In September 1814, hundreds of foreigners began to converge on Vienna, the capital city of the Austrian Empire. Many were members of European royalty—kings, archdukes, princes, and their wives—accompanied by their diplomatic advisers and scores of servants. Their congenial host was the Austrian emperor Francis I, who never tired of providing Vienna’s guests with concerts, glittering balls, sumptuous feasts, and an endless array of hunting parties. One participant remembered, “Eating, fireworks, public illuminations. For eight or ten days, I haven’t been able to work at all. What a life!” Of course, not every waking hour was spent in pleasure during this gathering of notables, known to history as the Congress of Vienna. These people were also representatives of all the states that had fought Napoleon, and their real business was to arrange a final peace settlement after almost a decade of war. On June 8, 1815, they finally completed their task.
The forces of upheaval unleashed during the French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars were temporarily quieted in 1815 as rulers sought to restore stability by reestablishing much of the old order to a Europe ravaged by war. Kings, landed aristocrats, and bureaucratic elites regained their control over domestic governments, and internationally the forces of conservatism tried to maintain the new status quo; some states even used military force to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries in their desire to crush revolutions.

But the Western world had been changed, and it would not readily go back to the old system. New ideologies of change, especially liberalism and nationalism, both products of the revolutionary upheaval initiated in France, had become too powerful to be contained. Not content with the status quo, the forces of change gave rise first to the revolts and revolutions that periodically shook Europe in the 1820s and 1830s and then to the widespread revolutions of 1848. Some of the revolutions and revolutionaries were successful; most were not. Although the old order usually appeared to have prevailed, by 1850, it was apparent that its days were numbered. This perception was reinforced by the changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution. Together the forces unleashed by the dual revolutions—the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution—made it impossible to return to prerevolutionary Europe. Nevertheless, although these two revolutions initiated what historians like to call the modern European world, it will also be apparent that much of the old still remained in the midst of the new.

**The Conservative Order**
(1815–1830)

The immediate response to the defeat of Napoleon was the desire to contain revolution and the revolutionary forces by restoring much of the old order. But the triumphant rulers were not naive and realized that they could not return to 1789.

**The Peace Settlement**

In March 1814, even before Napoleon had been defeated, his four major enemies—Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia—had agreed to remain united, not only to defeat France but to ensure peace after the war. After Napoleon’s defeat, this Quadruple Alliance restored the Bourbon monarchy to France in the person of Louis XVIII and agreed to meet at a congress in Vienna in September 1814 to arrange a final peace settlement.
Elsewhere, however, the principle of legitimacy was largely ignored and completely overshadowed by more practical considerations of power. The congress’s treatment of Poland, to which Russia, Austria, and Prussia all had claims, illustrates this approach. Prussia and Austria were allowed to keep some Polish territory. A new, nominally independent Polish kingdom, about three-quarters of the size of the duchy of Warsaw, was established with the Romanov dynasty of Russia as its hereditary monarchs. Although the Russian tsar Alexander I (1801–1825) voluntarily granted the new kingdom a constitution guaranteeing its independence, Poland’s foreign policy (and Poland) remained under Russian control. Prussia was compensated for its loss of Polish lands by receiving two-fifths of Saxony, the Napoleonic German kingdom of Westphalia, and the left bank of the Rhine. Austria in turn was compensated for its loss of the Austrian Netherlands by being given control of two northern Italian provinces, Lombardy and Venetia.

In making these territorial rearrangements, the powers at Vienna believed they were following the familiar eighteenth-century practice of maintaining a balance of power or equilibrium among the great powers. Essentially, this meant a balance of political and military forces that guaranteed the independence of the great powers by ensuring that no one country could dominate Europe. To balance Russian gains, Prussia and Austria had been strengthened. According to Metternich, this arrangement had clearly avoided a great danger: “Prussia and Austria are completing their systems of defense; united, the two monarchies form an unconquerable barrier against the enterprises of any conquering prince who might perhaps once again occupy the throne of France or that of Russia.”

Considerations of the balance of power also dictated the allied treatment of France. France had not been overly weakened so that it could remain a great power. Nevertheless, the fear that France might again upset the European peace remained strong enough that the great powers attempted to establish major defensive barriers against possible French expansion. To the north of France, they created a new enlarged kingdom of the Netherlands composed of the former Dutch Republic and the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium) under a new ruler, King William I of the House of Orange. To the southeast, Piedmont (officially styled the kingdom of Sardinia) was enlarged. On France’s eastern frontier, Prussia was strengthened by giving it control of the territory along the east bank of the Rhine. The British at least expected Prussia to be the major bulwark against French expansion in central Europe, but the Congress of Vienna also created a new league of German states, the Germanic Confederation, to replace the Napoleonic Confederation of the Rhine.

Napoleon’s escape from Elba and his One Hundred Days in the midst of the Congress of Vienna delayed the negotiations but did not significantly alter the overall agreement. It was decided, however, to punish the French people for their enthusiastic response to Napoleon’s return. France’s borders were returned to those of 1790, and it was forced to pay an indemnity and accept an army of occupation for five years.

The Vienna peace settlement of 1815 has sometimes been criticized for its failure to recognize the liberal and
national forces unleashed by the French revolutionary and Napoleonic eras. Containing these revolutionary forces was precisely what the diplomats at Vienna hoped to achieve. Their transfers of territories and peoples to the victors to create a new balance of power, with little or no regard for the wishes of the peoples themselves, was in accord with long-standing traditions of European diplomacy. One could hardly expect Metternich, foreign minister of the Austrian Empire, a dynastic state composed of many different peoples, to espouse a principle of self-determination for European nationalities. Whatever its weaknesses, the Congress of Vienna has received credit for establishing a European order that managed to avoid a general European conflict for almost a century.

The Ideology of Conservatism

The peace arrangements of 1815 were but the beginning of a conservative reaction determined to contain the liberal and nationalist forces unleashed by the French Revolution. Metternich and his kind were representatives of the ideology known as conservatism (see the box above). As a modern political philosophy, conservatism dates from 1790 when Edmund Burke (1729–1797) wrote his Reflections on the Revolution in France in reaction to the French Revolution, especially its radical republican and democratic ideas. Burke maintained that society was a contract, but “the state ought not to be considered as nothing better than a partnership agreement in a trade of pepper and coffee, to be taken up for a temporary interest and to be dissolved by the fancy of the parties.” The state was a partnership but one “not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead and those who are to be born.” No one generation therefore has the right to destroy this partnership; instead, each generation has the duty to preserve and transmit it to the next. Burke advised against the violent overthrow of a government by revolution, but he did not reject the possibility of change. Sudden change was unacceptable, but that did not eliminate gradual or evolutionary improvements.
Bon, Ferdinand I, as king of Naples and Sicily was accom-
plished by the return of the nobility and clergy to their privi-
egated positions. Army officers and businessmen led a
rebellion that soon spread to the northern Italian kingdom of Piedmont.

Metternich was especially disturbed by the revolts in Italy since he saw them as a threat to Austria’s domi-
nation of the peninsula. At Troppau, he proposed a pro-
tocol that established the principle of intervention. It read:

> States which have undergone a change of Government due
to revolution, the results of which threaten other states. *ipso facto* cease to be members of the European Alliance, and
remain excluded from it until their situation gives guaran-
tees for legal order and stability. If, owing to such situations,
 immediate danger threatens other states, the Powers bind
themselves, by peaceful means, or if need be by arms, to
bring back the guilty state into the bosom of the Great
Alliance.  

The principle of intervention meant the great powers had
the right to send armies into countries where there were
revolutions to restore legitimate monarchs to their thrones.
Britain refused to agree to the principle, arguing that it had
never been the intention of the Quadruple Alliance to
interfere in the internal affairs of other states, except in
France. In Britain’s eyes, only revolutionary outbursts
threatening the peace of Europe necessitated armed inter-
vention. Ignoring the British response, Austria, Prussia,
and Russia met in a third congress at Laibach in January
1821 and authorized the sending of Austrian troops to
Naples. These forces crushed the revolt, restored Ferdi-
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For independence was led by Simón Bolívar (1783–1830), hailed as the Liberator. His forces freed Colombia in 1819 and Venezuela in 1821. A second liberator was José de San Martín (1778–1850) who liberated Chile in 1817 and then, in 1821, moved on to Lima, Peru, the center of Spanish authority. He was soon joined by Bolívar who assumed the task of crushing the last significant Spanish army in 1824. Mexico and the Central American provinces also achieved their freedom, and by 1825, after Portugal had recognized the independence of Brazil, almost all of Latin America had been freed of colonial domination.

In the early 1820s, only one major threat to the newly independent Latin American states remained. Flushed by their success in crushing rebellions in Spain and Italy, the victorious continental powers favored the use of troops to restore Spanish control in Latin America. This time British opposition to intervention prevailed. Eager to gain access to an entire continent for investment and trade, the British proposed joint action with the United States against European interference in Latin America. Distrustful of British motives, President James Monroe acted alone in 1823, guaranteeing the independence of the new Latin American nations and warning against any further European intervention in the New World in the famous Monroe Doctrine. Actually, British ships were more important to Latin American independence than American words. Britain’s navy stood between Latin America and any European invasion force, and the continental powers were extremely reluctant to challenge British naval power.

**The Greek Revolt (1821–1832)**

The principle of intervention proved to be a double-edged sword. Designed to prevent revolution, it could also be used to support revolution if the great powers found it in their interest to do so. Despite their differences in the
congresses, Great Britain, France, and Russia found cause for cooperation.

In 1821, the Greeks revolted against their Ottoman Turkish masters. Although subject to Muslim control for 400 years, the Greeks had been allowed to maintain their language and their Greek Orthodox faith. A revival of Greek national sentiment at the beginning of the nineteenth century added to the growing desire for “the liberation of the fatherland from the terrible yoke of Turkish oppression.” Initial reaction to the Greek revolt by the European powers was negative since this appeared to be simply another revolt against established authority that should be crushed. But the Greek revolt was soon transformed into a noble cause by an outpouring of European sentiment for the Greeks’ struggle. Liberals rallied to the cause of Greek freedom, arguing that Greek democracy was being reborn. Romantic poets and artists (see Culture in an Age of Reaction and Revolution: The Mood of Romanticism later in this chapter) also publicized the cause of Greek independence.

Despite the public groundswell, mutual fears and other interests kept the European powers from intervening until 1827 when a combined British and French fleet went to Greece and defeated a large Ottoman fleet. In 1828, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire and invaded its European provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia. By the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829, which ended the Russian-Turkish war, the Russians received a protectorate over the two provinces. By the same treaty, the Ottoman Empire agreed to allow Russia, France, and Britain to decide the fate of Greece. In 1830, the three powers declared Greece an independent kingdom, and two years later a new royal dynasty was established in the hands of a son of the Bavarian king.

