, had returned to subsistence farming with little or no excess to sell
      ● No goods to exchange for food, paper money worthless → massive food shortages, everyone had 50g of bread only
  ○ Main aims
    1. Keep workers in cities producing munitions, essential war supplies and other needed goods → large-scale increase in economic output
    2. Feed the population
    3. (non-official aim) Develop socialism through the elimination of private property, commodity production and market change → shift to communist economics
  ○ Policies
    ● Prodvazyorstka - requisition of agricultural surpluses (with minimum) from peasants for centralised distribution among population
    ● Banning of private trade; state control of foreign trade
    ● Nationalisation of industry and introduction of strict centralised management
    ● Labour discipline for workers, strikes forbidden
    ● Obligatory labour duty onto non-working classes
    ● Rationing of good and most commodities, centralised distribution
    ● Military control of railways
• Results of War Communism
  o Military
  ■ Highly successful in helping Red Army against Whites, reclaimed territory
  o Social
  ■ Bitter resistance by the peasantry to prodrazvyorstka → refused to till land
  ■ Workers migrated from city to the countryside (or out of the country), Petrograd lost 72% of population, Moscow lost 53%
  ■ Series of workers’ strikes and peasants’ rebellions all over the country
  ■ Loss of mercantile, managerial talent, scholars, scientists, and other skilled groups amongst the educational elite
  ■ Food requisitioning + effects of 7 years of war + severe drought → famine with deaths of ~3-10 million
  ■ Appalling sanitary conditions, limited access to water
  o Economic
  ■ Emergence of black market despite martial law
    ● Collapse of rouble, rise in barter trade - wages paid in goods
    ● Cheka initially raided trains to prevent barter - Bolsheviks eventually allowed its existence at the risk of people starving
    ● Corrupt Bolsheviks themselves were involved in black market
  ■ Decrease in industrial output
    ● Decrease in heavy industries output by 20% in 1921 from 1913
    ● Grain harvests were slashed by ~50% by 1920 from 1913
The Red Terror (1917-1918)

- Background
  - Campaign of mass killings, torture, and systematic oppression to reinforce new measures (basically, War Communism)
  - Dealing with opposition
    - Workers angry at economic plight, low food rations and state violence - calls for new elections, free press, restoration of Constituent Assembly
    - Anarchists
    - Left-SRs protesting Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (1918) had turned to terrorism, shooting German ambassadors and captured Cheka leaders
  - Officially initiated as retribution for assassination of Petrograd Cheka leader, Moisei Uritsky, and another on Lenin himself

- Key events
  - Shooting of the Romanovs (17 July 1918)
    - Tsar Nicholas II and his family were executed by Bolsheviks led by Yakov Yurovsky in Ekaterinburg, in the Urals
    - Prevent the rescue of the Imperial Family by approaching White forces
    - Bodies drenched in acid, buried separately to avoid shrine being enacted to honour the family
  - [TERROR INTENSIFIES]
    - Significant numbers of prisoners, suspects, and hostages were executed on the basis of their belonging to the bourgeois
    - 50,000 Whites were executed - total death count ~500,000 stemming from indiscriminate murder of all possible ‘counterrevolutionaries’
    - Cheka combined into single body → labour camps, ran the gulags, conducted grain requisitions, suppressed peasant rebellions and uprisings
New Economic Policy (1921)

- Kronstadt Rebellion (March 1921) - Prompt
  - Major unsuccessful uprising against Bolsheviks late in the Russian Civil War - led by Stepan Petrichenko, consisting of Russian sailors, soldiers, and civilians
    - Bread rations were cut by a third to 1000 calories a day caused strikes - ‘equal rations for the working people’
    - Kronstadt sailors came from peasant families, and objected to Bolshevik treatment of the peasantry - ‘freedom for the peasants’
    - Came as a shock - Kronstadt sailors were thought to be very ‘Red’
  - Suppression
    - Trotsky requested their surrender otherwise they would be ‘shot like partridges’ - unrelenting bombardment of the Kronstadt fortress with artillery
    - 500 mutineers were shot on the spot, 2000 executed over next few months and the rest sent to Siberia
  - Outcomes
    - Many socialists all over the world lost faith in the Bolshevik revolution, which they now saw as a repressive regime
    - Decisive factor in Lenin’s loosening of his policy of War Communism, realising he was going to provoke a revolution which would throw out the Bolsheviks → New Economic Policy (NEP)

