



**Dr.M.G.R. GOVERNMENT ARTS AND
SCIENCE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN**

E- CONTENT

HISTORY OF EUROPE FROM C.E. 1453 TO C.E. 1789

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

VILLUPURAM –

JULY -2021

HISTORY OF EUROPE FROM C.E.1453 to C.E.1789

UNIT - I

Beginning of Modern Age - Geographical Discoveries - results -Capture of Constantinople by Turks 1453 -Transition from medieval to modern age.

UNIT - II

Renaissance in Italy - Literary Renaissance, Francesco, Petrarch, Giovanni Boccaccio - Artists of Renaissance: Leonardo - da - Vinci, Raphael, Michael Angelo - Venetian School of Painting -Impact of Renaissance.

UNIT - III

The Development Stages of Reformation: Martin Luther - Henry VIII of England - Charles V - Phillip II of Spain - Counter Reformation - Thirty Years war.

UNIT - IV

Louis XIV - Achievements - Foreign Policy - The Dutch War: Spanish War of Succession - The Treaty of Utrecht, 1713- Frederick The Great.

UNIT - V

Austrian War of Succession - Maria Theresa's domestic and foreign policy - Joseph II-reforms - Peter the Great - reforms and foreign policy - Catherine II - reforms and foreign policy - Unrest in Europe - Impact of the American war of Independence - Louis XVI of France.

EARLY MODERN EUROPE

From the early 15th century, Medieval Europe began to morph into early modern Europe. In the later Middle Ages trade had expanded, towns had grown in number and size, and a new, more sophisticated society had emerged. In large parts of western Europe feudalism, with its fragmented power-structures, had begun to give way to centralized monarchies, with their concentration of power in the hands of the king (or queen) and the officials who did the royal bidding.

This process had been enabled by – and in turn stimulated – the rise of gunpowder armies. Cannons and handguns put a final end to the military superiority of heavily armored knights and the invincibility of castles. Being expensive, cannons placed enhanced military power in the hands of those best able to afford them, the monarchs. With the rise of central power came an expansion in royal bureaucracies.

While these developments in politics and society had been going on, the Medieval mindset, with its near-complete subordination to the dominance of the Catholic Church, was being undermined by blatant corruption within the Church's hierarchy. The rise of popular religious movements – the Hussites in central Europe, the Lollards in England – calling for a return to the simpler Christianity of the Gospels had been preparing the ground for a more critical approach to belief.

The Italian Renaissance

A movement which modern scholars call the Italian Renaissance moved European civilization on away from its medieval past towards modernity. This was primarily the result of internal developments within Italy, in particular the rise of wealthy trading cities in northern Italy, such as Milan, Venice and above all Genoa. These competed fiercely with one another, not just in politics and war, but as patrons of culture as well. The intensity of their rivalry made for a fertile field for artistic endeavor.

Another cause was the fall of the great Christian city of Constantinople to the Muslim forces of the Ottoman Turks in 1453. This had been the historic capital of the Byzantine empire, itself a continuation of the Roman empire, for more than a thousand years, and its fall shocked all Europe. It also led to an exodus of scholars from the city who brought with much Greek and Roman learning that had been long lost to western Europe.

Artists and architects looked back to Roman models for their inspiration, and so remade much of the physical environment of European towns and countryside. Writers and thinkers also looked back to Greek and Roman philosophers, and this prompted them to rethink not only much of their understanding about the world, but, more importantly, the ways they sought this understanding.

From this would arise the experimental techniques of modern scientific enquiry; over the next few centuries the work of Vesalius, Copernicus, Kepler, Harvey, Galileo,

Newton and many others would revolutionize the West's knowledge of the material universe.

The Age of Discovery

In the meantime, the West's knowledge of the geography of the world expanded enormously with the voyages of discovery which began in the 15th century. The iconic moment in this was the accidental discovery of the Americas by Christopher Columbus in 1492, but there was a long series of voyages and overland expeditions which each contributed to Europeans' understanding of the world.

Over the next couple of centuries, the Americas were opened up to European conquest and colonization, and trade routes were pioneered linking the Atlantic with the Indian and Pacific Oceans. Western sailors and merchants developed a system of maritime commerce which, for the first time in world history, spanned the globe, and directed much of the world's trade towards Europe. This had a multiplier effect on European economic growth, especially in those regions bordering the Atlantic ocean.

Printing

Within Europe itself, one invention of the mid-15th century helped above any other to move Europe towards the modern world. This was moveable-type printing. To what extent this was an original development to Europe, or had spread to Europe from East Asia (where it had been invented several centuries before) is a hotly debated topic. It

certainly seems that Johannes Gutenberg, a German blacksmith and goldsmith, introduced some major innovations of his own to the technology.

What is also beyond doubt is that its impact on Europe was far more profound than it had been on China. The ability to print books, leaflets and posters brought down their cost dramatically. New knowledge and ideas could spread around the continent much more swiftly – and widely – than before, so that a discovery made by a Portuguese explorer or a German astronomer could soon be being read about by ordinary shopkeepers in Paris or London. This greatly increased the stock of knowledge, and stimulated a thirst for more.

The Reformation and Counter-Reformation

The impact printing had on the religious life of Europeans was even more profound. In the early 16th century, long-term unease about what was widely seen as the corrupt state of the Catholic Church led to the outbreak of a movement called the Reformation. Religious leaders such as Martin Luther and John Calvin called for root and branch reform of the Catholic Church, and when these calls were rejected, broke away to form the Protestant movement (which soon splintered into a bewildering number of churches and sects).

This split the Christian world of Europe into two hostile camps, the Protestant nations to the north and the Roman Catholic nations to the south. The Reformation led to a strong response from the Roman Catholic side. This was known as the Counter-Reformation. At the “hearts and minds” level, Ignatius Loyola founded the religious

order of the Jesuits, which became one of the most effective missionary organizations in world history. At the national and political level, Spain, at that time the leading power in Europe under its King Philip II, saw itself as the champion of the Roman Catholic Church, and strenuously fought to put down Protestantism wherever he could. This led the country into ultimately futile wars in the Netherlands and with England (including the launching of the impressive but ill-fated Spanish Armada in 1588), and to over-extending itself economically.

These and other wars of religion culminating in the terrible Thirty Years War in Germany (1618-48). These wars affected all aspects of European life. The western Christian world was no longer united, and the papacy, which had hitherto claimed spiritual leadership over all western Europe (eastern Europe was home to the Orthodox Church), was now a divisive office, utterly rejected by the Protestants of England, Scotland, Holland, north Germany, Scandinavia and other areas.

Here, a new, simpler style of Christianity emerged. Its emphasis on individual spirituality led to the printing of the Bible and other religious books in the vernacular languages of the different nations. It would also open the way to greater value being given to personal choice. This would become a defining feature of Western civilization, and amongst other things would open the way to the rise of the secular society which we know today.

Eastern Europe

The squabbling kingdoms of western Europe were unable to stop the rise of two huge new states to their east. The first of these was the Ottoman empire, which, even before its conquest of Constantinople, had acquired extensive territories in the Balkans. throughout the later 15th, 16th and 17th centuries this empire expanded far up into central Europe, twice besieging the city of Vienna (1529 and 1683), the capital of the Hapsburgs.

The other state was Russia. Although practicing the Orthodox Christian faith and therefore, in religious matters, within the orbit of Constantinople, the Russians had since the 13th century been politically – and to some extent culturally – a part of the Asiatic empire of the Mongols. In the 15th and 16th centuries, however, under the leadership of the Grand Princes of Muscovy the Russians had gradually liberated themselves from the political domination of the Mongols (by now known, in western Asia, known as the Golden Horde). Since then, the Russians had expanded westward into Europe, at the expense of the Poles, and southwards towards the Black Sea at the expense of the Ottoman Turks (for Russia's expansion, compare the maps for eastern Europe in 1453, 1648 and 1789).

During this process the Russians had also become increasingly westernized. Under a succession of Tsars, above all Peter the Great and Catherine the Great, the Russian elite had increasingly adopted European dress and culture. By the end of the early modern period they were counted as one of the great European powers, alongside Austria, France, Britain and the rising state of Prussia.

The Age of Enlightenment

Post-Reformation European thinkers thus felt more able to pursue their own individual quests for understanding. This, coupled with a strong reaction against the religious dogmatism which had caused so much bloodshed in the wars of religion, led to a new spirit of rationalism, apparent from the later 17th century onwards. Everything – religion, society, government, the material world – was scrutinized in a new way: cause and consequence rooted in the material world were sought. Traditionally accepted notions of divine providence were relegated to the margins.

This movement went by several names: the Age of Reason, the Enlightenment, the Scientific Revolution. Its effects were felt in philosophy, economics, medicine and science, and in politics – first, in political thought, and then in the practice of government. More rational foundations for governing were sought, and, once this thinking had penetrated the courts of Europe, more rational ways of governing countries were put into practice. The reforms of such “enlightened despots” as Louis XIV in France, Peter the Great and Catherine the Great in Russia, Frederick the Great in Germany, and other monarchs, were the fruits of this thinking. They created more efficient governing machines by giving more power to bureaucrats appointed on merit, instead of hereditary aristocrats, and applying rational thinking to the problems of administration.

Towards democracy

In all this, popular democracy was not high on the agenda. However, in certain Protestant countries, especially Holland and Britain, long-standing trends had been at work limiting the power of the monarch and placing more power in the hands of elected representatives of the people (albeit only a small proportion of the people were actually able to vote). By the end of the 17th century the Dutch Estates and English (later British) Parliament had become the seat of sovereignty in these two nations.

Overseas expansion and empire

It is no coincidence that these two countries had the most advanced economies in Europe. During the 17th century their overseas trade had multiplied many times over (sadly, much of it in the Atlantic Slave Trade, in which millions of enslaved Africans were taken to the Americas to work on plantations), and both of them had acquired trading settlements and colonies in North America, the West India, the coast of Africa and the East Indies. At home, agricultural improvements had boosted their farming, and better roads and canals were constructed to lubricate the wheels of trade and industry. Innovations such as joint-stock companies (above all the great east India Companies), national banks, stock exchanges and patent protection had eased the financing of commercial expansion, and the first booms and busts were soon causing excitement – the “tulip mania” of Holland and the South Sea Bubble in Britain. The modern world was fast approaching.

Holland, Britain and France were long-term rivals for overseas trade and empire. In North America and the Caribbean, and along the coasts of India and the East Indies, they fought each other for strategic advantage. Out of this rivalry grew a new kind of fighting force, the oceanic navy. Britain's navy eventually emerged as the most effective of these, and through her sea power Britain would build one of the largest empires that world history has ever seen (the only possible rivals, by different measures, are the Mongol empire and Qing dynasty China).

One by-product of this global rivalry was the discovery by Europeans of the southern landmasses of Australia and New Zealand, together with many much smaller Pacific islands. Although about as far east as it is possible to travel, Australia and New Zealand (and, on a smaller scale, Hawaii) were to become integral parts of "Western" civilization.

The transition from early modern to modern Europe

The end of the early modern phase of European history is usually regarded as being the outbreak of the French Revolution. This can be seen as the most radical political expression of the Enlightenment. It sought to break with traditional forms of government, based on hereditary monarchy, aristocracy and church, which all harked back to Medieval Europe. In their place it attempted to impose a more rational regime, based on the will of the people, elected assemblies, equality between the classes, and reason. It would lead eventually to the creation of new kinds of European states in the 19th century, which on the one hand were more responsive to the will of the people than

the more traditional states had been, and on the other hand had a far greater impact on the lives of their citizens.

Modern Europe was also being heralded by the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution. This had been gathering pace in Britain since around the mid-18th century, as a direct result of the strong economic growth which that country had been experiencing. This revolution would create an entirely new kind of society, with its locus in manufacturing than in agriculture, and in towns and cities rather than the countryside.

EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Early modern Europe is the period of European history between the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, roughly the late 15th century to the late 18th century. Historians variously mark the beginning of the early modern period with the invention of moveable type printing in the 1450s, the Fall of Constantinople and end of the Hundred Years' War in 1453, the end of the Wars of the Roses in 1487, the beginning of the High Renaissance in Italy in the 1490s, the end of the Reconquista and subsequent voyages of Christopher Columbus to the Americas in 1492, or the start of the Protestant Reformation in 1517. The precise dates of its end point also vary and are usually linked with either the start of the French Revolution in 1789 or with the more vaguely defined beginning of the Industrial Revolution in late 18th century England. Some of the more notable trends and events of the early modern period included the Reformation and the religious conflicts it provoked (including the French Wars of Religion and the Thirty Years' War), the rise of capitalism and modern nation states, widespread witch hunts and European colonization of the Americas.

History of geography

The **history of geography** includes many histories of geography which have differed over time and between different cultural and political groups. In more recent developments, geography has become a distinct academic discipline. 'Geography' derives from the Greek γεωγραφία – *geographia*,^[1] literally "Earth-writing", that is, description

or writing about the Earth. The first person to use the word *geographia* was Eratosthenes (276–194 BC). However, there is evidence for recognizable practices of geography, such as cartography (map-making), prior to the use of the term.

(a) Causes

Henry the Navigator of Portugal laid the foundation for long distance sea voyages. He established a navigation school to train sailors. In his school, he taught them how to use navigational instruments such as the mariner's compass and the astrolabe. The impulse for seafaring and adventurous spirit to explore uncharted sea waters was kindled by the curiosity generated by the Renaissance and the travel accounts of Marco Polo and Ibn Battuta. This was further fuelled by the crusading spirit of the Missionaries who dared to undertake dangerous voyages to spread the gospel to the non-believers in distant lands.

But the primary factor was economic. When the Ottoman Turks blocked the land route between the East and the West, spices and other goods became costlier. The European traders were deprived of the huge profits they were earning out of their trade in spices. This intensified the urge to discover a new sea route to Asia. The monarchs supported sea voyages in the hope that resources from trade would free them from their dependence on nobles.

A breakthrough was made in the fourteenth century when a copy of Ptolemy's Geography was brought from the Byzantine Empire to the West. By the middle of the fourteenth century, thanks to the printing press, multiple copies Henry the Navigator were made and circulated widely. It greatly increased the knowledge of the sea routes.

(b) Portuguese Explorations

The sailors of Prince Henry had travelled into Atlantic upto the islands of Azores and Madeira. They explored the west coast of Africa. **Lopo Gonzalves** was the first sailor to cross the equator. Till then sailors did not dare to venture beyond, as they harboured fears about boiling waters and sea monsters. **Bartholomew Diaz** ventured further down the African coast reaching cape point or the southern tip of Africa in 1487 A.D. (C.E.). He named it the *Cape of Storms* as he encountered fierce storms there. However, King John of Portugal renamed it as *Cape of Good Hope* as it provided hope to reach India by sea.

The Portuguese established trading posts along the west coast of Africa dealing in lumber, ivory and slaves. The establishment of trading posts enabled them to buy slaves and transport them directly to Portugal. The slaves were employed in the sugarcane plantations, and sugar was exported to Europe. Slaves were purchased from the African slave market and transported to the colonies under inhuman conditions in slave ships. They were chained and cramped into narrow spaces with insufficient air to

breathe. Many died during the journey. For those who survived, the suffering continued in the plantations. Slave trade increased with the discovery and colonization of America.

(c) Spain and Discovery of the New World

In 1492 A.D. (C.E.), **Columbus**, with the support of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain, set sail in three ships. He crossed the Atlantic Ocean and reached the Bahamas Island, Cuba and Haiti. Columbus thought he had reached the frontier areas of Asia. Hence, he called the natives he encountered as Indians. **Amerigo Vespucci**, another sailor, made three or four voyages and landed on the American mainland. He realized that it was not Asia and that they had stumbled upon a new continent. Hence, he called it the New World. Later, a German cartographer, while preparing a map of the world, named the new world after Amerigo Vespucci and called it America.

(d) Portuguese–Spanish Rivalry

The Portuguese claimed the territories discovered by Columbus. The dispute was referred to the Pope Alexander VI who drew an imaginary line north to south west of Azores and declared that the territories to the west of that line belonged to Spain and that of the east to the Portuguese. In 1497 A.D. (C.E.) Vasco da Gama sailed from Portugal as the head of four ships to find a sea route to India by going around Africa. After reaching the Cape of Good Hope, he set sail to India with the help of an Arab navigator. On 20th May 1498 A.D. (C.E.) he reached Calicut on the Malabar Coast. At Calicut Vasco da

Gama was astounded to find pepper and other spices, a precious commodity in Portugal, available at low prices. He bought as much spices as possible. Back home he earned huge profits. Later the Portuguese navy defeated the Zamorin of Calicut and captured Goa and made it its headquarters for all its possessions in the East. Thus the foundation of the Portuguese Empire in the East was laid.

In 1519 A.D. (C.E.), Ferdinand Magellan sailed westward and crossed the Straits, which later came to be known as Magellan Straits. As the sea was calm he called it the Pacific Ocean. On reaching an island he named it as Philippines after the Spanish Prince Philip. He was killed in a war with the locals. However, the ship in which he had travelled returned to Spain. Thus the first circumnavigation of the world had taken place.

FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE

Fall of Constantinople, (May 29, 1453), conquest of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmed II of the Ottoman Empire. The dwindling Byzantine Empire came to an end when the Ottomans breached Constantinople's ancient land wall after besieging the city for 55 days. Mehmed surrounded Constantinople from land and sea while employing cannon to maintain a constant barrage of the city's formidable walls. The fall of the city removed what was once a powerful defense for Christian Europe against Muslim invasion, allowing for uninterrupted Ottoman expansion into eastern Europe.

Context

By the mid-15th century, constant struggles for dominance with its Balkan neighbours and Roman Catholic rivals had diminished Byzantine imperial holdings to Constantinople and the land immediately west of it. Furthermore, with Constantinople having suffered through several devastating sieges, the city's population had dropped from roughly 400,000 in the 12th century to between 40,000 and 50,000 by the 1450s. Vast open fields constituted much of the land within the walls. Byzantine relations with the rest of Europe had soured over the last several centuries as well: the Schism of 1054 and the 13th-century Latin occupation of Constantinople entrenched a mutual hatred between the Orthodox Byzantines and Roman Catholic Europe. Nevertheless, just as deeply entrenched was the understanding that Byzantine control of

Constantinople was a necessary bastion against Muslim control of land and sea in the eastern Mediterranean.

In contrast to the Byzantines, the Ottoman Turks had extended their control over virtually all of the Balkans and most of Anatolia, having conquered several Byzantine cities west of Constantinople in the latter half of the 14th century. Constantinople itself became an Ottoman vassal during this period. Hungary was the primary European threat to the Ottomans on land, and Venice and Genoa controlled much of the Aegean and Black seas. Sultan Murad II laid siege to Constantinople in 1422, but he was forced to lift it in order to suppress a rebellion elsewhere in the empire. In 1444 he lost an important battle to a Christian alliance in the Balkans and abdicated the throne to his son, Mehmed II. However, he returned to power two years later after defeating the Christians and remained sultan until his death in 1451.

Now sultan for the second time, Mehmed II intended to complete his father's mission and conquer Constantinople for the Ottomans. In 1452 he reached peace treaties with Hungary and Venice. He also began the construction of the Boğazkesen (later called the Rumelihisarı), a fortress at the narrowest point of the Bosphorus, in order to restrict passage between the Black and Mediterranean seas. Mehmed then tasked the Hungarian gunsmith Urban with both arming Rumelihisarı and building cannon powerful enough to bring down the walls of Constantinople. By March 1453 Urban's cannon had been transported from the Ottoman capital of Edirne to the outskirts of Constantinople. In April, having quickly seized Byzantine coastal settlements along the Black Sea and Sea

of Marmara, Ottoman regiments in Rumelia and Anatolia assembled outside the Byzantine capital. Their fleet moved from Gallipoli to nearby Diplokionion, and the sultan himself set out to meet his army.

In the meantime, Byzantine Emperor Constantine XI Palaeologus entreated major powers in Christendom to aid him in the impending siege. Hungary refused to assist, and, instead of sending men, Pope Nicholas V saw the precarious situation as an opportunity to push for the reunification of the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, a priority of the papacy since 1054. Orthodox leaders voted in favour of union, but the people of Constantinople were adamantly against it and rioted in response. Military support came from Venice and Genoa. An Ottoman attack on a Venetian ship in the Bosphorus prompted the Venetian Senate to send 800 troops and 15 galleys to the Byzantine capital, and many Venetians presently in Constantinople also chose to support the war effort, but the bulk of the Venetian forces were delayed for too long to be of any help. For Genoa's part, the city-state sent 700 soldiers to Constantinople, all of whom arrived in January 1453 with Giovanni Giustiniani Longo at their head. Emperor Constantine XI named Giustiniani commander of his land defenses and spent the rest of the winter strengthening the city for a siege.

Battle

In the 15th century, Constantinople's walls were widely recognized as the most formidable in all of Europe. The land walls spanned 4 miles (6.5 km) and consisted of a double line of ramparts with a moat on the outside; the higher of the two stood as high as

40 feet (12 metres) with a base as much as 16 feet (5 metres) thick. These walls had never been breached in the thousand years since their construction. An adjoining sea wall ran along the Golden Horn and the Sea of Marmara, the latter section being 20 feet (6 metres) high and 5 miles (8 km) long. When combined with a large metal chain that had been drawn across the Golden Horn, Constantine was confident that the city's defenses could repel a naval assault and withstand Mehmed's land forces until relief came from Christian Europe. However, Constantine's capacity to defend his city was hampered by his small fighting force. Eyewitness Jacopo Tedaldi estimates a presence of 30,000 to 35,000 armed civilians and only 6,000 to 7,000 trained soldiers. Giustiniani intended to concentrate most of these men at the land walls to the north and west, the centre of which he observed to be the most vulnerable section of the city. A small fleet of naval and armed merchant vessels were also stationed in the Golden Horn to defend the chain. However, without outside support, Constantinople's defenders would be spread thin.

The Ottoman besiegers vastly outnumbered the Byzantines and their allies. Between 60,000 and 80,000 soldiers fought on land, accompanied by 69 cannon. Baltaoğlu Süleyman Bey commanded a fleet stationed at Diplokionion with an estimated 31 large and midsize warships alongside nearly 100 smaller boats and transports. Mehmed's strategy was straightforward: he would use his fleet and siege lines to blockade Constantinople on all sides while relentlessly battering the walls of the city with cannon. He hoped to breach them or otherwise force a surrender before a Christian relief force could arrive.

On April 6 the Ottomans began their artillery barrage and brought down a section of the wall. They mounted a frontal assault of the land walls on April 7, but the Byzantines repelled them and were able to repair the defenses. After pausing to reposition his cannon, Mehmed reopened fire and thereafter maintained daily bombardment.

On April 12 the sultan dispatched a contingent of troops to subdue two nearby Byzantine forts and ordered Baltaoğlu to rush the chain. The fleet was twice driven back, and Baltaoğlu retreated to Diplokionion until the night of the 17th, when he moved to capture the Princes Islands southeast of the city at the same time that Mehmed's land regiments assaulted the Mesoteichon section of the wall. Constantinople's defenders once again held their ground, however, and Baltaoğlu's success at the islands was irreparably marred by the revelation that three relief ships from the pope and one large Byzantine vessel had nearly reached the city unhindered. The Ottoman galleys were too short to capture the tall European warships, and, with the help of the Golden Horn fleet, the warships safely sailed past the chain. Upon hearing of his navy's defeat, Mehmed stripped Baltaoğlu of his rank and arranged for his replacement.

Mehmed was determined to take the Golden Horn and pressure the Byzantines into submission. He angled one of his cannons such that it could strike the defenders of the chain and then began to construct an oiled wooden ramp upon which he intended to portage his smaller vessels from the Bosphorus to the Golden Horn. By April 22 the ships had circumvented the chain in this way and, barring the chain itself, seized control of all

the waters surrounding the city. The defenders attempted to attack the remainder of the Ottoman fleet in the Bosphorus, but they were defeated.

Having encircled Constantinople in full, Mehmed continued his artillery barrage of the land walls through May 29. The Ottoman cannon created several breaches, but most were too narrow to send troops through. The city's defenders continued to repair the walls at night and reinforced areas at the damaged Gate of St. Romanus and the Blachernae sector. In the early hours of May 29, Ottoman labourers filled the moat surrounding the city. Just before dawn, the sultan launched a coordinated artillery, infantry, and naval assault on Constantinople. Two attempts to rush the Gate of St. Romanus and the Blachernae walls were met with fierce resistance, and the Ottoman soldiers were forced to fall back. Mehmed ordered a third attack on the gate, this time with one of his own palace regiments of 3,000 Janissaries. A small group reached the top of a tower through another gate but were nearly eliminated by the defenders until Giustiniani was mortally wounded by Ottoman gunfire while on the ramparts. He was carried to the rear, and his absence sowed confusion and lowered morale among the ranks. This allowed the sultan to send in another Janissary regiment and take the inner wall at the Gate of St. Romanus.

A rout of the defenders ensued, with many of the Venetian and Genoese fighters retreating to their ships in the Golden Horn. Emperor Constantine XI is reported to have been killed while either fighting near the breach or fleeing to an escape boat. Although the sultan attempted to prevent a total sack of the city, he permitted an initial period of

looting that saw the destruction of many Orthodox churches. When most of Constantinople was secure, Mehmed himself rode through the streets of the city to the great cathedral of Hagia Sophia, the largest in all of Christendom, and converted it into the mosque Ayasofya. He stopped to pray and then demanded that all further looting cease immediately. The sultan thus completed his conquest of the Byzantine capital.

Aftermath

Mehmed II and his army were remarkably restrained in their handling of affairs after the fall of Constantinople. They largely refrained from slaughtering commoners and nobility, instead choosing to ransom them to their home states and primarily executing only those who fought after the surrender. Mehmed repopulated the city with people from a multitude of backgrounds and faiths and relocated his capital from Edirne to Constantinople, ensuring a multicultural seat of power for a multicultural empire. He also began to view himself as *Kayser-i Rûm* (“Caesar of Rome”), the inheritor of the Roman Empire and all its historical lands. He asserted this claim with a series of campaigns that thoroughly subjugated both the Balkans and Greece by the late 15th century.

For Christendom, Mehmed’s victory at Constantinople represented a serious shift in its dealings with the East. Now devoid of both a long-standing buffer against the Ottomans and access to the Black Sea, Christian kingdoms relied on Hungary to halt any further westward expansion. Many modern scholars also agree that the exodus of Greeks to Italy as a result of this event marked the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance.

MIDDLE AGES: TRANSITION TO THE MODERN WORLD

The transition from the medieval to the modern world was foreshadowed by economic expansion, political centralization, and secularization. A money economy weakened serfdom, and an inquiring spirit stimulated the age of exploration. Banking, the bourgeois class, and secular ideals flourished in the growing towns and lent support to the expanding monarchies. The church was weakened by internal conflicts as well as by quarrels between church and state. As feudal strength was sapped, notably by the the Hundred Years War and the Wars of the Roses, there emerged in France and England the modern nation state. A forerunner of intellectual modernity was the new humanism of the Renaissance. Finally, the great medieval unity of Christianity was shattered by the religious theories that culminated in the Protestant Reformation.

Introduction

Middle Ages, period in Western European history that followed the disintegration of the West Roman Empire in the 4th and 5th cent. and lasted into the 15th cent., i.e., into the period of the Renaissance. The ideas and institutions of western civilization derive largely from the turbulent events of the Early Middle Ages and the rebirth of culture in the later years. The importance of the Middle Ages has been increasingly recognized as scholarship based on newly published source material, archaeological findings, and studies of demographics and migration patterns presents more accurate and detailed analyses of events and trends.

Middle Ages: Beginnings and Cultural Developments

Although the transitions were gradual, and exact dates for the demarcation of the Middle Ages are misleading, convention often places the beginning of the period between the death of the Roman emperor Theodosius I in 395 and the fall of Rome to the Visigoths in 410. The Dark Ages, formerly a designation for the entire period of the Middle Ages, and later for the period c.450–750, is now usually known as the Early Middle Ages. The term Dark Ages may be more a judgment on the lack of sources for evaluating the period than on the significance of events that transpired.

Medieval Europe was far from unified; it was a large geographical region divided into smaller and culturally diverse political units that were never totally dominated by any one authority. With the collapse of the Roman Empire, Christianity became the standard-bearer of Western civilization. The papacy gradually gained secular authority; monastic communities, generally adhering to the Rule of St. Benedict, had the effect of preserving antique learning; and missionaries, sent to convert the Germans and other tribes, spread Latin civilization.

By the 8th cent. culture centered on Christianity had been established; it incorporated both Latin traditions and German institutions, such as Germanic laws. The far-flung empire created by Charlemagne illustrated this fusion. However, the empire's fragile central authority was shattered by a new wave of invasions, notably those of the Vikings and Magyars.

Feudalism, with the manorial system (see also tenure) as its agricultural base, became the typical social and political organization of Europe. The new framework gained stability from the 11th cent., as the invaders became Christian and settled and as prosperity was created by agricultural innovations, increasing productivity, and population expansion.

Middle Ages: The High Middle Ages

As Europe entered the period known as the High Middle Ages, the church became the universal and unifying institution. While some independence from feudal rule was gained by the rising towns (see commune, in medieval history), their system of guilds perpetuated the Christian and medieval spirit of economic life, which stressed the collective entity, disapproved of unregulated competition, and minimized the profit motive. Strong popes, notably Gregory VII, worked for a reinvigorated Europe guided by a centralized church, a goal virtually realized under Innocent III.

Militant religious zeal was expressed in the Crusades, which also stemmed from the growing strength of Europe. Security and prosperity stimulated intellectual life, newly centered in burgeoning universities (see colleges and universities), which developed under the auspices of the church. From the Crusades and other sources came contact with Arab culture, which had preserved works of Greek authors whose writings had not survived in Europe. Philosophy, science, and mathematics from the Classical and Hellenistic periods were assimilated into the tenets of the Christian faith and the

prevailing philosophy of scholasticism; Aristotle, long associated with heresy, was adapted by St. Thomas Aquinas to Christian doctrine.

Christian values pervaded scholarship and literature, especially Medieval Latin literature, but Provençal literature also reflected Arab influence, and other flourishing medieval literatures, including German literature, Old Norse literature, and Middle English literature, incorporated the materials of pre-Christian traditions. The complex currents, vitality, and religious fervor of medieval culture are evident in the classics of Dante and Chaucer. Gothic architecture developed most notably in the 12th cent., against a background of the cultural and economic ascendancy of Western Europe.

Middle Ages: Transition to the Modern World

The transition from the medieval to the modern world was foreshadowed by economic expansion, political centralization, and secularization. A money economy weakened serfdom, and an inquiring spirit stimulated the age of exploration. Banking, the bourgeois class, and secular ideals flourished in the growing towns and lent support to the expanding monarchies. The church was weakened by internal conflicts as well as by quarrels between church and state. As feudal strength was sapped, notably by the Hundred Years War and the Wars of the Roses, there emerged in France and England the modern nation state. A forerunner of intellectual modernity was the new humanism of the Renaissance. Finally, the great medieval unity of Christianity was shattered by the religious theories that culminated in the Protestant Reformation.

UNIT – II

ITALIAN RENAISSANCE

Toward the end of the 14th century A.D., a handful of Italian thinkers declared that they were living in a new age. The barbarous, unenlightened “Middle Ages” were over, they said; the new age would be a “rinascità” (“rebirth”) of learning and literature, art and culture. This was the birth of the period now known as the Renaissance. For centuries, scholars have agreed that the Italian Renaissance (another word for “rebirth”) happened just that way: that between the 14th century and the 17th century, a new, modern way of thinking about the world and man’s place in it replaced an old, backward one. In fact, the Renaissance (in Italy and in other parts of Europe) was considerably more complicated than that: For one thing, in many ways the period we call the Renaissance was not so different from the era that preceded it. However, many of the scientific, artistic and cultural achievements of the so-called Renaissance do share common themes, most notably the humanistic belief that man was the center of his own universe.

The Italian Renaissance in Context

Fifteenth-century Italy was unlike any other place in Europe. It was divided into independent city-states, each with a different form of government.

Florence, where the Italian Renaissance began, was an independent republic. It was also a banking and commercial capital and, after London and Constantinople, the third-largest city in Europe. Wealthy Florentines flaunted their money and power by becoming patrons, or supporters, of artists and intellectuals. In this way, the city became the cultural center of Europe and of the Renaissance.

The New Humanism: Cornerstone of the Renaissance

Thanks to the patronage of these wealthy elites, Renaissance-era writers and thinkers were able to spend their days doing just that. Instead of devoting themselves to ordinary jobs or to the asceticism of the monastery, they could enjoy worldly pleasures. They traveled around Italy, studying ancient ruins and rediscovering Greek and Roman texts.

To Renaissance scholars and philosophers, these classical sources from Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome held great wisdom. Their secularism, their appreciation of physical beauty and especially their emphasis on man's achievements and expression formed the governing intellectual principle of the Italian Renaissance. This philosophy is known as "humanism."

Renaissance Science and Technology

Humanism encouraged people to be curious and to question received wisdom (particularly that of the medieval Church). It also encouraged people to use experimentation and observation to solve earthly problems. As a result, many Renaissance intellectuals focused on trying to define and understand the

laws of nature and the physical world. For example, Renaissance artist Leonardo Da Vinci created detailed scientific “studies” of objects ranging from flying machines to submarines. He also created pioneering studies of human anatomy. Likewise, the scientist and mathematician Galileo Galilei investigated one natural law after another. By dropping different-sized cannonballs from the top of a building, for instance, he proved that all objects fall at the same rate of acceleration. He also built a powerful telescope and used it to show that the Earth and other planets revolved around the sun and not, as religious authorities argued, the other way around. (For this, Galileo was arrested for heresy and threatened with torture and death, but he refused to recant: “I do not believe that the same God who has endowed us with senses, reason and intellect has intended us to forgo their use,” he said.)

However, perhaps the most important technological development of the Renaissance happened not in Italy but in Germany, where Johannes Gutenberg invented the mechanical movable-type printing press in the middle of the 15th century. For the first time, it was possible to make books—and, by extension, knowledge—widely available.

Renaissance Art and Architecture

Michelangelo’s “David.” Leonardo da Vinci’s “The Last Supper.” Sandro Boticelli’s “The Birth of Venus.” During the Italian Renaissance, art was everywhere (just look up at Michelangelo’s “The Creation” painted on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel!). Patrons such as Florence’s Medici

family sponsored projects large and small, and successful artists became celebrities in their own right.

Renaissance artists and architects applied many humanist principles to their work. For example, the architect Filippo Brunelleschi applied the elements of classical Roman architecture—shapes, columns and especially proportion—to his own buildings. The magnificent eight-sided dome he built at the Santa Maria del Fiore cathedral in Florence was an engineering triumph—it was 144 feet across, weighed 37,000 tons and had no buttresses to hold it up—as well as an aesthetic one.

Brunelleschi also devised a way to draw and paint using linear perspective. That is, he figured out how to paint from the perspective of the person looking at the painting, so that space would appear to recede into the frame. After the architect Leon Battista Alberti explained the principles behind linear perspective in his treatise “Della Pittura” (“On Painting”), it became one of the most noteworthy elements of almost all Renaissance painting. Later, many painters began to use a technique called *chiaroscuro* to create an illusion of three-dimensional space on a flat canvas.

Fra Angelico, the painter of frescoes in the church and friary of San Marco in Florence, was called “a rare and perfect talent” by the Italian painter and architect Vasari in his “Lives of The Artists.” Renaissance painters like

Raphael, Titian and Giotto and Renaissance sculptors like Donatello and Lorenzo Ghiberti created art that would inspire generations of future artists.

The End of the Italian Renaissance

By the end of the 15th century, Italy was being torn apart by one war after another. The kings of England, France and Spain, along with the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor, battled for control of the wealthy peninsula. At the same time, the Catholic Church, which was itself wracked with scandal and corruption, had begun a violent crackdown on dissenters. In 1545, the Council of Trent officially established the Roman Inquisition. In this climate, humanism was akin to heresy. The Italian Renaissance was over.

FRANCESCO PETRARCA

Petrarch's rediscovery of Cicero's letters is often credited with initiating the 14th-century Italian Renaissance and the founding of Renaissance humanism.^[2] In the 16th century, Pietro Bembo created the model for the modern Italian language based on Petrarch's works, as well as those of Giovanni Boccaccio, and, to a lesser extent, Dante Alighieri.^[3] Petrarch would be later endorsed as a model for Italian style by the Accademia della Crusca.

Petrarch's sonnets were admired and imitated throughout Europe during the Renaissance and became a model for lyrical poetry. He is also known for being the first to develop the concept of the "Dark Ages,"^[4] which most modern scholars now find misleading and inaccurate.