The Greek revolt made a deep impression on Europeans. It was the first successful revolt against the status quo and represented a victory for both the liberal and the national forces that the great powers were trying so hard to repress. But to keep this in perspective, we need to remember that the European powers did not quite see it that way. They had given the Greeks a German king, and the revolution had been successful only because the great powers themselves supported it. Until 1830 the Greek revolt had been the only successful one in Europe; the conservative domination was still largely intact.

**The Conservative Domination: The European States**

Between 1815 and 1830, the conservative domination of Europe evident in the Concert of Europe was also apparent in domestic affairs.

**GREAT BRITAIN: RULE OF THE TORIES**

In 1815, Great Britain was governed by the aristocratic landowning classes that dominated both houses of Parliament. Suffrage for elections to the House of Commons, controlled by the landed gentry, was restricted and un-

---

**THE GREEK STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM: EUGÈNE DELACROIX, GREECE EXPIRING ON THE RUINS OF MISSOLONI.** The Greek revolt against the Ottoman Empire brought a massive outpouring of European sentiment for the Greeks. Romantic artists and poets were especially eager to publicize the struggle of the Greeks for independence. In this painting, the French painter Delacroix personified Greece as a majestic, defenseless woman appealing for aid against the victorious Ottoman Turk seen in the background. Delacroix's painting was done soon after the fall of the Greek fortress of Missolonghi to the Ottomans.

---

equal, especially in light of the changing distribution of the British population due to the Industrial Revolution. Large, new industrial cities such as Birmingham and Manchester, for example, had no representatives while landowners used pocket and rotten boroughs (see Chapter 18) to control seats in the House of Commons. Although the monarchy was not yet powerless, in practice the power of the crown was largely in the hands of the ruling party in Parliament.

Within Parliament there were two political factions, the Tories and Whigs. Although both of them were still dominated by members of the landed classes, the Whigs were beginning to receive support from the new moneyed interests generated by industrialization. Tory ministers largely dominated the government until 1830 and had little desire to change the existing political and electoral
system. Tory leadership during the Napoleonic wars made them wary of radicalism and reform movements, an attitude that governed their activities after 1815.

Popular discontent grew apace after 1815 because of severe economic difficulties. The Tory government’s response to falling agricultural prices was the Corn Law of 1815, a measure that placed extraordinarily high tariffs on foreign grain. Though beneficial to the landowners, subsequent high prices for bread made conditions for the working classes more difficult. Mass protest meetings took a nasty turn when a squadron of cavalry attacked a crowd of 60,000 demonstrators at St. Peter’s Fields in Manchester in 1819. The death of eleven people, called the Peterloo Massacre by government detractors, led Parliament to take even more repressive measures. The government restricted large public meetings and the dissemination of pamphlets among the poor. Before further repression could lead to greater violence, the Tory ministry was broadened by the addition of men who believed that some concessions to change rather than sheer repression might best avoid revolution. By making minor reforms in the 1820s, the Tories managed to avoid meeting the demands for electoral reforms—at least until 1830 (see Reform in Great Britain later in this chapter).

RESTORATION IN FRANCE

In 1814, the Bourbon family was restored to the throne of France in the person of Louis XVIII (1814–1824). Louis understood the need to accept some of the changes brought to France by the revolutionary and Napoleonic eras. Consequently, the constitutional Charter of 1814 maintained Napoleon’s Concordat with the pope and accepted Napoleon’s Civil Code with its recognition of the principle of equality before the law (see Chapter 19). The property rights of those who had purchased confiscated lands during the Revolution were preserved. The Charter of 1814 also established a bicameral (two-house) legislature with a Chamber of Peers chosen by the king and a Chamber of Deputies chosen by an electorate restricted to slightly fewer than 100,000 wealthy people.

Louis’s grudging moderation, however, was opposed by liberals anxious to extend the revolutionary reforms and by a group of ultraroyalists who criticized the king’s willingness to compromise and retain so many features of the Napoleonic era. The ultras hoped to return to a monarchical system dominated by a privileged landed aristocracy and to restore the Catholic church to its former position of influence.

The initiative passed to the ultraroyalists in 1824 when Louis XVIII died and was succeeded by his brother, the count of Artois, who became Charles X (1824–1830). Charles had been the leader of the ultraroyalists and was determined to restore the old regime as far as possible. In 1825, he granted an indemnity to aristocrats whose lands had been confiscated during the Revolution. Moreover, the king pursued a religious policy that encouraged the church to reestablish control over the French educational system. Public outrage, fed by liberal newspapers, forced the king to compromise in 1827 and even to accept the principle of ministerial responsibility—that the ministers of the king were responsible to the legislature. But in 1829 he violated his commitment. A protest by the deputies led the king to dissolve the legislature in 1830 and call for new elections. France was on the brink of another revolution.

INTERVENTION IN THE ITALIAN STATES AND SPAIN

In 1815, the Italian peninsula was still divided into a number of states. The Congress of Vienna had established nine states, including Piedmont (officially Sardinia) in the north ruled by the house of Savoy; the kingdom of the Two Sicilies (Naples and Sicily); the Papal States; a handful of small dukiches ruled by relatives of the Austrian emperor; and the important northern provinces of Lombardy and Venetia that were now part of the Austrian Empire. Much of Italy was under Austrian domination, and all the states had extremely reactionary governments eager to smother any liberal or nationalist sentiment. The crushing of attempts at revolt in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies and Piedmont in 1821 discouraged opposition, although secret societies motivated by nationalistic dreams and known as the Carbonari—the charcoal burners—continued to conspire and plan for revolution.

In Spain, another Bourbon dynasty had been restored in the person of Ferdinand VII in 1814. Ferdinand (1814–1833) had agreed to observe the liberal constitution of 1812, which allowed for the functioning of an elected parliamentary assembly known as the Cortes. But the king soon reneged on his promises, tore up the
constitution, dissolved the Cortes, and persecuted its members, which led a combined group of army officers, upper-middle-class merchants, and liberal intellectuals to revolt. The king capitulated in March 1820 and promised once again to restore the constitution and the Cortes.

Metternich’s policy of intervention came to Ferdinand’s rescue. In April 1823, a French army moved into Spain and forced the revolutionary government to flee Madrid. By August of that year, the king had been restored to his throne. Ignoring French advice to adopt moderate policies, Ferdinand VII tortured to death, imprisoned, or exiled the supporters of a constitutional system. Intervention had succeeded.

**REPRESSION IN CENTRAL EUROPE**

After 1815, the forces of reaction were particularly successful in central Europe. The Habsburg empire and its chief agent, Prince Clemens von Metternich, played an important role. Metternich boasted: “You see in me the chief Minister of Police in Europe. I keep an eye on everything. My contacts are such that nothing escapes me.” Metternich’s spies were everywhere, searching for evidence of liberal or nationalist plots. Metternich worried too much in 1815. Although both liberalism and nationalism emerged in the German states and the Austrian Empire, they were initially weak as central Europe tended to remain under the domination of aristocratic landowning classes and autocratic, centralized monarchies.

The Vienna settlement in 1815 recognized the existence of thirty-eight sovereign states in what had once been the Holy Roman Empire. Austria and Prussia were the two great powers although their non-German territory was not included in the confederation. The other states varied considerably in size from the large south German kingdom of Bavaria to the small principality of Schaumburg-Lippe. Together these states formed the Germanic Confederation, but the confederation had little real power. It had no real executive, and its only central organ was the federal diet, which needed the consent of all member states to take action, making it virtually powerless. The purpose of the Germanic Confederation was not to govern the German states but to provide a common defense against France or Russia. However, it also came to serve as Metternich’s instrument to repress revolutionary movements within the German states.

Initially, Germans who favored liberal principles and German unity looked to Prussia for leadership. During the Napoleonic era, King Frederick William III (1797–1840), following the advice of his two chief ministers, Baron Heinrich von Stein and Baron Karl von Hardenberg, instituted political and institutional reforms in response to Prussia’s defeat at the hands of Napoleon. Hardenberg told the king in 1806: “Your Majesty! We must do from above what the French have done from below.” The reforms included the abolition of serfdom, municipal self-government through town councils, the expansion of primary and secondary schools, and universal military conscription to form a national army. The reforms, however, did not include the creation of a legislative assembly or representative government as Stein and Hardenberg wished. After 1815 Frederick William grew more reactionary and was content to follow Metternich’s lead. Though reforms had made Prussia strong, it remained largely an absolutist state with little interest in German unity.

Liberal and national movements in the German states seemed largely limited to university professors and students. The latter began to organize Burschenschaften or student societies dedicated to fostering the goal of a free, united Germany (see the box on p. 618). Their ideas and their motto, “Honor, Liberty, Fatherland,” were in part inspired by Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, who had organized gymnastic societies during the Napoleonic wars to promote the regeneration of German youth. Jahn was a noisy nationalist who encouraged Germans to pursue their Germanic heritage and urged his followers to disrupt the lectures of professors whose views were not nationalistic.

From 1817 to 1819, the Burschenschaften pursued a variety of activities that alarmed German governments. An aide wrote to Metternich that “of all the evils affecting Germany today, even including the licentiousness of the press, this student nuisance is the greatest, the most urgent and the most threatening.” At an assembly held at the Wartburg Castle in 1817, marking the three-hundredth anniversary of Luther’s Ninety-Five Theses, the crowd burned books written by conservative authors. When a deranged student assassinated a reactionary playwright, Metternich had the diet of the Germanic Confederation draw up the Karlsbad Decrees of 1819. These closed the Burschenschaften, provided for censorship of the press, and placed the universities under close supervision and control. Thereafter, except for a minor flurry of activity from 1830 to 1832, Metternich and the cooperative German rulers maintained the conservative status quo.

The Austrian Empire was a multinational state, a collection of different peoples under the Habsburg emperor who provided a common bond. The empire encompassed eleven peoples of different national origin, including Germans, Czechs, Magyars (Hungarians), Slovaks, Romanians, Slovones, Poles, Serbians, and Italians. The Germans, though only a quarter of the population, were economically the most advanced and played a leading role in governing Austria. Since Austria was predominantly agricultural, the landed nobility continued to be the most important class and held most of the important positions as army officers, diplomats, ministers, and civil servants. Essentially, the Austrian Empire was held together by the dynasty, the imperial civil service, the imperial army, and the Catholic church. But its national groups, especially the Hungarians, with their increasing desire for autonomy acted as forces to break the Austrian Empire apart.