- Policies
  - Abolished grain requisitioning
    - Replaced with ‘tax in kind’ - peasants handed over fixed proportion of grain to state, but with lower minimal amount and could sell surpluses in open market
  - National freedoms
    - Loosened Russification policies - Muslim cultures allowed, Ukrainian language permitted and certain religious cultures were restored
- Removal of ban on private trade
  - Food and goods could now flow more easily between country and city
  - Privately owned shops reopened, including small businesses that would produce goods for peasants to buy
  - Rationing abolished and people free to purchase food → free market economy returned
- State control of heavy industry, transport and banking
  - Large-scale heavy industries e.g. coal, steel, oil
  - Reorganised industry into trusts that had to buy materials and pay their workers from own budgets - expect to manage their budgets well
  - Brought in experts to help increase production
- Results
  - Economic recovery
    - Stabilised economy saw rapid recovery as small-scale enterprises responded quickly to surge in demand
    - Trade increased between peasants from different villages, improved conditions brought reduced opposition to the Bolsheviks
    - Foreign countries saw the NEP as a step away from communism and were less afraid to invest in Russia
      - Adverse effects on Lenin’s aims towards a socialist society, but did help him in consolidating his power
    - By 1925, there was so much food they didn’t know what to do with it → prices dropped, peasants were reluctant to supply food because they were unable to purchase industrial / consumer goods - “scissor crisis”
  - Social
    - Emergence of new class called ‘NEPmen’ - private traders that flourished under NEP, came to handle ¾ of retail trade
    - Peasants did well - kulaks emerged once again
    - Increase of demand for hand-crafted goods, preserved culture
• Political repression under NEP
  o Censorship
    ■ More systematic by 1922, writers and scholars deported to convince intelligentsia not to criticise the government
    ■ Pre-publication censorship
  o Attacks on political rivals
    ■ Bolsheviks arrested 5000 Mensheviks for counterrevolutionary activities
    ■ Outlawed Mensheviks and SR organisations
    ■ Show trials
  o Crushing peasant revolts
    ■ Tambov Rebellion (1922) saw their village swamped by Red ARmy and destroyed in a brutal campaign
    ■ Rewarded villages that supported Bolsheviks with salt (valuable)
  o Cheka renamed to GPU (1922)
    ■ Establishment of imprisonment and death penalty as arbitrary
    ■ Periodically harassed NEPmen and kulaks to ensure that they were keeping capitalistic tendencies under control
  o Attacks on Church
    ■ Seen as rival power, enjoyed revival at beginning of NEP
    ■ *Union of the Militant Godless* (1921) was a direct challenge to the Church, stripped them of items and death penalties were handed out to leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church + priests imprisoned

The NEP was a success, despite being an ideological retreat. Lenin died in 1924.

In spite of his opinion that the NEP should last several decades at least, until universal literacy was accomplished, Stalin, in 1928, abolished it and introduced full central planning, re-nationalisation, and from the late 1920s onwards introduced a policy of rapid industrialization. Stalin's collectivization of agriculture was his most notable departure from the NEP approach.
3.2.1 Causes of the CCW (1934-1935)

Summary of events

- Long Civil War (1912-1949) spanning from the collapse of imperial power until Mao’s victory in 1949.
- First Chinese Civil War (1927-1937) started with the White Terror, interrupted by the Sino-Japanese War (1937) and subsequently WWII, followed by the Second Chinese Civil War (1946-1949).

