

12 – Realism, Nationalism, and Imperialism, 1850-1914

Failure in the revolutions of 1848 vaulted Europe into a new era. Intellectually, the Romantic temperament faded, as artists, scientists, and politicians adopted a hard-headed mindset of realism and materialism. Military power, industry, organization, electricity, commodities—these products of modern life replaced the imaginary, spiritual, emotional, idealistic, and rhetorical of Romanticism. This chapter reviews the post-1848 realist and materialist ethos in the arts and ideas, its application in national unification projects, in the continuing progress of technological and industrial change, and, ultimately, how all these were deployed in Europe's domination of Asia and Africa through imperialism. The events in this chapter culminate centuries-long developments and represent the zenith of European power in world history.

Realism and Materialism

If the Romantics presented a world of possibilities through the imagination, then the realists refocused their attention on the world as it really was, warts and all. For writers and artists of the second half of the 19th century, industry and technology dominated the lives of Europeans.

Art and Literature

After 1850, writers turned from Romantic themes to the lives of those directly affected by a changing material reality. Characters in realist novels struggled to understand and cope with the impersonal forces of economic and social change. British author Charles Dickens (1812-1870) filled his novels with compelling characters thrown into a World of sooty cities, cruel orphanages, and corrupt business practices. Stories such as *Hard Times* and *Oliver Twist* revealed the underside of Britain's rapid industrialization and the crushing inequality attending material progress. Realist writers abandoned the conventions of Romantic rhetoric in favor of an unsentimental, precise style, as in Gustave Flaubert's (1821-1880) *Madame Bovary*. The title character becomes disillusioned with her mundane middle-class life and marriage, engages in several adulterous affairs, and ultimately commits suicide.

Realist artists turned their canvases into windows on the lives of the downtrodden. French painters led the way in revealing the difficult circumstances of landless peasants and exhausted factory workers. Jean-François Millet (1814-1875) highlighted in paintings such as *The Sower* and *The Gleaners* the backbreaking labor of culling enough from the earth to eke out survival. His paintings were echoed by those of Gustave Courbet (1819-1877), whose *Stonebreakers* eloquently captured the brutal work of two manual laborers crushing stones for gravel. We focus on the physical posture of the workers rather than their faces, which are covered in shadows. As photography developed throughout the century, an additional medium became available to depict difficult social problems.

Positivism

• THEME MUSIC

Positivism marks the culmination of the authority of science and belief in objective knowledge (OS), representing a continuity with the Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment. However, positivism goes beyond a particular epistemology (method of knowledge) to take up a philosophical or cosmological position—that only objects verifiable by the senses can exist.

As the influence of organized religion declined in Europe, many substituted it with belief in the potential of science. The power of scientific thought seemed validated by its production of immense material benefits through industry and technology. French philosopher August Comte (1798-1857) captured this faith with the theory of positivism. Comte believed that history had progressed through three stages—the theological, metaphysical (or philosophical), and the scientific. The great revolutions of 1789-1848 faltered, according to Comte, because of their adherence to overly abstract principles. Progress must rely on a hard-nosed and empirical investigation of reality, avoiding wishful thinking and unsupported generalizations. Comte categorized all the sciences and argued for a science of society (sociology), which would become a new secular religion.

Marxism

Karl Marx (1818-1883) claimed the mantle of a “scientific socialism” and turned his political philosophy into one of the most influential movements in history. From a middle-class family, Marx studied philosophy and law in college and eventually fell in with German radicals. Working for a series of left-wing publications, Marx hailed the revolutions of 1848 as the beginning of the socialist age. Marx's lifelong collaborator, Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), was the son of a German textile owner who rebelled against his inheritance and had published *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1844) to highlight the inequalities generated by capitalism. Together the two produced the famous pamphlet, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), urging the working class to unite and throw off their chains. Though the revolutions of 1848 failed, the manifesto established the outlines of

AP Achiever

Marxian socialism and a program of nationalization of property, universal suffrage, and the redistribution of property. As the collaborators worked within the newly established First International – founded in 1864 to promote a union of working-class parties – Marx labored at his masterwork of political economy, *Capital*; later finished by Engel in the 1880s. Marx and Engels wove together three diverse strands into their comprehensive critique of capitalism: German philosophy, British industrialism, and French radicalism. Marxian socialism comprises the following pillars:

Alienation of labor – In his early writings, Marx blamed the increasing division of labor (i.e., specialization) for alienating (or creating a feeling of separation) the worker from his product, his labor, himself, and his fellow man, who exploits him.

Labor theory of value – Borrowing from the British classical economists, Marx held that the value of a product equaled the amount of labor that went into producing it. Therefore, the difference between the worker’s wages and the ultimate price of the products—what the factory owner calls profit—robs the worker of his uncompensated “surplus labor.”

Dialectical materialism – Marx took Hegel’s historical notion of the clash of opposing forces as producing change (thesis + antithesis + synthesis) and applied it to clashing systems of production. Whereas Hegel emphasized a dialectic of ideas, Marx held that antagonistic material forces produced change, called economic determinism. Marxism, thus, offered a complete view of history, in keeping with German philosophy.

Class struggle – Each economic system is associated with a dominant class that owns the means of production. In feudalism, for example, the aristocracy owns the essential resource (land) and exercises power based on this ownership. The bourgeoisie who own capital (factories, banks, etc.) represent the most productive class in history, but their exploitation of the propertyless unskilled workers who are forced to sell their labor, the proletariat, inevitably produces the system opposing capitalism—socialism. As workers increase in number, they will develop class identity (consciousness) and eventually unite to overthrow those who oppress them.