Still Metternich managed to hold it all together after 1815. His antipathy to liberalism and nationalism was understandably grounded in the realization that these forces threatened to tear the empire apart. The growing
University Students and German Unity

In the early nineteenth century, university students and professors were the chief supporters of German nationalism. Especially important were the Burschenschaften, student societies that espoused the cause of German unity. In this selection, the liberal Heinrich von Gagern explains the purpose of the Burschenschaften to his father.

Heinrich von Gagern, Letter to His Father

It is very hard to explain the spirit of the student movement to you, but I shall try, even though I can only give you a few characteristics. . . . It speaks to the better youth, the man of heart and spirit and love for all this good, and gives him nourishment and being. For the average student of the past, the university years were a time to enjoy life, and to make a sharp break with his own background in defiance of the philistine world, which seemed to him somehow to foreshadow the tomb. Their pleasures, their organizations, and their talk were determined by their status as students, and their university obligation was only to avoid failing the examination and scraping by adequately—bread-and-butter learning. They were satisfied with themselves if they thought they could pass the examination. There are still many of those nowadays, indeed the majority over-all. But at several universities, and especially here, another group—in my eyes a better one—has managed to get the upper hand in the sense that it sets the mood. I prefer really not to call it a mood; rather, it is something that presses hard and tried to spread its ideas. . . .

Those who share in this spirit have then quite another tendency in their student life, Love of Fatherland is their guiding principle. Their purpose is to make a better future for the Fatherland, each as best he can, to spread national consciousness, or to use the much ridiculed and maligned Germanic expression, more folkishness, and to work for better constitutions. . . . We want more sense of community among the several states of Germany, greater unity in their policies and in their principles of government; no separate policy for each state, but the nearest possible relations with one another; above all, we want Germany to be considered one land and the German people one people. In the forms of our student comradeship we show how we want to approach this as nearly as possible in the real world. Regional fraternities are forbidden, and we live in a German comradeship, one people in spirit, as we want it for all Germany in reality. We give our selves the freest of constitutions, just as we should like Germany to have the freest possible one, insofar as that is suitable for the German people. We want a constitution for the people that fits in with the spirit of the times and with the people's own level of enlightenment, rather than what each prince gives his people according to what he likes and what serves his private interest. Above all, we want the princes to understand and to follow the principle that they exist for the country and not the country for them. In fact, the prevailing view is that the constitution should not come from the individual states at all. The main principles of the German constitution should apply to all states in common, and should be expressed by the German federal assembly. This constitution should deal not only with the absolute necessities, like fiscal administration and justice, general administration and church and military affairs and so on; this constitution ought to be extended to the education of the young, at least at the upper age levels, and to many other such things.

liberal belief that each national group had the right to its own system of government could only mean disaster for the multinational Austrian Empire. While the forces of liberalism and nationalism grew, the Austrian Empire largely stagnated. Metternich had not prevented an explosion in Austria; he only postponed it until 1848.

RUSSIA: AUTOCRACY OF THE TSARS

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Russia was overwhelmingly rural, agricultural, and autocratic. The Russian tsar was still regarded as a divine-right monarch with unlimited power although the extent of the Russian Empire made the claim impractical. Most of the Russian land remained in the control of a class of noble landlords who monopolized the civil service and army officer corps. The land was tilled by serfs, the most exploited lower class in Europe.

In 1801, Alexander I (1801–1825) came to the Russian throne after a group of aristocrats assassinated his detested father, Tsar Paul I (1796–1801). Alexander had been raised in the ideas of the Enlightenment and gave every appearance of being liberal minded. But his liberalism was always conditioned by the autocratic tradition of the tsars. As one adviser said: “He would have willingly agreed that every man should be free, on the condition that he should voluntarily do only what the Emperor wished.”

Initially, however, Alexander seemed willing to make reforms. With the aid of his liberal adviser, Michael Speransky, he relaxed censorship, freed political prisoners, and reformed the educational system. He refused, however, to grant a constitution or free the serfs in the face of opposition from the nobility. Then, too, Alexander himself gradually moved away from his reforming tendencies,
and after the defeat of Napoleon, Alexander reverted to strict and arbitrary censorship. Soon opposition to Alexander arose from a group of secret societies.

One of these societies, known as the Northern Union, was composed of young aristocrats who had served in the Napoleonic wars and had become aware of the world outside Russia as well as intellectuals alienated by the censorship and lack of academic freedom in Russian universities. The Northern Union favored the establishment of a constitutional monarchy and the abolition of serfdom. The sudden death of Alexander in 1825 offered them their opportunity.

Although Alexander’s brother Constantine was the legal heir to the throne, he had renounced his claims in favor of his brother Nicholas. Constantine’s abdication had not been made public, however, and during the ensuing confusion in December 1825, the military leaders of the Northern Union rebelled against the accession of Nicholas. This so-called Decembrist Revolt was soon crushed by troops loyal to Nicholas and its leaders executed.

The revolt transformed Nicholas I (1825–1855) from a conservative into a reactionary determined to avoid another rebellion. Under Nicholas both the bureaucracy and the secret police were strengthened. Constituting the Third Section of the tsar’s chancellery, the political police were given sweeping powers over much of Russian life. They deported suspicious or dangerous persons, maintained close surveillance of foreigners in Russia, and reported regularly to the tsar on public opinion.

Matching Nicholas’s fear of revolution at home was his fear of revolution abroad. There would be no revolution in Russia during the rest of his reign; if he could help it, there would be none in Europe either. Contemporaries called him the Policeman of Europe because of his willingness to use Russian troops to crush revolutions.

◆ The Ideologies of Change

Although the conservative forces were in the ascendancy from 1815 to 1830, powerful movements for change were also at work. These depended on ideas embodied in a series of political philosophies or ideologies that came into their own in the first half of the nineteenth century.

-liberalism

One of these ideologies was liberalism, which owed much to the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century and to the American and French Revolutions at the end of that century. In addition, liberalism became even more significant as the Industrial Revolution made rapid strides, since the developing industrial middle class largely adopted the doctrine as its own. There were divergences of opinion among people classified as liberals, but all began with a common denominator, the belief that people should be as free from restraint as possible. This idea is evident in both economic and political liberalism.

Also called classical economics, economic liberalism had as its primary tenet the concept of laissez-faire, or the belief that the state should not interrupt the free play of natural economic forces, especially supply and demand. Government should not interfere with the economic liberty of the individual and should restrict itself to only three primary functions: defense of the country, police protection of individuals, and the construction and maintenance of public works too expensive for individuals to undertake. If individuals were allowed economic liberty, ultimately they would bring about the maximum good for the maximum number and benefit the general welfare of society.

The case against government interference in economic matters was greatly enhanced by Thomas Malthus (1766–1834). In his major work, *Essay on the Principles of Population*, Malthus argued that population, when unchecked, increases in a geometric ratio while the food supply correspondingly increases only in an arithmetic ratio. The result will be severe overpopulation and ultimately starvation for the human race if this growth is not held in check. According to Malthus, nature imposes a major restraint: “Unwholesome occupations, severe labor and exposure to the seasons, extreme poverty, bad
nursing of children, great towns, excesses of all kinds, the whole train of common disease, and epidemics, wars, plague and famine." Misery and poverty were simply the inevitable result of the law of nature; no government or individual should interfere with its operation.

The ideas of Thomas Malthus were further developed by David Ricardo (1772–1823). In his Principles of Political Economy, written in 1817, Ricardo developed his famous “iron law of wages.” Following Malthus, Ricardo argued that an increase in population means more workers; more workers in turn cause wages to fall below the subsistence level. The result is misery and starvation, which then reduce the population. Consequently, the number of workers declines, and wages rise above the subsistence level again, which in turn encourages workers to have larger families as the cycle is repeated. According to Ricardo, raising wages arbitrarily would be pointless since it would accomplish little but this vicious cycle. Nature is harsh, but attempting to change the laws of nature through the charity of employers or legislation by the state would merely make the situation worse.

Like economic liberalism, political liberalism stressed that people should be free from restraint. Politically, liberals came to hold a common set of beliefs. Chief among them was the protection of civil liberties or the basic rights of all people, which included equality before the law, freedom of assembly, speech, and press, and freedom from arbitrary arrest. All of these freedoms should be guaranteed by a written document, such as the American Bill of Rights or the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. In addition to religious toleration for all, most liberals advocated separation of church and state. The right of peaceful opposition to the government in and out of parliament and the making of laws by a representative assembly (legislature) elected by qualified voters constituted two other liberal demands. Many liberals believed, then, in a constitutional monarchy or constitutional state with limits on the powers of government in order to prevent despotism, and in written constitutions that would also help to guarantee these rights.

Many liberals also advocated ministerial responsibility or a system in which ministers of the king were responsible to the legislature rather than to the king, giving the legislative branch a check upon the power of the executive. Liberals in the first half of the nineteenth century also believed in a limited suffrage. Although all people were entitled to equal civil rights, they should not have equal political rights. The right to vote and hold office would be open only to men who met certain property qualifications. As a political philosophy, liberalism was tied to middle-class men, especially industrial, middle-class men who favored the extension of voting rights so that they could share power with the landowning classes. They had little desire to let the lower classes share that power. Liberals were not democrats.

One of the most prominent advocates of liberalism in the nineteenth century was the English philosopher John Stuart Mill (1806–1873). On Liberty, his most famous work published in 1859, has long been regarded as a classic statement on the liberty of the individual (see the box on p. 621). Mill argued for an “absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects” that needed to be protected from both government censorship and the tyranny of the majority.

Mill was also instrumental in expanding the meaning of liberalism by becoming an enthusiastic supporter of women’s rights. When his attempt to include women in the voting reform bill of 1867 failed, Mill published an essay entitled On the Subjection of Women, which he had written earlier with his wife, Harriet Taylor. He argued that “the legal subordination of one sex to the other” was wrong. Differences between women and men, he claimed, were due not to different natures but simply to social practices. With equal education, women could achieve as much as men. On the Subjection of Women would become an important work in the nineteenth-century movement for women’s rights.

**Nationalism**

Nationalism was based on an awareness of being part of a community that has common institutions, traditions, language, and customs. This community is called a “nation,” and it, rather than a dynasty, city-state, or other political unit, becomes the focus of the individual’s primary political loyalty. Nationalism did not become a popular force for change until the French Revolution, and even then nationalism was not so much political as cultural with its emphasis upon the uniqueness of a particular nationality. Cultural nationalism, however, evolved into political nationalism. The latter advocated that governments should coincide with nationalities. Thus, a divided people such as the Germans wanted national unity in a German nation-state with one central government. Subject peoples, such as the Hungarians, wanted national self-determination or the right to establish their own autonomy rather than be subject to a German minority in a multinational empire.