Long term causes:

- Early 20th Century China (1915-1919)
  - Succession of Pu Yi (1908), only two years old at the time, resulted in Prince Chun ruling as a regent but was incapable of implementing essential reform
    - Increased taxation → upset the business classes
    - No socio-economic progress made
    - Succeeded in dismissing Jiang Jieshi
  - Double Tenth (1911)
    - A revolution to overthrow the ruling dynasty
      - The key tensions and issues that led to this revolution would also be significant in the causes of the civil war 15 years later: the impact of imperialism, anti-foreign sentiment and political weakness
    - Many provinces declared themselves independent of Beijing, and Sun Yixian was invited to be the President of the Chinese Republic at its establishment
    - Manchu attempts to suppress the rebellion failed, as the general of the Army, Yuan Shikai, arranged a deal with Sun Yixian to become the President in exchange for the end of Manchu rule
    - By 1912, Pu Yi had abdicated → end of the Manchus
- At this point, the revolution was incomplete, as there was no real introduction of democracy and most former imperial officials kept their positions
- Revolution was led by the military, with Chinese radicals, and not the middle classes
  - Yuan Shikai’s military dictatorship (1912-1915)
    - Key tensions left unresolved and regionalism continued - barrier to united China
    - 1912: Sun Yixian reformed as the GMD
      - Aims:
        - 1. Nationalism: to rid China of foreign influence, united China and to regain its international respect
        - 2. Democracy: the people should be educated so they could ultimately rule themselves democratically
        - 3. People’s livelihood: essentially ‘land reform’, the redistribution of land to the peasants and economic development
      - Sun moved Yuan from his power base in Beijing to Nanjing, attempting to undermine him, but Yuan was like, “No, what the hell are you doing.”
      - GMD was only a regional power in the Southern promises, that lacked the organization to mount an attack on Yuan
  - 1912: New Culture Movement
    - Scholars called for the creation of a new Chinese culture based on global and western standards, especially democracy and science
      - On May 4, 1919, students in Beijing protested the Paris Peace Conference giving German rights over Shandong to Imperial Japan, turning this cultural movement into a
political one in what became known as the May Fourth Movement

- 1913: Sun flees to Japan
  - Yuan abolishes regional assemblies in an attempt to centralise power → further alienation of the provincial powers especially as tax revenues were centrally controlled

- 1915-1921: Demands
  - Set of demands sent by Japan to the weak government of China, which would greatly extend Japanese control of Manchuria and of the Chinese economy
  - China responded with a nationwide boycott of Japanese goods; Japan’s exports to China fell 40%
    - The overall political impact of Japan’s actions were highly negative, creating a considerable amount of public ill-will towards Japan, contributing to the May Fourth Movement, and a significant upsurge in nationalism

- 1916: Yuan fucks up
  - “I’m the emperor.” - Yuan’s famous last words → lose the support of the military before his death 3 months later

- Socio-economic factors
  - Under the rule of the imperial Manchu dynasty, the vast majority of the population were peasants.
    - Faced high taxes to fund Manchu dynasty
    - High land rents -- some peasants paid up to 80% of their harvest → unsustainable livelihood

- Famines
  - Faced starvation due to subsistence farming techniques and natural disasters (floods and droughts) leaving them with barely enough to feed their families
• Population grew without a corresponding increase in cultivated land area made famines more frequent - especially in the second half of the 19th century where the population grew by 8% but cultivated land area only increased by 1%

■ Unable to find refuge from poverty in the city
• High unemployment due to better technology and cheap Western imports

● Imperialism and anti foreign sentiment
  ○ European imperialist powers had humiliated and exploited China and caused the destabilization of China’s ruling Manchu regime