Revolution – Marx condemned early utopian socialists and the anarchists of eastern and southern Europe for what he considered unrealistic schemes. Rule by the oppressed proletariat would only result from organization, agitation, and planning, not by separate communes and assassinations. Though Marx hoped for a worldwide movement of the working class, he believed it possible, if

unlikely, that the revolution might succeed through democratic means in some nations.

Marxism exercised wide influence among all working-class movements, both revolutionary and democratic. Even those who rejected Marx’s critique of capitalism had to confront his powerful ideology of change. Many have claimed that the appeal of Marxism lies in its similarity to an organized religion, though Marx rejected religion as the “opiate of the masses.” Marxism offers its adherents religious-like symbols: prophets (Marx and Engels), holy books (Marx’s writings), a chosen race (proletariat), and an end of the world (history’s culmination with communism, where the state “withers away”). Marxism would finally gain power in the 20th century, though some claim that these national experiments represent a distortion of Marx’s doctrine, suggesting that there may be “as many Marxisms as there are Marxists.”

• SKILL SET

This section distills orthodox Marxism; however, the theory has been altered and fitted to many contexts, including the most backward of the industrial powers (during the Russian Revolution) and used by anti-colonial powers to establish economic independence and promote global equality (CCOT).

National Unification

It seems each century produces an event that completely transforms the diplomatic landscape. In the 19th century, the unifications of Italy and Germany altered the entire framework of European diplomacy. European political structures proved unable to incorporate successfully the emergence of these two new powers, leading to the most destructive wars in history in the 20th century. Italy and Germany had been divided for centuries. What allowed for their unifications in the middle of the 19th century? Once again, we must look to the failed outcomes of the revolutions of 1848.

The Crimean War, 1853-1856

Revolutions in 1848 undermined the Concert of Europe, the agreement of the great powers to resolve issues collectively—and paved the way for the mid-century Crimean War. The Crimean War seemed avoidable and was poorly fought, but ultimately proved of great importance for subsequent diplomacy.

For centuries after its last foray into central Europe in 1683, the Ottoman Empire slowly receded in power. The empire found itself prey to continual attacks by a Russian nation intent on gaining a warm-weather seaport. Only the intervention of Britain, which opposed Russian expansionism into the Mediterranean, kept the “Sick Man of Europe” on life support. When Napoleon fell in France in 1815, the Ottoman sultan wrung concessions from the Ottoman sultan to protect Christian minorities within the empire, the

Russians demanded the same treatment. Fearing the further growth of Russian power, the French and British stiffened the sultan's resistance to Russian intrusion. When war ensued, the Russian navy shattered the archaic Ottoman fleet in the Black Sea and moved into two Turkish-held provinces (current-day Romania). France and Britain demanded that the Russians evacuate the provinces or face war. Even though Russia complied, the two western powers declared war anyway because of anti-Russian public opinion in their nations. Austria now used the situation to its own benefit. Russia had aided Austria in 1849 by crushing the Hungarian revolt. Instead of repaying the favor, Austria exploited Russia's predicament by moving into the recently evacuated provinces. Isolated, Russia attempted to defend itself against the combined weight of France, Russia, and the Italian kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia.

The Crimean War represents the inaugural industrialized conflict, with the first use of trenches, telegraphs, and railways. Nonetheless, poor communication; strategic errors, and disease cost an inordinate number of lives. The only hero of the struggle was Florence Nightingale (1820-1910), who helped found the nursing profession and demonstrated the ability of women to take on productive public roles. By 1855, the new Russian tsar, Alexander II, realized that the war had underscored Russia's technological and economic backwardness. With the Treaty of Paris (1856), Russia agreed to demilitarize the Black Sea and halt its expansion into the Balkans.

Though the war was over, the issues raised by it were not. By forever destroying the Concert of Europe, the Crimean War encouraged states to pursue national interests with little regard for the effects on the international order. Napoleon III considered the war a great-victory and was falsely convinced of France's strength and prominence. British leaders felt disappointed at the cost and outcome of the war and fell into "splendid isolation" for half a century, standing aside while Italy and Germany unified. With its overly subtle diplomacy, Austria had isolated itself, a fatal error as it would face two wars in the next 10 years. Before the ink was dry on the treaty, Russia was determined to reform internally and continue its expansion at the first opportunity. Finally, by its involvement, little Piedmont-Sardinia won itself a great power patron in its drive for unification.

The Unification of Italy

• SKILL SET

To ensure your understanding of the new politics of realism (*Realpolitik*), compare and contrast (COMP) the tactics used by Cavour and Bismarck, respectively, to unify Italy and Germany.

Background and Romantic Nationalism

The Italian peninsula was divided since the time of the Roman Empire. Though Italy pioneered the Renaissance, its diverse city-states lost their independence as a result of foreign invasion. Since the 17th century, foreign powers dominated politics in Italy. The nationalism of the French Revolution and the policies of Napoleon revived dreams of a united Italy. The Congress of Vienna's restoration of traditional rule frustrated these aspirations. Despite failure to expel foreign rule in the revolutionary period 1815-1848, Italian nationalists could now look to leadership from Piedmont-Sardinia and exploit the increasingly tenuous position of Austria, the foreign power blocking unification.