Nationalism was fundamentally radical in that it threatened to upset the existing political order, both internationally and nationally. A united Germany or united Italy would upset the balance of power established in 1815. By the same token, an independent Hungarian state would mean the breakup of the Austrian Empire. The conservatives tried so hard to repress nationalism because they were acutely aware of its potential to bring about such dramatic change.

At the same time, in the first half of the nineteenth century, nationalism and liberalism became strong allies. Most liberals believed that liberty could only be realized by peoples who ruled themselves. One British liberal said, “it is in general a necessary condition of free institutions that the boundaries of governments should coincide in the main with those of nationalities.” The combination of liberalism with nationalism also gave a cosmopolitan dimension to nationalism. Many nationalists believed that once
each people obtained their own state, all nations could be linked together into a broader community of all humanity.

**Early Socialism**

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the pitiful conditions found in the slums, mines, and factories of the Industrial Revolution gave rise to another ideology for change known as socialism. The term eventually became associated with a Marxist analysis of human society (see Chapter 22), but early socialism was largely the product of political theorists or intellectuals who wanted to introduce equality into social conditions and believed that human cooperation was superior to the competition that characterized early industrial capitalism. To later Marxists, such ideas were impractical dreams, and they contemptuously labeled the theorists utopian socialists. The term has endured to this day.

The utopian socialists were against private property and the competitive spirit of early industrial capitalism. By eliminating them and creating new systems of social organization, they thought that a better environment for humanity could be achieved. Early socialists proposed a variety of ways to accomplish that task.
One approach, set out in the teachings of the Frenchman Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825), was the organization of all society into a cooperative community. Two elites, the intellectual leaders and the industrial managers, would use industrial and scientific technology to coordinate society for the benefit of all. In the process, government would vanish, as it would no longer be needed in the new society.

Another group of early socialists sought to create voluntary associations that would demonstrate the advantages of cooperative living. To Charles Fourier (1772–1838), the competitive industrial system was failing to satisfy human passions and actually repressed them. He proposed instead the creation of small model communities called phalansteries. These were self-contained cooperatives, each consisting ideally of 1,620 people. Communal housed, the inhabitants of the phalanstery would live and work together for their mutual benefit. Work assignments would be rotated frequently to relieve workers of undesirable tasks. Unable to gain financial backing for his phalansteries, Fourier's plan remained untested.

Robert Owen (1771–1858), the British cotton manufacturer, also believed that humans would reveal their true natural goodness if they lived in a cooperative environment. At New Lanark in Scotland, he was successful in transforming a squalid factory town into a flourishing, healthy community. But when he attempted to create a self-contained cooperative community at New Harmony, Indiana, in the United States in the 1820s, internal bickering within the community eventually destroyed his dream. One of Owen's disciples, a wealthy woman named Frances Wright, bought slaves in order to set up a...
model community at Nashoba, Tennessee. The community failed, but Wright continued to work for women’s rights.

The Frenchman Louis Blanc (1813–1882) offered yet another early socialist approach to a better society. In *The Organization of Work*, he maintained that social problems could be solved by government assistance. Denouncing competition as the main cause of the economic evils of his day, he called for the establishment of workshops that would manufacture goods for public sale. The state would finance these workshops, but the workers would own and operate them. Blanc believed that the gradual spread of these workshops would provide a cooperative rather than competitive foundation for the entire economic life of the nation.

With their plans for the reconstruction of society, utopian socialists attracted a number of female supporters who believed that only a reordering of society would help women. Zoë Gatti de Gamond, a Belgian follower of Fourier, established her own phalanstery, which was supposed to provide men and women with the same educational and job opportunities. As part of collective living, men and women were to share responsibilities for child care and housecleaning. The ideas of Saint-Simon proved especially attractive to a number of women who participated in the growing activism of women in politics that had been in motion during the French Revolution. Saint-Simon’s cooperative society recognized the principle of equality between men and women, and a number of working-class women, including Suzanne Voilquin, Claire Démar, and Reine Guindorf, published a newspaper dedicated to the emancipation of women.

One female utopian socialist, Flora Tristan (1803–1844), even attempted to foster a “utopian synthesis of socialism and feminism.” She traveled through France preaching the need for the liberation of women. Her *Worker’s Union*, published in 1843, advocated the application of Fourier’s ideas to reconstruct both family and work:

> Workers, be sure of it. If you have enough equity and justice to inscribe into your Charter the few points I have just outlined, this declaration of the rights of women will soon pass into custom, from custom into law, and before twenty-five years pass you will then see inscribed in front of the book of laws which will govern French society: THE ABSOLUTE EQUALITY of man and woman. Then, my brothers, and only then, will human unity be constituted.

She envisioned this absolute equality as the only hope to free the working class and transform civilization.

Flora Tristan, like the other utopian socialists, was largely ignored by her contemporaries. Although criticized for their impracticality, the utopian socialists at least laid the groundwork for later attacks on capitalism that would have a far-reaching result. But further industrialization would have to occur before those changes could be realized. In the first half of the nineteenth century, socialism remained merely a fringe movement compared to liberalism and nationalism.

◆ Revolution and Reform (1830–1850)

Beginning in 1830, the forces of change began to break through the conservative domination of Europe, more successfully in some places than in others. Finally, in 1848 a wave of revolutionary fervor moved through Europe, causing liberals and nationalists everywhere to think that they were on the verge of creating a new order.

◆ Another French Revolution

The new elections Charles X had called in 1830 produced another victory for the French liberals; at this point the king decided to seize the initiative. He believed that concessions had brought the downfall of Louis XVI during the first French Revolution and was determined not to go in
that direction. On July 26, 1830, Charles issued a set of edicts (July Ordinances) that imposed a rigid censorship on the press, dissolved the legislative assembly, and reduced the electorate in preparation for new elections. Charles's actions produced an immediate rebellion—the July Revolution. Barricades went up in Paris as a provisional government led by a group of moderate, property libertés was hastily formed and appealed to Louis-Philippe, the duke of Orléans, a cousin of Charles X, to become the constitutional king of France. Charles X fled to Britain; a new monarchy had been born.

Louis-Philippe (1830–1848) was soon called the bourgeois monarch because political support for his rule came from the upper middle class. Louis-Philippe even dressed like a member of the middle class in business suits and hats. Constitutional changes that favored the interests of the upper bourgeoisie were instituted. Financial qualifications for voting were reduced, yet remained sufficiently high that the number of voters only increased from 100,000 to barely 200,000, guaranteeing that only the wealthiest people would vote.

To the upper middle class, the bourgeois monarchy represented the stopping place for political progress. To the lesser bourgeoisie and the Parisian working class, who had helped to overthrow Charles X in 1830, it was a severe disappointment because they had been completely excluded from political power. The rapid expansion of French industry in the 1830s and 1840s gave rise to an industrial working class concentrated in certain urban areas. Terrible working and living conditions and the periodic economic crises that created high levels of unemployment led to worker unrest and sporadic outbursts of violence. In 1831 and 1834, government troops were used to crush working-class disturbances in Lyons, center of the silk industry. These insurrections witnessed an emerging alliance between workers and radical advocates of a republic. The government's response—repression and strict censorship of the press—worked temporarily to curb further overt resistance.

Even in the legislature—the Chamber of Deputies—there were differences of opinion about the bourgeois monarchy and the direction in which it should grow. Two groups rapidly emerged, although both were composed of upper-middle-class representatives. The Party of Movement, which was led by Adolphe Thiers, favored ministerial responsibility, the pursuit of an active foreign policy, and limited expansion of the franchise. The Party of Resistance was led by François Guizot who believed that France had finally reached the "perfect form" of government and needed no further institutional changes. After 1840, the Party of Resistance dominated the Chamber of Deputies. Guizot cooperated with Louis-Philippe in suppressing ministerial responsibility and pursuing a policy favoring the interests of the wealthier manufacturers and tradespeople. The government's unwillingness to change led to growing frustration and revolutionary stirrings. They finally erupted in 1848.

Revolutionary Outbursts in Belgium, Poland, and Italy

Supporters of liberalism played a primary role in the July Revolution in France, but nationalism was the crucial force in three other revolutionary outbursts in 1830. Rebels in all three states, however, were motivated by the success of the French revolutionaries. Nationalism was the key factor in a revolt that took place in the Netherlands. In an effort to create a stronger, larger state on France's north-
ern border, the Congress of Vienna had added the area once known as the Austrian Netherlands to the Dutch Republic. The combination of two states with different languages, traditions, and religions was never really acceptable to the Belgians, nor did they appreciate the absolutist rule of the Dutch king, William of Orange. In 1830, the Belgians rose up against the Dutch and succeeded in convincing the major European powers to accept an independent, neutral Belgium. Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, a minor German prince, was designated to be the new king, and a Belgian national congress established a constitutional monarchy for the new state.

The revolutionary scenarios in Italy and Poland were much less successful. Metternich sent Austrian troops to crush revolts in three Italian states. Poland, too, had a nationalist uprising in 1830 when revolutionaries tried to end Russian control of their country. But the Polish insurgents failed to get hoped-for support from France and Britain, and by September 1831 the Russians had crushed the revolt and established an oppressive military dictatorship over Poland.

Reform in Great Britain

In 1830, new parliamentary elections brought the Whigs to power in Britain. At the same time, the successful July Revolution in France served to catalyze change in Britain. The Industrial Revolution had led to an expanding group of industrial leaders who objected to the corrupt British electoral system, which excluded them from political power. The Whigs, though also members of the landed classes, realized that concessions to reform were superior to revolution; the demands of the wealthy industrial middle class could no longer be ignored. In 1830, the Whigs introduced an election reform bill that was enacted in 1832 after an intense struggle (see the box on p. 626).

The Reform Act gave explicit recognition to the changes wrought in British life by the Industrial Revolution. It disfranchised fifty-six rotten boroughs and enfranchised forty-two new towns and cities and reapportioned others. This gave the new industrial urban communities some voice in government. A property qualification (of £10 annual rent) for voting was retained, however, so the number of voters only increased from 478,000 to 814,000, a figure that still meant that only one in every thirty people was represented in Parliament. Thus, the Reform Act of 1832 primarily benefited the upper middle class; the lower middle class, artisans, and industrial workers still had no vote. Moreover, the change did not significantly alter the composition of the House of Commons. One political leader noted that the Commons chosen in the first election after the Reform Act seemed “to be very much like...
The Voice of Reform: Macaulay on the Reform Act of 1832

Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800–1859) was a historian and Whig member of Parliament. This selection is an excerpt from his speech given in Parliament in support of the Reform Act of 1832, which extended the right to vote to the industrial middle classes of Britain. His argument was very simple: it is better to reform than to have a political revolution.