■ Infringement on sovereignty undermining Manchu regime by foreign powers
• Britain defeated China in the mid 19th century in the Opium Wars, subsequently “carving up” the Chinese Empire into spheres of influence by the Europeans, Americans and later, Japanese
  ○ Imperialist powers had control over their trade, territory and sovereignty
  ○ Foreigners refused to abide by Chinese laws, and they had their own extra-territorial courts

■ Religious destabilisation
• Surge of missionaries in attempt to spread Christianity

■ Financial destabilisation
• Inflation and corruption made China unable to resist the influx of foreigners → rising nationalist sentiment and opposition to imperial power, who were convinced that the abdication of the emperor was necessary for the country’s modernisation and return to power
○ Boxer Rebellion (1899) - violent rebellion against Westerners which failed because they lacked modern weaponry

○ Japanese involvement
  ■ While subjugated by the West, they faced humiliation of defeat to Japan in the Sino-Japanese War (1895)
    ● Later, they lost more territory to Japan when it was part of the settlement in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905)

○ Political instability
  ○ Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864)
    ■ Religious and political reform movement in Southern China that expanded into a civil war between the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom (rebels) and the Manchu dynasty
  ○ Self-Strengthening Movement (1861-1895)
    ■ Period of reform in response to increasing Western power and influence in China, but failed to decide how to “strengthen” China → movement failed
    ● The Manchus did not coherently support reform, leaving China to remain subjugated by the West
  ○ Boxer Rebellion (1899)
    ■ The popular anti-Western feeling turned into a widespread violent rebellion
    ■ BUT, it failed due to the lack of modern weaponry
      ● Undermined the Manchu dynasty and exposed its weakness as the emperor had to employ foreign troops to crush rebellion
  ○ Overthrow of the Manchu dynasty
    ■ Manchus weakened both financially and politically by inflation and corruption
Corruption was widespread in both local and provincial government officials and tax revenue did not reach the central government

**Short-term causes**

- Regionalism (1916-1928)
  - Death of Yuan removed the only unifying factor in China → the break up of China into small states controlled by warlords
    - Each territory was run individually (with its own taxes, laws and currencies)
    - Constant war to expand territories, and therefore power and wealth → peasant suffering
    - No warlord was willing to relinquish his armies to the central government
      - The division of the country increased the sense of humiliation felt by many Chinese and, coupled with their desire to get rid of foreign influence, led to an increase in nationalism during the decade of warlord rule
      - The poor social conditions for the peasantry would set the grounds for the support the CCP would receive later on
  - May Fourth Movement (1919)
    - Students led a mass demonstration in Beijing against the warlords, traditional Chinese culture and the Japanese
      - Triggered by Versailles statement, where Shandong had been given to Japan, giving the appearance that the Chinese had joined the Allies to be humiliated
    - Dedicated to change and the rebirth of China as a proud and independent nation
      - Inspiration from the Bolsheviks → Chinese Communist Party
      - Inspiration from the GMD - grew stronger due to warlordism
  - Death of Sun Yixian (1935) and subsequent events
Jiang Jieshi, a committed nationalist, took over the GMD after Sun’s death
- Aims of GMD socialist in nature - proof of strong Soviet links (** not communist in nature) → Soviets would invest in the GMD, providing aid and assistance, with the goal of fostering good relationships with nationalist China
  - Over time, Jiang became increasingly anti-communist
- Formation of CCP (1921)
  - intellectual without military strength initially
- First United Front (1922)
  - GMD and CCP had the common goal of uniting China and freeing her from imperialism
  - The Northern Expedition (1926) was the First United Front’s first attempt to crush the warlords, and with great success; by 1927, the communists had Hangzhou, Shanghai and Nanjing, by 1928 Beijing, completing the mission in 2 years
- GMD announced that it was the legitimate government of China and the new capital and seat of government would be Nanjing