Youth and early career

Petrarch was born in the Tuscan city of Arezzo on 20 July 1304. He was the son of Ser Petracco and his wife Eletta Canigiani. His given name was *Francesco Petracco*, which was Latinized to *Petrarca*. Petrarch's younger brother was born in Incisa in Val d'Arno in 1307. Dante Alighieri was a friend of his father.^[8]

Petrarch spent his early childhood in the village of Incisa, near Florence. He spent much of his early life at Avignon and nearby Carpentras, where his family moved to follow Pope Clement V, who moved there in 1309 to begin the Avignon Papacy.

Petrarch studied law at the University of Montpellier (1316–20) and Bologna (1320–23) with a lifelong friend and schoolmate called Guido Sette. Because his father was in the legal profession (a notary), he insisted that Petrarch and his brother also study law. Petrarch, however, was primarily interested in writing and Latin literature and considered these seven years wasted. Additionally, he proclaimed that through legal manipulation his guardians robbed him of his small property inheritance in Florence, which only reinforced his dislike for the legal system. He protested, "I couldn't face making a merchandise of my mind," as he viewed the legal system as the art of selling justice.^[8]

Petrarch was a prolific letter writer and counted Boccaccio among his notable friends to whom he wrote often. After the death of their parents, Petrarch and his brother Gherardo went back to Avignon in 1326, where he worked in numerous clerical offices. This work gave him much time to devote to his writing. With his first large-scale work, *Africa*, an epic in Latin about the great Roman general Scipio Africanus, Petrarch emerged as a European celebrity. On 8 April 1341, he became the second^[9] poet laureate since classical antiquity and was crowned by Roman *Senatori* Giordano Orsini and Orso dell'Anguillara on the holy grounds of Rome's Capitol.^{[10][11][12]}

He traveled widely in Europe, served as an ambassador, and (because he traveled for pleasure,^[13] as with his ascent of Mont Ventoux) has been called "the first tourist".^[14] During his travels, he collected crumbling Latin manuscripts and was a prime mover in the recovery of knowledge from writers of Rome and Greece. He encouraged and advised Leontius Pilatus's translation of Homer from a manuscript

purchased by Boccaccio, although he was severely critical of the result. Petrarch had acquired a copy, which he did not entrust to Leontius,^[15] but he knew no Greek; Petrarch said, "Homer was dumb to him, while he was deaf to Homer".^[16] In 1345 he personally discovered a collection of Cicero's letters not previously known to have existed, the collection *Epistulae ad Atticum*, in the Chapter Library (*Biblioteca Capitolare*) of Verona Cathedral.^[17]

Disdaining what he believed to be the ignorance of the centuries preceding the era in which he lived, Petrarch is credited or charged with creating the concept of a historical "Dark Ages".^[4]

Education and early poems

Petrarch's father, a lawyer, had been obliged to leave Florence in 1302 and had moved to Arezzo, where Petrarch was born. The family eventually moved to Avignon (1312), in the Provence region of southern France, the home of the exiled papal court, at which an Italian lawyer might hope to find employment. Petrarch's first studies were at Carpentras, France, and at his father's insistence he was sent to study law at Montpellier, France (1316). From there he returned to Italy with his younger brother Gherardo to continue these studies at Bologna (1320). But already he was developing what, in a later letter, he described as "an unquenchable thirst for literature."

Petrarch's earliest surviving poems, on the death of his mother, date from the Montpellier and Bologna period, though like all Petrarch's work they were heavily

revised later. Meanwhile, his knowledge and love of the Classical authors increasing, he made his acquaintance with the new vernacular poetry that was being written. After his father's death, in 1326, Petrarch was free to abandon his law studies and pursue his own interests. Returning to Avignon, he took minor ecclesiastical orders and entered the household of the influential cardinal Giovanni Colonna. Petrarch enjoyed life in Avignon, and there is a famous description of him and his brother as dandies in its polished courtly world; but he was also making a name there for his scholarship and the elegance of his culture.

As well as a love of literature, Petrarch also had during his early youth a deep religious faith, a love of virtue, and an unusually deep perception of the transitory nature of human affairs. There now followed the reaction—a period of dissipation—which also coincided with the beginning of his famous chaste love for a woman known now only as Laura. Vain attempts have been made to identify her, but Petrarch himself kept silent about everything concerning her civil status, as though he thought it unimportant. He first saw her in the Church of St. Clare at Avignon on April 6, 1327, and loved her, although she was outside his reach, almost until his death. From this love there springs the work for which he is most celebrated, the Italian poems (*Rime*), which he affected to despise as mere trifles in the vulgar tongue but which he collected and revised throughout his life.

BOCCACCIO, GIOVANNI

Boccaccio was one of the first humanistic writers of the Renaissance. He began writing in the tradition of chivalric literature, which attracted him because of its secular motifs and its use of themes from classical literature, a literature close to Boccaccio in its earthly humanistic spirit. The narrative poem *Filostrato* (1338, published in 1498), the novel *Filocolo* (begun in 1336, published in 1472), and the narrative poem *Teseida* (1339, published in 1475) deal with episodes from classical mythology, but their most important characteristic is the description of psychological experiences. Boccaccio's closeness to Dante became apparent in the pastoral *L'Ameto* (1341, published in 1478) and especially in the narrative poem *Vision of Love* (1342, published in 1521). In the narrative poem *The Nymphs of Fiesole* (1345, published in 1477), which was inspired by *The Metamorphoses* of Ovid, contemporary reality shines through the images of classical mythology. The idea of the narrative poem is a defense of man's right to earthly love. In the novella *Fiammetta* (1343, published in 1472), Boccaccio describes real people, his contemporaries. In this novella he reveals a woman's inner world and in so doing anticipates the European psychological novel.

Boccaccio's best work was the *Decameron* a collection of realistic short stories united by their common humanistic and Renaissance spirit and constituting an artistic whole. Boccaccio tells of seven young women and three young men who have retreated to a villa in the country during the plague which raged in Florence in 1348. For ten days they tell

each other stories, and it is this which gives the work its name. One of the book's major themes is criticism of the Catholic Church and satiric mockery of the clergy, the monks and the papal court. Boccaccio rejects the asceticism of the Middle Ages and defends the right of human beings to enjoy life on earth. He glorifies sensual love and man's natural drives. The *Decameron* gives a broad and realistic picture of life in Italy during the period of the trecento. In coming out against feudal privileges and class inequality Boccaccio developed the idea that human nobility should be measured by deeds, not by birth. The book is imbued with the spirit of freethinking and cheerful humor. As the successor to Dante and Petrarch, he continued the development of a national Italian literature written in the vernacular. He himself used the Florentine dialect.

Boccaccio later experienced a crisis concerning his humanistic ideals, a crisis which was reflected in *The Raven* a narrative poem written in the form of a vision, in which he satirized women. He wrote commentaries on 17 songs from Dante's *Divine Comedy* and was the first to write his biography, *The Life of Dante Alighieri* (c. 1360, published 1477). Boccaccio was also the author of the treatises in Latin *The Genealogy of the Gentile Gods*, *About Famous Women*, and *The Lives of Great People*.

LEONARDO DA VINCI

Leonardo da Vinci (15 April 1452 – 2 May 1519) was an Italian polymath of the High Renaissance who was active as a painter, draughtsman, engineer, scientist, theorist, sculptor and architect. While his fame initially rested on his achievements as a painter, he also became known for his notebooks, in which he made drawings and notes on a variety of subjects, including anatomy, astronomy, botany, cartography, painting, and paleontology. Leonardo's genius epitomized the Renaissance humanist ideal, and his collective works compose a contribution to later generations of artists matched only by that of his younger contemporary, Michelangelo.

Born out of wedlock to a successful notary and a lower-class woman in, or near, Vinci, he was educated in Florence by the renowned Italian painter and sculptor Andrea del Verrocchio. He began his career in the city, but then spent much time in the service of Ludovico Sforza in Milan. Later, he worked in Florence and Milan again, as well as briefly in Rome, all while attracting a large following of imitators and students. Upon the invitation of Francis I, he spent his last three years in France, where he died in 1519. Since his death, there has not been a time where his achievements, diverse interests, personal life, and empirical thinking have failed to incite interest and admiration,^{[3][4]} making him a frequent namesake and subject in culture.

Leonardo is among the greatest painters in the history of art and is often credited as the founder of the High Renaissance.^[3] Despite having many lost works and less than

25 attributed major works—including numerous unfinished works—he created some of the most influential paintings in Western art.^[3] His magnum opus, the *Mona Lisa*, is his best known work and often regarded as the world's most famous painting. *The Last Supper* is the most reproduced religious painting of all time and his *Vitruvian Man* drawing is also regarded as a cultural icon. In 2017, *Salvator Mundi*, attributed in whole or part to Leonardo,^[5] was sold at auction for US\$450.3 million, setting a new record for the most expensive painting ever sold at public auction.

Revered for his technological ingenuity, he conceptualized flying machines, a type of armored fighting vehicle, concentrated solar power, an adding machine,^[6] and the double hull. Relatively few of his designs were constructed or even feasible during his lifetime, as the modern scientific approaches to metallurgy and engineering were only in their infancy during the Renaissance. Some of his smaller inventions, however, entered the world of manufacturing unheralded, such as an automated bobbin winder and a machine for testing the tensile strength of wire. He made substantial discoveries in anatomy, civil engineering, hydrodynamics, geology, optics, and tribology, but he did not publish his findings and they had little to no direct influence on subsequent science.^[7]

Early life (1452–1472)

Birth and background

Leonardo da Vinci,^[b] properly named Leonardo di ser Piero da Vinci (Leonardo, son of ser Piero from Vinci),^{[8][9][c]} was born on 15 April 1452 in, or close to, the Tuscan hill town of Vinci; Florence was 20 miles away.^{[10][11][d]} He was born out of

wedlock to Ser Piero da Vinci [fr] (Ser Piero di Antonio di Ser Piero di Ser Guido da Vinci; 1426–1504),^[15] a Florentine legal notary,^[10] and Caterina [it] (c. 1434 – 1494), from the lower-class.^{[16][17]} It remains uncertain where Leonardo was born; the traditional account, from a local oral tradition recorded by the historian Emanuele Repetti,^[18] is that he was born in Anchiano, a country hamlet that would have offered sufficient privacy for the illegitimate birth, though, it is still possible he was born in a house in Florence, which Ser Piero almost certainly had.^{[19][a]} Leonardo's parents both married separately the year after his birth. Caterina—who later appears in Leonardo's notes as only "Caterina" or "Catelina"—is usually identified as the Caterina Buti del Vacca who married the local artisan Antonio di Piero Buti del Vacca, nicknamed "L'Accattabriga" ("the quarrelsome one").^{[16][18]} Other theories have been proposed, particularly that of art historian Martin Kemp, who suggested Caterina di Meo Lippi, an orphan that married supposedly with aid from Ser Piero and his family.^{[20][e][f]} Ser Piero married Albiera Amadori—having been betrothed to her the previous year—and after her death in 1462, went on to have three subsequent marriages.^{[18][23][g]} From all the marriages, Leonardo eventually had 12 half-siblings, who were much younger than he was (the last was born when Leonardo was 40 years old) and with whom he had very little contact.^[h]

Very little is known about Leonardo's childhood and much is shrouded in myth, partially because of his biography in the frequently apocryphal *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* (1550) from the 16th-century art historian Giorgio Vasari.^{[26][27]} Tax records indicate that by at least 1457 he lived in the

household of his paternal grandfather, Antonio da Vinci,^[10] but it is possible that he spent the years before then in the care of his mother in Vinci, either Anchiano or Campo Zeppi in the parish of San Pantaleone.^{[28][29]} He is thought to have been close with his uncle, Francesco da Vinci,^[3] but his father was likely in Florence most of the time.^[10] Ser Piero, who was the descendant of a long line of notaries, established an official residence in Florence by at least 1469 and led a successful career.^[10] Despite his family history, Leonardo only received a basic and informal education in (vernacular) writing, reading and mathematics, possibly because his artistic talents were recognised early, so his family decided to focus their attention there.^[10]

Later in life, Leonardo recorded his earliest memory, now in the Codex Atlanticus.^[30] While writing on the flight of birds, he recalled as an infant when a kite came to his cradle and opened his mouth with its tail; commentators still debate whether the anecdote was an actual memory or a fantasy.^[31]

Verrocchio's workshop

In the mid-1460s, Leonardo's family moved to Florence, which at the time was the centre of Christian Humanist thought and culture.^[32] Around the age of 14,^[24] he became a *garzone* (studio boy) in the workshop of Andrea del Verrocchio, who was the leading Florentine painter and sculptor of his time.^[32] This was about the time of the death of Verrocchio's master, the great sculptor Donatello.^[1] Leonardo became an apprentice by the age of 17 and remained in training for seven years.^[34] Other famous painters apprenticed in the workshop or associated with it

include Ghirlandaio, Perugino, Botticelli, and Lorenzo di Credi.^{[35][36]} Leonardo was exposed to both theoretical training and a wide range of technical skills,^[37] including drafting, chemistry, metallurgy, metal working, plaster casting, leather working, mechanics, and wood-work, as well as the artistic skills of drawing, painting, sculpting, and modelling.^{[38][j]}

Leonardo was a contemporary of Botticelli, Ghirlandaio and Perugino, who were all slightly older than he was.^[39] He would have met them at the workshop of Verrocchio or at the Platonic Academy of the Medici.^[35] Florence was ornamented by the works of artists such as Donatello's contemporaries Masaccio, whose figurative frescoes were imbued with realism and emotion, and Ghiberti, whose *Gates of Paradise*, gleaming with gold leaf, displayed the art of combining complex figure compositions with detailed architectural backgrounds. Piero della Francesca had made a detailed study of perspective,^[40] and was the first painter to make a scientific study of light. These studies and Leon Battista Alberti's treatise *De pictura* were to have a profound effect on younger artists and in particular on Leonardo's own observations and artworks.^{[33][41]}

Much of the painting in Verrocchio's workshop was done by his assistants. According to Vasari, Leonardo collaborated with Verrocchio on his *The Baptism of Christ*, painting the young angel holding Jesus' robe in a manner that was so far superior to his master's that Verrocchio put down his brush and never painted again,^[‡ 1] although this is believed to be an apocryphal story.^[13] Close examination reveals areas of the work that have been painted or touched-up over the tempera, using the new technique of oil

paint, including the landscape, the rocks seen through the brown mountain stream, and much of the figure of Jesus, bearing witness to the hand of Leonardo.^[42] Leonardo may have been the model for two works by Verrocchio: the bronze statue of *David* in the Bargello, and the Archangel Raphael in *Tobias and the Angel*.^[13]

Vasari tells a story of Leonardo as a very young man: A local peasant made himself a round shield and requested that Ser Piero have it painted for him. Leonardo, inspired by the story of Medusa, responded with a painting of a monster spitting fire that was so terrifying that his father bought a different shield to give to the peasant and sold Leonardo's to a Florentine art dealer for 100 ducats, who in turn sold it to the Duke of Milan.^[‡ 2]

First Florentine period (1472–c. 1482)

By 1472, at the age of 20, Leonardo qualified as a master in the Guild of Saint Luke, the guild of artists and doctors of medicine,^[k] but even after his father set him up in his own workshop, his attachment to Verrocchio was such that he continued to collaborate and live with him.^{[35][43]} Leonardo's earliest known dated work is a 1473 pen-and-ink drawing of the Arno valley.^{[36][44][l]} According to Vasari, the young Leonardo was the first to suggest making the Arno river a navigable channel between Florence and Pisa.^[45]

In January 1478, Leonardo received an independent commission to paint an altarpiece for the Chapel of St. Bernard in the Palazzo Vecchio,^[46] an indication of his independence from Verrocchio's studio. An anonymous early biographer, known

as Anonimo Gaddiano, claims that in 1480 Leonardo was living with the Medici and often worked in the garden of the Piazza San Marco, Florence, where a Neoplatonic academy of artists, poets and philosophers organized by the Medici met.^{[13][m]} In March 1481, he received a commission from the monks of San Donato in Scopeto for *The Adoration of the Magi*.^[47] Neither of these initial commissions were completed, being abandoned when Leonardo went to offer his services to Duke of Milan Ludovico Sforza. Leonardo wrote Sforza a letter which described the diverse things that he could achieve in the fields of engineering and weapon design, and mentioned that he could paint.^{[36][48]} He brought with him a silver string instrument—either a lute or lyre—in the form of a horse's head.^[48]

With Alberti, Leonardo visited the home of the Medici and through them came to know the older Humanist philosophers of whom Marsiglio Ficino, proponent of Neoplatonism; Cristoforo Landino, writer of commentaries on Classical writings, and John Argyropoulos, teacher of Greek and translator of Aristotle were the foremost. Also associated with the Platonic Academy of the Medici was Leonardo's contemporary, the brilliant young poet and philosopher Pico della Mirandola.^{[39][41][49]} In 1482, Leonardo was sent as an ambassador by Lorenzo de' Medici to Ludovico il Moro, who ruled Milan between 1479 and 1499.^{[39][13]}

First Milanese period (c. 1482–1499)

Leonardo worked in Milan from 1482 until 1499. He was commissioned to paint the *Virgin of the Rocks* for the Confraternity of the Immaculate Conception and *The Last*

Supper for the monastery of Santa Maria delle Grazie.^[50] In the spring of 1485, Leonardo travelled to Hungary on behalf of Sforza to meet king Matthias Corvinus, and was commissioned by him to paint a Madonna.^[51] Leonardo was employed on many other projects for Sforza, including the preparation of floats and pageants for special occasions, a drawing and wooden model for a competition to design the cupola for Milan Cathedral (which he withdrew),^[52] and a model for a huge equestrian monument to Ludovico's predecessor Francesco Sforza. This would have surpassed in size the only two large equestrian statues of the Renaissance, Donatello's *Gattamelata* in Padua and Verrocchio's *Bartolomeo Colleoni* in Venice, and became known as the *Gran Cavallo*.^[36] Leonardo completed a model for the horse and made detailed plans for its casting,^[36] but in November 1494, Ludovico gave the bronze to his brother-in-law to be used for a cannon to defend the city from Charles VIII of France.^[36]

Salaì, or Il Salaino ("The Little Unclean One," i.e., the devil), entered Leonardo's household in 1490 as an assistant. After only a year, Leonardo made a list of his misdemeanours, calling him "a thief, a liar, stubborn, and a glutton," after he had made off with money and valuables on at least five occasions and spent a fortune on clothes.^[53] Nevertheless, Leonardo treated him with great indulgence, and he remained in Leonardo's household for the next thirty years.^[54] Salaì executed a number of paintings under the name of Andrea Salaì, but although Vasari claims that Leonardo "taught him many things about painting,"^[55] his work is generally considered to be of less artistic merit than others among Leonardo's pupils, such as Marco d'Oggiono and Boltraffio.

When Ludovico Sforza was overthrown by France in 1500, Leonardo fled Milan for Venice, accompanied by his assistant Salaì and friend, the mathematician Luca Pacioli.^[56] In Venice, Leonardo was employed as a military architect and engineer, devising methods to defend the city from naval attack.^[35] On his return to Florence in 1500, he and his household were guests of the Servite monks at the monastery of Santissima Annunziata and were provided with a workshop where, according to Vasari, Leonardo created the cartoon of *The Virgin and Child with St Anne and St John the Baptist*, a work that won such admiration that "men [and] women, young and old" flocked to see it "as if they were going to a solemn festival."^[3]^[n]

In Cesena in 1502, Leonardo entered the service of Cesare Borgia, the son of Pope Alexander VI, acting as a military architect and engineer and travelling throughout Italy with his patron.^[56] Leonardo created a map of Cesare Borgia's stronghold, a town plan of Imola in order to win his patronage. Upon seeing it, Cesare hired Leonardo as his chief military engineer and architect. Later in the year, Leonardo produced another map for his patron, one of Chiana Valley, Tuscany, so as to give his patron a better overlay of the land and greater strategic position. He created this map in conjunction with his other project of constructing a dam from the sea to Florence, in order to allow a supply of water to sustain the canal during all seasons.

Leonardo had left Borgia's service and returned to Florence by early 1503,^[58] where he rejoined the Guild of Saint Luke on 18 October of that year. By this same month, Leonardo had begun working on a portrait of Lisa del Giocondo, the model

for the *Mona Lisa*,^{[59][60]} which he would continue working on until his twilight years. In January 1504, he was part of a committee formed to recommend where Michelangelo's statue of *David* should be placed.^[61] He then spent two years in Florence designing and painting a mural of *The Battle of Anghiari* for the Signoria,^[56] with Michelangelo designing its companion piece, *The Battle of Cascina*.^[o]

In 1506, Leonardo was summoned to Milan by Charles II d'Amboise, the acting French governor of the city.^[64] There, Leonardo took on another pupil, Count Francesco Melzi, the son of a Lombard aristocrat, who is considered to have been his favourite student.^[35] The Council of Florence wished Leonardo to return promptly to finish *The Battle of Anghiari*, but he was given leave at the behest of Louis XII, who considered commissioning the artist to make some portraits.^[64] Leonardo may have commenced a project for an equestrian figure of d'Amboise;^[65] a wax model survives and, if genuine, is the only extant example of Leonardo's sculpture. Leonardo was otherwise free to pursue his scientific interests.^[64] Many of Leonardo's most prominent pupils either knew or worked with him in Milan,^[35] including Bernardino Luini, Giovanni Antonio Boltraffio, and Marco d'Oggiono. In 1507, Leonardo was in Florence sorting out a dispute with his brothers over the estate of his father, who had died in 1504.

Second Milanese period (1508–1513)

By 1508, Leonardo was back in Milan, living in his own house in Porta Orientale in the parish of Santa Babila.^[66] In 1512, Leonardo was working on plans for an equestrian monument for Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, but this was prevented by an invasion

of a confederation of Swiss, Spanish and Venetian forces, which drove the French from Milan. Leonardo stayed in the city, spending several months in 1513 at the Medici's Vaprio d'Adda villa.^[67]

Rome and France (1513–1519)

In March of 1513, Lorenzo de' Medici's son Giovanni assumed the papacy (as Leo X); Leonardo went to Rome that September, where he was received by the pope's brother Giuliano.^[67] From September 1513 to 1516, Leonardo spent much of his time living in the Belvedere Courtyard in the Apostolic Palace, where Michelangelo and Raphael were both active.^[66] Leonardo was given an allowance of 33 ducats a month, and according to Vasari, decorated a lizard with scales dipped in quicksilver.^[68] The pope gave him a painting commission of unknown subject matter, but cancelled it when the artist set about developing a new kind of varnish.^{[68][p]} Leonardo became ill, in what may have been the first of multiple strokes leading to his death.^[68] He practiced botany in the Gardens of Vatican City, and was commissioned to make plans for the pope's proposed draining of the Pontine Marshes.^[69] He also dissected cadavers, making notes for a treatise on vocal cords;^[70] these he gave to an official in hopes of regaining the pope's favor, but was unsuccessful.^[68]

In October 1515, King Francis I of France recaptured Milan.^[47] Leonardo was present at the 19 December meeting of Francis I and Leo X, which took place in Bologna.^{[35][71][72]} In 1516, Leonardo entered Francis' service, being given the use of the manor house Clos Lucé, near the king's residence at the royal Château d'Amboise. Being

frequently visited by Francis, he drew plans for an immense castle town the king intended to erect at Romorantin, and made a mechanical lion, which during a pageant walked toward the king and—upon being struck by a wand—opened its chest to reveal a cluster of lilies.^{[73][‡ 3][q]} Leonardo was accompanied during this time by his friend and apprentice Francesco Melzi, and supported by a pension totalling 10,000 scudi.^[66] At some point, Melzi drew a portrait of Leonardo; the only others known from his lifetime were a sketch by an unknown assistant on the back of one of Leonardo's studies (c. 1517)^[75] and a drawing by Giovanni Ambrogio Figino depicting an elderly Leonardo with his right arm assuaged by cloth.^{[76][r]} The latter, in addition to the record of an October 1517 visit by Louis d'Aragon,^[s] confirms an account of Leonardo's right hand being paralytic at the age of 65,^[79] which may indicate why he left works such as the *Mona Lisa* unfinished.^{[77][80][81]} He continued to work at some capacity until eventually becoming ill and bedridden for several months.^[79]

Death

Leonardo died at Clos Lucé on 2 May 1519 at the age of 67, possibly of a stroke.^{[82][81][83]} Francis I had become a close friend. Vasari describes Leonardo as lamenting on his deathbed, full of repentance, that "he had offended against God and men by failing to practice his art as he should have done."^[84] Vasari states that in his last days, Leonardo sent for a priest to make his confession and to receive the Holy Sacrament.^[‡ 4] Vasari also records that the king held Leonardo's head in his arms as he died, although this story may be legend rather than fact.^{[t][u]} In accordance with his will, sixty beggars

carrying tapers followed Leonardo's casket.^{[49][v]} Melzi was the principal heir and executor, receiving, as well as money, Leonardo's paintings, tools, library and personal effects. Leonardo's other long-time pupil and companion, Salaì, and his servant Baptista de Vilanis, each received half of Leonardo's vineyards.^[86] His brothers received land, and his serving woman received a fur-lined cloak. On 12 August 1519, Leonardo's remains were interred in the Collegiate Church of Saint Florentin at the Château d'Amboise.^[87]

Salaì owned the *Mona Lisa* at the time of his death in 1524, and in his will it was assessed at 505 lire, an exceptionally high valuation for a small panel portrait.^[88] Some 20 years after Leonardo's death, Francis was reported by the goldsmith and sculptor Benvenuto Cellini as saying: "There had never been another man born in the world who knew as much as Leonardo, not so much about painting, sculpture and architecture, as that he was a very great philosopher."^[89]

RAPHAEL

Raffaello Sanzio da Urbino^[2] (Italian: [raffa'ello 'santsjo da ur'bi:no]; March 28 or April 6, 1483 – April 6, 1520),^{[3][a]} known as **Raphael**,^[5] was an Italian painter and architect of the High Renaissance. His work is admired for its clarity of form, ease of composition, and visual achievement of the Neoplatonic ideal of human grandeur.^[6] Together with Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci, he forms the traditional trinity of great masters of that period.^[7]

Raphael was enormously productive, running an unusually large workshop and, despite his early death at 37, leaving a large body of work. Many of his works are found in the Vatican Palace, where the frescoed Raphael Rooms were the central, and the largest, work of his career. The best known work is *The School of Athens* in the Vatican Stanza della Segnatura. After his early years in Rome, much of his work was executed by his workshop from his drawings, with considerable loss of quality. He was extremely influential in his lifetime, though outside Rome his work was mostly known from his collaborative printmaking.

After his death, the influence of his great rival Michelangelo was more widespread until the 18th and 19th centuries, when Raphael's more serene and harmonious qualities were again regarded as the highest models. His career falls naturally into three phases and three styles, first described by Giorgio Vasari: his early years in Umbria, then a period of about four years (1504–1508) absorbing the artistic traditions

of Florence, followed by his last hectic and triumphant twelve years in Rome, working for two popes and their close associates.^[8]

His father was court painter to the ruler of the small but highly cultured city of Urbino. He died when Raphael was eleven, and Raphael seems to have played a role in managing the family workshop from this point. He trained in the workshop of Perugino, and was described as a fully trained "master" by 1500. He worked in or for several cities in north Italy until in 1508 he moved to Rome at the invitation of the pope, to work on the Vatican Palace. He was given a series of important commissions there and elsewhere in the city, and began to work as an architect. He was still at the height of his powers at his death in 1520.

MICHELANGELO

Michelangelo di Lodovico Buonarroti Simoni was an Italian sculptor, painter, architect and poet of the High Renaissance born in the Republic of Florence, who exerted an unparalleled influence on the development of Western art. His artistic versatility was of such a high order that he is often considered a contender for the title of the archetypal Renaissance man, along with his rival and elder contemporary, Leonardo da Vinci.^[2] Several scholars have described Michelangelo as the greatest artist of his age and even as the greatest artist of all time.^{[3][4]}

A number of Michelangelo's works of painting, sculpture, and architecture rank among the most famous in existence.^[2] His output in these fields was prodigious; given the sheer volume of surviving correspondence, sketches, and reminiscences, he is the best-documented artist of the 16th century. He sculpted two of his best-known works, the *Pietà* and *David*, before the age of thirty. Despite holding a low opinion of painting, he also created two of the most influential frescoes in the history of Western art: the scenes from Genesis on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in Rome, and *The Last Judgment* on its altar wall. His design of the Laurentian Library pioneered Mannerist architecture.^[5] At the age of 74, he succeeded Antonio da Sangallo the Younger as the architect of St. Peter's Basilica. He transformed the plan so that the western end was finished to his design, as was the dome, with some modification, after his death.

Michelangelo was the first Western artist whose biography was published while he was alive.^[2] In fact, two biographies were published during his lifetime. One of them, by Giorgio Vasari, proposed that Michelangelo's work transcended that of any artist living or dead, and was "supreme in not one art alone but in all three".^[6]

In his lifetime, Michelangelo was often called *Il Divino* ("the divine one").^[7] His contemporaries often admired his *terribilità*—his ability to instil a sense of awe. Attempts by subsequent artists to imitate^[8] Michelangelo's impassioned, highly personal style resulted in Mannerism, the next major movement in Western art after the High Renaissance.

Venetian painting was a major force in Italian Renaissance painting and beyond. Beginning with the work of Giovanni Bellini (c. 1430–1516) and his brother Gentile Bellini (c. 1429–1507) and their workshops, the major artists of the **Venetian school** included Giorgione (c. 1477–1510), Titian (c. 1489–1576), Tintoretto (1518–1594), Paolo Veronese (1528–1588) and Jacopo Bassano (1510–1592) and his sons. Considered to give primacy of colour over line,^[1] the tradition of the Venetian school contrasted with the Mannerism prevalent in the rest of Italy. The Venetian style exerted great influence upon the subsequent development of Western painting.^[2]

By chance, the main phases of Venetian painting fit rather neatly into the centuries. The glories of the 16th century were followed by a great fall-off in the 17th, but an unexpected revival in the 18th,^[3] when Venetian painters enjoyed great success around Europe, as Baroque painting turned to Rococo. This had ended completely by

the extinction of the Republic of Venice in 1797 and since then, though much painted by others, Venice has not had a continuing style or tradition of its own.^[4]

Though a long decline in the political and economic power of the Republic began before 1500, Venice at that date remained "the richest, most powerful, and most populous Italian city"^[5] and controlled significant territories on the mainland, known as the *terraferma*, which included several small cities who contributed artists to the Venetian school, in particular Padua, Brescia and Verona. The Republic's territories also included Istria, Dalmatia and the islands now off the Croatian coast, who also contributed. Indeed, "the major Venetian painters of the sixteenth century were rarely natives of the city" itself,^[6] and some mostly worked in the Republic's other territories, or further afield.^[7]

The rest of Italy tended to ignore or underestimate Venetian painting; Giorgio Vasari's neglect of the school in the first edition of his *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* in 1550 was so conspicuous that he realized he needed to visit Venice for extra material in his second edition of 1568.^[8] In contrast, foreigners, for whom Venice was often the first major Italian city visited, always had a great appreciation for it and, after Venice itself, the best collections are now in the large European museums rather than other Italian cities. At the top, princely, level, Venetian artists tended to be the most sought-after for commissions abroad, from Titian onwards, and in the 18th century most of the best painters spent significant periods abroad, generally with great success.^[9]

MARTIN LUTHER

Martin Luther, (born November 10, 1483, Eisleben, Saxony [Germany]—died February 18, 1546, Eisleben), German theologian and religious reformer who was the catalyst of the 16th-century Protestant Reformation. Through his words and actions, Luther precipitated a movement that reformulated certain basic tenets of Christian belief and resulted in the division of Western Christendom between Roman Catholicism and the new Protestant traditions, mainly Lutheranism, Calvinism, the Anglican Communion, the Anabaptists, and the Antitrinitarians. He is one of the most influential figures in the history of Christianity.

Early life and education

Early life

Soon after Luther's birth, his family moved from Eisleben to the small town of Mansfeld, some 10 miles (16 km) to the northwest. His father, Hans Luther, who prospered in the local copper-refining business, became a town councillor of Mansfeld in 1492. There are few sources of information about Martin Luther's childhood apart from his recollections as an old man; understandably, they seem to be coloured by a certain romantic nostalgia.

Luther began his education at a Latin school in Mansfeld in the spring of 1488. There he received a thorough training in the Latin language and learned by rote the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and morning and evening prayers. In 1497 Luther was sent to nearby Magdeburg to attend a school operated by the Brethren of the Common Life, a lay monastic order whose emphasis on personal piety apparently exerted a lasting influence on him. In 1501 he matriculated at the University of Erfurt, at the time one of the most distinguished universities in Germany. The matriculation records describe him as *in habendo*, meaning that he was ineligible for financial aid, an indirect testimonial to the financial success of his father. Luther took the customary course in the liberal arts and received the baccalaureate degree in 1502. Three years later he was awarded the master's degree. His studies gave him a thorough exposure to Scholasticism; many years later, he spoke of Aristotle and William of Ockham as "his teachers."

Conversion to monastic life

Having graduated from the arts faculty, Luther was eligible to pursue graduate work in one of the three "higher" disciplines—law, medicine, or theology. In accordance with the wishes of his father, he commenced the study of law. Proudly he purchased a copy of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* ("Corpus of Canon Law"), the collection of ecclesiastical law texts, and other important legal textbooks. Less than six weeks later, however, on July 17, 1505, Luther abandoned the study of law and entered the monastery in Erfurt of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, a mendicant order founded in

1256. His explanation for his abrupt change of heart was that a violent thunderstorm near the village of Stotternheim had terrified him to such a degree that he involuntarily vowed to become a monk if he survived. Because his vow was clearly made under duress, Luther could easily have ignored it; the fact that he did not indicates that the thunderstorm experience was only a catalyst for much deeper motivations. Luther's father was understandably angry with him for abandoning a prestigious and lucrative career in law in favour of the monastery. In response to Luther's avowal that in the thunderstorm he had been "besieged by the terror and agony of sudden death," his father said only: "May it not prove an illusion and deception."

By the second half of the 15th century, the Augustinian order had become divided into two factions, one seeking reform in the direction of the order's original strict rule, the other favouring modifications. The monastery Luther joined in Erfurt was part of the strict, observant faction. Two months after entering the monastery, on September 15, 1505, Luther made his general confession and was admitted into the community as a novice.

Luther's new monastic life conformed to the commitment that countless men and women had made through the centuries—an existence devoted to an interweaving of daily work and worship. His spartan quarters consisted of an unheated cell furnished only with a table and chair. His daily activities were structured around the monastic rule and the observance of the canonical hours, which began at 2:00 in the morning. In the fall of 1506, he was fully admitted to the order and began to prepare for his ordination to

the priesthood. He celebrated his first mass in May 1507 with a great deal of fear and trembling, according to his own recollection.

Doctor of theology

But Luther would not settle for the anonymous and routine existence of a monk. In 1507 he began the study of theology at the University of Erfurt. Transferred to the Augustinian monastery at Wittenberg in the fall of 1508, he continued his studies at the university there. Because the university at Wittenberg was new (it was founded in 1502), its degree requirements were fairly lenient. After only a year of study, Luther had completed the requirements not only for the baccalaureate in Bible but also for the next-higher theological degree, that of Sententiarius, which would qualify him to teach Peter Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* (*Sententiarum libri IV*), the standard theological textbook of the time. Because he was transferred back to Erfurt in the fall of 1509, however, the university at Wittenberg could not confer the degrees on him. Luther then unabashedly petitioned the Erfurt faculty to confer the degrees. His request, though unusual, was altogether proper, and in the end it was granted.

His subsequent studies toward a doctoral degree in theology were interrupted, probably between the fall of 1510 and the spring of 1511, by his assignment to represent the observant German Augustinian monasteries in Rome. At issue was a papal decree by Pope Julius II that had administratively merged the observant and the nonobservant houses of the order. It is indicative of Luther's emerging role in his order that he was chosen, along with a monastic brother from Nürnberg, to make the case for the observant

houses in their appeal of the ruling to the pope. The mission proved to be unsuccessful, however, because the pope's mind was already made up. Luther's comments in later years suggest that the mission made a profoundly negative impression on him: he found in Rome a lack of spirituality at the very heart of Western Christendom.

Soon after his return Luther transferred to the Wittenberg monastery to finish his studies at the university there. He received his doctorate in the fall of 1512 and assumed the professorship in biblical studies, which was supplied by the Augustinian order. At the same time, his administrative responsibilities in the Wittenberg monastery and the Augustinian order increased, and he began to publish theological writings, such as the 97 theses entitled *Disputation Against Scholastic Theology*.