Thomas Babington Macaulay, Speech of March 2, 1831

My hon. friend the member of the University of Oxford tells us that, if we pass this law, England will soon be a Republic. The reformed House of Commons will, according to him, before it has sat ten years, depose the King, and expel the Lords from their House. Sir, if my hon. friend could prove this, he would have succeeded in bringing an argument for democracy infinitely stronger than any that is to be found in the works of Paine. His proposition is, in fact, this—that our monarchical and aristocratical institutions have no hold on the public mind of England; that these institutions are regarded with aversion by a decided majority of the middle class. . . . Now, sir, if I were convinced that the great body of the middle class in England look with aversion on monarchy and aristocracy, I should be forced, much against my will, to come to this conclusion, that monarchical and aristocratical institutions are unsuited to this country. Monarchy and aristocracy, valuable and useful as I think them, are still valuable and useful as means, and not as ends. The end of government is the happiness of the people; and I do not conceive that, in a country like this, the happiness of the people can be promoted by a form of government in which the middle classes place no confidence, and which exists only because the middle classes have no organ by which to make their sentiments known. But, sir, I am fully convinced that the middle classes sincerely wish to uphold the royal prerogatives, and the constitutional rights of the Peers. . . .

But let us know our interest and our duty better. Turn where we may—within, around—the voice of great events is proclaiming to us, “Reform, that you may preserve.” Now, therefore, while everything at home and abroad forebodes ruin to those who persist in a hopeless struggle against the spirit of the age; now, while the crash of the proudest throne of the Continent is still resounding in our ears; . . . now, while the heart of England is still sound; now, while the old feelings and the old associations retain a power and a charm which may too soon pass away; now, in this your accepted time; now, in this your day of salvation, take counsel, not of prejudice, not of party spirit, not of the ignominious pride of a fatal consistency, but of history, of reason, of the ages which are past, of the signs of this most portentous time. Pronounce in a manner worthy of the expectation with which this great debate has been anticipated, and of the long remembrance which it will leave behind. Renew the youth of the State. Save property divided against itself. Save the multitude, endangered by their own ungovernable passions. Save the aristocracy, endangered by its own unpopular power. Save the greatest, and fairest, and most highly civilized community that ever existed, from calamities which may in a few days sweep away all the rich heritage of so many ages of wisdom and glory. The danger is terrible. The time is short. If this Bill should be rejected, I pray to God that none of those who concur in rejecting it may ever remember their votes with unavailing regret, amidst the wreck of laws, the confusion of ranks, the spoliation of property, and the dissolution of social order.

...
onomic liberals, favored the principles of free trade. Repeal came in 1846 when Robert Peel (1788–1850), leader of the Tories, persuaded some of his associates to support free trade principles and abandon the Corn Laws.

The year 1848, which witnessed revolutions in most of Europe, ended without a major crisis in Britain. On the Continent, middle-class liberals and nationalists were at the forefront of the revolutionary forces. In Britain, however, the middle class had been largely satisfied by the Reform Act of 1832 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. The British working classes were discontented, but they would have to wait until the second half of the nineteenth century to begin to achieve their goals.

**The Growth of the United States**

The U.S. Constitution, ratified in 1789, committed the United States to two of the major forces of the first half of the nineteenth century, liberalism and nationalism. Initially, this constitutional commitment to national unity was challenged by divisions over the power of the federal government vis-à-vis the individual states. Bitter conflict erupted between the Federalists and the Republicans. Led by Alexander Hamilton (1757–1804), the Federalists favored a financial program that would establish a strong central government. The Republicans, guided by Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826) and James Madison (1751–1836), feared centralization and its consequences for popular liberties. These divisions were intensified by European rivalries as the Federalists were pro-British and the Republicans pro-French. The conclusion of the War of 1812 brought an end to the Federalists, who had opposed the war, while the surge of national feeling generated by the war served to heal the nation’s divisions.

Another strong force for national unity came from the Supreme Court where John Marshall (1755–1835) was chief justice from 1801 to 1835. Marshall made the Supreme Court into an important national institution by asserting the right of the Court to overrule an act of Congress if the Court found it to be in violation of the Constitution. Under Marshall, the Supreme Court contributed further to establishing the supremacy of the national government by curbing the actions of state courts and legislatures.

The election of Andrew Jackson (1767–1845) as president in 1828 opened a new era in American politics. Jacksonian democracy introduced mass democratic politics. The electorate was expanded by dropping traditional property qualifications; by the 1830s suffrage had been extended to almost all adult white males. During the period from 1815 to 1850, the traditional liberal belief in the improvement of human beings was also given concrete expression. Americans developed detention schools for juvenile delinquents and new penal institutions, both motivated by the liberal belief that the right kind of environment would rehabilitate those in need of it. The abolitionist or national antislavery movement that developed in the 1830s also stemmed from liberal convictions. The American Anti-Slavery Society, established by William Lloyd Garrison (1805–1879) in 1833, already had 250,000 members by 1838.

By 1850, Europeans had become well aware of the growth of the American republic. Between 1830 and 1850, a wide variety of European political writers visited and examined the United States. The general thrust of their collective wisdom was that the United States was emerging as a world power. The French critic Sainte-Beuve wrote in 1847 that “Russia is still barbarous, but she is great. . . . The other youthful people is America . . . the future of the world is there, between these two great worlds.” Sainte-Beuve had the right idea even if he was somewhat premature.

**The Revolutions of 1848**

Despite the successes of revolutions in France, Belgium, and Greece, the conservative order continued to dominate much of Europe. But the forces of liberalism and nationalism, first generated by the French Revolution, continued to grow. In 1848, these forces of change erupted once more. As usual, revolution in France provided the spark for other countries, and soon most of central and southern Europe was ablaze with revolutionary fires. Tsar Nicholas I of Russia lamented to Queen Victoria in April 1848, “What remains standing in Europe? Great Britain and Russia.”

**Yet Another French Revolution**

Numerous signs of trouble preceded the revolution. A severe industrial and agricultural depression beginning in 1846 brought untold hardship to the lower middle class, workers, and peasants. One-third of the workers in Paris were unemployed by the end of 1847. Scandals, graft, and corruption were rife while the government’s persistent refusal to extend the suffrage angered the disfranchised members of the middle class. Even members of the upper middle class were discontented with the colorless reign of Louis-Philippe.

As Louis-Philippe’s government continued to refuse to make changes, opposition grew. Radical republicans and socialists, joined by the upper middle class under the leadership of Adolphe Thiers, agitated for the dismissal of Guizot. Since they were forbidden by law to stage political rallies, they used the political banquet to call for reforms. Almost seventy such banquets were held in France during the winter of 1847–1848; a grand, culminating banquet was planned for Paris on February 22. When the government forbade it, people came anyway; students and workers threw up barricades in Paris. Although Louis-Philippe now proposed reform, he was unable to form another ministry and abdicated on February 24 and fled to Britain. A provisional government was established by a group of moderate and radical republicans; the latter even included the socialist Louis
Blanc. The provisional government ordered that representatives for a Constituent Assembly to draw up a new constitution be elected by universal manhood suffrage.

The provisional government also established national workshops under the influence of Louis Blanc. As Blanc envisioned them, the workshops were to be cooperative factories run by the workers. In fact, the workshops became unemployment compensation units or public works, except that they provided little work beyond leaf raking and ditch digging. The cost of the program became increasingly burdensome to the government.

The result was a growing split between the moderate republicans, who had the support of most of France, and the radical republicans, whose main support came from the Parisian working class. In the elections for the National Assembly, 500 seats went to moderate republicans and 300 to avowed monarchists while the radicals gained only 100. From March to June, the number of unemployed enrolled in the national workshops rose from 10,000 to almost 120,000, emptying the treasury and frightening the moderates who responded by closing the workshops on June 21. The workers refused to accept this decision and poured into the streets. Four days of bitter and bloody fighting by government forces crushed the working-class revolt, described by some as a “class struggle.” Thousands were killed, and 11,000 prisoners were deported to the French colony of Algeria in North Africa. These “June days” left a legacy of hate. They had aspects of class warfare as the property classes became convinced that they had barely averted an attempt by the working class to destroy the social order. To many Europeans, the “June days” appeared to be a struggle of the bourgeoisie against the working class.

The new constitution, ratified on November 4, 1848, established a republic (Second Republic) with a unicameral (one-house) legislature of 750 elected by universal male suffrage for three years and a president, also elected by universal male suffrage, for four years. In the elections for the presidency held in December 1848, four republicans who had been associated with the early months of the Second Republic were resoundingly defeated by Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte.

How could a virtual unknown who had been arrested twice and sent into exile once be chosen president by a landslide? The name of Bonaparte had obviously worked its magic. The Napoleonic revival had been going on for years as romanticists glorified his legend. One old veteran said: “Why shouldn’t I vote for this gentleman. I, whose nose was frozen near Moscow.” Perhaps just as important, the French were tired of revolution, and Louis Napoleon had posed as a defender of order. Members of the rural and urban masses who voted for Napoleon in large numbers saw him as a man of the people. Since they had been excluded from political life since 1815, what better choice did they have? Within four years President Napoleon would become Emperor Napoleon (see Chapter 22). The French had once again made a journey from republican hopes to authoritarian order, a pattern that was becoming all too common in French history.

REVOLUTION IN CENTRAL EUROPE

Like France, central Europe experienced rural and urban tensions due to an agricultural depression beginning in 1845. But the upheaval here seems to have been set off by news of the revolution in Paris in February 1848 (see the box on p. 629). By early March 1848, handicraft workers in many German states were destroying the machines and factories that they blamed for depriving them of their jobs; peasants looted and burned the manor houses of the nobility. Many German rulers promised constitutions, a free press, jury trials, and other liberal reforms. In Prussia concessions were also made to appease the revolutionaries. King Frederick William IV (1840–1861) agreed to abolish censorship, establish a new constitution, and work for a united Germany. The latter promise had its counterpart throughout all the German states as governments allowed elections by universal male suffrage for deputies to an all-German parliament to meet in Frankfurt, the seat of the German Confederation. Its purpose was to fulfill a liberal dream—the preparation of a constitution for a new united Germany.

This Frankfurt Assembly was dominated by well-educated, articulate, middle-class delegates, many of them professors, lawyers, and bureaucrats. When it came to nationalism, many were ahead of the times and certainly ahead of the governments of their respective states. From the beginning, the assembly aroused controversy by claiming to be the government for all of Germany. Then, it became embroiled in a sticky debate over the composition of the new German state. Supporters of a Großdeutsch (“Big German”) solution wanted to include the German province of Austria, whereas proponents of a Kleindeutsch (“Small German”) solution favored excluding Austria and making the Prussian king the emperor of the new German state. The problem was solved when the Austrians withdrew, leaving the field to the supporters of the Kleindeutsch solution. Their victory was short-lived, however, as Frederick William IV gruffly refused the assembly’s offer of the title of “emperor of the Germans” in March 1849 and ordered the Prussian delegates home.