**Immediate causes**
- GMD attacks the CCP
  - Jiang disliked the CCP
    - CCP garnered popular support
      - During the Northern Expedition, the communists had promised the peasants land → garnering local peasant support
      - Industrial workers liked them → able to organize workers risings
    - Jiang sympathetic to the landlords and the middle classes, the peasant attacks against the landlords to seize land in communist areas was unacceptable to him
  - White Terror (1927)
○ Jiang expelled all communists from the GMD, and his attacks on the communists reached a peak in the White Terror
  - The workers army (under Zhou Enlai) were shot - over 5000 communists
  - Similar attacks carried out in other cities, massacring over thousands of communists, trade unionists and peasant leaders - 0.25 million people killed
● Civil war had begun!
  ○ By 1927, the CCP was nearly crushed
    - The failure to defeat the CCP in 1927 allowed for the CCP to build up its strength and emerge as much stronger in the Second United Front in 1927
    - The CCP was in a much better position to challenge the GMD in the second stage of the Chinese Civil War
3.2.2 First Half of the Chinese Civil War
(1927-1937)

- The Jiangxi Soviet (1934)
  - The CCP retreated to Jiangxi to survive the GMD onslaught, which became known as the Jiangxi Soviet
  - Mao Zedong’s writing suggests that the White Terror was proof that the United Front was ultimately doomed (ergo that cooperation with the GMD would destroy the CCP)
    - Mao also believed that the GMD and Comintern had the wrong strategy for China - should be peasant based and not urban
    - Vast majority of Chinese were peasants, with 88% of the 500 million living in rural areas
  - His tangent ideology (Marxism → Maoism) placed the proletariat at the centre of the revolution (the army’s tactics were guerrilla warfare and land reform was to be carried out in areas of CCP control) was successful with the results of recruitment found in the Jiangxi Soviet
    - These views were not shared by the Soviet Union, Comintern and more orthodox members of the CCP → ideological divide within the party → Comintern official Li Lisan launched an attack against the CCP

- Five Encirclement Campaigns
  - Attempt to destroy the Jiangxi Soviet and the CP
    - Encircled the Reds and cut them off from supplies and resources
  - Forced the communists into the Hunan and Jiangxi provinces, where they focused on strategy and survival → building up military forces the Red Army
  - The Fifth Encirclement Campaign saw a force of 80,000 men, air cover and artillery, as a result of German advice. It was successful at Ruijin in 1934.
The Long March (1935)

- Mao refused to surrender and decided to break the GMD’s lines and set up a new base, embarking on the Long March
  - The CCP trekked 9,600 km to Shanxi - took 368 days, 90% of the 90,000 communists died, but they broke through the encirclement in Jiangxi

- Key events of the Long March:
  - Crossing the Xiang River (GMD territory)
  - Captured Zunyi with guerrilla tactics → Zunyi Conference, Mao declares himself leader and that his forces will “march north to fight the Japanese”
  - Disputes between Zhang Guotao, Mao Zedong and Zhu De (splitting of Red Army)
  - Songpan Marshes - loss of many men due to terrain, attacks by local tribes and ingestion of poisonous plants
  - Arrival at the Shanxi Soviet in October 1935, setting up a base in Yan’an

- Outcomes of the Long March:
  - Ensured Mao’s position as the unchallenged leader
  - Ensured the CCP’s survival
  - Offered a defensible base in Yan’an
  - Propaganda victory for the CCP - March was an opportunity to spread their policies, recruit, won patriotic support for claiming to go fight the Japanese
  - Military experience for the CCP, especially in guerrilla tactics
  - Welded survivors into tight, dedicated group of fanatical revolutionaries
○ Second United Front (1937)
  ■ In 1931, Japan invaded China, taking over Manchuria, but Jiang only appealed to the League as he considered the communists a bigger threat
  ■ Mao calls for another United Front to fight the Japanese
    〇 Supported by everyone, including the northern warlords
    〇 comintern also, as Stalin was afraid of Jiang Jieshi as the only leader in China who was capable of effectively fighting the Japanese
  ■ Second United Front formally established in 1937, suspending the civil war → “National War of Resistance” (against the Japanese)
  ■ Outcomes:
    〇 GMD - lost patriotic support for not fighting the Japanese, aggravated by poor treatment of the peasants; benefited from support from the USSR and potentially from the USA
    〇 CCP - Mao’s offer to create a joint front with the GMD to fight the Japanese won the CCP popularity, allowing them to pose as true nationalists; gained legitimacy
3.2.3 Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945)