Many Italian nationalists preferred the creation of a united republic, which would require a takeover of the Papal States. Following the Congress of Vienna, the resurgence of Italian nationalism was fueled by two republican advocates: Giuseppe Mazzini (see Chapter 11) and Giuseppe Garibaldi, the charismatic leader of the Red Shirts. Both represented the spirit of romantic nationalism. Much of the practical work for Italian unity, however, was accomplished by a bookish and wily moderate, Camillo Benso di Cavour (1810-1861).

The Role of Piedmont-Sardinia and Cavour

Because of Piedmont-Sardinia's anti-Austrian role in the revolutions of 1848, many Italian nationalists looked to it for leadership. In 1848-1849, the king granted a constitution and attempted to unite the other Italian states in a war of liberation against Austria. Owing to his failure, the king abdicated in 1849, turning power to his son Victor Emmanuel II (r. 1849-1878). In 1852, the new king appointed Cavour as prime minister. Cavour supported Liberal ideas and had urged the unification of Italy in his newspaper, *Il Risorgimento*. Cavour understood practical affairs, having made a fortune in agriculture and business. As prime minister, Cavour looked to modernize the Piedmontese state—updating the tax and budget system, building railroads, pursuing free trade, limiting the power of the Catholic Church, and building a small but strong army. Though Cavour was willing to use Romantic ideals to his advantage, he favored a realistic (*Realpolitik*) approach to Italian unity. And this required a foreign ally.

With the Treaty of Plombières (1858), Cavour persuaded Napoleon III of France to join Piedmont-Sardinia in a joint attack on Austria. By the treaty,

AP Achiever

Piedmont would gain the Italian states of Lombardy and Venetia, while Napoleon would reconfirm French leadership of nationalism and exercise influence in Italy. In the ensuing war, Piedmont and France defeated the Austrian army, setting off revolutions in the northern Italian states. Fearing that the situation was spinning out of control, Napoleon ill signed a separate agreement with Austria, leaving Cavour high and dry. However, the northern Italian states in 1860 voted via plebiscites (elections related to issues not candidates) to join the Piedmontese state, which Napoleon acknowledged in exchange for Nice and Savoy from Piedmont.

Cavour now urged Garibaldi to take advantage of the revolutionary situation brewing in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the backward Bourbon monarchy controlling the southern half of the peninsula. With just over a thousand of his Red Shirts, Garibaldi rallied the countryside to his cause and moved up the peninsula. Once again, concerns over the position of the papacy complicated matters. Cavour did not wish to involve French troops guarding Rome in the situation, so he and Victor Emmanuel met Garibaldi south of Rome and asked him to relinquish his conquest to Piedmont-Sardinia. Though a republican, Garibaldi consented, and plebiscites confirmed the unification of the northern and southern halves of the peninsula. In March 1861, the new Italian kingdom was proclaimed, with Victor Emmanuel as its first monarch. Two months later, Cavour died, one might say from complications of nation-birth. Thus, it has been said that the new Italian kingdom represented the “passion of Mazzini, the audacity of Garibaldi, and the cunning of Cavour.

Italy completed its unification by gaining Venetia in 1866 and Rome (excluding the Vatican) in 1870 when Prussia, with whom Italy was allied, defeated Austria and then France in war. Though united, Italy experienced significant problems—opposition by the papacy to the new Italian state, economic underdevelopment, a corrupt political system known as *trasformismo* (the bribing of political opponents), and the wide cultural and economic differences between northern and southern Italy. Because it came so late to national unity, Italy often compensated by aggressively seeking colonies and attempting to regain “unredeemed” Italian-speaking territories.

The Unification of Germany

Background: German Dualism

Like Italy, Germany’s limbs had lain severed in central Europe for centuries. Conflicts between the Holy Roman Emperor and papacy in the Middle Ages stymied either from unifying Germany. Due to its elective nature, the emperor never became a strong absolutist ruler like the kings of France. Religious conflict in the 16th and 17th

centuries splintered German politics, formalized with the Westphalia settlement in 1648. In the 19th century, the dualism of two German powers

Austria and Prussia—effectively checked either from consolidating the smaller German states into one nation unified around German language and ethnicity. When Liberals failed in 1848 at Frankfurt to unify Germany, it opened the door for a different path to the same objective. Prussia’s great military tradition had decayed since the time of Frederick the Great (d. 1786). The kingdom entered the French revolutionary wars late (1807) and then was defeated decisively by Napoleon. Moreover, Austria under Metternich dominated German politics after the Congress of Vienna, leaving Prussia to play second fiddle. When William I (r. 1861-1888) inherited the Prussian throne from his faltering brother, he set out to reestablish Prussia’s power.

With his first act, William introduced long-overdue reforms in the army. At the advice of his generals, William called for the expansion of the army, regular conscription (the draft), the creation of a General Staff (to devise war plans), and the introduction of modern rifled weapons, such as the breech-loading needle gun. According to the Prussian Constitution of 1850, representatives to the Reichstag (lower house of the parliament) were apportioned by a unique three-tiered voting system, designed to favor the wealthy Junker elite. However, as Germany industrialized, the power of the middle-class Liberal Party grew in Prussia. Liberals in the Reichstag resented the conservative influence of the army as well as the Junker class who dominated it and opposed the king’s reforms. Neither king nor Reichstag would budge, plunging Prussia into a constitutional crisis.