The Frankfurt Assembly soon disbanded. Although some members spoke of using force, they had no real means of compelling the German rulers to accept the constitution they had drawn up. The attempt of the German liberals at Frankfurt to create a German state had failed.

The Austrian Empire also had its social, political, and nationalist grievances and needed only the news of the revolution in Paris to encourage it to erupt in flames in March 1848. The Hungarian liberal gentry under Louis Kossuth agitated for “commonwealth” status; they were willing to keep the Habsburg monarch, but wanted their own legislature. In March, demonstrations in Budapest,
Revolutionary Excitement: Carl Schurz and the Revolution of 1848 in Germany

The excitement with which German liberals and nationalists received the news of the February Revolution in France and their own expectations for Germany are well captured in this selection from the Reminiscences of Carl Schurz (1829–1906). Schurz made his way to the United States after the failure of the German revolution and eventually became a U.S. senator.

Carl Schurz, Reminiscences

One morning, toward the end of February, 1848, I sat quietly in my attic-chamber, working hard at my tragedy of “Ulrich von Hutten,” [a sixteenth-century German knight] when suddenly a friend rushed breathlessly into the room, exclaiming: “What, you sitting here! Do you not know what has happened?”

“No; what?”

“The French have driven away Louis Philippe and proclaimed the republic.”

I threw down my pen—and that was the end of “Ulrich von Hutten.” I never touched the manuscript again. We tore down the stairs, into the street, to the market-square, the accustomed meeting-place for all the student societies after their midday dinner. Although it was still forenoon, the market was already crowded with young men talking excitedly. There was no shouting, no noise, only agitated conversation. What did we want there? This probably no one knew. But since the French had driven away Louis Philippe and proclaimed the republic, something of course must happen here, too. . . . We were dominated by a vague feeling as if a great outbreak of elemental forces had begun, as if an earthquake was impending of which we had felt the first shock, and we instinctively crowded together. . . .

The next morning there were the usual lectures to be attended. But how profitless! The voice of the professor sounded like a monotonous drone coming from far away. What he had to say did not seem to concern us. The pen that should have taken notes remained idle. At last we closed with a sigh the notebook and went away, impelled by a feeling that now we had something more important to do—to devote ourselves to the affairs of the fatherland. And this we did by seeking as quickly as possible again the company of our friends, in order to discuss what had happened and what was to come. In these conversations, excited as they were, certain ideas and catchwords worked themselves to the surface, which expressed more or less the feelings of the people. Now had arrived in Germany the day for the establishment of “German Unity,” and the founding of a great, powerful national German Empire. In the first line the convocation of a national parliament. Then the demands for civil rights and liberties, free speech, free press, the right of free assembly, equality before the law, a freely elected representation of the people with legislative power, responsibility of ministers, self-government of the communes, the right of the people to carry arms, the formation of a civic guard with elective officers, and so on—in short, that which was called a “constitutional form of government on a broad democratic basis.” Republican ideas were at first only sparingly expressed. But the word democracy was soon on all tongues, and many, too, thought it a matter of course that if the princes should try to withhold from the people the rights and liberties demanded, force would take the place of mere petition. Of course the regeneration of the fatherland must, if possible, be accomplished by peaceable means. . . . Like many of my friends, I was dominated by the feeling that at last the great opportunity had arrived for giving to the German people the liberty which was their birthright and to the German fatherland its unity and greatness, and that it was now the first duty of every German to do and to sacrifice everything for this sacred object.
worked vigorously to restore the imperial government in Hungary. The Austrian armies, however, were unable to defeat Kossuth's forces, and it was only through the intervention of Nicholas I, who sent a Russian army of 140,000 men to aid the Austrians, that the Hungarian revolution was finally crushed in 1849. The revolutions in Austria had also failed. Autocratic government was restored; emperor and propertied classes remained in control while the numerous nationalities were still subject to the Austrian government.

REVOLTS IN THE ITALIAN STATES
The failure of the revolutionary uprisings in Italy in 1830–1831 had served to discredit the secret societies that had fomented them and encouraged the Italian movement for unification to take a new direction. The leadership of Italy’s risorgimento (“Resurgence”) passed into the hands of Giuseppe Mazzini (1805–1872), a dedicated Italian nationalist who founded an organization known as Young Italy in 1831 (see the box on p. 631). This group set as its goal the creation of a united Italian republic. In his work The Duties of Man, Mazzini urged Italians to dedicate their lives to the Italian nation: “O my Brother! love your Country. Our Country is our home.” A number of Italian women also took up Mazzini’s call. Especially noticeable was Cristina Belgiojoso, a wealthy aristocrat who worked to bring about Italian unification. Pursued by the Austrian authorities, she fled abroad and started a newspaper in Paris to espouse the Italian cause.

The dreams of Mazzini and Belgiojoso seemed on the verge of fulfillment when a number of Italian states rose in revolt in 1848. Beginning in Sicily, rebellions spread northward as ruler after ruler granted a constitution to his people. Citizens in Lombardy and Venetia also rebelled against their Austrian overlords. The Venetians declared a republic in Venice. The king of the northern Italian state of Piedmont, Charles Albert (1831–1849), took up the call and assumed the leadership for a war of liberation from Austrian domination. His invasion of Lombardy proved unsuccessful, however, and by 1849 the Austrians had reestablished complete control over Lombardy and Venetia. Counterrevolutionary forces also prevailed throughout Italy. French forces helped Pope Pius IX regain control of Rome. Elsewhere Italian rulers managed to recover power on their own. Only Piedmont was able to keep its liberal constitution.

THE FAILURES OF 1848
Throughout Europe in 1848, popular revolts had initiated revolutionary upheavals that had led to the formation of liberal constitutions and liberal governments. But how could so many immediate successes in 1848 be followed by so many disasters only months later? Two reasons stand out. The unity of the revolutionaries had made the revolutions possible, but divisions soon shattered their ranks. Except in France, moderate liberals from the propertied classes failed to extend suffrage to the working classes who had helped to achieve the revolutions. But as radicals pushed for universal male suffrage, liberals everywhere pulled back.
Concerned about their property and security, they rallied to the old ruling classes for the sake of order and out of fear of social revolution by the working classes. All too soon, established governments were back in power.

In 1848, nationalities everywhere had also revolted in pursuit of self-government. But here too, frightfully little was achieved as divisions among nationalities proved utterly disastrous. Though the Hungarians demanded autonomy from the Austrians, at the same time they refused the same to their minorities—the Slovenes, Croats, and Serbs. Instead of joining together against the old empire, minorities fought each other. No wonder that one Czech could remark in April 1848: “If the Austrian state had not already existed for so long, it would have been in the interests of Europe, indeed of humanity itself, to endeavor to create it as soon as possible.” The Austrians’ efforts to recover the Hungarian provinces met with little success until they began to play off Hungary’s rebellious minority nationalities against the Hungarians.

◆ The Emergence of an Ordered Society

Everywhere in Europe, the revolutionary upheavals of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries made the ruling elite nervous about social disorder and the potential dangers to their lives and property. At the same time, the influx of large numbers of people from the countryside into rapidly growing cities had led to horrible living conditions, poverty, unemployment, and great social dissatisfaction. The first half of the nineteenth century witnessed a significant increase in crime rates, especially against property, in Britain, France, and Germany. The rise in crimes of property caused a severe reaction by middle-class urban inhabitants who feared the threat the urban poor posed to their security and possessions. New police forces soon appeared to defend the propertied classes from criminals and social misfits.
The Development of New Police Forces

The first major contribution of the nineteenth century to the development of a disciplined or ordered society in Europe was a regular system of police. A number of European states established civilian police forces—a group of well-trained law enforcement officers who were to preserve property and lives, maintain domestic order, investigate crime, and arrest offenders. It was hoped that their very presence would prevent crime. The new police forces were not readily welcomed, especially in countries where the memory of oppressive acts carried out by political and secret police still lingered. The function of the new police—to protect citizens—eventually made them acceptable, and by the end of the nineteenth century, many Europeans viewed them approvingly.

This new approach to policing made its first appearance in France in 1828 when Louis-Maurice Debelleyme, the prefect of Paris, proclaimed as his goal: “The essential object of our municipal police is the safety of the inhabitants of Paris. Safety by day and night, free traffic movement, clean streets, the supervision of and precaution against accidents, the maintenance of order in public places, the seeking out of offenses and their perpetrators.” In March 1829, the new police, known as serjeants, became visible on Paris streets. They were dressed in blue uniforms to make them easily recognizable by all citizens. They were also lightly armed with a white...
cane during the day and a saber at night, underscoring the fact that they made up a civilian, not a military, body. Initially, there were not many of the new police officers. Paris had 85 by August of 1829 and only 500 in 1850. Before the end of the century, their number had increased to 4,000.

The British, fearful of the powers exercised by military or secret police in authoritarian continental European states, had long resisted the creation of a professional police force. Instead, Britain depended upon a system of unpaid constables recruited by local authorities. Often these local constables were incapable of keeping order, preventing crimes, or apprehending criminals. Such jobs could also be dangerous and involve incidents like the one reported by a man passing by a local pub in 1827:

I saw Thomas Franklin [constable of the village of Leighton Buzzard] coming out backwards. John Brandon . . . was opposite and close to the constable. I saw the said John Brandon strike the said constable twice “bang full in the face” the blows knocked the constable down on his back. John Brandon fell down with him. Sarah Adams . . . got on
top of the constable and jostled his head against the ground. . . . The constable appeared very much hurt and his face was all over blood.10

The failure of the local constables led to a new approach. Between September 1829 and May 1830, 3,000 uniformed police officers appeared on the streets of London. They came to be known as bobbies after Sir Robert Peel, who had introduced the legislation that created the force. By 1856, the new police had become obligatory for all local authorities.

As is evident from the first instruction book for the new British police, their primary goal was to prevent crime: “Officers and police constables should endeavour to distinguish themselves by such vigilance and activity as may render it impossible for any one to commit a crime within that portion of the town under their charge.”11 The municipal authorities soon found, however, that the police were also useful for imposing order on working-class urban inhabitants. On Sundays they were called upon to clean up after Saturday night’s drinking bouts. As demands for better pay and treatment led to improved working conditions, British police began to develop a sense of professionalism (see the box on p. 635).