Although there is some uncertainty about the details of Luther's academic teaching, it is known that he offered courses on several biblical books—two on the book of Psalms—as well as on St. Paul's epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews. From all accounts Luther was a stimulating lecturer. One student reported that he was Scholars have scrutinized Luther's lecture notes for hints of a developing new theology, but the results have been inconclusive. Nor do the notes give any indication of a deep spiritual struggle, which Luther in later years associated with this period in his life.

The indulgences controversy of Martin Luther

Indulgences and salvation

In the fall of 1517 an ostensibly innocuous event quickly made Luther's name a household word in Germany. Irritated by Johann Tetzel, a Dominican friar who was reported to have preached to the faithful that the purchase of a letter of indulgence entailed the forgiveness of sins, Luther drafted a set of propositions for the purpose of conducting an academic debate on indulgences at the university in Wittenberg. He dispatched a copy of the *Ninety-five Theses* to Tetzel's superior, Archbishop Albert of Mainz, along with a request that Albert put a stop to Tetzel's extravagant preaching; he also sent copies to a number of friends. Before long, Albert formally requested that official proceedings be commenced in Rome to ascertain the work's orthodoxy. Meanwhile, it began to be circulated in Germany, together with some explanatory publications by Luther.

Luther clearly intended the *Ninety-five Theses* to be subservient to the church and the pope, and their overall tone is accordingly searching rather than doctrinaire. Nevertheless, there is a detectable undercurrent of "reforming" sentiment in the work—expressed in several theses beginning with the phrase "Christians are to be taught that..."—as well as some openly provocative statements. Thesis 86, for example, asks,

Scholars have disagreed about how early Luther began to formulate the theological positions that eventually caused him to part ways with the church. If he had

done so by the fall of 1517, then the *Ninety-five Theses* must be viewed as the first—albeit hesitant—manifesto of a new theology. Most scholars, however, believe that Luther’s conversion was a lengthy process that did not culminate until well after the indulgences controversy was in full swing in the spring of 1518. Indeed, his conversion to a new understanding of the gospel was heavily influenced by the controversy, according to this view.

By the end of 1518, according to most scholars, Luther had reached a new understanding of the pivotal Christian notion of salvation, or reconciliation with God. Over the centuries, the church had conceived the means of salvation in a variety of ways, but common to all of them was the idea that salvation is jointly effected by humans and by God—by humans through marshalling their will to do good works and thereby to please God and by God through his offer of forgiving grace. Luther broke dramatically with this tradition by asserting that humans can contribute nothing to their salvation: salvation is, fully and completely, a work of divine grace.

Luther’s understanding came to him after a long inner conflict in which he agonized, even despaired, over his inability to marshal his will adequately to do good works. While meditating on The Letter of Paul to the Romans (1:17)—in which the Apostle declares, “For in it [i.e., the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith: as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live’”—Luther experienced an illumination that he later described as a kind of conversion. “It was as if the very gates of heaven had opened before me,” he wrote. The dramatic and

intensely personal nature of this experience helps to explain Luther's determined refusal, during the indulgences controversy, to recant his theological views.

Luther, Cajetan, and Eck

By the summer of 1518 the *causa Lutheri* ("the case of Luther") had progressed far enough to require that Luther present himself in Rome to be examined on his teachings. After his territorial ruler, the elector Frederick III of Saxony, intervened on his behalf, Luther was summoned instead to the southern German city of Augsburg, where an imperial Diet was in session. Frederick took action not because he supported Luther's teachings—which were still being formed—but because he felt that it was his responsibility as a prince to ensure that his subject was treated fairly. Rome, for its part, acceded to Frederick's wishes because it needed German financial support for a planned military campaign that it hoped to sponsor against the Ottoman Empire—whose forces were poised to invade central Europe from Hungary—and because Frederick was one of the seven electors who would choose the successor of the ailing Holy Roman emperor Maximilian I. The papacy had a vital interest in the outcome of this election.

Against these larger political issues, the case of the Wittenberg professor paled in importance. Luther's antagonist at the imperial Diet, Cardinal Cajetan, was head of the Dominican order, an ardent defender of the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, and one of the most learned men in the Roman Curia. Cajetan had taken his assignment seriously and was thus well prepared for his interrogation of Luther. Once the two men met, their fundamental differences quickly became apparent. Their encounter was made even more

difficult by the fact that neither had great respect for the other—Cajetan observed that Luther had “ominous eyes and wondrous fantasies in his head,” while Luther remarked that Cajetan may well be “a famous Thomist, but he is an evasive, obscure, and unintelligible theologian.”

In Cajetan’s view the key issues were Luther’s denial that the church is empowered to distribute as indulgences the infinite “treasury of merits” accumulated by Christ on the cross—on this point Luther directly contradicted the papal bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius* (1343; “Only Begotten Son of God”) of Clement VI—and Luther’s insistence that faith is indispensable for justification. After three days of discussion (October 12–14), Cajetan advised Luther that further conversations were useless unless he was willing to recant. Luther immediately fled Augsburg and returned to Wittenberg, where he issued an appeal for a general council of the church to hear his case.

Luther had reason to be nervous. Papal instructions from August had empowered Cajetan to have Luther apprehended and brought to Rome for further examination. On November 9, 1518, Pope Leo X issued the bull *Cum postquam* (“When After”), which defined the doctrine of indulgences and addressed the issue of the authority of the church to absolve the faithful from temporal punishment. Luther’s views were declared to be in conflict with the teaching of the church.

Well aware that he was the cause of the controversy and that in *Cum postquam* his doctrines had been condemned by the pope himself, Luther agreed to refrain from participating in the public debate. Others, however, promptly took his place, sounding the knell of reform in both church and society. The controversy was drawing participants from wider circles and addressing broader and weightier theological issues, the most important of which was the question of the authority of the church and the pope. Eventually, a bitter dispute between Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt, a colleague of Luther at Wittenberg, and Johann Eck, a theologian from Ingolstadt and an able defender of the church, drew Luther back into the fray. Because the entire controversy was still considered an academic matter, Eck, Carlstadt, and Luther agreed to a public debate, which took place in Leipzig in June 1519.

The setting was hardly a friendly one for Luther and Carlstadt, because Duke George of Saxony had already established himself as a staunch defender of the church. Upon hearing the sermon of the opening ceremony, which exhorted the participants to adhere to the truth in their debating, George remarked that he had not realized that theologians were so godless as to need such preaching. The initial debate between Eck and Carlstadt covered extensive theological ground but was listless. Luther's debate with Eck was more lively, as Eck, a skillful debater, repeatedly sought to show that Luther's position on the issue of papal primacy was identical to that of Jan Hus, the Bohemian theologian who was condemned for heresy at the Council of Constance (1414–18). This was a conclusion calculated to shock the audience at Leipzig, whose university had been

founded in the previous century by refugees from the Hussite-dominated University of Prague. Luther repeatedly denied the charge but then noted that some of Hus's opinions, such as his assertion that there is one holy Catholic church, were not heretical. Eck's prodding led Luther to state that even general councils, such as the Council of Constance, can be in error when they promulgate opinions not *de fide* (concerning the faith). This admission was perceived as damaging to Luther's cause and allowed Eck to boast that he had succeeded in revealing Luther's true beliefs.

Excommunication

Meanwhile, after a delay caused by the election of the new German emperor, the formal ecclesiastical proceedings against Luther were revived in the fall of 1519. In January 1520 a consistory heard the recommendation that Luther's orthodoxy be examined, and one month later a papal commission concluded that Luther's teachings were heretical. Because this conclusion seemed hasty to some members of the Curia, another commission, consisting of the heads of the several important monastic orders, was convened, and it rendered the surprisingly mild judgment that Luther's propositions were "scandalous and offensive to pious ears" but not heretical. After Eck appeared in Rome and made dire pronouncements on the situation in Germany, yet another examination of Luther's writings was undertaken. Finally, on June 15, 1520, Leo issued the bull *Exsurge Domine* ("Arise O Lord"), which charged that 41 sentences in Luther's various writings were "heretical, scandalous, offensive to pious ears," though it did not

specify which sentences had received what verdict. Luther was given 60 days upon receiving the bull to recant and another 60 days to report his recantation to Rome.

At first Luther believed that the story of the bull was a malicious rumour spread by Eck. When the reality of his condemnation became clear, however, he responded belligerently in a tract titled *Against the Execrable Bull of the Antichrist*. Upon the expiration of the 60-day period stipulated in the bull, on December 10, 1520, Luther cancelled his classes, marched to a bonfire started by his students outside one of the city gates, and threw a copy of the bull into the fire.

The ensuing bull of excommunication, *Decet Romanum Pontificem* ("It Pleases the Roman Pontiff"), was published on January 3, 1521. Martin Luther was formally declared a heretic. Ordinarily, those condemned as heretics were apprehended by an authority of the secular government and put to death by burning. In Luther's case, however, a complex set of factors made such punishment impossible. The new German king (and Holy Roman emperor), Charles V, had agreed as a condition of his election that no German would be convicted without a proper hearing; many, including Luther himself, were convinced that Luther had not been granted this right. Others noted various formal deficiencies in *Exsurge Domine*, including the fact that it did not correctly quote Luther and that one of the sentences it condemned was actually written by another author. Still others thought that Luther's call for reform deserved a more serious hearing. A proposal was therefore circulated that Luther should be given a formal hearing when the imperial Diet convened in Worms later in the spring.

Understandably, the papal nuncio Girolamo Aleandro, who represented the Curia in the Holy Roman Empire, vehemently rejected this idea. His position was clear: a convicted heretic did not warrant a hearing. The Diet could do nothing other than endorse the ecclesiastical verdict and bring the heretic to his deserved judgment. Charles shared Aleandro's sentiment but realized that the idea of giving Luther a hearing enjoyed widespread support in Germany. Charles's adviser Mercurino Gattinara, mindful of the need for good relations with the estates (the three main orders of society—clergy, nobility, and townspeople), repeatedly urged the emperor not to issue an edict against Luther without their full consent. Gattinara's caution was justified, because in February the estates refused to support an edict condemning Luther's writings and instead urged that, in view of the restlessness of the commoners, Luther be cited to appear before the Diet "to the benefit and advantage of the entire German nation, the Holy Roman Empire, our Christian faith, and all estates." Charles acceded, and on March 6, 1521, he issued a formal invitation to Luther to appear before the estates assembled in Worms. Charles's apparent surrender was perhaps the only acceptable resolution of the matter; even Aleandro could easily convince himself that Luther's citation was in the best interest of the church. If Luther recanted, the problem of his heresy would be removed; if he did not, the estates could no longer refuse to endorse formal action against him.

Diet of Worms

Luther appeared before the Diet of Worms on April 17, 1521. He was informed that he had been called to the meeting to acknowledge as his own the books that had

been published in his name and to repudiate them. He briefly acknowledged the books but requested time to ponder his second answer, which was granted. The following day Luther admitted that he had used inappropriate language but declared that he could not and would not recant the substance of his writings. He refused to repudiate his works unless convinced of error by Scripture or by reason. Otherwise, he stated, his conscience was bound by the Word of God. According to a traditional but apocryphal account, he ended his statement with the words, "Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me. Amen."

Following his appearance, Luther participated in intense discussions involving representatives of the emperor, Aleandro, and the Saxon elector Frederick. Although every effort was made to induce Luther to recant, in the end the discussions failed over his refusal to repudiate a single sentence from the 41 cited in the papal bull. But behind that stood the charge that Luther, a single individual, presumed to challenge 1,500 years of Christian theological consensus. On April 26 Luther hurriedly left Worms, and on May 8 Charles drew up an edict against him. Charles undertook one more unsuccessful effort to obtain the support of the estates, which continued to fear that Luther's condemnation would incite rebellion among the commoners. The Diet then officially adjourned. On May 25, after the elector Joachim Brandenburg assured the emperor of the support of the few rulers who remained in Worms, Charles signed the edict against Luther.

The document enumerated Luther's errors along the lines of *Exsurge Domine*, declared Luther and his followers (some of whom were identified by name) to be political outlaws, and ordered his writings to be burned. Thus, the *causa Lutheri* was considered closed. It was enormously important, however, that doubts about the propriety of the edict were voiced at once. Its claim to represent the "unanimous consent of the estates" was plainly incorrect, since by the end of May most of the rulers had long since left Worms. Meanwhile, on his journey back to Wittenberg, Luther was "kidnapped" by soldiers of Frederick and taken secretly to Wartburg Castle, near the town of Eisenach, where he remained in hiding for the better part of a year. During this period few people knew of Luther's whereabouts; most thought he was dead.

During his stay in the Wartburg, Luther began work on what proved to be one of his foremost achievements—the translation of the New Testament into the German vernacular. This task was an obvious ramification of his insistence that the Bible alone is the source of Christian truth and his related belief that everyone is capable of understanding the biblical message. Luther's translation profoundly affected the development of the written German language. The precedent he set was followed by other scholars, whose work made the Bible widely available in the vernacular and contributed significantly to the emergence of national languages.

Controversies after the Diet of Worms

Attempts to carry out the Edict of Worms were largely unsuccessful. Although Roman Catholic rulers sought determinedly to suppress Luther and his followers, within

two years it had become obvious that the movement for reform was too strong. By March 1522, when Luther returned to Wittenberg, the effort to put reform into practice had generated riots and popular protests that threatened to undermine law and order.

Luther's attitude toward these developments was conservative. He did not believe that change should occur hurriedly. In accordance with his notion of "making haste slowly," he managed to control the course of reform in Wittenberg, where his influence continued to be strong. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that Luther's significance as a public figure began to decline after 1522. This is not to say that he did not play a crucial role in the continuing course of events—for he did. Nor is this to say that his influence may not be discerned after 1522—for it can. After the Edict of Worms, however, the cause of reform, of whatever sort, became a legal and political struggle rather than a theological one. The crucial decisions were now made in the halls of government and not in the studies of the theologians. Moreover, by 1523 various other reformers, including Thomas Müntzer, Huldrych Zwingli, and Martin Bucer, had arisen to challenge Luther's primacy of place and to put forward a more radical vision of reform in church and society.

Beginning in the summer of 1524, large numbers of peasants in southwestern Germany staged a series of uprisings that were partly inspired by Luther's reform proposals, though they also addressed long-standing economic and political grievances. By the spring of 1525 the rebellion, known as the Peasants' War, had spread to much of central Germany. The peasants, who were supported by the reformer

Müntzer, published their grievances in a manifesto titled “The Twelve Articles of the Peasants”; the document is notable for its declaration that the rightness of the peasants’ demands should be judged by the Word of God, a notion derived directly from Luther’s teaching that the Bible is the sole guide in matters of morality and belief. Luther wrote two responses—*Admonition to Peace Concerning the Twelve Articles of the Peasants*, which expressed sympathy for the peasants, and *Against the Murderous and Robbing Hordes of the Peasants*, which vehemently denounced them. Both works represented a shift away from his earlier vision of reform as encompassing societal as well as religious issues. It is likely that they helped to alienate the peasants from Luther’s cause.

Luther faced other challenges in the mid-1520s. His literary feud with the great Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus came to an unfortunate conclusion when the two failed to find common ground. Their theological dispute concerned the issue of whether humans were free to contribute to and participate in their own salvation. Erasmus, who took the affirmative view, argued that Luther’s insistence on the radical priority of grace undermined all human ethical effort. Luther insisted that Erasmus’s position reduced the great soteriological drama of the Incarnation and the cross to shallow moral concepts.

In 1525 Luther was isolated from various other reformers in a controversy over the meaning of the Eucharist, or the Lord’s Supper. The dispute concerned the proper interpretation of Jesus’ words of institution when he said, “This is my body... This is my blood.” Whereas Zwingli argued that these words had to be understood symbolically, as “This symbolizes my body... This symbolizes my blood,” Luther argued

strenuously for a literal interpretation. Accordingly, Zwingli held that Jesus was spiritually but not physically present in the communion host, whereas Luther taught that Jesus was really and bodily present. The theological disagreement was initially pursued by several southern German reformers, such as Johannes Brenz, but after 1527 Luther and Zwingli confronted each other directly, with increasing rancour and vehemence, particularly from Luther. As far as he was concerned, Zwingli was an “enthusiast” who did not take the plain words of Scripture seriously. Thus, the reform movement became a house that was publicly divided.

In the view of some, notably Landgrave Philip of Hesse, this division had serious political implications. There was no doubt that the emperor and the princes of the Catholic territories were determined to suppress the new Lutheran heresy, if necessary by force. The disagreement over communion precluded one strategy of dealing with this ominous Catholic threat, namely by establishing a united Protestant political (and military) front. Whereas Luther, in his wonderful otherworldliness, gravely doubted the wisdom of any effort to protect the gospel by military means, Zwingli envisioned a comprehensive anti-Catholic political front that would reach from Zürich to Denmark. When Philip first entertained the notion of a colloquy between Zwingli, Luther, and a number of other reformers, he was prompted by his desire to create the basis of a Protestant political alliance. Luther was initially reluctant and had to be persuaded to attend the meeting, which was held in Marburg on October 1–4, 1529 (see Marburg, Colloquy of). From the outset Luther made it clear that he would not

change his views: he took a piece of chalk and wrote the Latin version of the words of institution, “Hoc est corpus meum” (“This is my body”), on the table. In the end the two sides managed to fashion a contorted agreement, but the deep division within Protestantism remained.

On June 13, 1525, Luther married Katherine of Bora, a former nun. Katherine had fled her convent together with eight other nuns and was staying in the house of the Wittenberg town secretary. While the other nuns soon returned to their families or married, Katherine remained without support. Luther was likewise at the time the only remaining resident in what had been the Augustinian monastery in Wittenberg; the other monks had either thrown off the habit or moved to a staunchly Catholic area. Luther’s decision to marry Katherine was the result of a number of factors. Understandably, he felt responsible for her plight, since it was his preaching that had prompted her to flee the convent. Moreover, he had repeatedly written, most significantly in 1523, that marriage is an honourable order of creation, and he regarded the Roman Catholic Church’s insistence on clerical celibacy as the work of the Devil. Finally, he believed that the unrest in Germany, epitomized in the bloody Peasants’ War, was a manifestation of God’s wrath and a sign that the end of the world was at hand. He thus conceived his marriage as a vindication, in these last days, of God’s true order for humankind.

While Luther’s enemies indulged themselves in sarcastic pronouncements upon his matrimony—Erasmus remarked that what had begun as tragedy had turned into comedy—his friends and supporters were chagrined over what they took to be the poor

timing of his decision. (It is noteworthy that Luther was not the first of the reformers to marry.) Katherine of Bora proved to be a splendid helpmate for Luther. *Table Talks*, a collection of Luther's comments at the dinner table as recorded by one of his student boarders, pays tribute to "Dr. Katie" as a skillful household manager and as a partner in theological conversations. The couple had six children: Johannes ("Hans"), Elizabeth, Magdalene, Martin, Paul, and Margarete. Luther's letters to his children, as well as his deep sadness at the losses of his daughters Elizabeth and Magdalene—the latter of whom died in his arms in September 1542—are indicative of the warm relationships that characterized his family and marriage.

Later years of Martin Luther

As a declared heretic and public outlaw, Luther was forced to stay out of the political and religious struggle over the enforcement of the Edict of Worms. Sympathetic rulers and city councils became the protagonists for Luther's cause and the cause of reform. When Charles V convened a Diet to meet at Augsburg in 1530 to address unresolved religious issues, Luther himself could not be present, though he managed to travel as far south as Coburg—still some 100 miles north of Augsburg—to follow developments at the Diet. In Augsburg it fell to Luther's young Wittenberg colleague Philipp Melanchthon to represent the Protestants. Melanchthon's summary of the reformers' beliefs, the Augsburg Confession, quickly became the guiding theological document for the emerging Lutheran tradition.

Luther's role in the Reformation after 1525 was that of theologian, adviser, and facilitator but not that of a man of action. Biographies of Luther accordingly have a tendency to end their story with his marriage in 1525. Such accounts gallantly omit the last 20 years of his life, during which much happened. The problem is not just that the cause of the new Protestant churches that Luther had helped to establish was essentially pursued without his direct involvement, but also that the Luther of these later years appears less attractive, less winsome, less appealing than the earlier Luther who defiantly faced emperor and empire at Worms. Repeatedly drawn into fierce controversies during the last decade of his life, Luther emerges as a different figure—irascible, dogmatic, and insecure. His tone became strident and shrill, whether in comments about the Anabaptists, the pope, or the Jews. In each instance his pronouncements were virulent: the Anabaptists should be hanged as seditionists, the pope was the Antichrist, the Jews should be expelled and their synagogues burned. Such were hardly irenic words from a minister of the gospel, and none of the explanations that have been offered—his deteriorating health and chronic pain, his expectation of the imminent end of the world, his deep disappointment over the failure of true religious reform—seem satisfactory.

In 1539 Luther became embroiled in a scandal surrounding the bigamy of Philip, landgrave of Hesse. Like many other crowned heads, Philip lived in a dynastically arranged marriage with a wife for whom he had no affection. Engaging in extramarital relationships disturbed his conscience, however, so that for years he felt unworthy to receive communion. His eyes fell on one of his wife's ladies-in-waiting, who

insisted on marriage. Philip turned to Luther and the Wittenberg theologians for advice. In his response, which he amply augmented with biblical references, Luther noted that the patriarchs of the Old Testament had been married to more than one wife and that, as a special dispensation, polygamy was still possible. Philip accordingly entered into a second marriage secretly, but before long it became known—as did Luther’s role in bringing it about.

From the mid-1530s Luther was plagued by kidney stones and an obvious coronary condition. Somewhat sheepishly, he attributed his poor health to the severity of his life in the monastery. He nevertheless continued his academic teaching—from 1535 to 1545 he lectured on the book of Genesis, one of his most insightful biblical expositions—and preached regularly at the city church until his colleague Johannes Bugenhagen assumed that responsibility. Even then, Luther continued to preach in the Augustinian monastery. After the death of one of his oldest friends, Nikolaus Hausmann, in 1538 and that of his daughter Magdalene four years later, references to death became increasingly abundant in Luther’s correspondence. Thus he wrote in a June 1543 letter to a friend:

In February 1546 Luther journeyed, despite his failing health, to Eisleben, the town where he was born. He set out to mediate an embarrassing quarrel between two young and arrogant noblemen, the counts Albrecht and Gebhard of Mansfeld. He was successful, and he so informed his wife in what proved to be his last letter. One day later, on February 18, death came. His body was interred in the Castle Church in Wittenberg.

Significance

Martin Luther is assuredly one of the most influential figures in Western civilization during the last millennium. He was the catalyst for the division of Western Christendom into several churches, but he also left a host of cultural legacies, such as the emphasis on vernacular language. He was primarily a theologian, and there is a great wealth of insights in his writings, which in their definitive scholarly edition (the so-called Weimar Edition) comprise more than 100 folio volumes. But he was not a systematic theological thinker. Much like St. Augustine in late antiquity, Luther was what might be called a polemical theologian. Most of his writings—such as *Bondage of the Will* against Erasmus and *That These Words ‘This Is My Body’ Still Stand Against all Enthusiasts* against Zwingli—were forged in the heat of controversy and were inescapably given to one-sided pronouncements, which are not easy to reconcile with positions he took in other writings. It is, therefore, not easy to find agreement on the elements of Luther’s theology.

Moreover, the assessment of Luther’s theological significance was for centuries altogether dependent on the ecclesiastical orientation of the critic. Protestant scholars viewed him as the most stunning exponent of the authentic Christian faith since the time of the Apostles, while Catholics viewed him as the epitome of theological ignorance and personal immorality. These embarrassingly partisan perspectives have changed in recent decades, and a less confessionally oriented picture of Luther has emerged.

Certain key tenets of Luther's theology have shaped Protestant Christianity since the 16th century. They include his insistence on the Bible, the Word of God, as the only source of religious authority, a dogma known as *sola Scriptura*; his emphasis on the centrality of grace, appropriated by faith, as the sole means of human salvation; and his understanding of the church as a community of the faithful—a priesthood of all believers—rather than as a hierarchical structure with a prominent division between clergy and laity. Luther was not the first to express these notions, and indeed recent scholarship on the 15th century has shown that much of what was traditionally considered Luther's revolutionary innovation had striking antecedents. Nevertheless, the vigour and centrality that these ideas received in Luther's thought made them in important respects dramatically new. Certain corollaries of Luther's central teachings also made his achievement new and noteworthy. His insistence, for example, that sacred Scripture be available to commoners prompted him not only to translate the Bible into German but also to compose hymns and to advocate the establishment of schools in the cities.

Recent interpreters of Luther have attempted to understand his thought in terms of his struggle against the overpowering reality of the Devil or in terms of his intense fear of a death that would permanently separate him from God. Although there is evidence to support both views, neither quite captures Luther's spiritual essence. What seems to characterize him more than anything else is an almost childlike trust in God's overarching forgiveness and acceptance. Luther talked much about

his *tentationes* (“temptations”), by which he meant his doubts about whether this divine forgiveness was real. But he overcame these doubts, and his life thereafter was one of joyous and spontaneous trust in God’s love and goodness toward him and all sinners. Luther called this “Christian freedom.”

The centre of scholarly attention in Luther studies in the late 20th century was Luther’s understanding of the proper role of the Christian in society and politics. According to many scholars, Luther’s disavowal of the German peasants in 1525 and his notion that, as he once put it, “the Gospel has nothing to do with politics” facilitated a tendency toward political passivity among Protestant Christians in Germany. Likewise, his strident pronouncements against the Jews, especially toward the end of his life, have raised the question of whether Luther significantly encouraged the development of German anti-Semitism. Although many scholars have taken this view, this perspective puts far too much emphasis on Luther and not enough on the larger peculiarities of German history.

Luther’s notions developed in opposition to the belief developed by the medieval Catholic church that all of society wore a Christian mantle. The notion of a “Christian” politics or a “Christian” economics was anathema to Luther. However, this did not mean that the public realm had no principles that needed to be honoured. What Luther rejected was the notion that there was a uniquely “Christian” approach to these realms; uniquely Christian, Luther insisted, was only that which pertained to Jesus’ salvational work of redemption.

HENRY VIII

Henry VIII, (born June 28, 1491, Greenwich, near London, England—died January 28, 1547, London), king of England (1509–47) who presided over the beginnings of the English Renaissance and the English Reformation. His six wives were, successively, Catherine of Aragon (the mother of the future queen Mary I), Anne Boleyn (the mother of the future queen Elizabeth I), Jane Seymour (the mother of Henry's successor, Edward VI), Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard, and Catherine Parr.

Accession to the throne

Henry was the second son of Henry VII, first of the Tudor line, and Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV, first king of the short-lived line of York. When his elder brother, Arthur, died in 1502, Henry became the heir to the throne; of all the Tudor monarchs, he alone spent his childhood in calm expectation of the crown, which helped give an assurance of majesty and righteousness to his willful, ebullient character. He excelled in book learning as well as in the physical exercises of an aristocratic society, and, when in 1509 he ascended the throne, great things were expected of him. Six feet tall, powerfully built, and a tireless athlete, huntsman, and dancer, he promised England the joys of spring after the long winter of Henry VII's reign.

Henry and his ministers exploited the dislike inspired by his father's energetic pursuit of royal rights by sacrificing, without a thought, some of the unpopular institutions and some of the men that had served his predecessor. Yet the unpopular means for governing the realm soon reappeared because they were necessary. Soon after

his accession, Henry married Catherine of Aragon, Arthur's widow, and the attendant lavish entertainments ate into the modest royal reserves.

More serious was Henry's determination to engage in military adventure. Europe was being kept on the boil by rivalries between the French and Spanish kingdoms, mostly over Italian claims; and, against the advice of his older councillors, Henry in 1512 joined his father-in-law, Ferdinand II of Aragon, against France and ostensibly in support of a threatened pope, to whom the devout king for a long time paid almost slavish respect.

Henry himself displayed no military talent, but a real victory was won by the earl of Surrey at Flodden (1513) against a Scottish invasion. Despite the obvious pointlessness of the fighting, the appearance of success was popular. Moreover, in Thomas Wolsey, who organized his first campaign in France, Henry discovered his first outstanding minister. By 1515 Wolsey was archbishop of York, lord chancellor of England, and a cardinal of the church; more important, he was the king's good friend, to whom was gladly left the active conduct of affairs. Henry never altogether abandoned the positive tasks of kingship and often interfered in business; though the world might think that England was ruled by the cardinal, the king himself knew that he possessed perfect control any time he cared to assert it, and Wolsey only rarely mistook the world's opinion for the right one.

Nevertheless, the years from 1515 to 1527 were marked by Wolsey's ascendancy, and his initiatives set the scene. The cardinal had some occasional ambition

for the papal tiara, and this Henry supported; Wolsey at Rome would have been a powerful card in English hands. In fact, there was never any chance of this happening, any more than there was of Henry's election to the imperial crown, briefly mooted in 1519 when the emperor Maximilian I died, to be succeeded by his grandson Charles V. That event altered the European situation. In Charles, the crowns of Spain, Burgundy (with the Netherlands), and Austria were united in an overwhelming complex of power that reduced all the dynasties of Europe, with the exception of France, to an inferior position. From 1521, Henry became an outpost of Charles V's imperial power, which at Pavia (1525), for the moment, destroyed the rival power of France. Wolsey's attempt to reverse alliances at this unpropitious moment brought reprisals against the vital English cloth trade with the Netherlands and lost the advantages that alliance with the victor of Pavia might have had. It provoked a serious reaction in England, and Henry concluded that Wolsey's usefulness might be coming to an end.

Loss of popularity of Henry VIII

While the greatness of England in Europe was being shown up as a sham, the regime was also losing popularity at home. The fanciful expectations of the early days could not, of course, endure; some measure of reality was bound to intrude. As it was, journalists and writers continued to be full of hope for a king who, from 1517, commanded the services of a new councillor, Sir Thomas More, one of the outstanding minds of the day. But More soon discovered that Henry found it easy to keep his enjoyment of learned conversation apart from the conduct of policy. Nothing for the

moment could dent Wolsey's strength, and this had serious drawbacks for the king, who supported him. The country was showing increasing signs of its discontent, and Wolsey's efforts to remedy grievances only exasperated men of influence without bringing satisfaction to the poor. Feelings came to the boil in the years 1523–24. Although he disliked parliaments, Wolsey had to agree to the calling of one in 1523, but the taxes voted were well below what was required. Next year, the attempt to levy a special tax led to such fierce resistance that Henry rescinded it, he and the cardinal both trying to take the credit for the remission of what they had been jointly responsible for imposing. While he had Wolsey to take the blame, Henry could afford such fiascoes; the cardinal could not. By 1527 a government policy that, though seemingly Wolsey's, was really the king's was facing bankruptcy; ineffective abroad, unpopular at home, it made the regime look as empty of positive purpose as in fact it was.

At this point, the king entered affairs unmistakably and spectacularly. Among his failures so far had been his or Catherine's inability to provide a male heir to the throne; several stillbirths and early deaths had left only a girl, the princess Mary (born in 1516), to carry on the line, and no one relished the thought of a female succession with all the dynastic and political uncertainties it would bring. Being the man he was, Henry could not suppose the fault to be his. His rapidly growing aversion to Catherine was augmented by his infatuation with one of the ladies of the court, Anne Boleyn, the sister of one of his earlier mistresses. Henry was no profligate; indeed, he had a strong streak of prudery, but he sought the occasional relief from marriage to a worthy but ailing wife to which princes

have generally been held entitled. In Anne he met his match; this 20-year-old girl, brought up in a tough school of courtly intrigue, would be more than a king's mistress. It took Henry, who in any case needed to marry her if the expected issue was to solve the succession problem, some six years to achieve their joint purpose. Inadvertently, he provoked a revolution.

From 1527 Henry pursued what became known as “the King's great matter”: his divorce from Catherine. He convinced himself that his first marriage had been against the divine law; that is, against the biblical injunction (Lev.) forbidding marriage with a brother's widow. The deaths of the children proved God's judgment on the union. With his characteristic readiness to convert his own desires into the law of God, Henry rapidly assured himself that he was living in mortal sin with Catherine and had to find relief if he was again to become acceptable to God. He appealed to Rome for a declaration of annulment. Popes had usually obliged kings in such matters, but Henry had picked both his time and his case badly. He was asking Pope Clement VII to help him discard the emperor's aunt, but Clement, the emperor's prisoner in 1527–28, never thereafter dared resist Charles, whose powerful feelings of familial honour and public prestige barred any concession to Henry's wishes. Moreover, the pope's reluctance was increased by the fact that he was being asked to declare illegal an earlier exercise of papal power—which had licensed Henry's marriage to his brother's widow—of a kind that brought a good deal of money to the papal coffers.

Thus, Henry's attempts to solve his dilemma in the accepted legal way were doomed from the start. Wolsey, in a worse dilemma, since only success in the impossible could keep him in power, obtained a trial of the case in England, but this was frustrated by his fellow judge, Cardinal Campeggio, on orders from Rome (1529). Within weeks, Wolsey was ousted, but his disappearance solved nothing, and the councillors who succeeded him could offer little help to their king, who knew only what he wanted, not how to get it.

The chancellorship went to Thomas More, who had told Henry that he did not approve of the divorce and who wished to devote himself to a fight against Lutheran heresy. Confusion was the keynote of policy for some three years while the king dithered between hope that Rome might yet be forced to let the formal trial of his first marriage take place in England and stirrings of a more radical nature—to reject Rome outright. But, though he occasionally talked of doing just that, neither he nor anyone else knew how to convert talk into action.

The breach with Rome of Henry VIII

Action called for a revolution, and the revolution required a man who could conceive and execute it. That man was Thomas Cromwell, who, in April 1532, won control of the council and thereafter remained in command for some eight years. The revolution consisted of the decision that the English church should separate from Rome, becoming effectively a spiritual department of state under the rule of the king as God's deputy on earth. The revolution that he had not intended gave the king his wish: in

January 1533 he married Anne Boleyn; in May a new archbishop, Thomas Cranmer, presided over the formality of a trial that declared the first marriage annulled; in September the princess Elizabeth was born. The pope retaliated with a sentence of excommunication; it troubled no one.

The supreme headship on earth over the Church of England, though he had not sought it, represented Henry's major achievement. It had very wide-ranging consequences, but those that immediately concerned the king were two. In the first place, the new title consolidated his own concept of kingship, his conviction that (as he once said) he had no superior on earth. It rounded off the majestic image of divinely instituted royal rule that it was Henry's constant ambition to present to an awed and obedient world. But, in the second place, it created a real personal problem for the king: earlier, in his book *Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum* (1521), he had attacked Luther and had expressed a profound devotion to the papacy and had been rewarded with the title of Defender of the Faith. Now he had turned against the pope; his act was equal to encouraging the Protestant Reformation, a thing attractive to Cranmer and Cromwell (and perhaps Anne Boleyn) but not to Henry, who despised Luther. The religion of the newly independent church was for its head to settle: for the rest of his life, Henry, who prided himself on his theological learnings, was to give much time and thought to the nature of the true religion. With the exception of the papal primacy, he never gave up the main tenets of the faith in which he had grown up, but he changed his mind on details and arrived at an amalgam of his own in which transubstantiation and

clerical celibacy mingled with radical views about the worldly authority of the church and man's ability to seek salvation without the aid of priests.

Domestic reforms

Cromwell's decade, the 1530s, was the only period of the reign during which a coherent body of policies was purposefully carried through. Cromwell's work greatly enlarged Henry's power, especially by transferring to the crown the wealth of the monasteries, dissolved in 1536–40, and new clerical taxes; but it also, more explicitly than ever, subjected the king to the law and to the legislative supremacy of Parliament. Since Henry knew how to work with parliaments, the immediate effect was to make him appear more dominant than ever and to give to his reign a spurious air of autocracy—spurious because in fact the rule of law remained to control the sovereign's mere will. The appearance of autocracy was misleadingly emphasized by the fact that all revolutions have their victims. As heads rolled, the king's earlier reputation as a champion of light and learning was permanently buried under his enduring fame as a man of blood. Old friends such as More, refusing to accept the new order, fell before the onslaught, as did some 50 other men caught by the treason laws. Between 1538 and 1541 the families of Pole and Courtenay were destroyed by the axe for treasons linked with efforts abroad to reverse the course of events in England but mainly because they could claim royal blood and represented a dynastic danger to the unprolific Tudor line.

The king now embarked on the series of matrimonial adventures that made him appear both a monster and a laughingstock. He soon tired of Anne, who failed to produce

a male heir; in 1536 she was executed, with other members of the court, for alleged treasonable adultery. Catherine of Aragon, rejected but unbowed, had died a little earlier. Henry immediately married Jane Seymour, who bore him his son Edward but died in childbirth (1537). The next three years were filled with attempts to replace her, and the bride chosen was Anne, sister of the duke of Cleves, a pawn in Cromwell's policy for a northern European alliance against dangers from France and the Emperor. But Henry hated the first sight of her and at once demanded his freedom, an end achieved by a quick divorce.