- Impact of war on GMD
  - GMD troops were very demoralized due to ill treatment and were highly unmotivated
    - Jiang sent his best troops to Yan’an withdrawing into Chongqing - he hoped that the US would win the war for him → bad impact on morale
    - Furthermore, all US aid trickled through the Himalayas, as the Japanese controlled coastal ports and land routes
  - Multiple factions due to rising discontent with Jiang caused by rampant corruption, military failures and inflation
    - Jiang responded with increased repression, exacerbating discontent
  - Raging corruption undermined the (late) efforts to elicit popular support through the introduction of reforms
    - Conscription alienated the peasantry
  - Lacked control over China’s provinces (controlled the capital in central China and areas in the south); previously GMD controlled areas now under Japanese control - causing Jiang to lose much needed tax revenue
    - Printed more money → high levels of inflation → bad for the middle classes, the main/natural supporters of the GMD
    - Peasantry also affected
  - Exhausted physically and psychologically as they bore the brunt of Japanese attacks and sustained heavy losses
    - Undermined the GMD advantage in numbers of men and weapons, their control over larger territory and population and international support
  - Mao emphasized GMD support from USA to associate Jiang Jieshi with the Western imperialists, associating the GMD with popular anti-imperialist/foreign sentiment
Impact of the war on the CCP
- Used guerrilla tactics, sustained light losses - able to continue revolutionary warfare, liberating towns and implementing their policies
  - Land reforms
  - Setting up village schools
  - Reducing taxes, fixing debt
- Gained support through egalitarian policies
  - Same living conditions for all
  - Intellectuals had to work with peasantry, think their thoughts
  - Women were treated as equals with men (given the freedom to marry whom they chose and had the right to divorce, education, voting at 18, military service and to form women’s associations)
- Appeared to have provided good leadership during the war when they were then perceived as “true nationalists”
- Fostered an image of conducting guerrilla warfare in defense of the people
- Skillful organization and effective propaganda allowed party membership to increase
3.2.4 Second Half of the Chinese Civil War and Communist Victory (1946-1949)

Course of the Second Half of the Chinese Civil War
The second stage of the war was more of an international affair with foreign intervention and the polarization of international political context because of the Cold War.

- US foreign intervention
  - US sought a diplomatic solution between the CCP and the GMD but neither side was willing to share power. General Marshall managed to get them to agree on the following terms:
    - Prepare to set up a coalition government
    - Form a temporary state council
    - United their armies into a national army
    - Have free elections for the local government
  - Both parties were not prepared to honour the terms of the agreement and continued to move troops into Manchuria (1946) even as negotiations were being made.
- Initial GMD victories (1945-1947)
  - GMD troops outnumbered the CCP and had better equipment + US troops
- Subsequent CCP victories (1947-1949)
  - General Marshall managed to get Jiang to agree to a truce, which worked to the CCP’s advantage as it spared them of a final assault on their headquarters and gave them time
    - Trained their forces to be ready for war
    - Introduced more land reforms which resulted in more peasants to joining the communists
- The Red Army was now called the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) and reverted to guerrilla warfare
- Key events of 1949 leading to collapse of GMD resistance
  - January: PLA launches offensive against vital railway junction of Xuzhou → emerge victorious
  - Late January: CCP takes Tianjing, Beijing → controls northern China
  - April: CCP takes Nanjing
  - May: CCP takes Shanghai
  - October: CCP takes Guangzhou → Mao proclaims People’s Republic of China in Beijing
  - November: Crushing of remaining GMD resistance