Police systems were reorganized throughout the Western world during the nineteenth century. Reformers followed first the French and then the British model, but local traditions were often important in shaping a nation’s system. After the revolutions of 1848 in Germany, a state-financed police force called the Schutzmannschaft, modeled after the London police, was established for the city of Berlin. The Schutzmannschaft began as a civilian body, but already by 1851 the force had become organized more along military lines and was used for political purposes. Their military nature was reinforced by their weaponry, which included swords, pistols, and brass knuckles. One observer noted that “A German policeman on patrol is armed as if for war.”12

Although the new police alleviated some of the fears about the increase in crime, contemporary reformers approached the problem in other ways. Some of them believed that the increase in crime was related to the dramatic increase in poverty. As one commented in 1816: “Poverty, misery are the parents of crime.” Strongly influenced by the middle-class belief that unemployment was the result of sheer laziness, European states passed poor laws that attempted to force paupers to find work on their own or enter workhouses designed to make people so utterly uncomfortable they would choose to reenter the labor market.

Meanwhile, another group of reformers was arguing that poor laws failed to address the real problem, which was that poverty was a result of the moral degeneracy of the lower classes, increasingly labeled the “dangerous classes” because of the threat they posed to middle-class society. This belief led one group of secular reformers to form institutes to instruct the working classes in the applied sciences in order to make them more productive members of society. The London Mechanics’ Institute, established in Britain, and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge in the Field of Natural Sciences, Technical Science, and Political Economy, founded in Germany, are but two examples of this approach to the “dangerous classes.”

Organized religion took a different approach. British evangelicals set up Sunday Schools to improve the morals of working children, and in Germany evangelical Protestants established nurseries for orphans and homeless children, women’s societies to care for the sick and poor, and prison societies that prepared women to work in prisons. The Catholic church attempted the same kind of work through a revival of its religious orders; dedicated priests and nuns used spiritual instruction and recreation to turn young male workers away from the moral vices of gambling and drinking and female workers from lives of prostitution.

THE LONDON POLICE. One response to the revolutionary upheavals of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was the development of civilian police forces that would be responsible for preserving property, arresting criminals, and maintaining domestic order. This early photograph shows a group of London policemen who came to be known as bobbies after Sir Robert Peel, the man who was responsible for introducing the legislation that initiated the London police force.
The new British police forces, organized first in London in 1829, were generally well established throughout a good part of Britain by the 1840s. As professionalism arose in the ranks of the forces, so too did demands for better pay and treatment. In these two selections, police constables make clear their demands and complaints.

**Petition for Higher Pay by a Group of Third-Class Constables (1848)**

Men joining the Police service as 3rd Class Constables and having a wife and 3 children to support on joining, are not able properly to do so on the pay of 16/8d. Most of the married men on joining are somewhat in debt, and are unable to extricate themselves on account of rent to pay and articles to buy which are necessary for support of wife and children. We beg leave to state that a married man having a wife and 2 children to support on joining, that it is as much as he can do upon 16/8d per week, and having to remain upon that sum for the first 12 to 18 months.

**Complaints from Constables of D Division of the London Metropolitan Police**

We are not treated as men but as slaves we englishmen do not like to be terrorized by a set of Irish Sergeants who are only lenient to their own countrymen we the D division of Paddington are nearly all ruled by these Irish Sergeants after we have done our night-Duty may we not have the privilege of going to Church or staying at home to Suit our own inclination when we are ordered to. The Superintendent to go to church in our uniform on wednesday we do not object to the going to church we like to go but we do not like to be ordered there and when we go on Sunday nights we are asked like so many schoolboys have we been to church should we say no let reason be what it may it does not matter we are forthwith ordered from Paddington to Marylebone lane the next night—about 2 hours before we go to Duty that is 2 miles from many of our homes being tired with our walk there and back we must either loiter about the streets or in some public house and there we do not want to go for we cannot spare our trifling wages to spend them there but there is no other choice left—for us to make our time out to go on Duty at proper time on Day we are ordered there for that offense another Man may faultlessly commit—the crime of sitting 4 minutes during the night—then we must be ordered there another to Shew his old clothes before they are given in even we must go to the expense of having them put in repair we have indeed for all these frightful crimes to walk 3 or 4 miles and then be wasting our time that makes our night 3 hours longer than they ought to be another thing we want to know who has the money that is deducted out of our wages for fines and many of us will be obliged to give up the duty unless we can have fair play as to the stationing of us on our beats why cannot we follow round that may all and each of us go over every beat and not for the Sergeants to put their favorites on the good beats and the others kept back their favorites are not the best policemen but those that will spend the most with them at the public house there are a great many of these things to try our temper.

**The Reform of Prisons**

The increase in crime led to a rise in arrests. By the 1820s, in most countries the indiscriminate use of capital punishment, even for crimes against property, was increasingly being viewed as ineffective and was replaced by imprisonment. Although the British had shipped people convicted of serious offenses to their colonial territory of Australia, that practice began to slow down in the late 1830s when the colonists loudly objected. Incarceration, then, was the only alternative. Prisons served to isolate criminals from society, but a growing number of reformers questioned their purpose and effectiveness, especially when prisoners were subjected to harsh and even humiliating work as punishment. By the 1830s, European governments were seeking ways to reform their penal systems. Motivated by the desire not just to punish, but to rehabilitate and transform criminals into new persons, the British and French sent missions to the United States in the early 1830s to examine how the two different systems then used in American prisons accomplished this goal. At the Auburn Prison in New York, for example, prisoners were separated at night but worked together in the same workshop during the day. At Walnut Street Prison in Philadelphia, prisoners were separated into individual cells.

After examining the American prisons, both the French and British constructed prisons on the Walnut Street model with separate cells that isolated prisoners from one another. At Petite Roquette in France and Pentonville in Britain, prisoners wore leather masks while they exercised and sat in separate stalls when in chapel. Solitary confinement, it was believed, forced prisoners back on their own consciences, led to greater remorse, and increased the possibility that they would change their evil ways. One supporter of the separate-cell system noted how:

a few months in the solitary cell renders a prisoner strangely impassible. The chaplain can then make the brawny navvy cry like a child: he can work on his feelings in almost any way he pleases; he can, so to speak,
Culture in an Age of Reaction and Revolution: The Mood of Romanticism

At the end of the eighteenth century, a new intellectual movement known as Romanticism was developing as a reaction against the Enlightenment's preoccupation with reason in discovering truth. Though the Romantics, especially the early Romantics, by no means disparaged reason, they tried to balance its use by stressing the importance of intuition, feeling, emotion, and imagination as sources of knowing. As one German Romantic put it: "It was my heart that counseled me to do it, and my heart cannot err.”

The Characteristics of Romanticism

Romanticism had its beginnings in Germany when a group of German poets began to emphasize emotion, sentiment, and the importance of inner feelings in their works. An important model for Romanticism was the tragic figure in The Sorrows of the Young Werther, a novel by the great German writer, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), who later rejected Romanticism in favor of Classicism. Werther was a Romantic figure who sought freedom in order to fulfill himself. Misunderstood and rejected by society, he continued to believe in his own worth through his inner feelings, but his deep love for a girl who did not love him finally led him to commit suicide. After Goethe's Sorrows of the Young Werther, numerous novels and plays appeared whose plots revolved around young maidens tragically carried off at an early age (twenty-three was most common) by disease (usually tuberculosis, at that time a protracted disease that was usually fatal) to the sorrow and sadness of their male lovers.

Another important characteristic of Romanticism was individualism or an interest in the unique traits of each person. The Romantics’ desire to follow their inner drives led them to rebel against middle-class conventions. Long hair, beards, and outrageous clothes served to reinforce the individualism that young Romantics were trying to express. Many Romantic novels focused on the theme of the individual's conflict with society.

Sentiment and individualism came together in the Romantics' stress on the heroic. The Romantic hero was a solitary genius who was ready to defy the world and sacrifice his life for a great cause. In the hands of the British writer, Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881), however, the Romantic hero did not destroy himself in ineffective protests against society, but transformed society instead. In his historical works, Carlyle stressed that historical events were largely determined by the deeds of such heroes.

Many Romantics believed that states and societies, like individual organisms, evolved through time, and that each person had a Geist or spirit that made that people unique. This perspective inspired Romanticism to study history because they saw it as a way to understand how a nationality came to be what it was. They singled out one period of history—the Middle Ages—for special attention because the European states had first emerged during that time. The medieval period was also seen as an age of faith and religious emotion rather than reason. No doubt, the Romantic reverence for history contributed to the nineteenth century's fascination with nationalism.

This historical mindedness was manifested in many ways. In Germany, the Grimm brothers collected and published local fairy tales, as did Hans Christian Andersen in Denmark. The revival of medieval Gothic architecture left European countrysides adorned with pseudo-medieval castles and cities bedecked with grandiose neo-Gothic cathedrals, city halls, parliamentary buildings, and even railway stations. Literature, too, reflected this historical consciousness. The novels of Walter Scott (1771–1832) became European best-sellers in the first half of the nineteenth century. Ivanhoe, in which Scott tried to evoke the clash between Saxon and Norman knights in medieval England, became one of his most popular works.

To the historical mindedness of the Romantics could be added an attraction to the bizarre and unusual. In an exaggerated form, this preoccupation gave rise to so-called Gothic literature (see the box on p. 638), chillingly evident in the short stories of horror by the American Edgar Allan Poe (1808–1849) and in Frankenstein by Mary Shelley (1797–1851). Her novel was the story of a mad scientist who brings into being a humanlike monster who goes berserk. Some Romantics even sought the unusual in their own lives by pursuing extraordinary states of experience in dreams, nightmares, frenzies, and suicidal depression or by experimenting with cocaine, opium, and hashish to produce drug-induced, altered states of consciousness.
**Romantic Poets and the Love of Nature**

To the Romantics, poetry ranked above all other literary forms because they believed it was the direct expression of one’s soul. The Romantic poets were viewed as seers who could reveal the invisible world to others. Their incredible sense of drama made some of them the most colorful figures of their era, living intense but short lives. Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822), expelled from school for advocating atheism, set out to reform the world. His *Prometheus Unbound*, completed in 1820, is a portrait of the revolt of human beings against the laws and customs that oppress them. He drowned in a storm in the Mediterranean. Lord Byron (1788–1824) dramatized himself as the melancholy Romantic hero that he had described in his work, *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage*. He participated in the movement for Greek independence and died in Greece fighting the Ottomans.