The Work of Bismarck

To solve the crisis, William turned in 1862 to Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898), appointing him Chancellor. Bismarck hailed from the Junker class, but surpassed that often provincial and mediocre group with his intelligence and ambitions. A romantic turned conservative, Bismarck gained wide diplomatic experience representing Prussia to France, Russia, and the German Confederation. In his political approach, Bismarck played the consummate game of *Realpolitik*. Bismarck possessed no predetermined plan for the unification of Germany; rather, he took advantage of opportunities presented to him. To deal with the political crisis in Prussia, Bismarck turned the tables on the Liberals in the Reichstag, claiming that they held no constitutional power to block needed reforms. He appealed to Prussian patriotism, arguing that the other German states did not look to Prussia’s liberalism—that was the mistake of 1848—but to its “iron and blood.” When the Reichstag continued to refuse taxes to implement the army

reforms, Bismarck simply instructed the bureaucracy to collect the taxes anyway.

• THEME MUSIC

Certainly the unification of Germany represents one of the turning points of the course (PER), and it may be useful for you to identify its effects. As the Prime Minister of Britain noted at the time: "There is not a diplomatic tradition which has not been swept away. You have a new world, new influences at work, new and unknown objects and dangers with which to cope....The balance of power has been entirely destroyed." Consider how subsequent political and diplomatic events were shaped by the creation of this new restless empire (SP).

To unify Germany, Bismarck waged three separate wars. His opponent in each war found itself diplomatically isolated and maneuvered into appearing as the aggressor. When the Poles revolted against Russian authority in 1863, almost every great power expressed support for their national aspirations, but without tangible assistance. Bismarck calculated that he needed the future friendship of great power Russia, so he supported their crushing of the Polish revolt. In 1864, Denmark formally incorporated the mainly German-speaking provinces of Schleswig and Holstein (which it had occupied since 1848) into the Danish kingdom, violating an international treaty. Nationalism flared in Germany. Rather than working through the German Confederation as Austria preferred, Bismarck suggested a joint approach by the two leading powers. Austria relented, and the two powers easily defeated their enemy in the Danish War, occupying the two provinces of Schleswig and Holstein.

The joint occupation of the two provinces offered ample opportunity for conflict between the two German powers. The dispute festered, as Bismarck intended, and eventually Austria turned to the German Confederation for relief. Citing a violation of the occupation agreement, Prussia went to war against Austria. Before entering the conflict, Bismarck ensured Austria's isolation—Russia was favorable after Bismarck's support for the Polish revolt; Napoleon was bought off with vague promises of French expansion; Italy hoped to gain Venetia from Austria; and Britain maintained its splendid isolation. In the ensuing Austro-Prussian War (or Seven Weeks' War) of 1866, Prussia's superior railroads, staff organization, and needle gun overwhelmed the Austrians. Despite the designs of William, Bismarck treated Austria leniently; they lost only Venetia and, more importantly, were forced to bow out of German affairs. Prussia annexed the states of north Germany, and in 1867 Bismarck created the North German Confederation, insisting that its Reichstag be elected by universal male suffrage. What's more, the Reichstag hailed Bismarck's achievement by retroactively approving the illegally collected taxes with the Indemnity Bill of 1866.

The mostly Catholic German states stood outside this union. Anticipating future conflict with France, Bismarck convinced these states to join in an alliance with the North German Confederation should war break out with France. When the Spanish throne became vacant in 1870, Bismarck had his pretext. The Spanish nobles offered the throne to a Hohenzollern relative of William's, an offer that Bismarck pressed the candidate to accept. Not wishing to be surrounded by Hohenzollerns, the French vehemently objected. William relented and encouraged his cousin to drop the offer. Now Napoleon III of France overplayed his hand and demanded an apology from William via the French ambassador. Bismarck edited an account of the meeting, known as the Ems Dispatch, to make it seem as if the king had insulted the French ambassador. Napoleon took the bait and declared war. Once again, Bismarck's opponent was isolated; the French were easily defeated in the Franco-Prussian War and embarrassingly, Napoleon himself was captured at Sedan. The resulting treaty imposed a 5-billion franc indemnity on the French, and, more importantly, they lost Alsace-Lorraine, which became a source of enmity between the two nations throughout the 20th century. In January 1871, Bismarck's work was complete with the proclamation of the German Empire with William I as Kaiser (emperor).

Though Bismarck helped engineer a federal constitution that respected the traditions of the other German states and allowed elements of democracy, power was still exercised in an authoritarian fashion. Government ministers reported to the Kaiser, not the Reichstag, and Bismarck effectively concentrated key positions in his own hands (Chancellor; Prussian Minister of State), which allowed him to exploit democratic mechanisms to ensure his domination of policy. This new German empire immediately upset the balance of power in Europe. Its economic and military potential threatened to dwarf its neighbors. Even though Bismarck worked to maintain peace in Europe after 1871, some historians believe that he laid the foundation for the militarism and state glorification that gave rise to the Nazis in the 20th century.

Other Nation-Building Efforts

Italy and Germany represent the most salient examples of nationalism's power to unify states. However, already territorially unified states, such as France and Russia, worked toward greater internal cohesion through reform. The following states demonstrate three different models of reform.