Physical and mental decline

The Cleves fiasco destroyed Cromwell; it enabled his many enemies to turn the king against him, and in July 1540 his head fell on the scaffold. Henry had by now become truly dangerous: always secretive and suspicious, now he was beginning to show paranoiac tendencies. Convinced that he controlled everyone, he was in fact readily manipulated by those who knew how to feed his suspicions and pander to his self-righteousness. Full of experience—the oldest king in Europe—and increasingly competent in the routine of rule, he lacked the comprehensive vision and large spirit that would have made him a great man. His temperamental deficiencies were aggravated by what he regarded as his undeserved misfortunes and by ill health; he grew enormously fat. His mind did not weaken, but he grew restless, peevish, and totally unpredictable; often melancholy and depressed, he was usually out of sorts and always out of patience. In 1540–42 he briefly renewed his youth in marriage to the 20-year-old Catherine

Howard, whose folly in continuing her promiscuity, even as queen, brought her to the block. The blow finished Henry. Thereafter, he was really a sad and bitter old man, and, though he married once more, to find a measure of peace with the calm and obedient Catherine Parr, his physical ruin was complete.

But he was still the king and, from Cromwell's fall (which he regretted too late), the only maker of policy. Policy in the hands of a sick, unhappy, violent man was not likely to be either sensible or prosperous, and so it proved. Left to himself, Henry concentrated on keeping the realm united, despite the growing strife between the religious factions, and on keeping before the world his own image as the glorious monarch of the age. The first resulted in frequent explosions against the ingratitude of his subjects and against his councillors. The second brought him back to his first love—war and conquest, the sport of kings.

In 1542 the emperor and the king of France resumed hostilities. After a pretense of independence, Henry again joined the former; the Scots promptly joined the French. The Scots were routed at Solway Moss (1542), and their king died soon after: this opened the possibility of subjugating that country permanently by means of a marriage alliance between the infant heirs to the two thrones. But the Scottish dream quickly collapsed as Henry's crude handling of that nation gave control to a pro-French party, determined to resist even an alliance with England; physical conquest was beyond the king's means. Henry personally managed both the war and the subsequent negotiations, and he displayed amazing energy for so sick a man. But energy is not the same thing as

competence. The war proved ruinous. Money had to be raised by selling off the monastic lands, which had brought a good income; the desperate expedient of debasing the coinage, though it brought temporary succour, led to a violent inflation that made things worse. Yet, even after the emperor made peace with France (1544), Henry would not let go until two years later.

As the year 1546 drew to a close, it was apparent to all observers that the king had not long to live. Not that it was clear to the man most concerned; he continued as before, lamenting religious dissension, attending to the business of government, continuing the pretense of deathless majesty, destroying the powerful Howard family, whom he suspected of plotting to control his successor. Conscious almost to the very end, he died on January 28, 1547. He left the realm feeling bereft and the government the more bewildered because, to the last, he had refused to make full arrangements for the rule of a boy king.

Legacy of Henry VIII

As king of England from 1509 to 1547, Henry VIII presided over the beginnings of the English Reformation, which was unleashed by his own matrimonial involvements, even though he never abandoned the fundamentals of the Roman Catholic faith. Though exceptionally well served by a succession of brilliant ministers, Henry turned upon them all; those he elevated, he invariably cast down again. He was attracted to humanist learning and was something of an intellectual himself, but he was responsible for the deaths of the outstanding English humanists of the day. Though six times married, he left

a minor heir and a dangerously complicated succession problem. Of his six wives, two joined a large tally of eminent persons executed for alleged treason; yet otherwise his regime observed the law of the land with painful particularity. Formidable in appearance, in memory, and in mind, and fearsome of temper, he yet attracted genuine devotion and knew how to charm people. Monstrously egotistical and surrounded by adulation, he nevertheless kept a reasonable grasp on the possible; forever taking false steps in politics, he emerged essentially unbeaten and superficially successful in nearly everything he attempted to do.

Henry VIII has always seemed the very embodiment of true monarchy. Even his evil deeds, never forgotten, have been somehow amalgamated into a memory of greatness. He gave his nation what it wanted: a visible symbol of its nationhood. He also had done something toward giving it a better government, a useful navy, a start on religious reform and social improvement. But he was not a great man in any sense. Although a leader in every fibre of his being, he little understood where he was leading his nation. But, if he was neither statesman nor prophet, he also was neither the blood-stained monster of one tradition nor the rowdy bon vivant of another. Though cold, self-centred, ungiving, forever suspicious of the ways of the world, he could not descend to the second stereotype; despite a ruthlessness fed by self-righteousness, he never took the pleasure in killing required of the first. Simply, he never understood why the life of so well-meaning a man should have been beset by so many unmerited troubles.

CHARLES V

Charles V, (born February 24, 1500, Ghent, Flanders [now in Belgium]—died September 21, 1558, San Jerónimo de Yuste, Spain), Holy Roman emperor (1519–56), king of Spain (as Charles I; 1516–56), and archduke of Austria (as Charles I; 1519–21), who inherited a Spanish and Habsburg empire extending across Europe from Spain and the Netherlands to Austria and the Kingdom of Naples and reaching overseas to Spanish America. He struggled to hold his empire together against the growing forces of Protestantism, increasing Ottoman and French pressure, and even hostility from the pope. At last he yielded, abdicating his claims to the Netherlands and Spain in favour of his son Philip II and the title of emperor to his brother Ferdinand I and retiring to a monastery.

Early life

Charles was the son of Philip I the Handsome, king of Castile, and Joan the Mad. His paternal grandparents were the Holy Roman emperor Maximilian I and Mary, duchess of Burgundy, and his maternal grandparents were Isabella I and Ferdinand II, the Roman Catholic king and queen of Spain. After his father's death in 1506, Charles was raised by his paternal aunt Margaret of Austria, regent of the Netherlands. His spiritual guide was the theologian Adrian of Utrecht (later Pope Adrian VI), a member of

the *devotio moderna*, a religious and educational reform movement promoting literacy among the masses.

In 1515 Charles came of age as duke of Burgundy and assumed rule over the Netherlands. His scope of activities soon widened. On January 23, 1516, Ferdinand II died. As a result, the problem of the succession in Spain became acute, since by the terms of Ferdinand's will, Charles was to govern in Aragon and Castile together with his mother (who, however, suffered from a nervous illness and never reigned). Furthermore, the will provided that Francisco, Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, who was the archbishop of Toledo and one of Ferdinand and Isabella's most-influential advisers, should direct the administration in Castile. The Spanish opponents of Ferdinand who had fled to Brussels succeeded in having the will set aside, however, and on March 14, 1516, Charles was proclaimed king in Brussels as Charles I of Aragon and Castile.

In September 1517 he arrived in Spain, a country with whose customs he was unfamiliar and whose language he was as yet barely able to speak. There he instituted, under Burgundian influence, a government that was little better than foreign rule. When his election as king of Germany in 1519 (succeeding his grandfather Emperor Maximilian I) recalled him to that country after some two and one-half years in Spain, Charles left behind him a dissatisfied and restless people. Adrian, whom he had installed as regent, was not strong enough to suppress the revolt of the Castilian cities (*comuneros*) that broke out at that point. Making the most of their candidate's German parentage and buying up German electoral votes (mostly with money supplied by the

powerful Fugger banking family), Charles's adherents had meanwhile pushed through his election as emperor over his powerful rival, Francis I of France.

Imperialist goals, rivalry with Francis I, and fight against Protestantism

In October 1520 Charles was accordingly crowned king of Germany in Aachen, assuming at the same time the title of Roman emperor-elect. In the spring of 1521 the imperial Diet, before which Martin Luther had to defend his theses, assembled at Worms. The reformer's appearance represented a first challenge to Charles, beginning with a sweeping invocation of his Roman Catholic ancestors, read out to the Diet. After Luther refused to recant the substance of his writings and left the Diet, Charles drew up the Edict of Worms. With it, he rejected Luther's doctrines and essentially declared war on Protestantism.

Gradually, the other chief task of his reign also unfolded: the struggle for hegemony in western Europe. That goal was a legacy of his Burgundian forefathers, including his ancestor Charles the Bold, who had come to naught in his fight against the French Valois Louis XI. His great-grandfather's quest was to become a fateful problem for Charles as well.

After defeating Duke Massimiliano Sforza at the Battle of Marignano in 1515, Francis I of France compelled him, in the Treaty of Noyon, to renounce his claim to the duchy of Milan. The vanquished Sforza turned for help to Pope Leo X and Charles V, with whom he concluded a treaty in 1521. Despite the outbreak of war with France,

Charles hurried back to Spain, where his followers had meanwhile gained the upper hand over the *comuneros*. Even though he granted an amnesty, the young monarch proved to be an intransigent ruler, bloodily suppressing the revolt and signing 270 death warrants. Those actions were nevertheless followed by a rapid and complete rapprochement between the pacified people and their sovereign; in fact, it was during that second and protracted sojourn in Spain (1522–29) that Charles became a Spaniard, with Castilian grandees replacing the Burgundians. There soon developed an emotionally tinged understanding between Charles and his Spanish subjects that was to be steadily deepened during his long rule. Henceforth, it was primarily the material resources of his Spanish domains that sustained his far-flung policies and his Spanish troops who acquitted themselves most bravely and successfully in his wars.

In 1522 his teacher Adrian of Utrecht became pope, as Adrian VI. His efforts to reconcile Francis I and the emperor failed, and three years later Charles's army defeated Francis I at the Battle of Pavia, taking prisoner the king himself. The victory ensured Spanish supremacy in Italy. Held in the alcazar of Madrid, the royal captive feigned agreement with the conditions imposed by Charles, even taking the emperor's oldest sister, Eleanora, the dowager queen of Portugal, for his wife and handing over his sons as hostages. The Treaty of Madrid concluding hostilities between the two countries was signed in January 1526, but as soon as he had regained his freedom, Francis rejected the treaty and refused to ratify it.

With the accession of Süleyman the Magnificent to the Ottoman sultanate in 1520, Turkish pressure on Europe increased once more. The sultan threatened not only Hungary but also those hereditary provinces of the Habsburgs that, by Charles's agreement in 1522 with his brother Ferdinand, thenceforth belonged to the younger branch of the Habsburgs. When Louis II of Hungary and Bohemia was defeated and killed by the Ottoman Turks in the Battle of Mohács in August 1526, Ferdinand assumed his throne both as the childless former monarch's brother-in-law and by virtue of the treaty of succession concluded in 1491 between his own grandfather and Louis's father, Vladislas II. After that, the Turkish danger became the Habsburgs' foremost concern on land, as it had been on the seas ever since Charles's accession to the throne of Spain. Although Charles realized that his first duty as emperor of Christendom lay in warding off that peril, he found himself so enmeshed in the affairs of western Europe that he had little time, energy, and money left for the task. In 1526 Charles married Isabella, the daughter of the late king Manuel I of Portugal.

In early 1527, instead of fighting the Turks, Charles's Spanish troops and his German mercenaries marched against Pope Clement VII, who had been his enemy since the establishment of the League of Cognac, the pope's alliance with France, Venice, Florence, and Milan against the emperor. Mutinous and with their pay in arrears, Charles's forces entered the defenseless city of Rome and looted it during the infamous sack of Rome (May 1527).

The pope, having surrendered to the mutinous troops, was ready for any compromise. The newly started war between the emperor and France also came to a close when the mother of Francis I approached Margaret of Austria, the emperor's aunt, through whose mediation the so-called "ladies' peace," the Treaty of Cambrai, was concluded in August 1529. The status quo was preserved: Charles renounced his claim to Burgundy; Francis, his claims to Milan and Naples. The pope, having made peace with Charles, met him in Bologna; there he crowned him emperor in February 1530. It was to be the last time that a Holy Roman emperor was crowned by a pope.

In 1530 Charles, attempting to bring about a reformation within the Roman Catholic Church through the convocation of a universal council, also tried to find a *modus vivendi* with the Protestants. The Roman Catholics, however, condemned the Augsburg Confession—the basic confession of the Lutheran doctrine faith presented to Charles at the Diet of Augsburg—and responded with the Confutation, which met with Charles's approval. The final decree issued by the Diet accordingly confirmed, in somewhat expanded form, the resolutions embodied in the Edict of Worms of 1521. That, in turn, caused the Protestant princes to close ranks in the following year in the Schmalkaldic League. Faced with renewed Turkish onslaughts, the emperor granted some concessions in return for armed support against the enemy. In 1532 a large army under Charles's personal command faced Süleyman's forces before the city of Vienna, but the order to give decisive battle was withheld. Instead, the emperor returned to Spain in 1533, leaving his brother Ferdinand behind as his deputy.

By taking up his grandfather Ferdinand of Aragon's project of conquering North Africa, Charles endeavoured to undertake by sea what he had not done on land. The attempt to repulse the corsair (and admiral of the Ottoman fleet) Barbarossa (Khayr al-Dīn) was nonetheless no more than a marginal operation, since Charles's capture of La Goulette (Ḥalq al-Wādī) and Tunis (1535) did nothing to diminish the strength of Süleyman's position.

From Africa the emperor sailed to Naples, entering Rome in 1536 to deliver his famous political address before Pope Paul III and the Sacred College of Cardinals in which he challenged the king of France (who had meanwhile invaded Savoy and taken Turin) to personal combat. When Francis declined, Charles invaded Provence in an operation that soon faltered. Through the pope's intercession, a peace agreement, the Truce of Nice, was concluded in June 1538.

Intent on suppressing the open revolt that had broken out in Ghent, his native city, the emperor himself went to the Netherlands. The country's regent—Charles's sister, Mary of Hungary—had proved incapable of settling the conflict between herself and the city, which jealously guarded its prerogatives. On his arrival in February 1540, Charles revoked Ghent's privileges, had 13 leading rebels executed, and gave orders to build a fortified castle. Once again his actions, as severe as those he had taken against the *comuneros* in 1522, were crowned by success. Toward the German Protestants, on the other hand, he showed himself conciliatory; in 1541 the Diet of Regensburg granted them major concessions, even if those were later rejected by both the pope and Luther.

Although Ferdinand, having lost his Hungarian capital in August 1541, pleaded for a land campaign against Süleyman I, Charles again decided on a naval venture, which failed dismally after an unsuccessful attack on Algiers.

When Charles granted his son Philip the duchy of Milan, the king of France, enraged because he had hoped to regain indirect control of Milan himself, rearmed and declared war in August 1542. Fighting broke out the following year, even though the pope had finally convoked, in Trent (Trento, Italy), the council for which the emperor had been pressing. Once again Charles's precarious financial situation partially accounted for the failure of his plans. His finances were in a perpetually unsettled state. The Spanish possessions in the New World were, of course, in an uninterrupted state of expansion throughout his entire reign, marked by, among other ventures, the conquest of Mexico and the conquest of Peru. The gold from those possessions did not add up to any sizable sum at the time. Only in 1550 did 17 Spanish ships provide the emperor with 3,000,000 ducats and others with a like sum, the earliest significant monetary transfusion from the New World. The silver mines of Potosí were not exploited systematically until the 1550s; thus, their revenue arrived too late for Charles. In 1516 Spain's floating debt amounted to 20,000 livres; by 1556 it had risen to 7,000,000. In 1556 the exchequer owed 6,761,272 ducats. Thus, the campaign of 1543–44, inadequately financed, bogged down. It was to no avail that the French and imperial armies faced one another in the field in November 1543 and again in August 1544. As in 1532, when Charles had faced the

Ottoman Turks before Vienna, neither side cared to open hostilities, with the result that the Peace of Cr  py (September 1544) again more or less confirmed the status quo.

The Council of Trent did not open until December 1545, but Paul III had earlier offered Charles men and money against the heretics. When the Protestant princes failed to put in an appearance at the imperial Diet of Regensburg in 1546, the religious and political situation turned critical once again. Charles prepared for war. In a battle that decided the whole campaign and placed his archenemies at his mercy, the emperor (who had been attacked by the German princes the previous September) defeated the Protestants at M  hlberg in April 1547. Ill much of the time, he spent the following year at Augsburg, where he succeeded in detaching the Netherlands from the imperial Diet's jurisdiction while yet assuring their continued protection by the empire. Also while in Augsburg, Charles drew up his "political testament" for Philip and reorganized the Spanish court. The Diet of Augsburg furthermore saw the publication of the "Interim," a formula conciliatory to the Protestants but retaining the Roman Catholic ritual in general. Although Charles believed that he had granted far-reaching concessions to the people and the Protestant authorities in that document, his main concern was to make the Protestants return to the Roman Catholic Church.

North Germany was now on the brink of revolt. The new king of France, Henry II, was eagerly awaiting an opportunity to renew the old rivalry between the houses of Valois and Burgundy, while the German princes believed that the moment was at hand to repay Charles for M  hlberg. After a secret treaty was signed in October 1551 between

Henry II, Albert II Alcibiades, margrave of Brandenburg, and Maurice, elector of Saxony, Maurice in January 1552 ceded to France the cities of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, thus handing over imperial lands. When Maurice tried to capture the emperor himself, the latter barely managed to escape. He soon gathered reinforcements, but the changed political situation compelled him to ratify an agreement made between his brother Ferdinand and the rebels, according to which the new Protestant religion was to be granted equal rights with Roman Catholicism. Charles's attempt to retake Metz that fall ended in a complete fiasco, with Burgundy capitulating to Valois and the emperor defeated in his struggle for hegemony in western Europe.

In order to save what he could of that hegemony, Charles, already severely racked by gout, tried new paths by preparing the ground for his widowed son's marriage with Mary I of England. It looked for a while as if his great hopes were about to be fulfilled, the joining of north and south and the realization of the dream of a universal empire. But, even though Philip married Mary in July 1554, the English Parliament emphatically refused to crown him. Since Mary remained childless, Charles's hopes came to naught. After an abortive last campaign against France, he prepared for his abdication, renouncing, in 1555 and 1556, his claims to the Netherlands and Spain in favour of Philip and those to the imperial crown in Ferdinand's favour. He disembarked in Spain at the end of September 1556 and moved to the monastery of Yuste, which he had long before selected as his final refuge, in early February 1557. There he laid the groundwork for the eventual bequest of Portugal to the Habsburgs after

the eventual death of King Sebastian (who was then still a child) with the help of his sister Catherine, grandmother of Sebastian and regent of Portugal. He aided his son in procuring funds in Spain for the continuation of the war against France, and he helped his daughter Joan, regent of Spain during Philip's absence in the Netherlands, in persecuting Spanish heretics.

Assessment of Charles's character

Not only the task but the man to whom it was given had a dual nature. By background and training, Charles was a medieval ruler whose outlook on life was stamped throughout by a deeply experienced Roman Catholic faith and by the knightly ideals of the late chivalric age. Yet his sober, rational, and pragmatic thinking again mark him as a man of his age. Although Charles's moral uprightness and sense of personal honour make it impossible to regard him as a truly Machiavellian statesman, his unswerving resolve and his refusal to give up any part whatsoever of his patrimony are evidence of a strong and unconditional will to power. More than that, it is precisely this individual claim to power that forms the core of his personality and explains his aims and actions.

Charles's abdication has been variously interpreted. While many saw in it an unsuccessful man's escape from the world, his contemporaries thought differently. Charles himself had been considering the idea even in his prime. In 1532 his secretary, Alfonso de Valdés, suggested to him the thought that a ruler who was incapable of preserving the peace and, indeed, who had to consider himself an obstacle to

its establishment was obliged to retire from affairs of state. Once the abdication had become a fact, St. Ignatius of Loyola had this to say:

The emperor gave a rare example to his successors...in so doing, he proved himself to be a true Christian prince...may the Lord in all His goodness now grant the emperor freedom.

In this last, metaphysically tinged period of his life, Charles's freedom consisted in his conscious and conscientious preparation for the *buen morir*, for a lucid death.

UNIT-IV

LOUIS XIV

Louis XIV, byname **Louis the Great**, **Louis the Grand Monarch**, or **the Sun King**, French **Louis le Grand**, **Louis le Grand Monarque**, or **le Roi Soleil**, (born September 5, 1638, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, France—died September 1, 1715, Versailles, France), king of France (1643–1715) who ruled his country, principally from his great palace at Versailles, during one of its most brilliant periods and who remains the symbol of absolute monarchy of the classical age. Internationally, in a series of wars between 1667 and 1697, he extended France's eastern borders at the expense of the Habsburgs and then, in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–14), engaged a hostile European coalition in order to secure the Spanish throne for his grandson.

Early life and marriage

Louis was the son of Louis XIII and his Spanish queen, Anne of Austria. He succeeded his father on May 14, 1643. At the age of four years and eight months, he was, according to the laws of the kingdom, not only the master but the owner of the bodies and property of 19 million subjects. Although he was saluted as “a visible divinity,” he was, nonetheless, a neglected child given over to the care of servants. He once narrowly escaped drowning in a pond because no one was watching him. Anne of Austria, who was to blame for this negligence, inspired him with a lasting fear of “crimes committed against God.”

Louis was nine years old when the nobles and the Paris Parlement (a powerful law court), driven by hatred of the prime minister Jules Cardinal Mazarin, rose against the crown in 1648. This marked the beginning of the long civil war known as the Fronde, in the course of which Louis suffered poverty, misfortune, fear, humiliation, cold, and hunger. These trials shaped the future character, behaviour, and mode of thought of the young king. He would never forgive either Paris, the nobles, or the common people.

In 1653 Mazarin was victorious over the rebels and then proceeded to construct an extraordinary administrative apparatus with Louis as his pupil. The young king also acquired Mazarin's partiality for the arts, elegance, and display. Although he had been proclaimed of age, the king did not dream of disputing the cardinal's absolute power.

The war begun in 1635 between France and Spain was then entering its last phase. The outcome of the war would transfer European hegemony from the Habsburgs to the Bourbons. A French king had to be a soldier, and so Louis served his apprenticeship on the battlefield.

In 1658 Louis faced the great conflict between love and duty, a familiar one for princes of that period. He struggled with himself for two years over his love for Mazarin's niece, Marie Mancini. He finally submitted to the exigencies of politics and in 1660 married Marie-Thérèse of Austria, daughter of King Philip IV of Spain, in order to ratify peace between their two countries.

The childhood of Louis XIV was at an end, but no one believed him capable of seizing the reins of power. No one suspected his thoughts. He wrote in his *Mémoires*:

The young king

Mazarin died on March 9, 1661. The dramatic blow came on March 10. The king informed his astonished ministers that he intended to assume all responsibility for ruling the kingdom. This had not occurred since the reign of Henry IV. It cannot be overemphasized that Louis XIV's action was not in accordance with tradition; his concept of a dictatorship by divine right was his own. In genuine faith, Louis viewed himself as God's representative on earth and considered all disobedience and rebellion to be sinful. From this conviction he gained not only a dangerous feeling of infallibility but also considerable serenity and moderation.

He was backed up first by the great ministers Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de Louvois, and Hugues de Lionne, among whom he fostered dissension, and later by men of lesser capacity. For 54 years Louis devoted himself to his task eight hours a day; not the smallest detail escaped his attention. He wanted to control everything from court etiquette to troop movements, from road building to theological disputes. He succeeded because he faithfully reflected the mood of a France overflowing with youth and vigour and enamoured of grandeur.

Despite the use of pensions and punishments, the monarchy had been unable to subdue the nobles, who had started 11 civil wars in 40 years. Louis lured them to his

court, corrupted them with gambling, exhausted them with dissipation, and made their destinies dependent on their capacity to please him. Etiquette became a means of governing. From that time, the nobility ceased to be an important factor in French politics, which in some respects weakened the nation.

Patronage of the arts of Louis XIV

Louis's great fortune was in having among his subjects an extraordinary group of men in every area of activity. He knew well how to make use of them. He was the protector of writers, notably Molière and Jean Racine, whom he ordered to sing his praises, and he imposed his own visions of beauty and nature on artists. France's appearance and way of life were changed; the great towns underwent a metamorphosis, the landscape was altered, and monuments arose everywhere. The king energetically devoted himself to building new residences. Little remains of his splendid palaces at Saint-Germain and Marly, but Versailles—cursed as extravagant even as it was under construction and accused of having ruined the nation—still stands.

Versailles was approximately the price of a modern airport; it was an object of universal admiration and enhanced French prestige. All the power of the government was brought to bear in the construction of Versailles. Louis XIV was not wrong, as some have claimed, to remove himself from unhealthful and tumultuous Paris, but he erred in breaking with the wandering tradition of his ancestors. The monarchy became increasingly isolated from the people and thereby assumed a decidedly mythical quality.

While Louis watched his buildings going up, Colbert, who supervised the construction, obtained from him the means to carry out an economic revolution aimed at making France economically self-sufficient while maximizing exports. Manufacturers, the navy and merchant marine, a modern police organization, roads, ports, and canals all emerged at about the same time. Louis attended to every detail, while at the same time giving dazzling entertainment and carrying on a tumultuous love affair with Louise de La Vallière.

In 1667 he invaded the Spanish Netherlands, which he regarded as his wife's inheritance, thus beginning a series of wars that lasted for a good part of his reign. Louis himself on his deathbed said, "I have loved war too much," but his subjects, who often complained of his prudence and moderation, would not have understood had he not used force to strengthen the frontiers of France. After a brilliant campaign, the king had to retreat (1668) in the face of English and especially Dutch pressure. He never forgave the Dutch and swore to destroy their Protestant mercantile republic. To this end he allied himself with his cousin Charles II of England and invaded the Netherlands in 1672. The long war that ensued ended in 1678, in the first treaty of Nijmegen with Louis triumphant.

Zenith and decline

The Sun King was at his zenith. Almost alone he had defeated a formidable coalition (Spain and the Holy Roman emperor had joined the Dutch against him) and dictated terms to the enemy. He had extended the frontier of France in the north

by annexing part of Flanders and in the east by seizing Lorraine and Franche-Comté. His fleet equaled those of England and Holland. Paris called him “the Great.” In his court he was an object of adoration, and as he approached age 40 he could view himself as far surpassing all other men.

At the same time, great changes were occurring in his private life. In 1680 the marquise de Montespan, who had replaced Mme de La Vallière as Louis’s mistress in 1667, was implicated in the Affair of the Poisons, a scandal in which a number of prominent people were accused of sorcery and murder. Fearful for his reputation, the king dismissed Mme de Montespan and imposed piety on his entourage. The ostentation, gambling, and entertainments did not disappear, but the court, subjected to an outward display of propriety, became suffused with boredom. Hypocrisy became the rule.

The king had openly renounced pleasure, but the sacrifice was made easier for him by his new favourite, the very pious Mme de Maintenon. She was the widow of the satirist Paul Scarron and the former governess of the king’s illegitimate children.

In 1682 the seat of government was transferred to Versailles. The following year marked a turning point in the life and reign of Louis XIV. The queen died, and the king secretly married Mme de Maintenon, who imperceptibly gained in political influence. He remained devoted to her; even at age 70 she was being exhorted by her confessor to continue to fulfill her conjugal duties, according to letters still extant.

Colbert also died, leaving the way free for the bellicose Louvois. The repulse of a Turkish invasion of his Austrian domains left the emperor free to oppose France in the west. In 1688–89 the fall of the Stuarts and William of Orange's accession to the throne of England further reversed the situation to the detriment of France.

Revocation of the Edict of Nantes

To his traditional enemies Louis now added the entire Protestant world. His mother had inculcated in him a narrow and simplistic religion, and he understood nothing of the Reformation. He viewed French Protestants as potential rebels. After having tried to convert them by force, he revoked the Edict of Nantes, which had guaranteed their freedom of worship, in 1685. The revocation, which was accompanied by a pitiless persecution, drove many artisans from France and caused endless misfortune. Thus began the decline.

England, the Dutch, and the emperor united in the Grand Alliance to resist Louis's expansionism. The resulting war lasted from 1688 to 1697. Despite many victories, Louis gave up part of his territorial acquisitions when he signed the Treaty of Rijswijk, for which the public judged him harshly. He reconciled himself to another painful sacrifice when he recognized William of Orange as William III of England, in violation of his belief in the divine right of the Stuart king James II to William's throne.

Three years later, in 1700, Charles II, the last Habsburg king of Spain, died, bequeathing his kingdoms to Louis's grandson, Philip of Anjou (Philip V). Louis,

who desired nothing more than peace, hesitated but finally accepted the inheritance. He has been strongly criticized for his decision, but he had no alternative. With England against him, he had to try to prevent Spain from falling into the hands of the equally hostile Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I, who disputed Philip's claim.

Final years of Louis XIV

In the War of the Spanish Succession the anti-French alliance was reactivated by William of Orange before his death. The disasters of the war were so great that, in 1709, France came close to losing all the advantages gained over the preceding century. Private griefs were added to Louis's public calamities. Almost simultaneously he lost his son, the grand dauphin; two of his grandsons, the dukes de Bourgogne and Berry; his great grandson, the duke de Bretagne; and his granddaughter-in-law, the duchess de Bourgogne, who had been the consolation of his declining years.

An excess of flattery from within and an excess of malediction from without had created an artificial image of the king. He was viewed as an idol who would collapse under the blows of ill fortune, but the opposite occurred. Having first been the embodiment of a triumphant nation, Louis surpassed himself by bearing his own suffering and that of his people with unceasing resolution.

Finally, a palace revolution in London, bringing the pacific Tories to power, and a French victory over the imperial forces at the Battle of Denain combined to end the war. The Treaties of Utrecht, and of Rastatt and Baden, signed in 1713–14, cost France

its hegemony but left its territory intact. It retained its recent conquests in Flanders and on the Rhine, which were so much in the order of things that neither later defeats nor revolutions would cause it to lose them.

Louis XIV died in 1715, four days shy of his 77th birthday. His body was borne, amid the jeers of the populace, to the Saint-Denis basilica. His heir, the last son of the duke de Bourgogne, was a five-year-old child who was not expected to live. Louis had distrusted his nephew, the duke d'Orléans, and wanted to leave actual power in the hands of the duke du Maine, his son by Mme de Montespan. In attempting to accomplish this, he had drawn up a will that was to help destroy the monarchy. The Parlement of Paris, convened to nullify the will after his death, rediscovered a political power that it used to prevent all reforms during the ensuing reigns, thus making the Revolution inevitable.

Legacy

During his lifetime, Louis was flattered ceaselessly by his subjects, while foreign journals compared him to a bloodthirsty tiger. Voltaire portrayed his grandeur in his *Age of Louis XIV*. The duke de Saint-Simon, a member of his court whose *Mémoires* show equal proportions of literary genius and insincerity, dealt with him quite harshly, without denying his admiration for him. Later judgments of Louis varied according to the author's political views.

Louis XIV was the foremost example of the monarchy that brought France to its pinnacle. He has been accused of having dug the grave of that monarchy, particularly through his religious policy, his last will, and his isolation of the court from the people. These mistakes could have been corrected. His irremediable error was to have concentrated all the machinery of the state in his own person, thus making of the monarchy a burden beyond human strength.

His reign, compared by Voltaire to that of the Roman emperor Augustus, had both its strong and its weak points. Despite his victories and conquests, France lost her primacy under him. Yet the brilliance of his reign made up for his military policies. The aristocracy of Europe adopted the language and customs of the France where the Sun King had shone, although resentments lingered for a long time.

The king identified with his office to such an extent that it is difficult to find the individual. His harshness and courage, despotism and stoicism, prodigious pride and passion for order, megalomania and religion, intolerance and love of beauty can be understood only as a function of the exigencies of governing. He wanted France to be powerful, prosperous, and magnificent but was not overly concerned with the well-being of the French people. His armies committed atrocities, but the horrors of today have eclipsed them, and under his reign one did not see whole nations reduced to slavery, mass deportations, and genocide. When an Italian chemist offered him a bacteriological weapon, he gave him a pension on condition that he never divulge his invention.

Louis was sometimes a tyrant, but in the words of Voltaire: “His name can never be pronounced without respect and without summoning the image of an eternally memorable age.”

THE DUTCH WAR: SPANISH WAR OF SUCCESSION

Background

In the late 1690s, the declining health of childless King Charles II of Spain deepened the ongoing dispute over his succession. Spain was no longer a hegemonic power in Europe but the Spanish Empire—a vast confederation that covered the globe and was still the largest of the European overseas empires—remained resilient. Ultimately, the main rivals for the Spanish inheritance were the heirs and descendants of the Bourbon King Louis XIV of France and the Austrian Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I. However, the inheritance was so vast that its transference would dramatically increase either French or Austrian power which, due to the implied threat of European hegemony, was of the utmost importance to Europe as a whole.

Rival Claims and Partitions

The French claim derived from Louis XIV's mother, Anne of Austria (the older sister of Philip IV of Spain), and his wife, Maria Theresa (Philip IV's eldest daughter). France had the stronger claim, as it originated from the eldest daughters in two generations. However, their renunciation of succession rights complicated matters, although in the case of Maria Theresa, the renunciation was considered null and void owing to Spain's breach of her marriage contract with Louis. In contrast, no renunciations tainted the claims of the Emperor Leopold I's son Charles, Archduke of

Austria, who was a grandson of Philip III's youngest daughter, Maria Anna. The English and Dutch feared that a French or Austrian-born Spanish king would threaten the balance of power, and thus preferred the Bavarian Prince Joseph Ferdinand, a grandson of Leopold I through his first wife, Margaret Theresa of Spain (the younger daughter of Philip IV).

In an attempt to avoid war, Louis signed the Treaty of the Hague with William III of England in 1698. This agreement divided Spain's Italian territories between Louis's son le Grand Dauphin and the Archduke Charles, with the rest of the empire awarded to Joseph Ferdinand. The signatories, however, omitted to consult Charles II, who was passionately opposed to the dismemberment of his empire. In 1699, he re-confirmed his 1693 will that named Joseph Ferdinand as his sole successor, but the latter died six months later. In 1700, Louis and William III concluded a fresh partitioning agreement, the Treaty of London. It allocated Spain, the Low Countries, and the Spanish colonies to Archduke Charles. The Dauphin would receive all of Spain's Italian territories. On his deathbed in 1700, Charles II unexpectedly offered the entire empire to the Dauphin's second son, Philip, Duke of Anjou, provided it remained undivided. Anjou was not in the direct line of French succession, thus his accession would not cause a Franco-Spanish union. Louis eventually decided to accept Charles II's will, and Philip, Duke of Anjou, became King Philip V of Spain.

Although most European rulers accepted Philip as king, tensions mounted, mostly because of a series of Louis's decisions. Louis's actions enraged Britain and the Dutch

Republic. With the Holy Roman Emperor and the petty German states, they formed another Grand Alliance. French diplomacy, however, secured Bavaria, Portugal, and Savoy as Franco-Spanish allies. Around the same time, Louis decided to acknowledge James Stuart, the son of James II, as king of England on the latter's death, infuriating William III. While William died in March 1702, the Austrians, the Dutch, and English allies formally declared war in May 1702.

War of the Spanish Succession

By 1708, the Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene of Savoy had secured victory in the Spanish Netherlands and in Italy and defeated Louis XIV's ally Bavaria. The Allies suffered a Pyrrhic victory at the 1709 Battle of Malplaquet, with 21,000 casualties, twice that of the French. French forces elsewhere continued to fight despite their defeats. The Allies were definitively expelled from central Spain by the Franco-Spanish victories at the Battles of Villaviciosa and Brihuega in 1710. France faced invasion, but the unity of the allies broke first. With the Grand Alliance defeated in Spain and its casualties and costs mounting and aims diverging, the Tories came to power in Great Britain in 1710 and resolved to end the war. Eventually, France recovered its military pride with the decisive victory at Denain in 1712. Yet French and British ministers prepared the groundwork for a peace conference, and in 1712 Britain ceased combat operations. The Dutch, Austrians, and German states fought on to strengthen their own negotiating position, but, defeated by Marshal Villars, they were soon compelled to accept Anglo-French mediation.

Peace Treaties

The 1713 Treaty of Utrecht recognized Louis XIV's grandson Philip, Duke of Anjou, as King of Spain (as Philip V), thus confirming the succession stipulated in the will of Charles II. However, Philip was compelled to renounce for himself and his descendants any right to the French throne. The Spanish territories in Europe were apportioned: Savoy received Sicily and parts of the Duchy of Milan, while Charles VI (the Holy Roman Emperor and Archduke of Austria) received the Spanish Netherlands, the Kingdom of Naples, Sardinia, and the bulk of the Duchy of Milan. Portugal had its sovereignty recognized over the lands between the Amazon and Oyapock rivers, in Brazil. In addition, Spain ceded Gibraltar and Minorca to Great Britain and agreed to give to the British the Asiento, a monopoly on the oceanic slave trade to the Spanish colonies in America. In North America, France ceded to Great Britain its claims to Newfoundland, the Hudson's Bay Company, the Acadian colony of Nova Scotia, and the formerly partitioned island of Saint Kitts.