Romantic poetry gave full expression to one of the most important characteristics of Romanticism: love of nature, especially evident in the works of William Wordsworth (1770–1850). His experience of nature was almost mystical as he claimed to receive “authentic tidings of invisible things”:

\[
\text{One impulse from a vernal wood} \\
\text{May teach you more of man,} \\
\text{Of Moral Evil and of good,} \\
\text{Than all the sages can.}^{14}
\]

To Wordsworth, nature contained a mysterious force that the poet could perceive and learn from. Nature served as a mirror into which humans could look to learn about themselves. Nature was, in fact, alive and sacred:

\[
\text{To every natural form, rock, fruit or flower,} \\
\text{Even the loose stones that cover the high-way,} \\
\text{I gave a moral life, I saw them feel,} \\
\text{Or link’d them to some feeling: the great mass} \\
\text{Lay bedded in a quickening soul, and all} \\
\text{That I beheld, respired with inward meaning.}^{15}
\]

Other Romantics carried this worship of nature further into pantheism by identifying the great force in nature with God. The Romantics would have nothing to do with the deist God of the Enlightenment, the remote creator of the world-machine. As the German Romantic poet Friedrich Novalis said: “Anyone seeking God will find him anywhere.”

The worship of nature also led Wordsworth and other Romantic poets to a critique of the mechanistic materialism of eighteenth-century science, which, they believed, had reduced nature to a cold object of study. Against that view of the natural world, Wordsworth offered his own vivid and concrete experience. To him the scientists’ dry, mathematical approach left no room for the imagination or for the human soul. The poet who left to the world “one single moral precept, one single affecting sentiment,” Wordsworth said, did more for the world than scientists who were soon forgotten. The monster created by Frankenstein in Mary Shelley’s Gothic novel symbolized well the danger of science when it tries to conquer nature. Many Romantics were convinced that the emerging industrialization would cause people to become alienated from their inner selves and the natural world around them.

**Romanticism in Art and Music**

Like the literary arts, the visual arts were also deeply affected by Romanticism. Although their works varied widely, Romantic artists shared at least two fundamental
American writers and poets made significant contributions to the movement of Romanticism. Although Edgar Allan Poe (1809–1849) was influenced by the German Romantic school of mystery and horror, many literary historians give him the credit for pioneering the modern short story. This selection from the conclusion of “The Fall of the House of Usher” gives a sense of the nature of so-called Gothic literature.

**Edgar Allan Poe, “The Fall of the House of Usher”**

No sooner had these syllables passed my lips, than—as if a shield of brass had indeed, at the moment, fallen heavily upon a floor of silver—I became aware of a distinct, hollow, metallic, and clangorous, yet apparently muffled, reverberation. Complete unnerved, I leaped to the chair in which he sat. His eyes were bent fixedly before him, and throughout his whole countenance there reigned a stony rigidity. But, as I placed my hand upon his shoulder, there came a strong shudder over his whole person; a sickly smile quivered about his lips and I saw that he spoke in a low, hurried, and gibbering murmur, as if unconscious of my presence. Bending closely over him, I at length drank in the hideous import of his words.

“Not hear it?—yes, I hear it, and have heard it. Long-long-many minutes, many hours, many days, have I heard it—yet I dared not—oh, pity me, miserable wretch that I am!—I dared not—I dared not speak! We have put her living in the tomb! Said I not that my senses were acute? I now tell you that I heard her first feeble movements in the hollow coffin. I heard them—many, many days ago—yet I dared not—I dared not speak! And now—to-night—. . . the rending of her coffin, and the grating of the iron hinges of her prison, and her struggles within the coppered archway of the vault! Oh whither shall I fly? Will she not be here anon? Is she not hurrying to upbraid me for my haste? Have I not heard her footsteps on the stair? Do I not distinguish that heavy and horrible beating of her heart? MADMAN!”—here he sprang furiously to his feet, and shrieked out his syllables, as if in the effort he were giving up his soul—“MADMAN! I TELL YOU THAT SHE NOW STANDS WITHOUT THE DOOR!”

As if in the superhuman energy of his utterance there had been found the potency of a spell, the huge antique panels to which the speaker pointed threw slowly back, upon the instant, their ponderous and ebony jaws. It was the work of the rushing gust—but then without those doors there DID stand the lofty and enshrouded figure of the lady Madeline of Usher. There was blood upon her white robes, and the evidence of some bitter struggle upon every portion of her emaciated frame. For a moment she remained trembling and reeling to and fro upon the threshold, then, with a low moaning cry, fell heavily inward upon the person of her brother, and in her violent and now final death-agonies, bore him to the floor a corpse, and a victim to the terrors he had anticipated.
ble, a contemporary English Romantic painter, described Turner’s paintings as “airy visions, painted with tinted steam.”

Eugène Delacroix (1798–1863) was the most famous French Romantic artist. Largely self-taught, he was fascinated by the exotic and had a passion for color. Both characteristics are visible in his The Death of Sardanapalus. Significant for its use of light and its patches of interrelated color, this portrayal of the world of the last Assyrian king was criticized at the time for its brilliant color. In Delacroix, theatricality and movement combined with a daring use of color. Many of his works reflect his own belief that “a painting should be a feast to the eye.”

To many Romantics, music was the most Romantic of the arts because it enabled the composer to probe deeply into human emotions. One Romantic writer noted: “It has been rightly said that the object of music is the awakening of emotion. No other art can so sublimely arouse human sentiments in the innermost heart of
Although music historians have called the eighteenth century an age of Classicism and the nineteenth the era of Romanticism, there was much carryover of classical forms from one century to the next. One of the greatest composers of all time, Ludwig van Beethoven, served as a bridge between Classicism and Romanticism.

Beethoven (1770–1827) is one of the few composers who was able singlehandedly to transform the art of music. Set ablaze by the events in France, a revolutionary mood burned brightly across Europe, and Beethoven, like other creative personalities, yearned to communicate his cherished beliefs. He said, “I must write, for what weighs on my heart, I must express.” For Beethoven, music had to reflect his deepest inner feelings.

Born in Bonn, Beethoven came from a family of musicians who worked for the electors of Cologne and became assistant organist at the court by the age of thirteen. He soon made his way to Vienna, then the musical capital of Europe, where he studied briefly under Haydn. Beginning in 1792, this city became his permanent residence although his unruly manner and offensive appearance made him barely tolerable to Viennese society.

During his first major period of composing, which extended from 1792 to 1800, his work was still largely within the classical framework of the eighteenth century, and the influences of Haydn and Mozart are paramount. During the next period of his creative life, which began in 1800, Beethoven declared, “I am making a fresh start.” With the composition of the Third Symphony (1804), also called the Eroica, which was originally intended for Napoleon, Beethoven broke through to the elements of Romanticism in his use of uncontrolled rhythms to create dramatic struggle and uplifted resolutions. E. T. A. Hoffman, a contemporary composer and writer, said, “Beethoven’s music opens the flood gates of fear, of terror, of horror, of pain, and arouses that longing for the eternal which is the essence of Romanticism. He is thus a pure Romantic composer.”

Beethoven served as a bridge from the classical era to Romanticism; after him came a number of musical geniuses who composed in the Romantic style. The Frenchman Hector Berlioz (1803–1869) was one of the most outstanding. His father, a doctor in Grenoble, intended that his son should also study medicine. The young Berlioz eventually rebelled, however, maintaining to his father’s disgust that he would be “no doctor or apothecary but a great composer.” Berlioz managed to fulfill his own expectations, achieving fame in Germany, Russia, and Britain, although the originality of his work kept him from receiving any real recognition in his native France.

Berlioz was one of the founders of program music, which was an attempt to use the moods and sound effects of instrumental music to depict the actions and emotions inherent in a story, event, or even a personal experience. This development of program music was evident in his concert overtures to Shakespeare’s plays and, above all, in his most famous piece, the first complete program symphony, known as the Symphonie fantastique. In this work, Berlioz used music to evoke the passionate emotions of a tortured love affair, including a fifth movement in which
he musically creates an opium-induced nightmare of a witches’ gathering.

\[\textbf{The Revival of Religion in the Age of Romanticism}\]

After 1815, Catholicism experienced a revival. In the eighteenth century, Catholicism had lost its attraction for many of the educated elite as even the European nobility flirted with the ideas of the Enlightenment. The restoration of the nobility brought a new appreciation for the Catholic faith as a force for order in society. This appreciation was greatly reinforced by the Romantic movement. The attraction of Romantics to the Middle Ages and their emphasis on emotion led them to their own widespread revival of Christianity.

Catholicism, in particular, benefited from this Romantic enthusiasm for religion. Especially among German Romantics, there were many conversions to the Catholic faith. One of the most popular expressions of this Romantic revival of Catholicism was found in the work of the Frenchman François-René de Chateaubriand (1768–1848). His book, \textit{Genius of Christianity}, published in 1802, was soon labeled the “Bible of Romanticism.” His defense of Catholicism was based not upon historical, theological, or even rational grounds, but largely upon Romantic sentiment. As a faith, Catholicism echoed the harmony of all things. Its cathedrals brought one into the very presence of God; according to Chateaubriand: “You could not enter a Gothic church without feeling a kind of awe and a vague sentiment of the Divinity . . . every thing in a Gothic church reminds you of the labyrinths of a wood; every thing excites a feeling of religious awe, of mystery, and of the Divinity.”

Protestantism also experienced a revival. That revival, or Awakening as it was called, had already begun in the eighteenth century with the enthusiastic emotional experiences of Methodism in Britain and Pietism in Germany (see Chapter 17). Methodist missionaries from England and Scotland carried their messages of sin and redemption to liberal Protestant churches in France and Switzerland, winning converts to their strongly evangelical message. Germany, too, witnessed a Protestant Awakening as enthusiastic evangelical preachers found that their messages of hellfire and their methods of emotional conversion evoked a ready response among people alienated by the highly educated establishment clergy of the state churches.

\[\textbf{CONCLUSION}\]

In 1815, a conservative order was reestablished throughout Europe, and the cooperation of the great powers, embodied in the Concert of Europe, tried to ensure its durability. But the revolutionary waves of the early 1820s and the early 1830s made it clear that the ideologies of liberalism and nationalism, unleashed by the French Revolution and now reinforced by the spread of the Industrial Revolution, were still alive and active. They faced enormous difficulties, however, as failed revolutions in Poland, Russia, Italy, and Germany all testify. At the same time, reform legislation in Britain and successful revolutions in Greece, France, and Belgium demonstrated the continuing strength of these forces of change. In 1848, they erupted once more all across Europe. And once more they failed. But not all was lost. Both liberalism and nationalism would succeed in the second half of the nineteenth century but in ways not foreseen by the idealistic liberals and nationalists who were utterly convinced that their time had come when they manned the barricades in 1848.
12. Quoted in ibid., p. 102.
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