France: Napoleon III and the Second Empire

After being elected president of the Second Republic, Louis Napoleon quickly consolidated his power. Presenting himself as a man of the people, he dissolved the legislature over the issue of universal male suffrage. In a coup d'état in 1851, Napoleon rescinded the 1848 republican constitution. With popular approval through a plebiscite, Napoleon announced in 1852 the Second Empire with himself as Emperor Napoleon III. Though Napoleon's foreign adventures proved disastrous—loss of control over Italian and German unification, a failed effort to create an empire in Mexico—he did modernize France internally.

Working through a professional and centrally controlled bureaucracy, Napoleon focused on France's economic development. He founded a national bank, built railways, promoted French industry, and in his most celebrated reform, rebuilt the city of Paris. Napoleon hired the talents of the architect and engineer Baron von Haussmann (1809-1891), who tore down old city walls and housing, constructed a modern sanitary system, built grand boulevards, and adorned it all with a feast of opera houses, theaters, and shopping centers. As Napoleon said, "I found Paris stinking, and left it smelling sweet." Due to increasing criticism, Napoleon after 1860 allowed more legislative input, relaxed press censorship, and pursued a policy of free trade with Great Britain. But such reforms could not rescue Napoleon from his foreign policy failures, and in 1870, the emperor himself was captured by the Prussian army (see above) and the empire ended. Workers of the shiny new Paris refused to surrender, however, and established a revolutionary Paris Commune, which harkened back to the principles of 1793 with its socialist program. Eventually, a popularly elected Constituent Assembly crushed the Paris Commune and established the Third Republic. Another French republic started off with the taint of class violence and military failure.

Russia: Alexander II's Modernization

The Crimean War demonstrated Russia's weakness vis-à-vis the other great powers. Recognizing the backwardness of his nation, Alexander II (r. 1855-1881) embarked on a series of top-down reforms that proved ultimately too little too late to save the Romanov dynasty. Fearing violent peasant upheaval, Alexander abolished serfdom in 1861. By terms of the liberation, peasants continued to live on the village *mir*s until they paid for the land they received. Russian agriculture continued to suffer from land shortages and rural overpopulation into the 20th century. In addition, Alexander introduced equality

into the legal system, abolished corporal and capital punishment, created local assemblies known as *zemstvos*, and reformed the army. These wide-ranging reforms did not heal the growing rift in Russian society between those who emphasized Russia's unique traditions (called Slavophiles) and those who believed Russia must become more modern (Westernizers). Led by discontented intellectuals, such as Alexander Herzen and Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), anarchism gained support in the context of an autocratic and archaic Russia. Eventually, an anarchist-inspired movement known as the People's Will succeeded in 1881 in assassinating Alexander after numerous failed attempts.

Austria-Hungary: The Dual Monarchy

The tattered Austrian empire was until the First World War ruled by Franz Joseph I (r. 1848-1916), a leader not known for his decisive action or ambitious projects. Franz Joseph attempted to hold together his diverse realm through the bureaucracy, the army, and loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty. Following the revolutions of 1848, Austria focused on internal development, building railroads and promoting industry, as well as centralization around the German language. These policies further alienated the Slavic and Magyar ethnic minorities. Following losses in the Italian and German wars of unification, Franz Joseph allowed the creation of the Dual Monarchy in 1867. This new Austro-Hungarian monarchy allowed autonomy for the Magyars but maintained unity through common ministries of finance, foreign affairs, and war. However, neither of these kingdoms was democratic. In fact, the Hungarians pursued Magyarization in their part of the empire, suppressing Slavic languages and culture. Not until 1907 did Austria grant universal male suffrage and even then, the imperial Reichsrat so often descended into ethnic conflict that Franz Joseph was forced to rule by decree. Austria-Hungary's ethnic problems laid the powder trail that ignited into the First World War.

• SKILL SET

Looking ahead, the ethnic and nationalist issues facing Austria proved one of the most intractable causes of World War I. In fact, one might argue that the inability of this great power to resolve its internal issues represents the most important cause of the conflict that would end up destroying it (CAUS).

The Second Industrial Revolution

Historians point to the year 1850 as roughly dividing the initial phase of industrialization from a new one characterized by a larger scale of industrial enterprises, a further geographic expansion of industry, and a much

closer relationship between theoretical science and its application in technology. This new phase we call the Second Industrial Revolution.

New Technologies and Methods

The period 1875-1910 represents arguably the greatest concentration of technological advance including our own age-in the history of the human race. Steam engines now powered larger factories, as mechanized production became the predominant form of manufacture. American Henry Ford pioneered a new form of mass production, the assembly line, which allowed for increased economies of scale (i.e., reduced costs at high levels of production) and cheaper products. With the Bessemer process, steel replaced iron as the essential metal in construction, railways, and for military use. Reinforced concrete and steel girders allowed for the development of skyscrapers, adding a new element to modern cities.

Theoretical advances in chemistry boosted the chemical industry. Germany quickly became the dominant producer of chemicals, which had numerous industrial, pharmaceutical, and military uses. Europeans harnessed the power of electricity to light cities, power streetcars, and provide for a seemingly inexhaustible source of energy. After its discovery in 1859, petroleum grew into a mineral resource vital to the needs of the new internal combustion engines and to nation-states dependent on its potential power. This catalog above only scratches the surface; refrigeration, photography, elevators, kitchen appliances, motion pictures, synthetic fabrics, TNT, X-rays, and many others could also be included.