After the signing of the Utrecht treaties, the French continued to be at war with Emperor Charles VI and with the Holy Roman Empire until 1714, when hostilities were ended with the Treaties of Rastatt and Baden. Spain and Portugal remained formally at war with each other until the Treaty of Madrid of February 1715, while peace between Spain and Emperor Charles VI, unsuccessful claimant to the Spanish crown, came only in 1720 with the signing of the Treaty of The Hague.

The War of the Spanish Succession brought to an end a long period of major conflict in Western Europe. The partition of the Spanish Monarchy had secured the balance of power, and the conditions imposed at Utrecht helped to regulate the relations between the major European powers over the coming century.

William of Orange and the Grand Alliance

William III's main goals in the conflict over the Spanish succession were to ensure the Protestant accession in England and curb the power of France and Louis XIV.

Key Points

- As William III's life drew towards its conclusion, he, like many other European rulers, was concerned with the question of succession to the throne of Spain. He sought to prevent the Spanish inheritance from going to the descendants of either Louis XIV or Leopold I, as he feared this would upset the European balance of power.
- Fearing the growing strength of the Holy Roman Empire, Louis XIV turned to William. The two signed two treaties partitioning Spain, but Charles II of Spain's decision to choose Louis's grandson as his successor made Louis ignore his treaty with England.
- While the Tory-dominated House of Commons was keen to prevent further conflict, to William III, France's growing

strength made war inevitable. From his perspective, losing the hard-won securities overturned the work of the last twenty years.

- As tensions mounted, Britain and the Dutch Republic grew enraged by Louis's actions and decisions. With the Holy Roman Emperor and the petty German states, they formed another Grand Alliance. Securing the Protestant succession and curbing Louis's ambitions was recognized by the Grand Alliance as one of England's main war aims.
- Before the War of the Spanish Succession was even declared, William died. His successor, Anne, continued William's policies to assure the Protestant succession in England and curb the French hegemony.
- The War of the Spanish Succession resulted in the partition of the Spanish Monarchy, which secured the balance of power and helped to regulate the relations between the major European powers over the coming century.

Key Terms

- **Grand Alliance:** A European coalition, consisting (at various times) of Austria, Bavaria, Brandenburg, the Dutch Republic, England, the Holy Roman Empire, Ireland, the Palatinate of the Rhine, Portugal, Savoy, Saxony, Scotland, Spain, and Sweden. The organization was founded in 1686 as the League of Augsburg in an attempt to halt Louis XIV of France's expansionist policies. After the Treaty of

Hague was signed in 1701, it went into a second phase as the Alliance of the War of Spanish Succession.

- **Treaty of London:** A 1700 treaty, known also as the Second Partition Treaty, attempting to restore the Pragmatic Sanction following the death of Duke Joseph Ferdinand of Bavaria. The Pragmatic Sanction had undermined the First Partition Treaty (the Treaty of Hague). Under the new Treaty, Archduke Charles (later Charles VI), the second son of the Emperor Leopold I, was to become king of Spain when Charles II died, and acquire her overseas colonies.
- **Treaty of Rastatt:** A peace treaty between France and Austria, concluded in March 1714 in the Baden city of Rastatt, that put an end to the state of war between them following the War of the Spanish Succession. The treaty followed the earlier Treaty of Utrecht of April 1713, which ended hostilities between France and Spain on the one hand, and Britain and the Dutch Republic on the other hand. A third treaty at Baden was required to end the hostilities between France and the Holy Roman Empire.
- **Treaty of Utrecht:** A series of individual peace treaties, rather than a single document, signed by the belligerents in the War of the Spanish Succession in the Dutch city of Utrecht in 1713. The treaties between several European states, including Spain, Great Britain, France, Portugal, Savoy, and the Dutch Republic, helped to end the war.
- **Treaty of Hague:** A 1698 treaty, known also as the First Partition Treaty, between England and France. The accord attempted to resolve who would inherit the

Spanish throne, proposing that Duke Joseph Ferdinand of Bavaria be the heir. Moreover, the agreement proposed that Louis, le Grand Dauphin, would get Naples, Sicily, and Tuscany, and Archduke Charles, the younger son of Emperor Leopold I, would get the Spanish Netherlands. Leopold, Duke of Lorraine, would take Milan, which in turn ceded Lorraine and Bar to the Dauphin.

William III of England and the Spanish Succession

William III (1650–1702) was sovereign Prince of Orange from birth, Dutch Stadtholder (*de facto* hereditary head of state) from 1672, and King of England, Ireland, and Scotland from 1689 until his death. As his life drew towards its conclusion, William, like many other European rulers, was concerned with the question of succession to the throne of Spain, which brought with it vast territories in Italy, the Low Countries, and the New World. The king of Spain, Charles II, had no prospect of having children, and among his closest relatives were Louis XIV and Leopold I, Holy Roman Emperor. William sought to prevent the Spanish inheritance from going to either monarch, as he feared it would upset the balance of power.

Partitions

Fearing the growing strength of the Holy Roman Empire, Louis XIV turned to William, his long-standing Protestant rival. England and the Dutch Republic had their own commercial, strategic, and political interests within the Spanish empire, and they were eager to return to peaceful commerce. Louis and William sought to solve the

problem of the Spanish inheritance through negotiation based on the principle of partition (at first without prior reference to the Spanish or Austrian courts), to take effect after the death of Charles II.

William and Louis agreed to the First Partition Treaty (Treaty of Hague), which provided for the division of the Spanish Empire: Duke Joseph Ferdinand of Bavaria would obtain Spain, while France and the Holy Roman Emperor would divide the remaining territories between them. However, when Joseph Ferdinand died of smallpox, the issue re-opened. In 1700, the two rulers agreed to the Second Partition Treaty (Treaty of London), under which the territories in Italy would pass to a son of the king of France and the other Spanish territories would be inherited by a son of the Holy Roman Emperor. This arrangement infuriated both the Spanish, who still sought to prevent the dissolution of their empire, and the Holy Roman Emperor, to whom the Italian territories were much more useful than the other lands. Unexpectedly, Charles II willed all Spanish territories to Philip, a grandson of Louis XIV. The French conveniently ignored the Second Partition Treaty and claimed the entire Spanish inheritance.

William III's Stand

The news that Louis XIV had accepted Charles II's will and that the Second Partition Treaty was dead was a personal blow to William III. However, after the exertions of the Nine Years' War, the Tory-dominated House of Commons was keen to prevent further conflict and restore normal commercial activity. Yet to William III,

France's growing strength made war inevitable. England also had its own interests in the Spanish Netherlands, and ministers recognized the potential danger posed by an enemy established to the east of the Strait of Dover who, taking advantage of favorable wind and tide, could threaten the British Isles. From William III's perspective, losing the hard-won securities overturned the work of the last twenty years.

Although the French king's ambitions and motives were not fully known, English ministers worked on the assumption that Louis XIV would seek to expand his territory and direct and dominate Spanish affairs. With the threat of a single power dominating Europe and overseas trade, London now undertook to support William III's efforts to reduce the power of France. As tensions mounted, Britain and the Dutch Republic grew enraged by Louis's actions and decisions. With the Holy Roman Emperor and the petty German states, they formed another Grand Alliance. This European coalition, consisting at various times of various European states, was originally founded in 1686 as the League of Augsburg. It was formed in an attempt to halt Louis XIV's expansionist policies. In 1701, it went into a second phase.

Even after the formation of the Grand Alliance, the French king continued to antagonize his European rivals. Around the same time as the Alliance was formed, the Catholic James II of England (VII of Scotland)—exiled in Saint-Germain since the Glorious Revolution—died, and Louis XIV recognized James II's Catholic son, James, as King James III of England. The French court insisted that granting James the title of King was a mere formality, but William and English ministers were indignant. Securing the

Protestant succession was soon recognized by the Grand Alliance as one of England's main war aims.

The War of the Spanish Succession

However, before the War of the Spanish Succession was even declared, William died. Anne, Mary II's younger sister and William's sister-in-law through his marriage to Mary, ascended to the British throne and at once assured the Privy Council of her two main aims: the maintenance of the Protestant succession and the reduction of the power of France. By the same token, Anne continued William's policies, and many leading statesmen of William's later years remained in office, which turned out fundamental to the success of the Grand Alliance in the early stages of the war.

The Austrians, the Dutch, and English allies formally declared war in May 1702. By 1708 the Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene of Savoy had secured victory in the Spanish Netherlands and in Italy, and had defeated Louis XIV's ally Bavaria. France faced invasion, but the unity of the allies broke first. With the Grand Alliance defeated in Spain and its casualties and costs mounting and aims diverging, the Tories came to power in Great Britain in 1710 and resolved to end the war. French and British ministers prepared the groundwork for a peace conference, and in 1712 Britain ceased combat operations. The Dutch, Austrians, and German states fought on to strengthen their own negotiating position, but, defeated by Marshal Villars, they were soon compelled to accept Anglo-French mediation. By the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) and the

Treaty of Rastatt (1714), the Spanish empire was partitioned between the major and minor powers. The Austrians received most of Spain's former European realms, but the Duke of Anjou retained peninsular Spain and Spanish America, where, after renouncing his claim to the French succession, he reigned as King Philip V. The European balance of power was assured.

The Peace of Utrecht

The Treaty of Utrecht, which initiated the end of the War of the Spanish Succession, strengthened the balance of power in Europe by securing two major goals: Louis XIV's acknowledgement of the Protestant succession in England, and safeguards to ensure that the French and Spanish thrones remained separate.

Key Points

- The War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714) was a European conflict triggered by the death of the last Habsburg king of Spain, Charles II, in 1700. As he had reigned over a vast global empire, the question of who would succeed him had long troubled ministers in capitals throughout Europe.
- The balance of victories and losses shifted regularly over the course of the war, with both sides exhausted militarily and financially. As early as 1710, the Tories initiated secret talks with the French, seeking mutual ground whereon Great Britain and France could dictate peace to the rest of Europe.

- The Congress of Utrecht opened in 1712, but it was not accompanied by an armistice. One of the first questions discussed was the nature of the guarantees to be given by France and Spain that their crowns would be kept separate.
- The treaty, which was in fact a series of separate treaties, secured Britain's main war aims: Louis XIV's acknowledgement of the Protestant succession in England, and safeguards to ensure that the French and Spanish thrones remained separate.
- A series of separate treaties signed between 1714 and 1720 ended conflicts that continued in the aftermath of Utrecht between states involved in the War of the Spanish Succession.
- Utrecht marked the rise of Great Britain under Anne and later the House of Hanover and the end of the hegemonic ambitions of France. It also secured the balance of power and helped to regulate the relations between the major European powers over the coming century.

Key Terms

- **War of the Spanish Succession:** A major European conflict of the early 18th century (1701/2–1714) triggered by the death in 1700 of the last Habsburg king of Spain, Charles II. The Austrians, the Dutch, and English allies formally declared war against France and its allies in May 1702.
- **Grand Alliance:** A European coalition consisting (at various times) of Austria, Bavaria, Brandenburg, the Dutch Republic, England, the Holy Roman Empire,

Ireland, the Palatinate of the Rhine, Portugal, Savoy, Saxony, Scotland, Spain, and Sweden. The coalition was founded in 1686 as the League of Augsburg in an attempt to halt Louis XIV of France's expansionist policies. After the Treaty of Hague was signed in 1701, it went into a second phase as the Alliance of the War of Spanish Succession.

- **treaties of Rastatt and Baden:** Two peace treaties that in 1714 ended ongoing European conflicts following the War of the Spanish Succession. The first treaty, signed between France and Austria in the city of Rastatt, followed the earlier Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, which ended hostilities between France and Spain on the one hand, and Britain and the Dutch Republic on the other hand. The second treaty, signed in Baden, was required to end the hostilities between France and the Holy Roman Empire.
- **Asiento:** The permission given by the Spanish government to other countries to sell people as slaves to the Spanish colonies, between 1543 and 1834. In British history, it usually refers to the contract between Spain and Great Britain created in 1713 that dealt with the supply of African slaves for the Spanish territories in the Americas.

Background: The War of the Spanish Succession

The War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714) was a European conflict triggered by the death of the last Habsburg King of Spain, Charles II, in 1700. He had reigned over a vast global empire and the question of who would succeed him had long troubled

ministers in capitals throughout Europe. Attempts to solve the problem by partitioning the empire between the eligible candidates from the royal Houses of France (Bourbon), Austria (Habsburg), and Bavaria (Wittelsbach) ultimately failed, and on his deathbed Charles II fixed the entire Spanish inheritance on Philip, Duke of Anjou, the grandson of King Louis XIV of France. With Philip ruling in Spain, Louis XIV would secure great advantages for his dynasty, but some statesmen regarded a dominant House of Bourbon as a threat to European stability, jeopardizing the balance of power.

To counter Louis XIV's growing dominance, England, the Dutch Republic, and Austria—together with their allies in the Holy Roman Empire—re-formed the Grand Alliance (1701) and supported Emperor Leopold I's claim to the Spanish inheritance for his second son, Archduke Charles. By backing the Habsburg candidate (known to his supporters as King Charles III of Spain) each member of the coalition sought to reduce the power of France, ensure their own territorial and dynastic security, and restore and improve the trade opportunities they had enjoyed under Charles II.

Peace Talks

The balance of victories and losses shifted regularly over the course of the war, with both sides exhausted militarily and financially, also as a result of a series of earlier wars waged in Europe. As early as August 1710, the Tories initiated secret talks with the French, seeking mutual ground whereon Great Britain and France could dictate peace to the rest of Europe. France and Great Britain had come to terms in October 1711, when the

preliminaries of peace had been signed in London. The preliminaries were based on a tacit acceptance of the partition of Spain's European possessions.

The Congress of Utrecht, opened in January 1712, followed, but it was not accompanied by an armistice (only in August did Britain, Savoy, France, and Spain agree to a general suspension of arms). One of the first questions discussed was the nature of the guarantees to be given by France and Spain that their crowns would be kept separate, but matters did not make much progress until July, when Philip signed a renunciation. With Great Britain and France having agreed upon a truce, the pace of negotiation quickened and the main treaties were finally signed in April 1713.

Treaty of Utrecht

The treaty, which was in fact a series of separate treaties, secured Britain's main war aims: Louis XIV's acknowledgement of the Protestant succession in England and safeguards to ensure that the French and Spanish thrones remained separate. In North America, where the War of the Spanish Succession turned into a war over colonial gains, Louis XIV ceded to Britain the territories of Saint Kitts and Acadia and recognized Britain's sovereignty over Rupert's Land and Newfoundland. In return, Louis XIV kept the major city of Lille on his northern border, but he ceded Furnes, Ypres, Menin, and Tournai to the Spanish Netherlands. He also agreed to the permanent demilitarization of the naval base at Dunkirk. The Dutch received their restricted barrier in the Spanish Netherlands and a share of the trade in the region with Britain. Prussia gained some

disputed lands and Portugal won minor concessions in Brazil against encroachments on the Amazon from French Guiana. In addition, Spain ceded Gibraltar and Minorca to Great Britain and agreed to give to the British the Asiento, a monopoly on the oceanic slave trade to the Spanish colonies in America. Above all, though, Louis XIV had secured for the House of Bourbon the throne of Spain, with his grandson, Philip V, recognized as the rightful king by all signatories.



First edition of the the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht between Great Britain and Spain in Spanish (left), and a later edition in Latin and English

The treaties, signed in the Dutch city of Utrecht, were concluded between the representatives of Louis XIV of France and his grandson Philip V of Spain on one hand, and representatives of Anne of Great Britain, Victor Amadeus II of Sardinia, John V of Portugal, and the United Provinces of the Netherlands on the other.

Aftermath

Utrecht marked the rise of Great Britain under Anne and later the House of Hanover and the end of the hegemonic ambitions of France. The lucrative trading opportunities afforded to the British were gained at the expense of Anne's allies, with the Dutch forgoing a share in the Asiento and the Holy Roman Empire ceding Spain to Philip V and being forced to reinstate the Elector of Bavaria. After the signing of the Utrecht treaties, the French continued to be at war with the Holy Roman Empire until 1714, when hostilities ended with the treaties of Rastatt and Baden. Spain and Portugal remained formally at war with each other until the Treaty of Madrid of February 1715, while peace between Spain and Emperor Charles VI, unsuccessful claimant to the Spanish crown, came only in 1720 with the signing of the Treaty of The Hague.

Weakened Spain eventually grew in strength under Philip V, and the country would return to the forefront of European politics. With neither Charles VI nor Philip V willing to accept the Spanish partition, and with no treaty existing between Spain and Austria, the two powers would soon clash in order to gain control of Italy, starting with a brief war in 1718. However, the War of the Spanish Succession brought to an end a long period of

major conflict in western Europe; the partition of the Spanish Monarchy had secured the balance of power, and the conditions imposed at Utrecht helped to regulate the relations between the major European powers over the coming century.

Reforms, 1763–80

Maria Theresa's second period of reform was more important than the first, because it carried with it elements of centralization and change that were portents of the kind of government, society, and economy that would emerge in the 19th century and mature in the 20th. As modern as some of these elements were, the government that introduced them was not thinking of long-range goals but was dealing with immediate problems, the most important being recovery from the Seven Years' War. The area requiring urgent attention was finance. The cost of the Seven Years' War had added so much debt to the treasury that, for the remainder of Maria Theresa's reign, servicing that debt while providing for the costs of defense and governmental operations became the obsession of many of her advisers.

Financial need led Maria Theresa and her statesmen into other fields. All realized that financial recovery to a great extent depended on an improved economy, and they introduced a number of measures to make it better. Foreign workers and artisans with skills in the manufacture of various articles were recruited from the Low Countries, the Italian lands, and Germany and settled throughout the monarchy. Farmers came from western Europe for settlement in some of the more remote lands of the monarchy that had been badly depopulated, mainly in southern and eastern Hungary. Some important sectors of the economy, such as textiles and iron making, were freed from guild restrictions. And in 1775 the government created a customs union out of most of the crown lands of the

monarchy, excluding some of the peripheral lands and the kingdom of Hungary, which was not joined to Austria in a customs union until 1851.

The basically mercantilist policy of Charles VI's reign and earlier was revised in line with the influence of physiocratic and so-called populationist theories (*see* physiocrat). Thenceforward human labour, and not precious metal, was gradually to become the yardstick of national wealth. This led, on the one hand, to restrictions on emigration and, on the other, to an easing of some imports that were not considered competitive with domestic industries.

Financial and economic reforms also had an impact upon society. Maria Theresa's government was fully aware that most taxes came from society's lower elements, and so it was eager to make certain that those lower elements had the wherewithal to bear their burden. In 1767 she imposed a law on Hungary regulating the rights and duties of the serfs and their lords with the intent of bettering the condition of the peasants, which was not good at all. This law suffered somewhat because the lords themselves were responsible for implementing it, but it was later codified into the Hungarian statutes in 1790–91 and remained the basic law regarding the status of the serfs until their final emancipation in 1848. In response to a serf revolt in 1774 protesting not only oppression but also hunger, Maria Theresa issued a law in Bohemia in 1775 that restricted the aristocratic practice of exploiting the work obligations of the peasantry. She also had plans drawn up to change the dues of the peasantry from various forms of service to a

strictly rent-paying system. Such a system was introduced on lands owned by the crown, but she did not enforce its extension to privately held lands. (*See also* serfdom.)

Maria Theresa also introduced a system of public education. The motivation for this reform came from concern both that the Roman Catholic Church in Austria was no longer maintaining public morality properly and that certain changes in the 18th-century economy required that Austria provide a better-educated work force. It is often assumed that the great mass of the people in Austria at this time were serfs working on the lords' lands, owing various work and money dues, and thus—while suffering oppression—at least forming a fairly stable society. In fact, by the late 18th century the vast majority of the rural population was made up of cottars, gardeners, and lodgers who owed minimal feudal duties and who depended on nonagricultural occupations for their survival. These people represented a proto-industrial work force, but they also represented an ignorant and potentially ill-disciplined rural population. Compulsory education was a method of instilling a good work ethic and a sense of morality in them. In 1774 Maria Theresa issued the General School Regulation for the Austrian lands, establishing a system of elementary schools, secondary schools, and normal schools to train teachers. The implementation of this regulation was difficult owing to a lack of teachers, resistance on the part of lords and peasants alike, and a shortage of funds. Despite these obstacles, however, 500 such schools had opened by 1780.

Foreign affairs, 1763–80

The great change in Maria Theresa's foreign policy after 1763 was her reconciliation to the loss of Silesia. Although as a result Maria Theresa and her advisers focused their attention for the most part on domestic affairs, a few foreign matters offered the monarchy opportunities for territorial gain and in two cases carried the threat of renewed warfare. In 1768 the old matter of the fate of the Ottoman Empire appeared again, this time in the form of a Russo-Turkish war and the possibility that Russia would not simply defeat the now-decaying Ottoman state but would replace it as the Habsburg neighbour in the southeast, a condition the Habsburgs wanted to prevent even at great cost. By 1771 Kaunitz was so fearful that this possibility was becoming a probability that he recommended that Austria form an alliance with the Turks to fight the Russians, an idea resisted by Maria Theresa, who still regarded the Turks as infidel predators in Europe. (*See also* Russo-Turkish wars.)

The threat of war diminished, however, owing to the intervention of Frederick II, who suggested as a solution to the crisis the annexation of Polish territory by the three great eastern European powers and the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire in its entirety in Europe. Austria agreed to this suggestion, although Maria Theresa herself did so most reluctantly. She believed that the difficulties she had had at the beginning of her reign had been brought on by the refusal of the European powers to respect the territorial integrity of their fellows and that, by agreeing to the partition of Poland, she was in fact endorsing the same kind of cynical, parasitical policy that had caused her such

grief and that she had regarded as so heinous in 1741. However, as Kaunitz warned her, refusal to take part would not only continue the threat of war but also weaken the monarchy relative to its two powerful neighbours, who had no compunction about adding land and taxpayers to their rolls while Austria received nothing. Consequently, in 1772, Austria, Prussia, and Russia participated in the First Partition of Poland, which added the Polish province of Galicia to the monarchy. (*See also* Poland, Partitions of.)

In 1775, following the initiative of Joseph II, Maria Theresa's son, who had joined her as coruler after the death of her husband, the monarchy wrested the province of Bukovina from the Turks. The province served as a convenient connection between Galicia and Transylvania.

In 1778 one of Kaunitz's initiatives, to trade the distant Austrian Netherlands for nearby Bavaria, led to a third war with Prussia. This War of the Bavarian Succession, however, featured virtually no military contact between the two powers, because Maria Theresa, who for a time had left most of the policy making to her chancellor and her son, intervened directly with her old enemy Frederick II and concluded with him the Treaty of Teschen. The treaty resulted in a few minor territorial adjustments—especially the addition of Bavarian territories east of the Inn River to Upper Austria—but above all in the canceling of the proposed swap of the Austrian Netherlands for Bavaria.

Early reign of Joseph II, 1780–85

Maria Theresa died in 1780 and was followed by Joseph II. The problem of succession had caused Maria Theresa considerable grief in her early years, and she had vowed to create not only governmental institutions to protect her lands but familial ones as well, most notably by making certain that there would never again be a shortage of Habsburgs to rule the monarchy (after her marriage, the official name of the family changed from Habsburg to Habsburg-Lorraine). She gave birth to 16 children, the oldest male being Joseph. Upon the death of Francis I in 1765, Joseph had become emperor and co-regent, but Maria Theresa kept most of the authority in her hands, a condition that led to frequent clashes between the strong-willed mother and the strong-willed son.

When Joseph became sole ruler, he was determined to implement his own policies. One was broadening church reform. Joseph's role as church reformer has been the subject of considerable debate. In Austrian history the term Josephinism generally means subjecting the Roman Catholic Church in the Habsburg lands to service for the state, but the origins and extent of such subjection have generated controversy. Both Maria Theresa and Joseph were devoutly Roman Catholic, but both also believed in firm state control of ecclesiastical matters outside of the strictly religious sphere. To improve the economy, Maria Theresa ordered restrictions on religious holidays and prohibited the taking of ecclesiastic vows before the 24th birthday. She insisted that clerics be subject to the jurisdiction of the state in nonecclesiastical matters and that the acquisition of land by the

church be controlled by the government. She took action against the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), but only in 1774, after the pope had ordered its suppression.

Joseph's most radical measures in church matters were the Edict of Toleration (1781) and his monastic reforms. The edict and the legislation attached to it gave Lutherans, Calvinists, and Orthodox Christians near equality with Roman Catholics and gave Jews the right to enter various trades as well as permission to study at universities. In this respect, the difference between Joseph and his mother was fundamental. While Maria Theresa regarded Protestants as heretics and Jews as the embodiment of the Antichrist, Joseph respected other Christian denominations, believed Jews did good service for the state, and had at least entertained the thought of an Austrian church independent of Rome.

As to the monasteries, Joseph held that institutions not engaged in useful work for the community—above all agriculture, care of the sick, and education—should be dissolved. Consequently, about a third of the Austrian monasteries ceased to exist, their former members being ordered to learn skills adapted to secular life. The property of the dissolved institutions was used to pay for the upkeep of parishes and to finance the establishment of new parishes.

Control of church discipline and church property were further tightened by Joseph; seminaries for the training of the clergy were secularized. He even tried, without success, to simplify the Roman Catholic liturgy. Many of his religious policies were discontinued

in the reaction that followed, but the Edict of Toleration and the monastic reforms remained.

Another of Joseph's famous reforms was the abolition of serfdom, which was not quite a total abolition but certainly changed considerably the status of the peasants. In November 1781 he issued a decree allowing any peasant to move away from his village, to engage in any trade of his choosing, and to wed whomever he wished, all without asking permission of his lord. Labour service required of a peasant's children was abolished, except for orphans. Initially these new freedoms applied only to the lands of the Bohemian crown, but over the next few years they were applied to the other Austrian lands and in 1785 to Hungary, the land that had been exempt from most reforms in the Theresian period. Joseph issued decrees providing for peasant appeals to the central government for redress of grievances; this was to make certain that the feudal courts, controlled by the lords, could not sabotage these reforms by issuing decisions against peasants who wanted to exercise their new rights. Such changes were preludes to Joseph's most daring reform, a proclamation in 1789 that all land, whether held by nobleman or commoner, would be taxed at the same rate of $12 \frac{2}{9}$ percent of its appraised value and that all dues and services paid by a peasant to his lord would now be commuted to a cash payment not to exceed $17 \frac{2}{9}$ percent of the peasant's production.

To muster popular support for these and other reforms, Joseph II in 1781 also substantially eased official censorship, which had been a characteristic of Theresian rule that had undergone a good bit of criticism even in the 18th century. His immediate

purpose was to generate support for his religious policies by unleashing those popular writers eager to condemn Roman Catholic clericalism and especially the pope, and for the first few years he was not disappointed. These very writers soon began to find fault with Joseph's policies, however, and the emperor began to respond in ways that reduced considerably the initial liberalization. Censorship was reimposed, and in 1786 he issued secret instructions to the police to concentrate their attention on monitoring public opinion at all levels of society. By 1789 the police reports contained almost exclusively news on agitators and potential unrest.

Late reign of Joseph II, 1785–90

Toward the end of Joseph's reign, there was indeed increasing dissatisfaction. Religious elements were unhappy with many of his reforms, and both lords and peasants were apprehensive about what his agricultural changes would mean for their future. Moreover, a few other policies had inspired resistance. In 1784 he informed the Hungarian government that its official language, Latin, was not effective for modern government and, since Hungarian was spoken by only part of the population of that kingdom, that the language of government from then on would be German. That language would be used in the central offices immediately, in the county offices after one year, and in the local offices after three. Government employment and even membership in the Hungarian Diet would be open to German speakers only. Although it was designed to facilitate administration, many Hungarians interpreted this language ruling to be a threat to their entire culture and spoke out enthusiastically against it. To add to the

Hungarians' horror, Joseph refused to submit to a coronation in Hungary lest he have to swear to uphold laws that he did not wish to, and then he had the sacred crown of the kingdom moved to Vienna.

By 1787 resistance to Joseph and his government was intensifying. One Habsburg possession that had escaped reforms during the reign of Maria Theresa and Joseph was the Austrian Netherlands, which ruled itself under its own laws. In January and March 1787 Joseph simply swept away the constitution of the Austrian Netherlands and announced that from then on it would be ruled according to absolutist principles, just like the other provinces of the monarchy. Resistance simmered in the Austrian Netherlands until 1789, when it boiled over into open revolt, forcing the administration there to flee to safety in the duchy of Luxembourg. By that time there also were rumours of rebellion in Hungary and in Galicia, and for a period it appeared as if revolution might erupt in many parts of the monarchy.

Joseph's reforms might not have generated as much opposition had it not been for his foreign policy. Joseph was not especially aggressive in foreign affairs, but he did follow the anti-Prussian advice of his and his mother's old chancellor, Kaunitz, and that advice ended in misfortune. Kaunitz firmly believed that Austria could check Prussia only with the help of Russia. Consequently, in 1781 he and Joseph negotiated with Catherine the Great a pact that provided for Russian help for Austria in case of war with Prussia. In exchange, Austria promised to help Russia in case of war with the Ottoman Empire. Confident of her diplomatic and military strength, Catherine

then engaged in a series of provocations toward the Turks that resulted in 1787 in a declaration of war by the sultan. Although Joseph had no real desire to participate in this war, his treaty obligations with Russia required him to do so. At first the war went poorly. In 1788 the Austrians waited for the Russians to take the offensive in Romanian lands—which they failed to do—only to be themselves attacked by the Turks and sent scurrying north from the Danube in an effort to reconsolidate their lines. Joseph himself was present on this campaign, which did no one any good. He could not inspire his officers to be more aggressive, and he became quite ill, so much so that he returned to Vienna in late 1788 in an effort to recover. The campaign in 1789 went much better, resulting in the Austrian conquest of the important fortress of Belgrade at the confluence of the Sava and Danube rivers and in a joint Austro-Russian offensive in Moldavia and Walachia that drove the Turks all the way to the Danube.

But by this time all the unfortunate consequences of Joseph's domestic and foreign policies were bearing down on him. The war itself caused an outpouring of popular agitation against his foreign policy, the people of the Austrian Netherlands rose in outright revolution, and reports of trouble in Galicia increased. Finally, it was Hungary that broke Joseph's spirit. In 1788 he had to convoke the old county assemblies to ask for recruits and supplies to fight the war. The noblemen who made up these assemblies replied with protests and demands that the old constitution be restored and that Joseph submit to coronation in the traditional Hungarian manner. Even the Hungarian

chancellery, the ministry in the central government in charge of Hungarian affairs, recommended that Joseph yield to these wishes of his constituents.

Faced with these difficulties, Joseph revoked many of the reforms that he had enacted earlier. In a letter of January 1790 he emphasized his good intentions in enacting his new laws in Hungary and then revoked all of them except the Edict of Toleration, the laws related to the status of peasants, and the monastic reforms. He agreed to call the Hungarian Diet—but not too soon, given the dangerous international situation—and he consented to return the crown to Hungary and to his own coronation as that country's king. The crowning never came to pass, however, for Joseph died the following month.

Conflicts with revolutionary France, 1790–1805

Joseph was succeeded by his younger brother, Leopold II. Leopold's reign (1790–92) was a short one, which many believe was quite unfortunate for the Habsburg monarchy because, had he lived, he might have been able to salvage many of Joseph's reforms. In addition, evidence indicates that he planned to introduce a measure of popular representation into the Habsburg government that might have given the monarchy greater stability as it encountered the challenges of industrialization, nationalism, liberalism, and democracy that became increasingly compelling in the next century.

Prior to his accession, Leopold had gained a considerable reputation as an enlightened prince of the Italian state of Tuscany, a land ruled directly by Maria

Theresa's husband and then passed to the second Habsburg son (*secundogeniture*). When he became emperor, Leopold saw as his primary task ending the war with the Turks as quickly as possible. That, he believed, would relieve a great deal of the strain in domestic matters so that he could slowly implement a reform program of his own.

By the time of Leopold's accession, the Turkish war had become somewhat complicated—not in a military sense but in a diplomatic one. In 1788 Prussia and Great Britain had formed a coalition to put pressure on Austria and Russia to conclude the war with little or no compensation. This pressure carried with it the threat of war if the two eastern empires did not comply. In 1789 Joseph had wanted to reach such an agreement, but he could not convince Kaunitz to do so, and Kaunitz still had great influence. Leopold, however, did not hesitate to cast aside the old chancellor's advice. Two weeks after he reached Vienna, Leopold notified the king of Prussia that he sought an accommodation based on the status quo ante, an accommodation reached in April 1790. The war was effectively over, although peace with the Turks was not concluded until August 1791 (Treaty of Sistova). (*See also* Jassy, Treaty of.)

Initially Leopold accepted the cancellation of many of Joseph's reforms and the increasing authority of the secret police under the guidance of Johann Anton, Graf (count) Pergen. But soon the new emperor began to twist this apparent reaction into something far more progressive. In 1790 and 1791 there came to him a number of petitions from the lower classes of society demanding redress of various grievances. Leopold welcomed these petitions and began to cite them as reasons for introducing some

changes in the nature of government, including providing greater representation for the lower orders in the provincial diets and placing the police under the rule of the law, a proposal that caused Pergen to resign. In fact, Leopold adopted a proposal of Joseph von Sonnenfels, an official often considered the leading enlightened political theorist in the monarchy, to make the police a service institution rather than an instrument of control. He put them in charge of local health measures and authorized them to settle minor disputes so that people would not have to go to law courts with petty arguments.

Apparently, in early 1792 Leopold was beginning to take steps to extend representation in the provincial diets to virtually all classes in society. Clearly he did not intend to establish a constitutional monarchy, but he believed that, by drawing the nonprivileged classes into the government, he could check the resistance of the privileged classes and at the same time create a constituency that would support an improved kind of enlightened absolutism. Whatever he had in mind, however, did not come to pass, for he died prematurely on March 1, 1792.

Succeeding Leopold was his much less able but longer-lived eldest son, Francis II (known as Holy Roman Emperor Francis II until 1806 and as Francis I, emperor of Austria, from 1804 to 1835). Francis's foremost problem was significantly different from those that had faced his father and uncle. The domestic situation was settled again, but foreign matters had become increasingly perilous owing to events in France. The French Revolution had erupted in the summer of 1789, and the initial Austrian policy had been essentially to leave France alone. Indeed, Leopold had at first made some approving

remarks about the changes in France, and Kaunitz had noted that at least France would not be a serious force in international affairs for some time. The event that changed these passive responses was the flight to Varennes, when King Louis XVI and his wife, Marie-Antoinette (the youngest daughter of Maria Theresa and therefore sister of Joseph and Leopold and aunt of Francis), fled Paris in June 1791 for the safety of the Austrian Netherlands. They reached the French border town of Varennes, where they were recognized and placed under arrest; later they were returned to Paris.

The flight to Varennes proved to monarchical Europe that, despite protestations to the contrary, the French king did not approve the course of the revolution and in fact had become a prisoner of it. As a result, Leopold and King Frederick William II of Prussia issued a joint declaration (the Declaration of Pillnitz, August 1791) expressing concern about the developments in France. The French government, now acting without the king, interpreted this declaration as a threat to its sovereignty and responded with a series of provocations—answered in kind by Austria and Prussia—that led to a French declaration of war on Austria in April 1792.

The declaration of war inaugurated a period of 23 years of almost continuous conflict (or preparation for conflict) between Austria and France (*see* French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars). During that time Austria and France fought five wars for a total of 14 years, and Austria lost all of them but the last. At one time (1809–12), Austria was stripped of all its Italian possessions, the Austrian Netherlands, its western German lands, its access to the Adriatic Sea, and the portion of Poland that it had acquired in the Third

Partition in 1795 (*see* Poland, Partitions of). In 1804 Francis added to his titles that of emperor of Austria, but he did so because he anticipated being stripped of his most venerated title of Holy Roman emperor, which he indeed was in 1806 at the insistence of Napoleon I (who had had himself declared emperor of France in 1804). French armies occupied Vienna twice, and in 1810 the Habsburgs had to endure the indignity of giving the hand of one of Francis's daughters, Marie-Louise, to Napoleon in marriage.

For the first two wars, that of the First Coalition (1792–97) and that of the Second Coalition (1799–1800), Austrian policy was guided by Franz Maria, Freiherr (baron) von Thugut, the only commoner to reach the rank of minister of foreign affairs in the history of the Habsburg monarchy. Thugut was an experienced diplomat and knew France very well, and he was convinced that the French Revolution represented a threat to the traditional European powers less in ideological terms than in terms of pure military might. He believed that the revolution had somehow reinvigorated an almost moribund French state and had resurrected its military power to a surprising—and dangerous—degree. Therefore, he looked upon the war against Revolutionary, and later Napoleonic, France as akin to the wars against France in the time of Louis XIV. In other words, what was required was a coalition of the great and small European powers to resist what was fundamentally French aggression.