### Reasons for the Communist victory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths of the CCP</th>
<th>Weaknesses of the GMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guerrilla tactics, revolutionary warfare</strong></td>
<td>Political errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Highly successful against GMD, and also Japanese</td>
<td>- Jiang resisted democratic changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increasingly repressive regime alienated liberals and the middle classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Failed to win mass support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Government relied on small but wealthy businessmen and landlords for support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Corruption and inefficiency further alienated the middle class and peasants, who had to bear the unfair taxation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLA organization, strength</strong></td>
<td>Economic errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excellent military leadership (e.g. Lin Biao)</td>
<td>- Rampant inflation → loss of middle class support (natural support base)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guerilla fighting force &gt; conventional fighting force</td>
<td>- Jiang only put in place deflationary measures in 1948, introducing a new currency and rationing, but it was too late → economic collapse in 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengthened by desertions of GMD soldiers and by capturing enemy weapons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More effective, higher morale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better behaved, appealed to peasants for help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of Mao</strong></td>
<td>Military errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Introduced innovative guerrilla tactics
- Strong leadership in Long March → broadening support base
- Used war against Japan as propaganda opportunity
- Adapted ideas and policies to suit changing military situation

- US support commented on poor quality of GMD troops, low morale → high desertion rate
- Did not behave as well as the CCP forces which had strict codes of behaviour
- Jiang’s leadership mistakes - like pouring resources into Manchuria when the fight was in Xuzhou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spread of Communist ideals</th>
<th>Role of intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Long March, Sino-Japanese War → spread influence in areas that were captured</td>
<td>- Superior intelligence in second stage of civil war → aware of GMD’s intended moves in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land reform in rural areas under communist control</td>
<td>- Jiang’s assistant chief of staff, Liu Fei was a communist spy and also head of GMD’s war planning board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mao’s touch like Midas’ touch → spread their influence wherever they went</td>
<td>- Several GMD commanders were also communist agents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Role of foreign intervention:**

- USA
  - Ideological
    - Pre-existing ideological conflict between communism and democracy
    - Growing anti-communism movement in the US - McCarthyism
    - Preventing the rise of the CCP would be a major Cold War victory for the US
    - Fit with US foreign policy - Truman Doctrine (where the US directly intervene in countries that were at risk of falling to communism)
    - Marshall’s formation of the unstable but democratic Political Consultative Conference
○ Self-interest
  ■ GMD’s ideology was nationalism - not compatible with capitalism and democracy
  ■ GMD lacked support from the US - only $27 million was given in the first few years and the $84 million given later on never made much of an impact
  ■ USA had already acquired an alternative base in Asia - Japan - when the strategic reason of acquiring China as a base had stopped, the intervention stopped as well
○ Military
  ■ Advisers provided training to the GMD during WWII but withdrew during the CCW due to growing anti-Americanism
  ■ Did not send troops
  ■ Imposed embargo (1946) to try and force a coalition government - on the assumption that the GMD had the clear upper hand
    ● Lifted in 1947 and ask the GMD to pay for it
  ■ Gave American aerial transportation that was crucial in transporting its forces to the key cities of Beijing and Nanjing and the Manchurian cities
○ USSR
  ■ Ideology
    ■ Wanted a CCP victory → prove that communism was superior to the rest of the world’s ideologies
      ● However, CCP chose to adopt moderate policies during the Yenan period to win over maximum support → caused Stalin to be suspicious of the orthodoxy of Maoism - ambivalent in his support for Mao
    ■ Breach US containment policy - Truman Doctrine
    ■ Conflict between Russian and Chinese aims
- Conflict between Russian and Chinese versions of communism - the former thought that it should be based on the industrial workers while the latter felt that it should be based on peasants
- Stalin wanted a divided China - would not pose a threat in the future → Stalin tried to convince Mao to cooperate with Chiang and stop at the Yangtze river and not pursue the GMd in 1949
  ○ Self-interest
    ■ Intervened directly only to get hold of Manchuria → stripping of $2 billion worth of war booty → needed economic resources to reconstruct economy after WWII
    ■ Only limited aid given → little financial aid as the Soviet economy was not able to help
    ■ Ultimate evidence of self-interest → signed a treaty with Chiang in 1945 - Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance in 1945
  ○ Military
    ■ Gave CCP strategic advantage by withdrawing from Manchuria → gave CCP the Manchurian countryside
    ■ Sent Soviet advisers who taught the CCP logistics, strategy and tactics, armoured and aerial warfare
    ■ Important because the Red Army was making the transition to being a conventional military but was a guerrilla force with untrained leaders
    ■ Did not commit troops
    ■ Provided large supplies of captured Japanese weapons to the CCP - important because the military previously lacked modern equipment
    ■ Unable to provide monetary funds due to the weak Soviet economy during that period of time
3.2.5 Outcomes of the Chinese Civil War