Transportation and Communication

Technological advances revolutionized transportation and communications. Steamships, allowed for faster ocean journeys and greater geographic mobility, establishing an essential means for European control of distant empires. The completion of the Suez (1869) and Panama Canals (1914) reduced transoceanic travel times even further. Invented in 1903, airplanes would not alter passenger travel for several generations, but did yield immediate military applications. New power sources also allowed for the development of city streetcars and subways and, by extension, the creation of suburbs and the further separation of home and work.

The technology of human communication had not changed much since the invention of the printing press in the 1450s. The late 19th century witnessed a series of inventions that made the world smaller and allowed European power a truly global reach. A transatlantic telegraph cable was laid in the 1870s to create the first instantaneous communication over continents; the invention of the telephone was not far behind. To facilitate railway schedules, standardized time zones were introduced in the 1880s. Marconi's discovery of radio waves translated in the early 20th century into a means for

AP Achiever

states to coordinate military power and control public opinion.

Business Cycles and Managing Markets

Despite the great wealth generated by this technological dynamo, the European economy suffered from boom-bust cycles in the period 1873-1896. Overproduction and unpredictable commodity prices routinely plunged Europe into recession, creating fear for governments of worker unrest and corporate bankruptcies. To manage the market, businesses became more organized. The modern corporation, with its complex administrative structures, accounting procedures, and stocks, dates from the late 19th century. Some industries informally collaborated in cartels to control the production and thus the prices of their manufactures. Banks pooled investment resources in consortia to control interest rates. These monopolies represented an attempt by companies to control an unpredictable market. Though governments continued to rely on market mechanisms and the gold standard to ensure stable currencies, many states began to move away from free trade toward protective tariffs to shield domestic industries.

Technological advances translated into new goods. Former luxuries became necessities. To reach consumers, corporations began to exploit communication advances for marketing purposes. Advertising in billboards, newspapers, and catalogs opened a new world of consumerism to European citizens. With its modernization, Paris sponsored the first department store, Bon Marche, in the 1870s. An increasingly sophisticated economy opened new employment opportunities in so-called white collar areas, such as retail, marketing, communications, and services.⁶

• THEME MUSIC

The Second Industrial Revolution reveals the tension inherent in the Poverty and Prosperity theme (PP), as it provided immense wealth to industrialists and European powers, at the same time left other groups (unskilled laborers, poor peasants, colonial areas) with inequality and dependence.

The Balance of Power and Global Integration

New developments in industry shifted the balance of economic power worldwide. Within Europe, Germany by 1900 surpassed Britain in steel, iron, coal mining, and chemical production. The United States arose as a competitor outside Europe, besting Britain and Germany both in steel and coal production also by 1900. European capital, however, commanded the world. With huge profits and sophisticated banking and investment methods, European corporations and governments came to dominate the functioning of the world economy. Imperial

powers like Britain, France, and Germany invested in Asian, African, and Latin American ventures, influencing those regions' economic decisions, if not controlling them outright. By 1914, economic activity had become truly global, with developments in one area of the world rippling throughout.

Imperialism

European control of global markets was nothing new in the 19th century. However, the period 1763-1871 saw a net decline in European colonial control, with American independence and Europe's preoccupation with revolutionary movements and internal development. Following the unification campaigns of Italy and Germany, as well as other internal nation-building programs, Europe's aspirations for national greatness turned outside the continent. With the advance of technology and organization stemming from the Second Industrial Revolution, European powers as of 1870 possessed both the means and motives for further penetration of the global market. Compared with earlier colonization, what distinguished European imperialism in the period 1871-1914 was more direct control of foreign territory and greater emphasis placed on colonies' internal infrastructure development.

Motives and Means

Motives for European imperialism can be divided into three basic categories – economic, political, and cultural. As you might expect, Marxist historians stress economic motives stemming from the expansion of capitalism. However, other historians contend that the pursuit of even financially valueless colonies demonstrates the power of national prestige as a driving force, or that the cultural impulse to “civilize inferior peoples” acted as more than a cynical pretext, but as a genuine idealistic mission.

Economic motives – As nations industrialized, they needed access to raw materials, particularly with the sophisticated industries of the Second Industrial Revolution. Rubber, oil, bauxite, copper, diamonds – all could be found in great supply in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. With European rivalries heating up, great powers feared dependence on potential enemies for strategic resources; colonies opened the door for self-sufficiency. With the problem of overproduction, nations also desired colonies as markets for finished products and outlets for investment of profits. However, most of the imperialist powers' capital went into more established industrialized areas, such as the United States or other European nations.

Political motives – Imperialist powers coveted strategic locations. Great Britain bought up shares in the Suez Canal Company and eventually formed a protectorate (a

nominally independent state indirectly controlled by another state) over Egypt in 1882 because of the geopolitical value of the Suez as a “lifeline to the British Empire.” When the United States became an imperial power in 1898 after the Spanish-American War, it looked at the Philippines and Pacific islands as important coaling stations or military bases. Nations like Italy pursued colonies at great cost primarily as a claim to status as one of the great powers. After 1871, the European powers carved up Africa with a nationalistic fervor driven by public opinion. In Germany, Bismarck disdained colonies in Africa but pursued them anyway to appease public opinion; colonies are “for elections,” he said. Finally, many feared that the mushrooming European population (from 260 million in 1850 to 450 million in 1914) would lead to political discontent. Colonies might act as an outlet for surplus population; indeed, 30–50 million immigrants left Europe in this period, but most went to the United States, the Americas, or Australia.