Regardless of his interpretation of the France he was fighting, his efforts ended in failure. In the War of the First Coalition, both Prussia and Spain dropped out in 1795, and for the next two years Austria carried the brunt of the struggle with some help from Britain. In

1797 serious defeats at the hands of the young Napoleon Bonaparte in Italy forced Austria to seek peace. By the Treaty of Campo Formio (October 1797), Austria gave up the Austrian Netherlands and Lombardy but acquired much of Venice.

Thugut was convinced that war would begin again soon, and for the next one he secured Russia as an ally. The War of the Second Coalition began in 1799 when Bonaparte was in Egypt and the French government was in crisis, and it looked for a time as if the Austro-Russian forces would win. However, a terrible defeat inflicted upon the coalition in Switzerland, followed by recrimination and blame heaped upon each ally by the other, resulted in Russia's leaving the alliance as the campaign of 1799 ended. Thugut convinced Francis to continue the struggle, which ended in significant Austrian defeats at Marengo in Italy and at Hohenlinden in Germany in 1800 and in the ouster of Thugut himself in early 1801. Austria sued for peace, which came in the Treaty of Lunéville (February 1801), by which Austria agreed to the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France (originally a provision of the Treaty of Campo Formio) and recognized French domination of the Austrian Netherlands, Switzerland, and Italy.

From 1801 to 1805, the Austrian government again focused on internal reform, especially in finances. The ongoing wars had cost a great deal of money, and the debt had risen to an astonishing degree. However, most of the expenses of the wars had been paid for by printing paper money, massive amounts of which were in circulation by 1801. Most merchants had accepted this paper money at face value during much of the 1790s, and there is evidence that some of it was invested in technology and industry, suggesting that

Austria enjoyed at this time its first hint of industrial revolution. Unfortunately, by 1801 merchants were doubting the value of the currency they received, and inflation assumed serious proportions. From 1801 to 1805 many proposals were advanced to reduce the debt and curb inflation, but none succeeded in doing so.

The other major area of reform was military, and here hope for success seemed higher because the genuine Austrian military hero of the time, Archduke Charles, brother of the emperor, undertook the task of improving the armed forces. He reduced the time of service for all ranks, curbed harsh disciplinary measures, and introduced a number of administrative changes. Yet he firmly believed that an army of long-serving and well-drilled enlisted men was the key to success, and he did not advocate the introduction of the draft that had led to such an incredible increase in the size of the French armies since 1794.

Conflicts with Napoleonic France

When the Austrians took the field against the French in 1805, the army was still inadequately equipped, insufficiently trained, under strength, and indifferently led. The war itself had come about owing to miscalculations by the foreign ministers, who firmly believed that an alliance with Russia in late 1804 would deter rather than encourage Napoleon from attacking either of the eastern empires. Napoleon had gathered his major force along the French Atlantic coast for a possible invasion of Great Britain, and the Austrian statesmen believed that, even should they receive news that Napoleon was

marching east, the Austrian and Russian armies could easily unite before he could bring his forces to central Europe.

They were wrong. In one of his most brilliant strategic moves, Napoleon marched his army quickly into Germany (and not into Italy, where the Austrians had anticipated he would go and where Archduke Charles had collected the largest Habsburg force). Napoleon surrounded an Austrian army at the city of Ulm, compelled it to surrender (see Ulm, Battle of), and advanced to Vienna itself, which he took in November 1805. He then moved into Moravia, to Vienna's northeast, where he met a remnant of the Austrian army and the oncoming Russians. He defeated both at the famous Battle of Austerlitz on December 2, 1805. Austria concluded peace immediately (Treaty of Pressburg, December 26, 1805), while Russia continued the war. In this treaty Austria gave up Venice to Napoleon's Italian kingdom, Tirol to Bavaria, and a number of other lands to Napoleon's clients. It did receive the former archbishopric of Salzburg (secularized in 1803); however, this territory would come under French administration (1809–10) and then Bavarian rule (1810–15) before finally becoming a permanent part of Austria after the Napoleonic Wars.

The next period of peace, 1806–09, again saw Austrian preparations for war, this time directed by a Rhineland German in Habsburg service, Johann Philipp, Graf (count) von Stadion. Like others before him, Stadion believed that Austria could not make any long-term accommodation with Napoleon because he represented a mortal danger to monarchical Europe. He believed also that Napoleon could be defeated only by large

armies, which he regarded as the secret to France's success. He thus proposed that the Austrians raise large armies, but he knew that the monarchy could not finance increases in the kind of armies that it had used in the past. Therefore, he proposed to supplement the regular troops with trained reserves and militia.

Stadion also realized, however, that, while costing less than long-serving regulars, reserves and militiamen needed reasons to fight. Consequently, he initiated martial appeals of various kinds tailored to various elements of society. The most famous of these was an appeal to nationalism, especially German nationalism. Some scholars point out the irony that the first official appeals to modern German nationalism came from the Habsburg government, which would be the primary foe of German nationalism in the 19th century and in some ways the victim of it in the 20th. But the Habsburg government under Stadion's direction did not limit its appeals to German nationalism to inspire its militia. It issued calls to patriotism, love of the emperor, provincialism, and xenophobia, plus appeals to Czechs, Slovenes, Hungarians, and Poles. Often the inspirational appeals to non-Germans were simply translations of the appeals to Germans with the appropriate words replaced with references to the correct national group.

In any case, it was for naught. Inspired by the popular resistance of the Spanish people to Napoleon, Stadion appealed to his own people in 1809 to go to war. The declaration came in April, and the French army occupied Vienna in May. However, on May 21–22, at Aspern, across the Danube from Vienna, Archduke Charles and the regular Austrian army inflicted the first defeat Napoleon was to suffer on the field of battle. They did not

take advantage of it, however; Napoleon regrouped and defeated Archduke Charles in July in the Battle of Wagram, just a few miles from Aspern. At the Treaty of Schönbrunn (October 1809), the monarchy surrendered considerably more territory but at least remained in existence.

After 1809, foreign policy and to some extent domestic policy passed into the hands of Klemens, Graf von Metternich (later given the title of Fürst [prince]), who would steer the monarchy's ship of state for the next 40 years. Unlike his predecessors in charge of foreign policy, Metternich believed that the only hope for the continued existence of the monarchy was to seek accommodation with Napoleon. It was he who arranged the marriage of Marie-Louise, and it was he who convinced Francis to send troops to take part in Napoleon's invasion of Russia in 1812.

Even when Napoleon suffered his thunderous defeat in Russia, Metternich was by no means eager to join his former allies in pursuing the defeated French. The main reason was that by this time Metternich had come to the conclusion that the key to the future security of the monarchy was not the restoration of the Europe of 1789 but rather the creation of an effective balance of power among the great European states. In his view, a completely victorious Russia would be just as great a threat to Austria as a completely victorious France. His goal was to arrange an agreement between Russia and Napoleonic France that would establish each one as a counterweight to the other while restoring an independent Habsburg monarchy and Prussia between them. Metternich sought this goal

through the first half of 1813, but Napoleon would agree to no concessions. So in August 1813, Austria formally declared war on France.

In the ensuing War of Liberation, Austria assumed the leading role. It provided the greatest number of troops to the allied forces, in addition to their commander, Karl Philipp, Fürst zu Schwarzenberg, and his brilliant staff officer, Joseph, Graf Radetzky. Metternich, however, never sought to vanquish Napoleon utterly, because he still distrusted Russian ambition as much as he did that of the French. He could never convince Napoleon to accept his views, however, and Austria in the end took part in Napoleon's defeat and exile to the island of Elba in 1814.

In September 1814 the congress to conclude the quarter century of war gathered in Vienna under Metternich's chairmanship. In terms of territory, Metternich gladly relinquished claims to the old Austrian Netherlands and the various Habsburg possessions in Germany for a consolidated monarchy at the centre of Europe. Austria regained its lands on the Adriatic and in the area that is now Austria, which it had previously lost, and it won considerable territory in Italy, including Lombardy, Venetia, Tuscany, and Modena.

But in Germany Metternich worked his greatest magic. He had no intention of restoring the old Holy Roman Empire but wished to create instead a system that could defend itself against both France and Russia and keep Prussia under control. His solution was the German Confederation, a body comprising 35 states and 4 free cities, with Austria

assuming the presidency. Such an institution, in Metternich's eyes, would give Austria far more influence in Germany than it had had under the old Holy Roman Empire.

While Metternich arranged central Europe as best he could, the four victorious powers—Austria, Prussia, Russia, and Great Britain—pledged to maintain the peace settlement, thereby establishing what is known as the Concert of Europe. Moreover, each monarch in Europe pledged allegiance to a Christian union of love, peace, and charity. This “Holy Alliance” was the brainchild of Alexander I of Russia; Metternich knew that it was little more than sentiment, but he welcomed it as a statement he could exploit to persuade other monarchs to do his bidding. With the end of the Congress of Vienna, Metternich became the “coachman of Europe” and would remain so for some time.

The Age of Metternich, 1815–48

The 33 years after the end of the Napoleonic Wars are called in Austria—and to some extent in all of Europe—the Age of Metternich. The chief characteristics of this age are the onset of the Industrial Revolution, an intensification of social problems brought on by economic cycles of boom and bust, an increasingly mobile population, more demands for popular participation in government, and the rising tide of nationalism, all watched over by governments intent upon preserving the social, political, and international status quo.

Metternich was the symbol of those forces eager to preserve the status quo. In the debate about his policies, some have argued that Metternich was little more than an oppressive, reactionary but opportunistic statesman, eager to snuff out sparks of revolution and

liberalism wherever he could detect them. Moreover, his much vaunted direction of the other powers in preserving the European order was really a mask for maintaining Habsburg influence in international affairs far out of proportion to the power that the monarchy actually possessed. Others contend that Metternich was one of the first philosophical conservatives, basing his social and political policies on coherent principles of orderly and cautious change in the context of good government and his diplomatic policies on maintaining stability by convincing the great powers of their mutual interests in preserving the European order as it then existed.

In international affairs, Metternich's Concert of Europe did not last long. Within a few years after the Congress of Vienna, it had become clear that the five great powers simply did not have sufficiently similar interests or goals to cooperate on every issue that came before them. After European congresses at Troppau, Laibach, and Verona (1820–22) granted permission to Austria to deal with revolutions in Italy and to France to do the same in Spain, Britain announced its withdrawal from the Concert of Europe, proclaiming that it wanted no more to do with the conservative Continental powers. Likewise, a revolution in France in 1830 weakened that country's link to Metternich's system, and he even had trouble with Russia, which was greatly upset by Ottoman persecution of Orthodox Christians during the movement for Greek independence (1821–30). (*See also* Troppau, Congress of; Laibach, Congress of; Verona, Congress of; July Revolution; Greek Independence, War of.)

In domestic matters, Metternich may have desired good government, but his reputation as an oppressor gained considerable credence after 1815. Protests against conservative policies by a gathering of German students (at the Wartburg Festival) in 1817 and the assassination of a conservative playwright (August von Kotzebue) in 1819 led, under Metternich's guidance, to the German Confederation's adopting the Carlsbad Decrees, a set of laws placing German and Austrian universities under strict control. Harsh censorship was imposed, and a commission was established at Mainz to investigate all student societies for subversives. Teachers, writers, and students suspected of liberal views were blacklisted throughout Germany and Austria. In 1824 the German Federal Diet renewed these provisions for an indefinite period and in 1832 and 1833 expanded them at Metternich's behest.

Metternich's name was also equated with suppressing liberalism and radicalism in Italy. In 1821 Austrian troops put down risings in Naples and Piedmont; in 1831 rebellions in Parma, Modena, and the Papal States likewise ended in suppression by Austrian soldiers. The Austrian regime became the nemesis of the Carbonari and Young Italy, two movements associated with Italian nationalism and republicanism that were enormously popular among educated Italians.

Whereas Metternich's name is often equated with oppression, he in fact was not eager to impose harsh and unrelenting rule in his own state or in others. Metternich believed that the best government was absolutism but that it was best because it guaranteed equal justice and fair administration for all. In the Habsburg monarchy and in the Italian

governments he saved from revolution, he advocated reforms that would provide good government for the people. In many places his appeals went unheeded—in the Papal States, for example—and even in Austria his influence in domestic affairs weakened considerably as time went on. In 1826 Emperor Francis appointed Franz Anton, Graf (count) von Kolowrat, minister of state, and he steadily reduced Metternich's influence in internal policy. In 1835 Francis died and was succeeded by his son Ferdinand, whose feeble-mindedness necessitated the creation of a "state conference" to rule the monarchy. It consisted of two of Ferdinand's uncles and his brother, along with Kolowrat and Metternich, as permanent members. High policy tended to drift, because the two archdukes were nonentities and Kolowrat and Metternich were usually at odds with one another.

While Metternich and his colleagues focused most of their attention on political activity, the monarchy was by no means standing still in economic and social matters. By the 1820s Austria was experiencing its first sustained industrial development. While many have regarded Austria's exclusion from the Zollverein, the German customs union created by Prussia in the 1820s and '30s, as permanently retarding Austria's economic advancement, in fact, by the 1840s, Austrian production of pig iron, coal, cotton textiles, woolens, and foodstuffs was growing at a faster rate than that of the Zollverein. Advocates of political liberalism may have suffered at this time, but those of economic liberalism were gaining ground. After Francis's death in 1835, practically all restrictions on new enterprises, especially those engaged in commerce, were lifted.

Most people still lived on the land, but even there changes were under way. As growing cities created markets for more and more agricultural goods, producers began to focus on agriculture for profit instead of for subsistence. Along with industrial crops such as sugar beets and flax, old crops such as wheat, vegetables, wine, and livestock were grown more and more for the commercial market. The social impact of these changes in agriculture became starkly apparent in 1848, when the final abolition of serfdom was encouraged by some of the landholding nobility, who were relying more and more on wage labour to work their estates and no longer wanted the obligations associated with having serfs.

Aiding these new economic efforts were the beginnings of an Austrian infrastructure of railroads and water transport. The first railroad on the European Continent appeared between Linz (Austria) and Budweis (now České Budějovice, Czech Republic); it was a horse-drawn railway between the Danube and the Moldau (Vltava) rivers, which in fact was a connection between the Danube and the Elbe river systems. In 1836 work began on a steam railway heading north from Vienna, and by 1848 the monarchy contained more than 1,000 miles (1,600 km) of track. Canals were not a feature of Habsburg transportation because of poor terrain, but steam navigation began on the Danube in 1830 and expanded quickly.

Revolution and counterrevolution, 1848–59

The year 1848 was a time of European-wide revolution. A general disgust with conservative domestic policies, an urge for more freedoms and greater popular participation in government, rising nationalism, social problems brought on by

the Industrial Revolution, and increasing hunger caused by harvest failures in the mid-1840s all contributed to growing unrest, which the Habsburg monarchy did not escape. In February 1848, Paris, the archetype of revolution at that time, rose against its government, and within weeks many major cities in Europe did the same, including Vienna. (*See 1848, Revolutions of.*)

As in much of Europe, the revolution of 1848 in the Habsburg monarchy may be divided into the three categories of social, democratic-liberal, and national, but outside Vienna the national aspect of the revolution fairly soon overshadowed the other two. On March 13, upon receiving news of the Paris rising, crowds of people, mostly students and members of liberal clubs, demonstrated in Vienna for basic freedoms and a liberalization of the regime. As happened in many cities in this fateful year, troops were called out to quell the crowds, shots were fired, and serious clashes occurred between the authorities and the people. The government had no wish to antagonize the crowds further and so dismissed Metternich, who was the symbol of repression, and promised to issue a constitution.

From that beginning to the end of October 1848, Vienna ebbed and flowed between revolution and counterrevolution, with one element or another gaining influence over the others. In mid-May the Habsburgs and their government became so concerned about the way matters were going that they fled Vienna, although they did return in August when it appeared that more-conservative elements were asserting control. The emperor issued a constitution in April providing for an elected legislature, but when the legislature met in

June it rejected this constitution in favour of one that promised to be more democratic. As the legislature debated various issues over the summer and autumn, the Habsburgs and their advisers regrouped both their confidence and their might, and on October 31 the army retook Vienna and executed a number of the city's radical leaders. By this time the legislature had removed itself to Kremsier (now Kromeríz, Czech Republic) in the province of Moravia, where it continued to work on a constitution. It finished its work there, issued its document, and was promptly overruled and then dismissed by the emperor.

Although the assembly in the end did not create a working constitution for Austria, it did issue one piece of legislation that had long-lasting influence: it fully emancipated the peasantry. The conservative regime that followed kept and implemented this law.

In other parts of the monarchy, the revolution of 1848 passed quickly through a liberal-democratic to a national phase, and in no place was this more evident or more serious than in Hungary. Joseph II's effort to incorporate Hungary more fully into the monarchy, along with the early 19th century's rising national awareness throughout Europe, had a profound impact upon the aristocratic Hungarians who held sway in the country. Modern nationalism made them even more intent on preserving their cultural traditions and on continuing their political domination of the land. Consequently, after 1815 the Hungarian nobility engaged in a number of activities to strengthen the Hungarian national spirit, demanding the use of Hungarian rather than Latin or German as the language of government and undertaking serious efforts to develop the country

economically. The revolution in Paris and then the one in Vienna in March 1848 galvanized the Hungarian Diet. Under the leadership of a young lawyer and journalist named Lajos Kossuth, the Hungarian Diet demanded of the sovereign sweeping reforms, including civil liberties and far greater autonomy for the Hungarian government, which would from then on meet in Pest (Buda and Pest were separate cities until 1873, when they officially merged under the name Budapest). Under great pressure from liberal elements in Vienna, the emperor acceded to these wishes, and the Hungarian legislators immediately undertook creating a new constitution for their land.

This new constitution became known as the March Laws (or April Laws) and was really the work of Kossuth. The March Laws provided for a popularly elected lower house of deputies, freedom for the “received religions” (i.e., excluding Jews), freedom of the press, peasant emancipation, and equality before the law. As the Hungarians set up their new national government based on these principles, they encountered from some of the minority nationalities living in their land the kind of resistance they had offered the Austrians. A characteristic of the new regime was an intense pride in being Hungarian, but the population in the Hungarian portion of the Habsburg monarchy was 60 percent non-Hungarian. And in 1848 all the talk about freedom and constitutions and protection of one’s language and culture had inspired many of these people as well. But Kossuth and his colleagues had no intention of weakening the Hungarian nature of their new regime; indeed, they made knowledge of Hungarian a qualification for membership in parliament and for participation in government. In other words, the new government seemed as

unsympathetic to the demands and hopes of its Serbian, Croatian, Slovak, and Romanian populations as Vienna had been to the demands of the Hungarians.

In March 1848 the Habsburgs made an appointment that would lead to war with the Hungarians; they selected as governor of Croatia Josip, Graf (count) Jelačić, well known for his devotion to the monarchy, for his dislike of the “lawyers’ clique” in Pest, and for his ability to hold the South Slavs in the southern portion of the monarchy loyal to the crown. Jelačić did not disappoint Vienna. One of his first acts was to reject all authority over Croatia by the new Hungarian government, to refuse all efforts by that government to introduce Hungarian as a language of administration, and to order his bureaucrats to return unopened all official mail from Pest. He also began negotiations with the leadership of the Serbs to resist Hungarian rule together.

From April to September 1848 the Hungarian government dealt with its minority nations and with the government in Austria on even terms, but then relations began to deteriorate. The return of the Habsburgs to Vienna in August, the more conservative turn in the government there that the return reflected, and Austrian military victories in Italy in July prompted the Habsburg government to demand greater concessions from the Hungarians. In September, military action against Hungary by Jelačić and his Croats prompted the Hungarian government to turn power over to Kossuth and the Committee of National Defense, which immediately took measures to defend the country. What then emerged was open warfare between regular Habsburg forces and Jelačić on the one hand and the Hungarians on the other.

The war was a bloody affair, with each side dominating at one time or another. In April 1849 the Hungarian government proclaimed its total independence from the Habsburgs, and in that same month the Austrian government requested military aid from Russia, an act that was to haunt it for years to come. Finally, in August 1849, the Hungarian army surrendered, and the land was put firmly under Austrian rule. Kossuth fled to the Ottoman Empire, and from there for years he traveled the world denouncing Habsburg oppression. In Hungary itself many rebel officers were imprisoned, and a number were executed.

A second serious national rising occurred in Italy. Since 1815 many Italians had looked upon the Habsburgs as foreign occupiers or oppressors, so when news of revolution reached their lands, the banner of revolt went up in many places, especially Milan and Venice. Outside the Habsburg lands, liberal uprisings also swept Rome and Naples. In Habsburg Italy, however, war came swiftly. In late March, answering a plea from the Milanese, the kingdom of Sardinia, the only Italian state with a native monarch, declared war on the emperor and marched into his lands.

The Habsburg government in Austria was initially willing to make concessions to Sardinia, but it was strongly discouraged from doing so by its military commander in Italy, the old but highly respected and talented Field Marshal Radetzky, who had been the Austrian chief of staff in the war against Napoleon in 1813–14. In July 1848 Radetzky proved the value of his advice by defeating the Sardinians at Custoza, a victory that helped restore confidence to the Habsburg government as it faced so many enemies.

Radetzky reimposed Habsburg rule in Milan and Venice, and in March 1849 he defeated the Sardinians once again when they invaded Austria's Italian possessions. (See Custoza, battles of.)

Besides the Hungarians and the Italians, the Slavic peoples of the monarchy also responded to the revolutionary surge, although with less violence than the other two. In June 1848 a Pan-Slav congress met in Prague to hammer out a set of principles that all Slavic peoples could endorse (see Pan-Slavism). The organizer of the conference was the great Czech historian František Palacký (most of the delegates were Czech), who not only had called for the cooperation of the Habsburg Slavs but also had endorsed the Habsburg monarchy as the most reasonable political formation to protect the peoples of central Europe. Upon being asked by the Germans to declare himself favourably disposed to their desire for national unity, he responded that he could not do so because it would weaken the Habsburg state. And in that reply he wrote his famous words: "Truly, if it were not that Austria had long existed, it would be necessary, in the interest of Europe, in the interest of humanity itself, to create it."

Unfortunately, the Pan-Slav congress met in a highly charged atmosphere, as young inhabitants of Prague likewise had been influenced by revolutions elsewhere and had taken to the streets. In the commotion, a stray bullet killed the wife of Field Marshal Alfred, Fürst (prince) zu Windischgrätz, the commander of the forces in Prague. Enraged, Windischgrätz seized the city, dispersed the congress, and established martial law throughout the province of Bohemia.

The Germans themselves also experienced a certain degree of national fervour, but in their case it was part of a general German yearning for national unification. Responding to calls for a meeting of national unity, in May 1848 delegates from all the German states met at Frankfurt to discuss a constitution for a united Germany. Made up primarily of the commercial and professional classes, this body was indeed distinguished and was looked upon by the German princes as an important gathering. To prove its respect for tradition, the Frankfurt parliament selected the emperor's uncle, Archduke Johann, as head of a provisional executive power and in September selected another Austrian, Anton, Ritter (knight) von Schmerling, as prime minister.

Despite this deference to Austria's prominent men, a major question the parliament addressed was whether to include Austria in the new Germany. Those who favoured doing so argued that a new Germany could accept the German-speaking provinces of the monarchy but not the non-German lands (the *Grossdeutsch*, or large German, position). Those against contended that the Austrian monarchy could never divide itself along ethnic lines and so favoured the exclusion of Austria altogether (the *Kleindeutsch*, or small German, position). Implicit in the latter position was that the new Germany would be greatly influenced if not dominated by Prussia, by far the most important German state next to Austria. In October 1848 the delegates agreed to invite the Austrian German lands to become part of the new Germany, but only if they were disconnected from non-German territory. This so-called compromise was really a victory for

the *Kleindeutsch* supporters, who knew that the Austrian government would reject the invitation because it would never willfully break the monarchy apart.

In the end neither position prevailed, because the Frankfurt parliament was unable to unify Germany. All the German states finally rejected its proposals, and in April 1849 it dissolved. Nonetheless, it had created the impression that, when the new Germany did emerge, it would do so under the aegis of Prussia and with the exclusion of Austria.

Neoabsolutist era, 1849–60

All things considered, the revolution across the empire had not accomplished much. Absolutism seemed firmly entrenched, and the political clock seemed to have been set back to the 18th century. And yet a regime so badly shaken as Austria's could not hope to rule unchallenged in the future. The unresolved social, constitutional, and national issues became more intense, and new changes were soon in the offing.

The period 1849–60 is called the Neoabsolutist era because it was the last effort by an Austrian emperor to provide good government by relying solely on bureaucratic effectiveness. In doing so, it was the legitimate descendant of the governments of Joseph II and Metternich. The emperor in this case was Francis Joseph, who in December 1848 had succeeded at the age of 18 to the throne in a deal engineered by Felix, Fürst (prince) zu Schwarzenberg, an able and iron-willed opponent of the 1848 revolutionaries and a proponent of strong central government. Francis Joseph had not been the heir, but Schwarzenberg contended that too many promises to revolutionaries

had been made in the name of Ferdinand and the true heir, Francis Joseph's father, Francis Charles, and so only his son could rule without making compromises. Francis Joseph thus became emperor and ruled for the next 68 years, dying in the midst of World War I at the age of 86.

Under Francis Joseph and Schwarzenberg, order was restored. Schwarzenberg died in 1852, and the new regime passed largely to the direction of Alexander, Freiherr (baron) von Bach, minister of the interior and a competent bureaucrat. Despite its reputation as a repressive instrument, Bach's government was not without positive accomplishments. It established a unified customs territory for the whole monarchy (including Hungary), composed a code for trades and crafts, completed the task of serf emancipation, and introduced improvements in universities and secondary schools. In this period, economic growth continued its slow but steady pace, which had characterized the monarchy before 1848 and would continue to do so after 1860.

The regime's policies on other matters were more typically reactionary. Freedom of the press as well as jury and public trials were abandoned, corporal punishment by police orders restored, and internal surveillance increased. The observation of the liberal reformer Adolf Fischhof that the regime rested on the support of a standing army of soldiers, a kneeling army of worshippers, and a crawling army of informants was exaggerated but not entirely unfounded. One of the more backward developments was the concordat reached with the papacy that gave the church jurisdiction in marriage questions, partial control of censorship, and oversight of elementary and secondary

education. Priests entrusted with religious education in the schools had the authority to see to it that instruction in any field, be it history or physics, did not conflict with the church's teachings.

The neoabsolutist regime came to an end because of its foreign policy. In the mid-1850s the matter that dominated the foreign offices of the European states was the Crimean War, a struggle that pitted an alliance system of Britain, France, the Ottoman Empire, and the Kingdom of Sardinia against Russia. Since the mid-18th century, Austrian statesmen had generally agreed that it was better to have as the monarchy's southeastern neighbour a weak Ottoman Empire than any strong power—especially Russia. So, in this war the monarchy declared its neutrality but also insisted that Russia not advance into the Ottoman provinces of Moldavia and Walachia, which lay to the east of the Austrian Empire. This policy had two deleterious results: it alienated Russia, which had helped the monarchy put down the Hungarian revolution, and it did not befriend France, which would in 1859 support Sardinia in its war of Italian unification against the Austrians.

It was the Austro-Italian war of 1859 that humiliated Austria and ended Bach's system. First securing support from Napoleon III of France, Sardinia provoked a woefully unprepared Austria into war and then invited France to come to the Italian kingdom's assistance. The Austrians suffered two major defeats at Magenta and Solferino and concluded peace. The monarchy gave up Lombardy and kept Venetia, but, more important, it lost its influence in Italy. The Habsburgs had no say in the events of 1860

and 1861 that led to the proclamation of a unified Italy under the rule of the kings of Sardinia. (*See also* Risorgimento.)

Constitutional experimentation, 1860–67

Internally, the defeats in Italy convinced Francis Joseph that neoabsolutism had failed. Clamour for economic, political, and even military rejuvenation became irresistible. In March 1860 Francis Joseph ordered that the Reichsrat, an empirewide, purely advisory council of state, be enlarged by the addition of 38 members proposed by the provincial diets and selected by the crown. Its main task was to advise the emperor on the composition of a new constitution. The body divided into two groups rather quickly. One, made up mostly of German-speaking delegates, wished to create a strong central parliament and to continue to restrict the power of the provincial governments. The other, made up of conservative federalists who were largely Hungarian, Czech, and Polish nobles, wished to weaken the central government and give considerable power to the provinces. The emperor sided with the federalists, who persuaded him to accept their position mainly with historical and not ethnic arguments, and he proclaimed by decree a constitution called the October Diploma (1860). The constitution established a central parliament of 100 members and gave it advisory authority in matters of finance, commerce, and industry. Authority in other internal matters was assigned to the provinces. Foreign policy and military issues remained the domain of the emperor.

No one was happy with the October Diploma. The German centralists opposed it for giving too much authority to the provinces, and the federalists, particularly the

Hungarians, opposed it for not restoring fully the old rights and privileges of the crown lands. Faced with such opposition, Francis Joseph abandoned the Diploma and four months later issued the February Patent (1861), officially a revision of the Diploma. This document provided for a bicameral system: an empirewide house of representatives composed of delegates from the diets and a house of lords consisting partly of hereditary members and partly of men of special distinction appointed for life. Furthermore, a separate parliamentary body for the non-Hungarian lands was established.

The February Patent restored much authority to the central government and so made the centralists happier, but it only antagonized further the federalists, now led enthusiastically by the Hungarians. Resistance was so great that by 1865 the constitution was considered unworkable, and Francis Joseph began negotiations with the Hungarians to revise it. In the meantime, a form of government by bureaucracy ran the country.

These constitutional issues received a significant jolt by another failure of Habsburg foreign policy. After the disbandment of the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1849, the German Confederation founded in 1815 had resumed its work, but the question of German unification had not gone away. In 1862 this issue gained an unlikely champion in the appointment of Otto von Bismarck as prime minister of Prussia and later chancellor of the German Empire. Bismarck was a Prussian patriot and a loyal subject of his king. While definitely not a German nationalist, he was determined to extend Prussia's power and authority into the German lands, and he knew that Prussia could expand its influence in Germany only at Austria's expense. From 1862 to 1866 he

conducted a remarkably deft foreign policy that succeeded in isolating Austria from possible allies in Europe.

By exploiting issues in the German Confederation, Bismarck was able in 1866 to force Austria into a position that could only be resolved by war. The conflict is known as the Seven Weeks' War or the Austro-Prussian War. On July 3, 1866, the two armies clashed in this struggle's only major Austro-Prussian battle, the Battle of Königgrätz, or Sadowa as it is known in Austrian histories. Although the battle was hard fought on both sides, the arrival of an extra Prussian force toward the end of the day decided it in favour of Prussia. Afterward, peace came quickly, because neither side wanted the war to continue. As Austria had been excluded from the future of Italy in 1859, so it was now excluded from the future of Germany. The German Confederation came to an end, and Prussia was allowed a free hand in reorganizing northern Germany as it wished (see North German Confederation). Moreover, Italy had joined Prussia against Austria and, although defeated on land and sea, received Venetia, Austria's last possession in Italy, for its loyalty. Internally, the war meant that the government had to reach a constitutional arrangement for the remainder of its possessions.

Karl A. Roeder Reinhold F. Wagnleitner

Austria-Hungary, 1867–1918

Ausgleich of 1867

The economic consequences of the defeat in the war of 1866 made it imperative that the constitutional reorganization of the Habsburg monarchy, under discussion since 1859, be brought to an early and successful conclusion. Personnel changes facilitated the solution of the Hungarian crisis. Friedrich Ferdinand, Freiherr (baron) von Beust (later Graf [count] von Beust), who had been prime minister of Saxony, took charge of Habsburg affairs, first as foreign minister (from October 1866) and then as chancellor (from February 1867). By abandoning the claim that Hungary be simply an Austrian province, he induced Emperor Franz Joseph to recognize the negotiations with the Hungarian politicians (Ferenc Deák and Gyula, Gróf [count] Andrassy) as a purely dynastic affair, excluding non-Hungarians from the discussion. On February 17, 1867, Franz Joseph restored the Hungarian constitution. A ministry responsible to the Hungarian Diet was formed under Andrassy, and in May 1867 the diet approved Law XII, legalizing what became known as the Ausgleich (“Compromise”). This was a compromise between the Hungarian nation and the dynasty, not between Hungary and the rest of the empire, and it is symptomatic of the Hungarian attitude that led Hungarians to refer to Franz Joseph and his successor as their king and never their emperor.

In addition to regulating the constitutional relations between the king and the Hungarian nation, Law XII accepted the unity of the Habsburg lands for purposes of conducting

certain economic and foreign affairs in common. The compromise was thus the logical result of an attempt to blend traditional constitutional rights with the demands of modern administration. In December 1867 the section of the Reichsrat representing the non-Hungarian lands of the Habsburg empire (known as the *engerer* Reichsrat) approved the compromise. Though after 1867 the Habsburg monarchy was popularly referred to as the Dual Monarchy, the constitutional framework was actually tripartite, comprising the common agencies for economics and foreign affairs, the agencies of the kingdom of Hungary, and the agencies of the rest of the Habsburg lands—commonly but incorrectly called “Austria.” (The official title for these provinces remained “the kingdoms and lands represented in the Reichsrat” until 1915, when the term “Austria” was officially adopted for them.)

Under the Ausgleich, both parts of the Habsburg monarchy were constitutionally autonomous, each having its own government and a parliament composed of an appointed upper and an elected lower house. The “common monarchy” consisted of the emperor and his court, the minister for foreign affairs, and the minister of war. There was no common prime minister and no common cabinet. Common affairs were to be considered at the “delegations,” annual meetings of representatives from the two parliaments. For economic and financial cooperation, there was to be a customs union and a sharing of accounts, which was to be revised every 10 years. (This decennial discussion of financial quotas became one of the main sources of conflict between the Hungarian and Austrian governments.) There would be no common citizenship, but such

matters as weights, measures, coinage, and postal service were to be uniform in both areas. There soon developed the so-called *gemeinsamer Ministerrat*, a kind of crown council in which the common ministers of foreign affairs and war and the prime ministers of both governments met under the presidency of the monarch. The common ministers were responsible to the crown only, but they reported annually to the delegations.

The Ausgleich for all practical purposes set up a personal union between the lands of the Hungarian crown and the western lands of the Habsburgs. The Hungarian success inspired similar movements for the restoration of states' rights in Bohemia and Galicia. But the monarch, who only reluctantly had given in to Hungarian demands, was unwilling to discontinue the centralist policy in the rest of his empire. Public opinion and parliament in Austria were dominated by German bourgeois liberals who opposed the federalization of Austria. As a prize for their cooperation in compromising with the Hungarians, the German liberals were allowed to amend the 1861 constitution known as the February Patent; the Fundamental Laws, which were adopted in December 1867 and became known as the December constitution, lasted until 1918. These laws granted equality before the law and freedom of press, speech, and assembly; they also protected the interests of the various nationalities, stating that

all nationalities in the state enjoy equal rights, and each one has an inalienable right to the preservation and cultivation of its nationality and language. The equal rights of all languages in local use are guaranteed by the state in schools, administration, and public life.

The authority of parliament was also recognized. Such provisions, however, were more a promise than a reality. Although parliament, for instance, did theoretically have the power to deal with all varieties of matters, it was, in any case, not a fully representative parliament (suffrage was restricted, and it was tied to property provisions until 1907). In addition, the king was authorized to govern without parliament in the event that the assembly should prove unable to work. Austrian affairs from 1867 to 1918 were, in fact, determined more by bureaucratic measures than by political initiative; traditions dating from the reign of Joseph II, rather than capitalist interests, characterized the Austrian liberals.

Domestic affairs, 1867–73

After the December constitution had been sanctioned, Franz Joseph appointed a new cabinet, which was named the “bourgeois ministry” by the press because most of its members came from the German middle class (though the prime minister belonged to the Austrian high aristocracy). In 1868 and 1869 that ministry was able to enact several liberal reforms, undoing parts of the concordat of 1855 between Austria and the papacy. Civil marriage was restored; compulsory secular education was established; and interconfessional relations were regulated, in spite of a strong protest from the Roman Catholic Church. In 1870 the Austrian government used the promulgation of the dogma of papal infallibility as pretext for the total abrogation of the concordat.

The progressive legislation of the bourgeois cabinet stood in sharp contrast to its inability to cope with the demands of the non-German nationalities. In 1868 the Czechs and the

Poles issued declarations demanding a constitutional status analogous to that of the Hungarians. The government in Vienna did give the Poles in Galicia a considerable amount of self-government, which was later used to Polonize the Ruthenian minority. In 1871 a ministry for Galician affairs was set up, and the Poles remained the staunchest supporters of the Austrian government well into World War I.