China

- CCP consolidated control in China → formation of authoritarian state
  - Suppression of freedom of rights
    - Tiananmen Square protests were forcibly dispersed with guns and tanks
      but the state used the civil war to justify its actions
    - Society was militarised
    - Mao given a godlike status
  - Economy exhausted after many years of conflict
    - Agricultural peasants fell as peasants were taken to fight → food shortages
    - Industrial production fell
    - Worsened financial situation as GMD leaders took Chinese foreign currency reserves and then fled to Taiwan
    - CCP → rift in relations with the West, loss of trade and contact
  - Actions taken by CCP to consolidate communist rule
    - Strict regulation of the economy to control inflation → taxes increased and new currency, RMB, introduced
    - Confiscated GMD territory, foreign assets → redistribution to poorer peasants
    - Nationalised banks, transport industries, gas and electricity supplies
    - New system of government
  - Social changes
    - Emancipated traditionally oppressed women, gained right to divorce, vote, property rights, outlawed arranged marriages etc.
    - Women had to take over hard farm labour when the men went to fight
    - Change was slow but reforms provided legal and social framework for women to establish equal rights with men
Education changes
- Rejected traditional Chinese education and teaching methods (but was not successful in breaking away from the model - “elite schools” still around which the children of high ranking party officials occupied)
- Opposed Western influence
- Heavy emphasis on testing, exams and physical education
- University education focused on technical and scientific subjects - a reflection of the country’s need for specialists
- Overseas education consisted only of the USSR after its isolation from the West

International
- Asia
  - Shifting of Cold War theatre from Europe to Asia → inspired insurgents
  - Korean War
- USSR
  - Success of worldwide communist revolution
  - Stalin feared that Mao was a rival for leadership in the communist world
    - Tensions between Stalin and Mao
      - Stalin felt that Maoism was not “genuinely revolutionary” (a mix of Marxism and traditional Chinese culture)
      - Mao was convinced that Stalin wanted a weak and divided China so the USSR would dominate Asia
    - Still has close relations, Sino-Soviet Treaty of Alliance (1950) with close cooperation over construction projects and sharing of Soviet scientific technology
    - Relations cooled during Chinese aid in Korean War
      - But worsened again after Stalin died - Destalinisation was seen as an attack on Mao’s leadership style
• USA
  o Blamed CCP victory on lack of support for GMD
    ■ Passing of new military budget
  o Intensified Cold War and McCarthyism
  o Did not recognize the different types of communism or that USSR and China had increasing tensions and hostility
  o “One China Policy” - refused to recognize the PRC as a legitimate state
  o China and USA had a radical change in attitude and policy towards one another in the 1960s and entered a period of dialogue known as ‘ping pong diplomacy’ - the end of Cold War tensions and improved relations