Cultural motives – Missionaries arrived first in Africa. The famous David Livingstone traveled to the Dark Continent as a ‘medical missionary and was followed by British middle-class Victorians who believed it their duty to civilize the supposedly inferior races. This paternalistic European attitude found expression in Rudyard Kipling’s (1865–1936) famous poem, “The White Man’s Burden,” which some view as an endorsement of the civilizing mission, whereas others view it as a satire. By the 1870s, the influence of Charles Darwin’s ideas (see next chapter) had seeped into the consciousness of writers, businessmen, and political leaders. Many viewed history as an ongoing struggle among races for resources and territory. According to Social Darwinism, war elevated the nation by calling for self-sacrifice and establishing the proper hierarchy among the victors and the defeated: Europeans often took their easy subjugation of technologically less-advanced tribal peoples as a moral endorsement of their imperial ambitions.

How was it possible for the small continent of Europe to control, directly or indirectly, almost two-thirds of the world’s population by 1914? First, European control arose directly from the technological advances of the Second Industrial Revolution. Steam power, telegraphs, medical advances (e.g., the discovery of quinine to treat malaria), and railroads allowed for global trade and communication as well as penetration of the interior of Africa and Asia. Second, with the industrialization of war, Europeans gained an overwhelming military superiority. The Asian civilizations of India and China, not to mention the tribal societies of Africa, proved no match for high-powered artillery, armored battleships, and machine guns. Finally, the complex and highly organized nature of

modern corporate capitalism sustained a long-term presence in colonies and provided for the systematic exploitation of resources.

As of 1870, Europe had colonized little of Africa; most areas inland from its coasts were unknown. The pursuit of African colonies got under way with the founding of the International Congo Association in 1878 by King Leopold II (r. 1865–1909) of Belgium. Private bankers financed Leopold’s venture, which was an entirely personal rather than a national concern. To manage the possible opening of Africa, Bismarck in 1884–1885 called the Berlin Conference among the great powers. The imperial powers agreed to create the Congo Free State as Leopold’s personal fiefdom and devised procedures for the orderly establishment of colonies. Leopold’s rule proved to be one of the harshest in Africa, as he ignored the prohibition on slavery, plundered the nation of rubber and ivory, all while the Congolese population was decimated by disease and overwork.

The Berlin Conference produced the opposite of the intended effect. By simply establishing coastal control, European nations could claim huge swaths of Africa’s interior by drawing lines on a map, usually with no regard for linguistic or tribal divisions. Imperialists exploited Africans’ lack of experience with European legal and economic concepts, as tribal leaders often unknowingly signed away trade and resource concessions. By 1900, all except Liberia and Ethiopia had fallen under direct European rule.

• THEME MUSIC

From the beginning of the course (1450), Europe had expanded its influence across the globe. The drive for resources and power stimulated exploration in the 15th and 16th centuries, created the Columbian Exchange and Commercial Revolution, and here culminates with the establishment of a European-dominated global economy via imperialism (INT).

To understand the nature of African imperialism, we briefly examine the British example. Early on, colonial secretary Joseph Chamberlain (1836–1914), fearing the spread of independence movements, proposed a tariff union between Britain and its colonies, thereby binding the colonies together in a system of imperial preferences. Gradually these dominions (self-governing areas such as Canada) would achieve complete self-rule but maintain strong economic ties with the mother country. Chamberlain’s idea would later bear fruit with the commonwealth system following World War I. African imperialism seemed to belong to adventurers like Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902) rather than statesmen like Chamberlain. Britain had already established in 1815 control of the Cape of Good Hope on the southern end of Africa, dispossessing the Dutch settlers who trekked overland to create the Orange Free State and Transvaal.

AP Achiever

When Rhodes was made prime minister of this Cape Colony, he dreamt of establishing a Cape-to-Cairo connection to cement Britain's dominance of Africa and the exploitation of his diamond interests. Rhodes went too far by trying to provoke war with the two Dutch republics and was forced to resign.

Imperial pursuits in Africa demonstrated the potential for conflict involving the great powers. To secure control of the Egypt, Britain extended its power into Sudan. This intrusion brought resistance by Muslim troops, and the retaliatory expedition in 1898 at Omdurman demonstrated the lethal advantage of machine guns and artillery over musket and spears, as the British lost only 48 men to 10,000 for the Sudanese. After their victory, British troops almost fell into conflict with the French, who controlled much of north and west Africa, at Fashoda. Cooler heads prevailed, and war was avoided. Such was not the case with the Dutch Boers.

Rhodes's policies eventually embroiled Britain in the costly Boer War (1899-1902), in which Britain's use of concentration camps and scorched-earth policies led to international condemnation. The potential for further conflict in Africa shook Britain out of its isolation as it went N C shopping for allies.

Imperialism in Asia – Three Examples

The British in India Compared to Africa, European powers employed indirect control of Asia. Because civilizations like India and China already possessed complex political and social hierarchies, European imperialists preferred to “plug in” to the existing power structure to establish control. In India, Britain had exploited that country's political divisions to gain local allies and establish indirect control through the British East India Company. In 1857, soldiers (called *sepoys*) in the Indian army revolted against Britain's insensitivity toward Hindus and Muslims. Britain subdued the Sepoy Mutiny with great brutality, dissolved the East India Company, and established direct rule, with Queen Victoria (1837-1901) as Empress of India.