The bourgeois ministry was split into a liberal-centralist and a conservative-federalist faction; its members could not reach an agreement on policies to be adopted. The liberal members of the cabinet opposed Czech demands; the conservatives were willing to consider them. Franz Joseph, indignant because of the anticlerical policy of the liberals, dismissed his prime minister, Karl, Fürst (prince) von Auersperg, in 1868 and replaced him with the conservative Eduard, Graf (count) von Taaffe, his boyhood friend. A period of indecision nevertheless persisted. The emperor wavered between the liberals, whose anticlericalism and parliamentarianism he disliked but with whom he sympathized in their centralist German-oriented policy, and the conservatives, whose political legislation he favoured but who aroused his fears by their demands for federalization. Neither Taaffe nor his successors Leopold Hasner, Ritter (knight) von Artha (1870), and Alfred, Graf Potocki (1870–71), could solve the Czech problem.

The Franco-German War of 1870–71 temporarily diverted public attention from the Czech demands. Opinion was divided strictly along lines of nationality: Austro-Germans celebrated the victories of the Prussian army, whereas the Slavs were decidedly pro-French. The Austrian government remained neutral because conflicting international

interests had blocked Austro-French negotiations (which had culminated in a meeting of Franz Joseph and French emperor Napoleon III at Salzburg in 1867). The victory of Prussian chancellor Otto von Bismarck and the establishment of the German Empire under the leadership of the Prussian king gave finality to the results of the 1866 Austro-Prussian War. Austria was definitely excluded from the German scene, and a reorientation of dynastic interests seemed a logical consequence. Franz Joseph decided to explore the possibility of satisfying the Czechs with some measure of federalism. On February 5, 1871, he appointed as prime minister Karl Siegmund, Graf von Hohenwart, a staunch clericalist. The driving mind in Hohenwart's cabinet was the minister of commerce, Albert Schäffle, an economist whose socialism may not have appealed to the emperor but whose federalism did.

As a first step toward conciliation with the Czechs, the cabinet dissolved parliament and the provincial diets. When the Bohemian elections improved the federalist position, Hohenwart proceeded to deal directly with the Czechs, copying in certain measure the method used to conclude the compromise with Hungary. Secret talks with the Czech leaders František Ladislav Rieger and František Palacký led Franz Joseph to issue an imperial rescript on September 12, 1871, promising the Czechs recognition of their ancient rights and showing his willingness to take the coronation oath. The Czechs answered this rescript on October 10, 1871, by submitting a constitutional program of 18 articles, called the Fundamental Articles. According to that program, Bohemian affairs should be regulated along the principles of the Hungarian compromise,

raising Bohemia to a status equal to Hungary. With that, Hohenwart, who had been up against violent German opposition from the first day of his appointment, aroused Hungarian resistance too. Andrassy, fearing that the Czech program could incite minority groups in Hungary, convinced Franz Joseph that the stability of the Habsburg monarchy was endangered by the Czech program. On October 27, 1871, Hohenwart was dismissed, and Franz Joseph returned the government to the hands of the German liberals.

The new Austrian prime minister, Adolf, Fürst von Auersperg, entrusted the key ministries of his cabinet to university professors and lawyers. The “ministry of doctors,” as it was nicknamed, concentrated on legal and administrative reform and tried to strengthen German control in parliament. After the dismissal of Hohenwart, the Czechs turned to passive resistance, withdrawing from the Bohemian diet and again abstaining from attendance at the parliament in Vienna. This gave the government the chance to weaken the federalist position by introducing a bill for electoral reform. Instead of the existing modus, whereby the diets selected the deputies that were sent to parliament, the new bill set up electoral districts, each of which was to elect one deputy directly to the Reichsrat. The new system, however, preserved the old division of the electorate into *curiae* (socioeconomic classes), making parliament in this way a representation of German bourgeois interests.

The political victory of German capitalism took place at the very moment of a severe economic crisis. The opening of the Vienna International Exhibition of 1873 was seen as a manifestation of the material progress and economic achievements of the Habsburg

monarchy. The so-called *Gründerjahre*, or years of expansive commercial enterprise during the late 1860s and early 1870s, however, were characterized not only by railroad and industrial expansion and the growth of the capital cities of Vienna and Budapest but also by reckless speculation. Warning signs of an imminent crisis were disregarded, and in May 1873, soon after the opening of the exhibition, the stock market collapsed.

The ensuing depression forced the government to abandon some liberal bourgeois principles. The state took over the railroads and instituted public-works projects in an attempt to alleviate popular distress. The government survived the crisis, however, and German liberal political rule continued for five more years. German liberalism would pass into eclipse not because of economic or domestic crisis but as a consequence of its opposition to foreign expansion.

A far-reaching consequence of the stock market crash of 1873 was the permeation of anti-Semitism into Austrian politics. Jews were accused of being responsible for the speculative stock market activities, even though official investigations proved that many elements of the population, including some ministers and aristocrats, had participated in the *Gründungsfieber*, or “speculative fever,” and the attendant scandals.

International relations: the Balkan orientation

After his appointment as foreign minister on November 14, 1871, Andrassy conducted the foreign affairs of Austria-Hungary with the intention of preserving the status quo.

Discarding the anti-Bismarck bias of his predecessor, Beust, he sought the friendship of the German Empire in order to strengthen his position in a possible confrontation with Russia over problems in the Balkans. The Dreikaiserbund (Three Emperors' League) of 1873, by which Franz Joseph and the German and Russian emperors agreed to work together for peace, gave expression to that policy and made a change of the status quo in the Balkans dependent on German consent.

The continuing decline of Ottoman power encouraged the Balkan nations in their opposition to Turkish rule, and in 1875 there were revolts and upheavals. Andr ssy failed to induce the Ottoman government to adopt a reform program, and by 1876 Russian intervention seemed imminent. Russia offered to join with Austria-Hungary in partitioning the Balkans between them, but Andr ssy believed that Austria-Hungary was a "saturated state" unable to cope with more nationalities and lands, and for a time he resisted the offer. He was aware, however, that Russia could not be restrained altogether; thus, through Bismarck's mediation, there were concluded two secret agreements, at Reichstadt (now Z kupy, Czech Republic) in July 1876 and at Budapest in January 1877, whereby Russia gave up its plans for a "great partition" and settled for the territory of Bessarabia and, in return, acquiesced in Austria-Hungary's acquiring Bosnia and Herzegovina. Austria-Hungary and Russia agreed to refrain from intervention for the time being, and it was only when great-power mediation proved unable to settle the conflict between Serbia and the Ottoman Empire that Russia declared war on the

Ottoman Empire in April 1877, after having again secured Austro-Hungarian neutrality (*see* Russo-Turkish wars).

In February 1878, with the war won, the Russians did not content themselves with Bessarabia and, in the Treaty of San Stefano, violated Austria-Hungary's Balkan interests by creating a large independent Bulgaria. Having Great Britain as an ally in his opposition to the Russian advance in southeastern Europe and Bismarck as an "honest broker," Andr ssy managed at the Congress of Berlin in July 1878 to force Russia to retreat from its excessive demands. Bulgaria was broken up again, Serbian independence was guaranteed, Russia retained Bessarabia, and Austria-Hungary was allowed to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina. Military occupation of those two provinces turned out to be more than the expected mere formality. It took 150,000 Habsburg troops and several weeks of fighting before the lands were under Habsburg authority. Since no agreement could be reached on whether the newly acquired lands should aggrandize the Hungarian or the Austrian part of the monarchy, they were placed under the jurisdiction of the common Habsburg ministry of finance.

Domestic affairs, 1879–1908

Political realignment

The German liberals had opposed the Balkan policy of Andr ssy, and, out of fear that the Slav element in the monarchy would be strengthened by the addition of a new Slav

population, they voted against the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina—in this way withdrawing support from the government. When Prime Minister Auersperg resigned, the era of German liberal predominance came to an end. In 1879, the same year in which the so-called Dual Alliance with the German Empire bound the Habsburg monarchy to Germany's foreign policy, the reappointment of Taaffe as Austrian prime minister signified a reorientation in domestic affairs. From 1879 onward, the German element in the Habsburg monarchy was on the defensive, fighting stubborn and senseless rearguard actions against the Slav drive for political and national equality.

Taaffe first tried to form a cabinet above parties. It was to include even the liberal Karl, Lord von Stremayr, who had presided over a caretaker government after Auersperg's resignation. The situation decisively changed when Taaffe persuaded the Czechs in 1879 to give up their parliamentary boycott and participate in the government. Taaffe then governed with the support of a conservative coalition, including Slavs, German aristocrats, and clericals, which gave itself the name of the Iron Ring. In April 1880, language ordinances were issued that made Czech and German equal languages in the “outer [public] services” in Bohemia and Moravia. In 1882 the University of Prague was divided, giving the Czechs a national university. In the same year, an electoral reform reduced the tax requirement for the right to vote from 10 to 5 florins, thus enfranchising the more prosperous Czech peasants and weakening the hold of the German middle class.

Despite the conservative character of the government, political life in the Habsburg monarchy underwent a decisive change during the Taaffe period. The traditional party

lineup decomposed, and new alignments and parties formed that were essentially radical and aggressive. From 1890 well into the 1920s, political life in Austria was dominated by three movements that originated in the 1880s: Pan-Germanism, Christian Socialism, and Democratic Socialism.

In German Austria, especially in Vienna, moderate liberals were increasingly challenged by extremist groups—notably German nationalists. In 1882 their “Linz program” proposed the restoration of German dominance in Austrian affairs by detaching Galicia, Bukovina, and Dalmatia from the monarchy, by reducing relations with Hungary to a purely personal union under the monarch, and by establishing a customs union and other close ties with the German Empire. This Pan-Germanic program found its chief protagonist in Georg, Ritter (knight) von Schönerer, a deputy to the Reichsrat, who also introduced a note of anti-Semitism into German nationalism. Although his version of extreme chauvinism and racialism never attracted more than a small number of followers, in a modified and moderate way Pan-Germanism and anti-Semitism became the ideological support of the bureaucracy and officer corps; though these elements did not favour union with Germany, they did feel that the Habsburg monarchy had the task of bringing German culture to the “inferior” non-German nationalities.

While Schönerer and Pan-Germanism appealed to the educated classes, Karl Lueger transformed the Christian Socialism of Karl, Freiherr (baron) von Voegelsang, into a political organization that appealed to small shopkeepers, artisans, tradesmen, and lower bourgeois circles of Vienna and the surrounding countryside. The workers’

movement, formerly a concern of welfare and adult-education societies, also transformed itself into a political party. Although workers' movements had been weakened in Austria by personal rivalries and government persecution, in 1889 at a conference in Hainfeld, Victor Adler managed to unite the competing Marxist groups into the Social Democratic Party (*see* Marxism).

Taaffe continued to seek compromises between nationalities that were becoming increasingly radical in their demands. The Slav orientation of the Taaffe cabinet did not satisfy the Czechs, for example, but rather encouraged a mood of belligerence; because the moderate Old Czechs failed to live up to radical demands, the nationalistic Young Czechs were able to gain support from the electorate. In 1890 Taaffe tried to negotiate an agreement between the Old Czechs and the German liberals, whereby Bohemia would be divided for administrative and judicial purposes along lines of nationality, but he was balked by the more chauvinistic Young Czechs and German nationalists, and his efforts led to riots in Prague in 1893.

When Emil Steinbach joined Taaffe's cabinet as minister of finance in 1891, he encouraged Taaffe and the emperor to try electoral reform as an instrument of breaking nationalist opposition. It was hoped that, by extending the franchise, nationalistic antagonism could be allayed and the growing unrest among urban workers could be placated. On October 10, 1893, the government introduced a suffrage bill that would have given the vote to virtually every literate adult male (while preserving the traditional system of voting in *curiae*). Conservative groups of all nationalities joined forces against

this bill, and, under pressure from the Hungarian government, Taaffe had to resign on November 11, 1893.

Though failing in political matters, the cabinet had introduced some economic reforms. Between 1888 and 1892 a system of cooperative banks for farmers was organized, the taxation system was revised, Austrian currency was stabilized by a return to the gold standard, and the florin was replaced by the crown, which remained the Austrian currency until 1924. The Taaffe government is also remembered for social-reform legislation; the laws of 1884 fixed the maximum working day at 11 hours, outlawed the employment of children under 12, required a Sunday rest day for workers, and set up compulsory insurance against accidents and sickness.

Political turmoil

The franchise question continued to dominate Austrian domestic affairs and became closely welded to the nationality conflicts. The next Austrian prime minister, Alfred, Fürst (prince) zu Windischgrätz (grandson of the Windischgrätz who seized Prague in 1848), sought to win the support of parliament by forming a cabinet in which the clerical conservatives, the Poles, and the German liberals were represented. They were united, however, only in opposition to universal suffrage. Each minister defended his national cause, and the ministry was torn by ceaseless conflict. The end came in June 1895, when the government fulfilled an old promise and introduced Slovene classes into the grammar school at Cilli (now Celje, Slovenia) in Steiermark. Because the school had

been exclusively German, this was regarded as a grave blow to the German cause, and the German liberals resigned, forcing Windischgrätz himself to resign.

Embittered by the conduct of the German liberals, Franz Joseph on October 2 entrusted the task of solving Austria's problems to a Polish aristocrat, Kasimir Felix, Graf (count) von Badeni, known as a "strong man" for the high-handed way in which he had acted as governor of Galicia. Little noticed at the time, the appointment of Badeni as Austrian prime minister symbolized the breakdown of German control over the Habsburg monarchy. For the first time in Habsburg history, Germans controlled none of the key positions of government. Not only the prime minister but also the finance minister (Leo, Ritter [knight] von Biliński) and the foreign minister (Agenor, Graf Gołuchowski, who had succeeded Gusztáv Siegmund, Graf Kálnoky von Köröspatak, in May 1895) came from the Polish part of the empire.

Badeni managed to induce parliament to accept a compromise franchise bill that introduced qualified universal male suffrage but preserved the system of class voting (a fifth *curia* was even added). The shortcomings of the new system enraged the parties representing the masses of the population. By 1897, however, elections held on the basis of the new suffrage had strengthened the radical elements in the Reichsrat; the Young Czechs, for instance, had completely overwhelmed the conservative Old Czechs.

In the 1870s and '80s, decisive economic changes with far-reaching social consequences had occurred in the Habsburg lands. Though remaining primarily agrarian, they had

undergone an industrialization that had resulted in an unprecedented growth of urban centres. Vienna, which had about 430,000 inhabitants in 1851, had become a metropolis of 1,800,000 by the turn of the 20th century, and that phenomenon was paralleled in other areas, especially in Bohemia, which had become the industrial centre of the western part of the Habsburg lands. Those socioeconomic developments naturally began to affect politics. From 1890 on, the advance of the Social Democrats and the Christian Socialists caused considerable tension in Vienna. In October 1894 the Social Democrats held their first impressive orderly mass demonstration in the capital, and the communal elections of 1895 made the Christian Socialists the strongest party in Vienna, ending the long liberal rule. When the emperor refused to confirm Karl Lueger, the popular leader of the Christian Socialists, as mayor of Vienna, there were demonstrations and protests. Not until Lueger was elected mayor for the fifth time did Franz Joseph agree to confirm him, in April 1897.

Counting on support from the Slav and conservative parties in parliament, Badeni dared to take up the Bohemian-language question again. In April 1897 he issued a famous language ordinance that introduced Czech as a language equal to German even in the “inner service”—i.e., for communications within government departments. This decision meant that civil servants in Bohemia and Moravia would have to be able to speak and write Czech as well as German. Since many Germans refused to learn Czech, the ordinance put them at a definite disadvantage in Bohemia’s administration. The publication of the ordinance provoked violent German reactions: university professors

signed resolutions of protest, mass meetings incited the public, and German deputies in the Reichsrat began to obstruct all legislative activities. The protest reached its climax in November 1897, when parliamentary sessions turned into bedlam, and popular protests against Badeni led to street demonstrations. The mass protest was not restricted to Vienna. It was even worse in some German towns in Bohemia; in Graz, clashes between soldiers and the masses ended in the death of one demonstrator.

To pacify the public, Franz Joseph gave in; on November 28, 1897, he dismissed Badeni and asked Paul, Freiherr (baron) Gautsch von Frankenthurn, a former minister of education, to form a government out of the German parties of parliament. Gautsch's attempts to appease the Germans ran into obstruction from the Czechs. The scene of violence shifted from Vienna to Prague and from the Reichsrat to the Bohemian diet. In March 1898 Gautsch was replaced by the former governor of Bohemia, Franz Anton, Fürst zu Thun und Hohenstein, who failed within a year. Of his successors neither Manfred, Graf Clary und Aldringen, who formally revoked the Badeni language ordinance, nor Heinrich Wittek, who headed a short-lived cabinet of a few weeks, managed to solve the nationality problem.

On January 18, 1900, Franz Joseph asked Ernest von Koerber, a former minister of the interior, to form a new cabinet. Koerber was the only commoner to be appointed prime minister by Franz Joseph. As a leading bureaucrat, he formed his ministry from the ranks of other bureaucrats, concentrating in subsequent years on the administration of public affairs and economic programs rather than trying to deal with political problems. First by

imperial decree and then, after some political bargaining, by consent of parliament, Koerber carried through a program of economic expansion, social legislation, and administrative reform; among his reforms was the liberation of the press from government and police control. By devious politicking, he managed to keep government activities free from national strife, but he could not prevent national emotions from becoming more and more extremist. The national conflict came to be fought over educational matters, and in the final years of Koerber's government the desire for national universities aroused the sentiments of Italians, Slovenes, and Ruthenians—turning the traditional Czech-German conflict into a multinational one. In December 1904 Koerber's various maneuverings faltered, and he was driven from office by a combination of parties.

The political climate in Austria was further complicated by the worsening of relations between the emperor and the Hungarian government. Hungarian separatists had agitated for the separation of the Habsburg army, and when Franz Joseph used an address to the troops at Chłopy (now in Poland) in 1903 for an unequivocal reaffirmation of the common and unified character of his army, a controversy developed that had repercussions in the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy. The plan to use universal suffrage—for which popular demand had strongly increased since the Russian Revolution of 1905—to break the opposition in Hungary actually furthered the cause of political democracy in Austria.

Electoral reform

Gautsch, who had been reappointed as prime minister, oversaw a bill that would instate universal franchise in Austria. This first bill, introduced to parliament in February 1906, ran into the opposition of the middle-class and conservative parties that still controlled parliament. Nevertheless, imperial interest and popular pressure—the Social Democrats had organized mass rallies to support the bill—combined to overcome parliamentary opposition. After Gautsch resigned in March 1906 and his successor, Conrad, Fürst (prince) von Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, failed to master the situation, Max Wladimir, Freiherr (baron) von Beck (Austrian prime minister from June 1906), managed to carry the bill through parliament. In January 1907 Franz Joseph sanctioned the law, which gave the vote to every male over age 23 and abolished the *curiae*.

The returns of the election of 1907 made the Germans inescapably a minority in parliament, with 233 members, though they certainly remained the strongest national group. (The Czechs could count on 107 seats, the Poles 82, the Ruthenians 33, the Slovenes 24, the Italians 19, the Serbs and Croats 13, and the Romanians 5.) Universal suffrage also brought the expected decline of the chauvinistic parties. The Young Czechs and the Pan-Germans were reduced to small factions without parliamentary influence, while the Christian Socialists and the Social Democrats returned as the two strongest parties out of more than 30 represented in parliament; the socialist delegation in the Austrian parliament was, in fact, larger than in any other country. The Austrian constitution, however, did not force the emperor to form his government according to

the composition of the parliament. Neither the Social Democrats nor the Christian Socialists acquired any significant influence on the shaping of Austrian government affairs.

Beck remained in office and satisfied the Christian Socialists with some concessions but for the most part based his policy on the support of the conservative parties. In 1905 the diet of Moravia had succeeded in finding a compromise between German and Czech national demands, and it was hoped that a similar compromise could be achieved for Bohemia. But, within a short time, national conflicts got the upper hand again, and parliamentary debate and public opinion were once more excited by national strife. In 1908, however, international complications diverted attention from domestic affairs.

Foreign policy, 1878–1908

The occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878 had reasserted Habsburg interests in Balkan affairs. Facing the possibility of conflict with Russia in this area, Austria-Hungary had looked for an ally, with the result that in 1879 Austria-Hungary and the German Empire had joined in the Dual Alliance, by which the two sovereigns promised each other support in the case of Russian aggression. The signing of the Dual Alliance was Andrassy's last act as foreign minister, but the alliance survived as the main element in the international position of the Habsburg monarchy until the last day of the empire. Under Andrassy's successors, Habsburg foreign policy continued its conservative course.

In 1881 an alliance with Serbia, which after the Congress of Berlin (1878) had turned to Austria-Hungary for protection, made this Balkan state a satellite of the Habsburg monarchy. The Three Emperors' League (comprising Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary) of the same year brought Russian recognition of Habsburg predominance in the western part of the Balkan Peninsula. The signatories of this alliance promised to consult one another on any changes in the status quo in the Ottoman Empire, and, while Russia was given assurances that its position regarding Bulgaria and the Straits (the Dardanelles, the Sea of Marmara, and the Bosphorus) would be recognized, Austria-Hungary received from Russia the promise that there would be no objection to a possible annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the future.

The Three Emperors' League was an important element in the structure of alliances that German chancellor Bismarck set up to stabilize Europe. Having decided to rely on Austria-Hungary as the fundamental partner in international affairs, Bismarck had to try to neutralize all the areas in which the Habsburg monarchy might be drawn into a conflict. It was essential to avoid being involved in a controversy at an inopportune moment and in a region of little interest to Germany. Bismarck therefore attempted to lessen the possibility of a conflict between Austria-Hungary and Russia by making them partners in the Three Emperors' League. And when, in 1882, Italy approached Germany to find a partner in its anti-French policy, Bismarck used the opportunity to neutralize another European trouble spot. He told the Italian foreign minister that the road to Berlin led through Vienna, with the result that the Triple Alliance (comprising Italy, Germany,

and Austria-Hungary) was signed in May 1882. It was primarily a defensive treaty against a French attack on Italy or Germany. It further stated that, in the event of any signatory coming to war with another power, the partners of the alliance would remain neutral. The treaty did not settle the problems still existing between the Habsburg monarchy and the Italian kingdom, but for Bismarck it sufficed that they were neutralized.

In 1883 Bismarck acted again to reduce the danger of war in “Europe’s backyard” by arranging a defensive agreement between Austria-Hungary and Romania. The Triple Alliance and the Romanian Alliance not only strengthened the international status quo but also gave security to the internal order of the Habsburg monarchy by weakening the irredentist movements in Transylvania and the Italian parts of Austria-Hungary.

The deterioration of German-French relations in the following years convinced Bismarck of the indispensability of the Triple Alliance, and he made every effort to force Vienna to renew the alliance in 1887. By threatening to withdraw protection against Russian aggression, Bismarck forced the Austro-Hungarian foreign minister Kálmoky to consent to his demands, but there can be no doubt that Austria-Hungary was impeded in its national interests by having to adapt its foreign policy to the German and Italian demand for the isolation of France. Although Kálmoky succeeded during the negotiations in avoiding any new obligation in western Europe, he was less successful in defending more-immediate Austrian interests. He managed to evade the Italian request for the support of an active Italian colonial policy, but he was unable to keep Italy out of

involvement in Balkan affairs. It might be that, in view of his own conservative and defensive policy, he saw an advantage in having Italy as a third partner in the maintenance of the status quo against possible Russian expansion. At any rate, it was on Kálnoky's initiative that the original Italian demand for a declaration in favour of the status quo along the Ottoman coasts and the Adriatic and Aegean seas was extended to the interior of the Balkan Peninsula. On top of this, Kálnoky granted the Italians the right to ask for compensation in case of any change in the territorial status quo without defining this term. In a certain way, all the differences and clashes between Austrian and Italian Balkan policy in the first decade of the 20th century can be traced to the introduction of this clause (later formulated in Article VII of the treaty) at the renewal of 1887.

In the same year, Bismarck built around the Triple Alliance a system of alliances and agreements that amounted to complete isolation of France and obliged the major European powers to guarantee the status quo along the borders of the Ottoman Empire. The First and Second Mediterranean Agreements of 1887 joined Great Britain to the powers (Austria-Hungary and Italy) interested in blocking Russia from the Straits and enabled Kálnoky to abandon direct agreements with Russia. The Three Emperors' League of 1881 was allowed to expire, and Austria-Hungary was thus left without any formal understanding with Russia. Gołuchowski, who followed Kálnoky as foreign minister in 1895, decided that direct relations with Russia should be renewed. In April 1897 Franz Joseph and Gołuchowski visited St. Petersburg. The agreements signed as a

result of that initiative aimed to exclude Italy from Balkan affairs and sought to entrust preservation of the Balkan order to the bilateral cooperation of the two eastern monarchies rather than to a multilateral alliance system. Thus, the final years of the 19th century were marked by a change from static continental policy to a more dynamic world policy, and the ensuing mobility in international relations reduced the value of the Triple Alliance.

The Austro-Russian agreements of 1897 came to bear in 1903, when a major revolt occurred in Macedonia. After a meeting between Tsar Nicholas II and Franz Joseph in October 1903, their foreign ministers drafted a reform program for the Ottoman Empire. A mutual neutrality agreement was added in 1904, leaving Austria-Hungary a free hand in the event of a conflict with Italy and enabling Russia to turn and face Japan (*see* Russo-Japanese War).

Explicitly excluded from the agreement with Russia were Balkan conflicts. When King Alexander of Serbia was assassinated in a military revolt in 1903 and the Obrenović dynasty was replaced by the Karadjordjević, Serbian relations with the Habsburg monarchy deteriorated. The Serbs adopted an expansionist policy of unifying all South Slavs in the Serbian kingdom, and, in order to block a Serbian advance, the Habsburg monarchy applied economic pressure. In 1906 all livestock imports from Serbia into Austria-Hungary were prohibited. This conflict, the so-called Pig War, did not crush Serbia but rather pushed it into the Russian camp.

When, in 1906, Gołuchowski was replaced as foreign minister by the former ambassador to St. Petersburg, Alois, Graf (count) Lexa von Aehrenthal, a turning point in Austrian foreign policy was signaled. Aehrenthal made a belated effort to free Austria-Hungary from its submission to German interests and to engage in a dynamic Balkan policy. A first step was his proposal for the construction of a railroad through the Sandžak of Novi Pazar, a strip of land that separated Serbia from Montenegro. The combined Russian and Serbian opposition forced Aehrenthal to abandon the project temporarily and made it clear that any advance in the Balkans would probably result in war with Serbia and perhaps with Russia as well.

The danger of such a conflict arose within a short time. In July 1908, after a revolution in the Ottoman Empire, the Young Turk movement announced the reform of the Ottoman constitution. Afraid that this constitutional change could undermine the Habsburg position in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which nominally were still under Ottoman suzerainty, Aehrenthal decided to use the opportunity to fortify the Austro-Hungarian position in the Balkan Peninsula. In September 1908 he met with the Russian foreign minister, Aleksandr, Count Izvolsky, and secured, so he thought, Russian approval of the proposed annexation in return for Austria's support in having the Straits opened to Russian warships. On October 6, 1908, the annexation was announced, immediately bringing a violent reaction from Serbia. When Izvolsky found that his plans for the Straits were opposed by Great Britain and France, he retracted his tentative support of Austria and supported the Serbian position. The situation became serious, and for a while war

seemed imminent. Franz, Freiherr (baron; later Graf [count]) Conrad von Hötzendorf, the chief of the general staff of the Habsburg monarchy, who had long advocated preventive war, pushed for an aggressive move, but Aehrenthal had apparently never planned more than going to the brink of war. In March 1909 a German ultimatum forced the Russians to withdraw their support from Serbia, and, since the Turkish government had agreed to the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in return for a monetary compensation, Serbia also had to come to terms with the Habsburg monarchy. The Bosnian crisis was settled, but the Serbs felt their national pride deeply wounded and continued to stir unrest in the South Slav provinces of the Habsburg monarchy.

Last years of peace

Conflicts of nationality

The annexation crisis had repercussions among the other Slav nationalities in the monarchy. For several years Czechs had been attracted by the Pan-Slav movement, and in July 1908 a Pan-Slav congress was held in Prague (*see* Pan-Slavism). During the diplomatic crisis of the following winter, the Czechs unabashedly took the side of the Serbs, and, on the day of the 60th anniversary of Franz Joseph's accession to the throne, martial law had to be declared in Prague. National strife broke out all over the monarchy, and parliamentary activities were all but blocked by filibustering and the riotous activities of the deputies. Austrian Prime Minister Beck had resigned in November 1908; his successor, Richard, Freiherr (baron) von Bienenrath, after having

accomplished little with a cabinet of civil servants, tried to appease the nationalities by including *Landsmannminister* (national representatives) in his cabinet (February 1909).

Obstruction in parliament continued. The Germans, in control of the government and the central administration, continued to assign to the monarchy the role of an outpost of German culture; the Slavs increasingly wanted to make Austria the home of Slav national aspirations. The Czech agrarian leader František Udržal stated in parliament: “We wish to save the Austrian parliament from utter ruin, but we wish to save it for the Slavs of Austria, who form two-thirds of the population.” A population census taken in 1910 more or less confirmed the Slav claim: out of the 28,324,940 inhabitants of the western half of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, nearly 36 percent regarded themselves as Germans, whereas more than 60 percent regarded themselves as Slavs—nearly 18 percent as Poles, about 13 percent as Ruthenians, about 23 percent as Czechs or Slovaks, nearly 5 percent as Slovenes, and almost 3 percent as Serbs or Croats. (Less than 3 percent identified themselves as Italians.) Slav predominance was weakened by the attitude of the Poles, who remained loyal to the central government, allowing the national conflict to assume the character of a primarily Czech-German quarrel.

Even the Social Democratic Party could not overcome nationalist antagonism. In 1899, at the party congress at Brünn (now Brno, Czech Republic), the Social Democrats had presented a national reform program based on democratic federalism, which would have granted the right of national decisions to territorial units formed on a basis of nationality. Karl Renner and Otto Bauer, who later became leaders of German-Austrian

socialism, drafted various programs for the solution of the nationality problem in books published between 1900 and 1910. But these efforts could not prevent the socialists from splitting along national lines too, and in 1910 the Czech socialists declared themselves independent of the Social Democratic Party.

Party rivalries

Such national differences weakened the socialist position in the elections of 1911. More than 50 parties had competed in the campaign, and, since the German nationalist parties had allied in the Deutscher Nationalverband (German National League), they managed to return to parliament as the strongest single party, gaining 104 seats out of 516. The Christian Socialists, weakened by personal rivalry, suffered heavy losses, winning only 76 seats. The Social Democrats received 44 seats and the Czech Social Democrats 24. The Czech parties were badly divided, with those representing the Czech middle class gaining 64 seats. Prime Minister Bienenroth found himself unable to form a workable ministry, and he was replaced by Gautsch, reappointed for the third and final time, who tried to reconcile the Germans and the Czechs.

For a while negotiations seemed quite successful, but extremist incidents deadlocked the talks, and the Gautsch cabinet was replaced by a new ministry headed by Karl, Graf (count) von Stürgkh, in November 1911. Unable to deal with the nationality problem in a parliamentary fashion, Stürgkh repeatedly suspended the Reichsrat. It was characteristic of the general political climate in Europe that Stürgkh had to concentrate his legislative

program on the improvement of Austrian armament, for international crises overshadowed the nationality conflict.

Conflict with Serbia

Since the Bosnian crisis of 1908–09, Austrian diplomats had been convinced that war with Serbia was bound to come. Aehrenthal died in February 1912, at a moment when an Italian-Turkish conflict over Tripoli (now in Libya) had provoked anti-Turkish sentiment in the Balkan states (*see* Italo-Turkish War). Leopold, Graf (count) von Berchtold, who directed Austro-Hungarian foreign policy from 1912 on, did not have the qualities required in such a critical period. Aehrenthal had been able to silence the warmongering activities of Conrad, the Habsburg chief of staff who continued to advocate preventive war against Italy and Serbia, but Berchtold yielded to the aggressive policies of the military and the younger members of his ministry. During the Balkan Wars (1912–13), fought by the Balkan states over the remnants of the Ottoman Empire, Austria-Hungary twice tried to force Serbia to withdraw from positions gained by threatening it with an ultimatum. In February and October 1913, military action against Serbia was contemplated, but in both instances neither Italy nor Germany was willing to guarantee support. Austria-Hungary ultimately had to acquiesce in Serbia's territorial gains. But by supporting Bulgaria's claims against Serbia, Austria-Hungary also had alienated Romania, which had shown resentment against the Habsburg monarchy because of the treatment of non-Hungarian nationalities in Hungary. Romania

thus joined Italy and Serbia in support of irredentist movements inside the Habsburg monarchy. By 1914, leading government circles in Vienna were convinced that offensive action against the foreign protagonists of irredentist claims was essential to the integrity of the empire.

In June 1914 Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the heir of Franz Joseph, participated in army maneuvers in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, disregarding warnings that his visit would arouse considerable hostility. When Franz Ferdinand and his wife were assassinated by the Bosnian Serb nationalist Gavrilo Princip at Sarajevo (Bosnia-Herzegovina) on June 28, 1914, the Austro-Hungarian foreign office decided to use the opportunity for a final reckoning with the Serbian danger. The support of Germany was sought and received, and the Austro-Hungarian foreign office drafted an ultimatum putting the responsibility for the assassination on the Serbian government and demanding full satisfaction. The attitude of the foreign office was shared by Conrad and the Austrian prime minister, Stürgkh, but it was opposed by the Hungarian prime minister, István, Count Tisza, who wanted an assurance that a military move against Serbia would not result in territorial acquisitions and thus increase the Serb element in the monarchy. His demand satisfied, Tisza joined the advocates of war.

In ministerial meetings on July 15 and 19, a deliberately provocative ultimatum was drafted in words that supposedly excluded the possibility of acceptance by Serbia. The ultimatum was handed to the Serbian government on July 23. The Serbian answer, handed in on time on July 25, was declared insufficient, though Serbia had agreed to all

Austro-Hungarian demands except for two that, in effect, entailed constitutional changes in the Serbian government. These demands were that certain unnamed Serbian officials be dismissed at the whim of Austria-Hungary and that Austro-Hungarian officials participate, on Serbian soil, in the suppression of organizations hostile to Austria-Hungary and in the judicial proceedings against their members. In its reply, the Serbian government pointed out that such demands were unprecedented in relations between sovereign states, but it nevertheless agreed to submit the matter to the international Permanent Court of Arbitration or to the arbitration of the Great Powers (comprising France, Germany, Great Britain, and Russia, in addition to Austria). On receiving this reply, the Austro-Hungarian ambassador left Belgrade (Serbia), severing diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Foreign Minister Berchtold and his government were clearly determined to make war on Serbia, regardless of the fact that such action might result in war between the Great Powers. While the European governments frantically tried to offer compromise solutions, Austria decided on a *fait accompli*. On July 28, 1914, Berchtold asked Franz Joseph to sign the declaration of war, informing him that

*it cannot be excluded that the [Triple] Entente powers [Russia, France, and Great Britain] might make another move to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict unless a declaration of war establishes a *fait accompli* [eine klare Situation geschaffen].*

In the meantime, the German government had taken control of the situation. Placing German strategic and national plans over Austro-Hungarian interests, Germany changed the Balkan conflict into a continental war by declaring war against Russia and France.

World War I

The German declaration of war subordinated the Austro-Serbian conflict to the German aim of settling its own rivalries with France and Russia. According to the terms of the military agreement between Germany and Austria-Hungary, the Austro-Hungarian army had to abandon plans to conquer Serbia and instead protect the German invasion of France against Russian intervention. The setbacks that the Austrian army suffered in 1914 and 1915 can be attributed to a large extent to the fact that Austria-Hungary became a military satellite of Germany from the first day of the war, though it cannot be denied that the Austrian high command proved to be quite incompetent. The Austro-Hungarian chief of staff, Conrad, had clamoured for preventive war since 1906, but, when he received his chance in July 1914, it turned out that the Austrian army had no plans for an expeditious offensive. Similarly, after Italy entered the war on the side of the Allied Powers in May 1915, Conrad was unprepared. The fact that only after the Germans had taken command could the Russian front be stabilized did little to enhance the prestige of the Austrian government.