Though India boasted its own manufacturing base, Britain turned the country into a raw materials producer. At the same time, Britain attempted to modernize India's infrastructure by building railroads, instructing the population in English, and educating elites at British universities so they might become effective civil servants. Ironically, many such students imbibed western ideas of nationalism and equality, tools that would be used by the likes of Mohandas Gandhi (1869-1948) and Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) to establish Indian independence later.

• EXAMPLE BASE

Though you have choices, the Course Description requires that you understand how colonial areas responded to and resisted European imperialism. As you read through this section, consider the range of responses, perhaps making a visual organizer to show similarities and differences or provide a brief assessment of effectiveness.

The Carving of China China disdained contact with foreigners and generally dismissed them as uncivilized. However, the weakness of the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) allowed westerners to exploit China's growing disintegration to their advantage. Though Europeans coveted Chinese goods, the only commodity Europeans seemed able to sell in China was opium. When the Chinese government attempted to stop the import of the noxious substance, the British responded with overwhelming military force. After several such Opium Wars at mid-century, Britain and France had imposed upon China trading and other concessions. By the Treaty of Nanking (1842), China surrendered Hong Kong and was forced to create free-trade treaty ports.

Soon Russia and Germany had joined in carving out spheres of influence in China. Even worse for the Chinese, Europeans were subject only to the laws of their home nation, not to those of China, an indignity known as extraterritoriality. In an attempt to keep open the Chinese market, the newly imperial United States secured agreement to the Open Door Policy, an effort to maintain China's territorial integrity and the free access of each power to the others' treaty ports. Anger against foreign control resulted in the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, led by a secret Chinese society. The imperial nations crushed the revolt and imposed even more indemnities and controls on the faltering Chinese government.

Japan's Modernization Only Japan seemed able to resist the onslaught of European imperialism. When Commodore Perry of the United States arrived in 1853, he encountered a united and prosperous civilization that had been virtually isolated for 300 years. Foreign contact brought down the Tokugawa Shogunate and almost led to a Chinese-style treatment of Japan. However, under reforming samurai, the authority of the emperor was restored and the most rapid modernization in history followed. During the so-called Meiji Restoration, Japan borrowed from the West liberally—its industrial techniques, educational practices, and military arts.

By 1890, Japan had established itself as an industrial, military, and imperial power in its own right. Japan surprised the world in 1894 by defeating the much larger China and establishing dominance over the Korean peninsula. In a sign of Japan's newfound prestige, Britain allied with the new Asian power in 1902. Conflict with Russia over resources in Manchuria soon led to the Russo-

Japanese War of 1904-1905. Japan shocked the world by defeating the Russians on land and sea, destroying the Russian fleet at Tsushima Strait. The outcome represented the first time in modern history that an Asian power had defeated a European power in war. Profound consequences issued from the Russo-Japanese War: first, Russia turned back toward expansion in the Balkans, setting the stage for the First World War; second, Russia's weak showing led to the Revolution of 1905, a warm-up for the great Russian Revolution of 1917; and finally, Japan had demonstrated to the rest of the world that Europeans could be defeated by turning their own weapons against them.

Critics and Consequences

Though many Europeans saw great glory in imperialism, some condemned it. Two of the most famous critiques came from J.A. Hobson (1858-1940), a British economist, and the great Russian revolutionary, V.I. Lenin (1870-1924). Hobson argued that European imperialism was driven by the accumulation of capital, which in turn required overseas investment and markets. If corporations would simply invest in workers' wages and if governments taxed excess wealth and redistributed it to the poor, the impulse to export European capital would diminish. In his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of World Capitalism* (1916), Lenin contributed to Marxist theory by claiming that the phenomenon of imperialism indicated the crisis inherent in capitalism. By concentrating power in fewer and fewer hands, capitalism inevitably expanded its geographic boundaries in pursuit of further areas of exploitation, leading directly to the First World War. Some historians dispute these assertions; the case of Italy is instructive. Italy desperately pursued colonies in Africa. In fact, at the hands of Ethiopia in 1898, Italy experienced the first major defeat by a European power in Africa. Nonetheless, Italy persisted in its ventures, risking war and diplomatic isolation, to gain in 1911 Libya, a vast expanse of desert hardly worth the cost in men, money, and resources.

How did European imperialism change Europe and the world? There are several arguments:

Rise of new powers – As a result of colonial opportunities, the United States and Japan both rose as imperial powers. After the Spanish-American War (1898), the United States acquired its first overseas possessions—Hawaii, the Philippines, and control of Cuba and the Panama Canal. The rise of these two Pacific powers would lead to conflict in World War II.

Intensification of European rivalries – The First World War did not begin in Africa or Asia, but the seeds of war were planted in colonies. To illustrate, conflicts between Russia and Britain over Persia and between Germany and

France in the Moroccan Crises (1905, 1911) helped cement the mutually antagonistic alliance systems that escalated that conflict.

Decolonization and dependency – Europe's hold on its colonies weakened after World War I and was severed after World War II. Today, no European nation possesses a colonial empire, yet issues of colonial dependence and resentment toward former European (and American) dominance show up in the issues of terrorism, tribal conflicts, and persistent economic underdevelopment.

Imperialism reveals a domestic connection as well. Colonial ventures acted as a laboratory for some to test the ideas of Darwinism and eugenics (the pseudoscience of studying racial characteristics), as well as new industrial and military technologies. The overseas drive for colonies reveals the intense domestic pressures operating at home—social, intellectual, and political. In the next chapter, we turn to these issues.