In July 1914 parliament was out of session, and the Austrian prime minister, Stürgkh, refused to convene it. That and the military censorship established immediately after the outbreak of the war concealed the discontent of the non-German population. While

German public opinion in Austria had welcomed the war enthusiastically and some Polish leaders supported the war out of anti-Russian feeling, the Czech population openly showed its animosity. The Czech leader Tomáš Masaryk, who had been one of the most prominent spokesmen of the Czech cause, emigrated to western Europe in protest. Karel Kramář, who had supported the Pan-Slav idea, was tried for high treason and found guilty on the basis of shaky evidence. German nationalism was riding high, but in fact the German Austrians had little influence left. In military matters they were practically reduced to executing Germany's orders; in economic affairs the Hungarians, who controlled the food supply, had the decisive influence. The Hungarian prime minister, Tisza, who had opposed the war in July 1914, became the strongman of the empire. On his advice Foreign Minister Berchtold was dismissed in January 1915, and the foreign office was again entrusted to a Hungarian, István, Count Burián. But Burián failed to keep Italy and Romania out of the war. German attempts to pacify the two states by concessions were unsuccessful because Franz Joseph was unwilling to cede any territory in response to the irredentist demands of the two nations. How little the outward calm in the Habsburg lands corresponded to the sentiment of the population became apparent when Stürgkh was assassinated in October 1916 by Friedrich Adler, the pacifist son of Victor Adler, the leader of Austrian socialism. Franz Joseph made Koerber prime minister once again, but Koerber had no chance to develop a program of his own.

On November 21, 1916, Franz Joseph died, leaving the throne and the shaky empire to his 29-year-old grandnephew, Charles (I), who had had little preparation for his task until

he became heir apparent on the death of Franz Ferdinand. Full of the best intentions, Charles set out to save the monarchy by searching for peace in foreign affairs and by recognizing the rights of the empire's non-German and non-Hungarian nationalities. Charles relied heavily on the advice of politicians who had had the confidence of Franz Ferdinand. He dismissed Koerber in December 1916 and made Heinrich, Graf (count) von Clam-Martinic, a Czech aristocrat, prime minister. At the foreign office he replaced Burián with Ottokar, Count Czernin.

When parliament was reconvened in May 1917, it became manifest how far internal disintegration of the Habsburg monarchy had progressed. Parliament again became the stage of unrelenting national conflicts. Finding so little support from the Czech side, Charles turned back to the German element, and in June 1917 he made Ernst von Seidler, once his tutor in administrative and international law, prime minister. Although he tried to appease the Czechs, the stubborn insistence of the Germans not to yield any of their prerogatives made reform of the empire impossible.

At the same time, various moves to get Austria-Hungary out of the war ended in failure. After a U.S. offer of general mediation had miscarried in December 1916, Charles tried through secret channels to deal directly with the Triple Entente powers. In the spring of 1917 an exchange of peace feelers took place through the mediation of his brother-in-law, Sixtus, Fürst (prince) von Bourbon-Parma, but Italy's unwillingness to abandon some of the concessions granted to it in the 1915 Treaty of London (by which Italy joined the

Allies) made these talks abortive. Similarly, negotiations with Allied representatives carried on in Switzerland brought no results.

Since the Austro-Hungarian government was unable to extricate itself from the Dual Alliance, which tied Austria-Hungary to Germany, France and England ceased to have regard for the integrity of the Habsburg monarchy. Furthermore, the revolutionary events in Russia in 1917 and the entry of the United States into the war introduced a new, ideological element into Allied policy toward the German-led coalition known as the Central Powers. The German-directed governments represented an authoritarian system of government, and national agitation in the Habsburg lands assumed the character of a democratic liberation movement, winning the sympathies of western European and American public opinion. From early 1918 the Allied governments began to officially promote the activities of the émigrés from Austria, foremost among them the Czech leader Masaryk, and in April 1918 the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities was organized in Rome.

But the collapse of the Habsburg monarchy cannot be ascribed to the Allied policy of supporting the independence claims of the Habsburg nationalities, which was only a belated adjustment to the changed conditions within Austria-Hungary. From the summer of 1917, the activities of the nationalist movements within the empire made the situation increasingly untenable. Two days before U.S. Pres. Woodrow Wilson proclaimed his Fourteen Points—one of which demanded the reorganization of the Habsburg monarchy in accordance with the principles of national autonomy—the Czechs demanded

outright independence (January 6, 1918). Within a month Polish and South Slav deputies, together with the Czechs, presented to the Reichsrat a program demanding the establishment of independent constituent assemblies for nationally homogeneous areas.

End of the Habsburg empire

As World War I raged and the national independence movement reached its final stage, another destabilizing development manifested itself. From 1915 on, the supply situation had worsened increasingly, and by January 1918 there were dangerous shortages, especially of food. Prompted by the difficult food situation and inspired by the Bolshevik victory in Russia (see Russian Revolution of 1917), a strike movement developed in the Habsburg lands. Demands for more bread and a demand for peace were combined with nationalist claims resulting in open opposition to the government. The strikes among the civilian population were followed by mutinies in the army and navy. In January and February 1918 the army and the government succeeded in suppressing the social unrest and antiwar demonstrations. But, from the same date, the national opposition movement gathered momentum.

The hopes that the government soon placed on peace settlements with the eastern states were not fulfilled. The treaties of Brest-Litovsk with Ukraine (signed in February 1918) and with Soviet Russia (March 3, 1918) as well as the Treaty of Bucharest, which established peace with Romania (May 7, 1918), did not alleviate the supply situation and irritated the Poles because of certain provisions of the Ukrainian settlement.

In April 1918 Czernin was replaced as foreign minister by Burián. This change resulted from the conflict between Czernin and Charles over the desirability and possibility of Austria's concluding a separate peace with the Allies. When Charles's secret overtures to the Allies in 1917 were revealed by French premier Georges Clemenceau, the Germans were outraged, and Czernin was dismissed on their orders. Burián returned to the foreign office on April 16 and immediately reported to the German high command at Spa (Belgium), where he and Charles had to assure the German emperor, William II, of their unchanging loyalty. While this act of submission satisfied the German Austrians, it further incensed the Slav opposition.

In May 1918 a Slav national celebration in Prague demonstrated the strength of the independence movements. But Charles and the German elements in the central government were still not aware of the extent of the disintegration. In July 1918 Prime Minister Seidler resigned, and his successor, Max Hussarek, Freiherr (baron) von Heinlein, began a belated effort to reorganize the Habsburg monarchy. Hussarek's efforts to federalize the empire in the moment of imminent military defeat unintentionally turned out to provide the basis for the formal liquidation of the Habsburg monarchy. On October 16, 1918, Charles issued a manifesto announcing the transformation of Austria into a federal union of four components: German, Czech, South Slav, and Ukrainian. The Poles were to be free to join a Polish state, and the port of Trieste was to be given a special status. The lands of the Hungarian crown were to be excepted from this program.

Within a few days, national councils were established in all the provinces of the empire, and for all practical purposes they acted as national governments. The Poles proclaimed the union of all Poles in a unified state and declared their independence at Warsaw on October 7, 1918; the South Slavs advocated union with Serbia; and on October 28, the Czechs proclaimed the establishment of an independent republic. The dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy was thus consummated by the end of October 1918—that is, before the war actually ended.

It was impossible for the country to survive another winter of hostilities, and on September 14, 1918, Burián published an appeal to all belligerents to discuss the possibilities of ending the war. When this move was opposed by the Germans as well as by the Allies, Burián tried for a separate peace settlement for Austria-Hungary. On October 14, 1918, he sent a note to President Wilson asking for an armistice on the basis of the Fourteen Points. On October 18 the U.S. secretary of state, Robert Lansing, replied that, in view of the political development of the preceding months and, especially, in view of the fact that the new country of Czechoslovakia had been recognized as being at war with the Central Powers, the U.S. government was unable to deal on the basis of the Fourteen Points anymore. On October 27 Gyula, Gróf (Count) Andrássy (the son of the former foreign minister Andrássy), who had replaced Burián three days before as foreign minister, sent a new note to Wilson; in asking for an armistice, he declared full adherence to the statements set forth in the U.S. note of October 18, thus explicitly

recognizing the existence of an independent Czechoslovak state. From this moment, it remained only to liquidate the war.

On October 22 Heinrich Lammasch, a renowned authority in the field of international law and a respected pacifist, formed a new cabinet. He hoped to save the Habsburg monarchy by drawing up a federative structure. Instead, however, he found himself charged with the task of supervising the dissolution of the empire and bringing about an orderly transfer of power. The government could not influence events outside Vienna any longer, and from October 30 it was even challenged in the central agencies by the German-Austrian state council.

Hostilities were ended by an armistice signed on November 3, 1918. The Austro-Hungarian high command, which had blundered into the war unprepared in 1914, did little better at its conclusion. Owing to inaccuracies in the wording of the documents, more than 300,000 Austro-Hungarian soldiers were taken prisoner by the Italian army.

For some days, the government hoped that, in spite of the secession of the Slav areas, the Habsburg dynasty could survive in the remaining lands. But even the German Austrians had lost faith in the Habsburgs, and, with revolutionary agitation on the rise and republican passion widespread, Charles adhered to the advice of Lammasch and decided to waive his rights to exercise political authority. On November 11, 1918, he issued a proclamation acknowledging “in advance the decision to be taken by German Austria”

and stating that he relinquished all part in the administration of the state. The declaration of November 11 marks the formal dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy.

First Republic and the Anschluss

Early postwar years

On October 21, 1918, the 210 German members of the Reichsrat of Austria formed themselves into the National Assembly for German-Austria, and on October 30 they proclaimed this an independent state under the direction of the State Council (Staatsrat), composed of the leaders of the three main parties (Social Democrats, Christian Socialists, and German Nationalists) and other elected members. Revolutionary disturbances in Vienna and, more important, the news of the declaration of a republic in Germany forced the State Council on the republican path (*see* The Weimar Republic, 1918–33). On November 12, the day after Charles's abdication, the National Assembly resolved unanimously that "German-Austria is a democratic republic" and also that "German-Austria is a component part of the German republic." Under the title of chancellor, the socialist Renner became head of a coalition government, with Bauer, the acknowledged spokesman of the left wing of the Social Democrats, as foreign secretary. On November 22 the territory of the republic was further defined: the National Assembly claimed for the new state all the Habsburg lands in which a majority of the population was German. It also claimed the German areas of Bohemia and Moravia.

From the first day, the republic was faced with the disastrous heritage of the war. Four years of war effort and the breakup of the Habsburg empire had brought economic exhaustion and chaos. The resulting social distress and poverty inspired revolutionary activities, making bolshevism appear the greatest danger to the new republic, especially after a Soviet republic was established in Hungary at the end of March 1919. The Austrian Social Democrats were determined to resist bolshevism with their own forces without making an alliance (as the German Social Democrats did) with the old order. The Volkswehr (People's Guard) was organized and was twice effective (April 17 and June 15) against communist attempts at a putsch. Bauer and fellow socialist leader Friedrich Adler staked their popularity on defeating the communist agitation in the workers' and soldiers' councils, which had been set up on the Soviet model. By mid-1919, political and social order was restored on parliamentary lines, and the Communist Party relapsed into insignificance.

More dangerous was the tendency of the *Länder* (states) to break away from Vienna or to claim almost complete independence. Though the principal motive of this was reluctance to send food supplies to Vienna, it also represented a genuine social, political, and ideological conflict: the administration of the industrialized capital was socialist controlled, while the states, being predominantly agrarian, remained conservative and faithful to the Roman Catholic tradition. This difference was aggravated by the fact that the Habsburg monarchy had been the only bond between the German Austrian lands; with the abdication of the emperor, no symbol of loyalty common to all states

remained. Vorarlberg voted for union with Switzerland in May 1919, and Tirol also attempted to secede.

In February 1919, elections for a constitutional assembly were held. The Social Democrats were returned as the largest single party, with 69 seats. The Christian Socialists won 63 and the German Nationalists 26. When this assembly met (March 4), it had to make wide concessions to federalism in order to appease the states. In exchange, Vienna was elevated to the rank of a state, and the mayor was made the equivalent of a state governor. This proviso subsequently enabled socialist-controlled Vienna to pursue an autonomous policy, even though the *Bundesregierung* (“federal government”) was controlled by the conservative parties from 1920 to 1934.

The constituent assembly also settled the constitution of the federal republic (October 1, 1920). The State Council was abolished, and a bicameral legislative assembly, the Bundesversammlung, was established. The Bundesrat (upper house) was to exercise only a suspensive veto and was to be elected roughly in proportion to the population in each state. This represented a defeat for the federal elements in the states, which had wanted the Bundesrat to exercise an absolute veto and to be composed of equal numbers of members from each state. The Nationalrat (lower house) was to be elected by universal suffrage on a basis of proportional representation. The Bundesversammlung in full session elected the president of the republic for a four-year term, but the federal government, with the chancellor at its head, was elected in the Nationalrat on a motion

submitted by its principal committee; this committee was itself representative of the proportions of the parties in the house.

The foreign policy of Bauer and the representatives of the major political parties had insisted firmly on Anschluss (“union”) with Germany, and, as late as 1921, unauthorized plebiscites held in the western provinces returned overwhelming majorities in favour of the union. But Article 88 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain (1919), signed by Austria and the Allied Powers, forbade Anschluss without the consent of the League of Nations and stipulated that the republic should cease to call itself Deutschösterreich (German-Austria); it became the Republik Österreich (Republic of Austria). The Austrian claim for the German-speaking areas of Bohemia and Moravia was denied by the Saint-Germain peace conference, and Austria also had to recognize the frontiers of Czechoslovakia along slightly rectified historical administrative lines. On Austria’s southern frontier, the newly created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes threatened armed invasion until it was decided that the border question should be settled by a plebiscite, which, on October 10, 1920, returned a majority of 59 percent in favour of Austria. The German-speaking districts of western Hungary were to be ceded to Austria outright, but Austria, in the face of Hungarian resistance, was obliged to hold a plebiscite. The area of Sopron was finally restored to Hungary.

After the elections of February 1919, Renner had formed another coalition government; however, following a government crisis in the summer of 1920, a caretaker cabinet under the Christian Socialist Michael Mayr was formed. This was the government that prepared

the draft of the constitution and introduced it into parliament. After its approval, new elections were held on October 17, 1920. The Christian Socialists were returned as the strongest party, gaining 82 seats, while the Social Democrats were reduced to 66 and the German Nationalists to 20. Mayr formed a cabinet composed of Christian Socialists; the Social Democrats went into opposition and never returned to the government during the First Republic.

This political division hardened, and no decisive change took place during the following years. The system of proportional representation combined with the ideological background of Austrian parties made oscillations of political allegiance unlikely. Of the two mass parties, the Social Democrats had an unshakable majority in Vienna (in which about a third of the republic's population lived), while the Christian Socialists had an equally secure majority among the Roman Catholic peasants and the conservative classes, the latter consisting largely of army officers, landowners, and big businesses. The urban middle classes, hostile to both workers and peasants, became German Nationalists. But German nationalism was not limited to the middle classes. Many workers and peasants felt themselves to be Germans and responded to the national appeal.

Economic reconstruction and political strife

The main task of the nonsocialist governments in power from the autumn of 1920 was to restore financial and economic stability. Between 1919 and 1921 Austria's urban population lived largely on relief from the United States and Great Britain, and, although production improved, distress was heightened by inflation that threatened financial

collapse in 1922. In October 1922 the chancellor, Ignaz Seipel, secured a large loan through the League of Nations, enabling Austrian finances to be stabilized. In return, Austria had to undertake to remain independent for at least 20 years. The controller general appointed by the League of Nations reported in December 1925 that the Austrian budget had been balanced satisfactorily, and in March 1926 international financial supervision was withdrawn.

Seipel's success in October 1922 gave Austria some years of stability and made economic reconstruction and relative prosperity possible. In socialist-controlled Vienna, an ambitious program of working-class housing, health schemes, and adult education was carried out under the leadership of Karl Seitz, Hugo Breitner, and Julius Tandler. "Red Vienna" thus acquired a unique reputation in Europe.

In 1920 all three major parties spoke in democratic terms. Despite democratic rhetoric, however, preparations for civil war had never been abandoned. The Christian Socialists, led by Seipel, a believer in strong government, were convinced that they had to protect the existing social order against a Marxist revolution. In the provinces, reactionary forces known as the Heimwehr (Home Defense Force)—originally formed for defense against Slavs invading from the south or against marauding soldiers returning from service in World War I—gradually acquired fascist tendencies (see fascism). The Social Democrats, who felt that their social-reform program was endangered, had their own armed force, the Schutzbund (Defense League), descended from the People's Guard of 1918.

The Schutzbund and the reactionary forces regularly demonstrated against each other. In 1927, in the course of a clash between members of the Schutzbund and reactionary forces at Schattendorf, an old man and a child were accidentally shot by reactionaries. When the latter were acquitted by a Vienna jury on July 14, the Social Democrats called for a mass demonstration, which got out of hand and ended in the burning down of the ministry of justice. In fighting between the police and the demonstrators, almost 100 people were killed and many more were wounded. The Social Democrats then launched a general strike, but it was called off after four days. Seipel had violently asserted the government's authority, and the balance between socialist and nonsocialist forces in Austria was never secure after this decisive date.

The Christian Socialists, pressed increasingly by the Heimwehr, began to take the offensive against the Social Democrats. Wilhelm Miklas, a leading Christian Socialist, was elected president in 1928, successor to the nonparty Michael Hainisch, who had been in office since December 1920. There were repeated attempts to revise the constitution, principally with the object of strengthening the power of the executive. After protracted negotiations, a compromise was reached late in 1929. On December 7, 1929, a series of constitutional amendments gave increased powers to the president. Of particular importance were the rights to appoint ministers and issue emergency decrees. But Vienna maintained its autonomy, and the democratic principle was preserved against the far-reaching authoritarian demands of the Heimwehr. In the elections of November 1930, the Social Democrats were returned as the largest single party, with 72 seats. The Christian

Socialists held 66, the German Nationalists 19, and the Heimwehr, elements of which had temporarily coalesced into a fascist party on the Italian model, 8.

These political events were overshadowed by the great world economic crisis (*see* Great Depression). Though the Social Democratic Party's leaders believed that the crisis should be met by the orthodox means of deflation and spending cuts, they were resolved not to be compromised by supporting these measures and refused to enter a coalition government. On the other hand, in October 1931 they acquiesced in suspending the election of the president by direct popular vote, as had been provided by the constitution of 1929, and agreed to the reelection of President Miklas by parliament. The government, meanwhile, led by Chancellors Johann Schober (1929–30) and Otto Ender (1930–31), was driven to desperate devices to stave off collapse. Schober, leader of the middle-class German Nationalists, launched a project for a customs union with Germany in March 1931; this provoked violent opposition from France and the alliance of the Little Entente (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Romania) and was subsequently condemned by a majority of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. The bankruptcy in May 1931 of the Creditanstalt, the country's most influential banking house, brought Austria close to financial and economic disaster. This, together with the rise of the National Socialists in Germany, resulted in considerable support being given to the Austrian Nazi Party (*see* National Socialism; Nazi Party). Provincial elections in 1932 showed that the Nazis were draining off votes from the conservative parties. The

Nationalists began to demand a general election, and this demand was taken up by the Social Democrats, who saw a chance of winning a majority in parliament.

Authoritarianism: Dollfuss and Schuschnigg

After the election, when Engelbert Dollfuss came to form a Christian Socialist government on May 20, 1932, he could count on a majority of only one vote. Chancellor Dollfuss belonged to a new generation that had been educated in the conservative conviction that the Western form of parliamentary government had been forced upon the central Europeans as a result of military defeat and socialist revolution and that the political and social order could be restored only by the establishment of some kind of strong authority. The leaders of the Christian Socialist Party found themselves under attack from two ideological enemies, the Marxists and the Nazis, who apparently threatened the very basis of the conservative order. In reaction, Dollfuss determined to replace parliamentary government with an authoritarian system. The opportunity to do this came in March 1933, when, during a debate on a minor bill, an argument arose over alleged irregularities in the voting procedure. The president of the Nationalrat resigned, the two vice presidents followed his example, and Dollfuss declared that parliament had proved unworkable. It never met again in full, and Dollfuss governed thereafter by emergency decree.

By this time (spring of 1933), Adolf Hitler was in power in Germany, and Nazi propaganda for the incorporation of Austria was greatly increased. Dollfuss turned to fascist Italy and authoritarian Hungary for help, as he was convinced that

British and French aid would be ineffective. This shift in foreign policy also can be attributed to the fact that Dollfuss had to rely ever more strongly on the help of the pro-fascist Heimwehr to stay in power.

The Social Democrats were subjected to increasing provocation and on February 12, 1934, took to arms. Civil war followed. After four days of fighting, Dollfuss and the Heimwehr were victorious. The Social Democratic Party was declared illegal and driven underground. In the course of the same year, all political parties were abolished except the Fatherland Front (Vaterländische Front), which Dollfuss had founded in 1933 to unite all conservative groups. In April 1934 the rump of the parliament was brought together and accepted an authoritarian constitution. The executive was given complete control over the legislative branch of government; the elected assemblies disappeared and were replaced by advisory bodies, appointed in a complicated and futile fashion. The human rights guaranteed under the democratic constitution also were swept away. "Republic" was removed from the official name of the country, which became merely the Federal State of Austria.

On July 25, 1934, a group of Nazis seized the chancellery and attempted to proclaim a government. Dollfuss, whom they had taken prisoner, was murdered. The plan, however, miscarried: the Nazis in the chancellery were compelled to surrender, and their leaders were executed; a Nazi rising in Steiermark was suppressed; and Hitler, faced with the mobilization of an Italian army on the Brenner Pass, repudiated his Austrian

followers. Franz von Papen was sent as German ambassador to reduce Austria by other means.

Kurt von Schuschnigg, who became chancellor on the death of Dollfuss, was a man of gentler personality and of less-violent political passions. His administration of the authoritarian constitution was in the easygoing Austrian fashion, less oppressive than in Italy and Germany. Schuschnigg had a mild preference for restoring the Habsburgs, but he shrank from the international complications this would involve. The regime drifted on without popular favour, weakened by the personal rivalries and ambitions of its leaders and sustained only by a guarantee from Italy. The temporary accord of Great Britain, France, and Italy in the Stresa Front (April 1935) seemed to promise new security, but the Italo-Ethiopian War soon destroyed the unity of the Western powers, and Austria's isolation was complete when Hitler and Italian leader Benito Mussolini allied themselves in 1936.

Schuschnigg had to negotiate a compromise with Germany, which was signed on July 11, 1936; Germany promised to respect Austrian sovereignty, and in return Austria acknowledged itself "a German state." The agreement left Austria open to Nazi infiltration. In January 1938 the Austrian police discovered a new Nazi conspiracy. Schuschnigg hoped to defeat this by a meeting with Hitler, but at Berchtesgaden, Germany, where Hitler received him on February 12, 1938, Schuschnigg was faced with threats of military intervention in support of the Austrian Nazis. He had to agree to give them a general amnesty and to include some leading Nazis in his cabinet; the Ministry of

the Interior had to be entrusted to Arthur Seyss-Inquart, the spokesman of Austrian Nazis. The open agitation of the Nazis threatened to destroy the government's authority, and confidential contacts in the European capitals brought Schuschnigg to realize that he could not count on the support of the western European powers. He therefore resolved to challenge Hitler alone. On March 9 he announced that a plebiscite would be held on March 13 to decide in favour of Austrian independence.

Anschluss and World War II

Though the Austrian crisis had taken him unaware, Hitler acted with energy and speed. Mussolini's neutrality was assured, there was a ministerial crisis in France, and the British government had made it known for some time that it would not oppose the union of Austria with Germany. On March 11, 1938, two peremptory demands were made for the postponement of the plebiscite and for the resignation of Schuschnigg. Schuschnigg gave way, and German troops, accompanied by Hitler himself, entered Austria on March 12. A Nazi government in Austria, headed by Seyss-Inquart, was established; it collaborated with Hitler in proclaiming the Anschluss on March 13.

France and Great Britain protested against the methods used by Hitler but accepted the fait accompli. The United States followed the British and French policy of appeasement, and the Soviet Union demanded only that the West should stop further German aggression and that the Anschluss should be handled by the League of Nations. The government of Mexico was the only one that did not accept the Anschluss, and it lodged an ultimately futile protest with the secretary-general of the League of Nations. A

questionable plebiscite on April 10, held throughout greater Germany, recorded a vote of more than 99 percent in favour of Hitler.

Austria was completely absorbed into Germany. Any official memory of Austrian existence was destroyed and suppressed. Austria was renamed Ostmark (Eastern March); Upper and Lower Austria became Upper and Lower Danube. Immediately after the invasion, the Nazis arrested many leaders of the anti-Nazi Austrian political parties and a great number of political opponents, particularly communists and socialists. Many Austrians, especially those of Jewish origin, were forced into exile.

The Viennese events during Kristallnacht—a short but devastating period of pogroms against Jewish people and property throughout Germany on November 9–10, 1938—proved that anti-Semitism was more virulent and violent in Austria than in most other German areas. A significant percentage of the Jews killed were in Vienna, where dozens of synagogues and hundreds of Jewish shops and apartments were destroyed and plundered. The degradation of the Austrian Jewish community—including the widespread threats against Jews' lives, the destruction or “Aryanization” (forcible confiscation) of Jewish property, and the exiling of Austrian, mostly Viennese, Jews—became known as the Viennese model (*Wiener Modell*), on which the Nazis based their later expulsion of Jews from all of Germany and German-occupied countries.

By the time World War II began in 1939, more than 100,000 Jews—roughly half of all Austrian Jews—had left Austria. When the fighting ceased, more than 65,000 Austrian

Jews had perished, many of them in extermination camps. Jews were not the only victims of Nazi persecution. Thousands of Roma (Gypsies) also were deported or murdered, and tens of thousands of Austrians with mental or physical disabilities were killed, most of them at Hartheim Castle, a so-called euthanasia centre near Linz.

Austrians were overrepresented not only in the system of terror against Jews but also on the battlefields. During the course of the war, hundreds of thousands of Austrians fought as German soldiers; a substantial number of Austrians served in the SS, the elite military corps of the Nazi Party. By the end of the war, approximately 250,000 Austrians had been killed or were missing in action. An even greater number of Austrians were held as prisoners of war, many of them for years in camps in the Soviet Union. In addition, more than 20,000 Austrians were killed in U.S. and British bombing raids.

As increasing numbers of Austrian men were enlisted in the German army, the resultant lack of workers, together with the tremendous buildup of the armament industries, brought compulsory labour on a massive scale to Austria. Foreign workers from many European countries were forced to work in industry as well as agriculture during the war, as were many thousands of concentration-camp inmates, most of them from the Mauthausen concentration camp, near Linz, or one of its satellite camps. (About half of the approximately 200,000 prisoners in these camps—many of them Russian soldiers—died.)

While the great majority of Austrians were not Nazis, popular support for Germany's wartime policies remained strong until the later phases of the war. The Austrian resistance was small, though it was by no means negligible. Left-wing resistance groups (mostly communists, with a smaller number of socialists) dominated, but conservative resisters (mainly Christian Socialists and monarchists) were active as well. During the war, tens of thousands of Austrians were arrested for political reasons; many of them died in concentration camps or prisons, and about 2,700 were executed. Additionally, a number of Austrians fought as Allied soldiers against the German army.

The resistance movement was hampered by the political antagonism that had weakened the First Republic of Austria between the two World Wars. This political divide was so deep and bitter that it blocked cooperation between Austrian émigrés and between the various resistance groups that had formed inside the country. Nevertheless, the possibility of reestablishing an independent Austria after the war was far from dead.

After the outbreak of the war, the Allied governments began to reconsider their attitude toward the Anschluss. In December 1941 Soviet premier Joseph Stalin informed the British that the U.S.S.R. would regard the restoration of an independent Austrian republic as an essential part of the postwar order in central Europe. In October 1943, at a meeting in Moscow of the foreign ministers of Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., and the United States, a declaration was published that declared the Anschluss null and void and pledged the Allies to restore Austrian independence; it also reminded the Austrians that they had to make an effort to rid themselves of the German yoke. Though the

British prime minister, Winston Churchill, continued to make proposals for setting up a central European federation comprising the former Habsburg lands and even southern Germany, the European Advisory Commission in London assumed that Austria would return to sovereignty within the borders of 1937.

When Soviet troops liberated Vienna on April 13, 1945, representatives from the resistance movement and the former political parties were allowed to organize and to set up a free provisional government. Though Austria was once again an independent republic, the future looked more than bleak. Much of the infrastructure of Austrian cities had been damaged or destroyed, and the country emerged from the war as one of the poorest in Europe.

Second Republic

Allied occupation

On April 27, 1945, former chancellor Karl Renner set up a provisional government composed of Social Democrats, Christian Socialists, and Communists and proclaimed the reestablishment of Austria as a democratic republic. The Western powers, afraid that the Renner government might be an instrument of communist expansion, withheld full recognition until the autumn of 1945. Because of similar suspicions, agreement on the division of Austrian zones of Allied occupation was delayed until July 1945. Shortly before the Potsdam Conference (which stipulated that Austria would not have to pay reparations but assigned the German foreign assets of eastern Austria to the U.S.S.R.),

control machinery was set up for the administration of Austria, giving supreme political and administrative powers to the military commanders of the four occupying armies (U.S., British, French, and Soviet). In September 1945 a conference of representatives of all states extended the authority of the Renner government to all parts of Austria.

A general election held in November 1945, in which former Nazis were excluded from voting, returned 85 members of the Austrian People's Party (corresponding to the Christian Socialists of the prewar period), 76 Socialists (corresponding to the Social Democrats and Revolutionary Socialists), and 4 Communists. Renner was elected president of the republic; Leopold Figl, leader of the Austrian People's Party, became chancellor of a coalition cabinet. As the coalition government was formed in proportion to the parties' strength in parliament, the Austrian People's Party and the Socialists were the sole partners. This principle of proportional representation, originally introduced in 1919, was to be an important factor in Austrian political life after 1945.

The government decided not to draft a new constitution but to return to the constitution of 1920, as amended by the laws of 1929. In June 1946 the control agreement of July 1945 regulating the machinery of Allied political supervision was modified by restricting Allied interference essentially to constitutional matters. Denazification laws passed in 1946 and 1947 eliminated Nazi influence from the public life of Austria.

From 1945 to 1952 Austria had to struggle for survival. After liberation from Nazi rule, the country faced complete economic chaos. Aid provided by the United Nations Relief

and Rehabilitation Administration and, from 1948, support given by the United States under the Marshall Plan made survival possible. Heavy industry and banking were nationalized in 1946, and, by a series of wage-price agreements, the government tried to control inflation. Interference by military commanders in political and economic affairs in the Soviet zone of occupation caused a considerable migration of capital and industry from Vienna and Niederösterreich to the formerly purely agricultural western states. This brought about a far-reaching transformation of the economic and social structure.

In 1949 former Nazis were allowed to participate in the general election. The Union of Independents (later renamed the Freedom Party), corresponding to the former German Nationalist group, won 16 seats in parliament. In subsequent elections (1953, 1956, 1959, 1962), the relationship of this party with the two main parties (the Austrian People's Party and the Socialists) remained stable. After Renner died (December 31, 1950), Theodor Körner, the Socialist mayor of Vienna, was elected president by direct popular vote. He was succeeded in 1957 by the leader of the Socialist Party, Adolf Schärf, who was followed in 1965 by Franz Jonas, former mayor of Vienna, and in 1974 by Rudolf Kirchschläger, former minister of foreign affairs.

The influence of the Socialists in the coalition government, which had been relatively strong under Figl's chancellorship, was reduced when the Austrian People's Party replaced Figl with Julius Raab in the spring of 1953 and had Reinhard Kamitz appointed minister of finance. The subsequent economic reconstruction and the advance to a prosperity unknown to Austrians since the years before World War I is generally

identified with the so-called Raab-Kamitz course, which was based on a modified free-market economy. The nationalized steel industry, electric power plants, and oil fields, together with the privately owned lumber and textile industries and the tourist traffic, were the major economic assets. The Austrian economy came to be dominated to a disproportionate extent by a trend toward the service sector because of the importance of tourism, which transformed the economic and social character of the rural Alpine areas. In addition, a heavy burden had been removed from the economy in 1953, when the Soviet government declared that it would pay its own occupation costs (as the United States had done since 1947). Thereupon, the British and the French followed suit.

The Berlin conference of the foreign ministers of France, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., and the United States in January 1954 raised Austrian hopes for the conclusion of a peace treaty. For the first time, Austria was admitted as an equal conference partner, but the failure of the foreign ministers to agree on the future of Germany again prejudiced Austria's chances. The Soviet government was not prepared to forgo the strategic advantages of maintaining forces in Austria as long as it perceived Germany to be a threat. In February 1955, however, the Soviet government suddenly extended an invitation to the Austrian government for bilateral negotiations. An Austrian delegation visited Moscow in April 1955, and an agreement was reached by which the Soviet government declared itself ready to restore full Austrian sovereignty and to evacuate its occupation troops in return for an Austrian promise to declare the country permanently neutral.

Restoration of sovereignty

The State Treaty—signed in Vienna on May 15, 1955, by representatives of the four occupying powers and Austria—formally reestablished the Austrian republic in its pre-1938 frontiers as a “sovereign, independent, and democratic state.” It prohibited Anschluss between Austria and Germany as well as the restoration of the Habsburgs. It also guaranteed the rights of the Slovene and Croatian minorities in Kärnten, Steiermark, and Burgenland. Great Britain, the United States, and France relinquished to Austria all property, rights, and interests held or claimed by them as former German assets or war booty. The U.S.S.R., however, obtained tangible payment for the restoration of Austrian freedom. This included \$150 million for the confiscated former German enterprises, which Austria bought back from the Administration of Soviet Property in Austria; \$2 million for the confiscated German assets of the First Danube Steamshipping Company; and 10 million metric tons of crude oil as the price of Austrian oil fields and refineries that had been Soviet war booty.

The treaty came into force on July 27, 1955, and by October 25 all occupation forces were withdrawn. On October 26 a constitutional law of perpetual Austrian neutrality was promulgated. The Austrian government had never left any doubts that the pledge to neutrality could be interpreted only as a military one and never as an ideological one. Throughout the Soviet occupation, the Austrians had proved their anticommunist attitude, and the spontaneous reaction of the Austrian people during the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 demonstrated their sympathy with Western democratic

ideas (*see* Hungary: The Revolution of 1956). Austria preserved political stability; changes in the personal and ideological structure of the government and political parties were effected without major political crisis.

Austria became a member of the United Nations in 1955 and of the Council of Europe in 1956. Major problems in foreign relations were the conflict with Italy over Südtirol (southern Tirol; now part of the Italian Trentino–Alto Adige region) and the problem of association with the European Economic Community (EEC; later succeeded by the European Union). During the Paris Peace Conference of 1946, an agreement had been signed guaranteeing the rights of the German-speaking population of Südtirol, a region that Italy had obtained after World War I. The Austrian government, claiming that the Italians had not lived up to their obligations, initiated bilateral talks. In the early 1960s, acts of terrorism committed by German-speaking chauvinists interfered with the progress of the negotiations, but in 1969 agreement was finally reached on implementing the guarantees provided in the agreement of 1946. In 1958 Austria joined the European Free Trade Association, but a special arrangement with the EEC, accompanied by prudent dealings with the communist neighbours, maintained Austria's status as a neutral nation. In that capacity, Austria provided for large numbers of refugees from eastern Europe; it also functioned as a transit link for Jewish émigrés from the U.S.S.R.

From 1962, disagreement over economic problems generated friction between the coalition parties. The annual budget led to grave disunity in the coalition, and in the autumn of 1965 the government resigned and called new elections. The elections, held on

March 6, 1966, brought a setback for the Socialist Party, and the Austrian People's Party was returned to parliament with an absolute majority. Negotiations for a new coalition government failed. The Socialists, led by a former foreign minister, Bruno Kreisky, went into opposition, and Josef Klaus formed the first one-party cabinet of the Second Republic. Contrary to widespread misgivings, the political stability of the country was not disturbed, and parliament was given new vigour and influence.

In ensuing provincial elections, the Socialist Party demonstrated recovery from the setback of 1966, and in the national elections of 1970 the Socialists managed to win a plurality of votes, becoming the strongest party in parliament, with 81 seats, though falling short of a majority. After negotiations for a new coalition cabinet failed, in May 1970 Kreisky was appointed chancellor, and he formed the country's first all-Socialist cabinet. Sensing increased support for the Socialists, he called for new elections in October 1971, which gave his party a clear majority of 93 seats. In the subsequent elections of 1975 and 1979, Austrian voters demonstrated their approval of Kreisky's policy of moderate social reform and economic stability by returning the Socialist Party to parliament in increasing strength: the elections of May 1979 gave the Socialists 95 seats, while the Austrian People's Party, continually weakened by regional animosities and leadership squabbles, received 77 seats and the Freedom Party 11.

The stability of Austrian politics in the 1970s was paralleled by an equally stable economy: besides having an elaborate system of social security and health insurance,

Austrians enjoyed an unbroken prosperity with one of the lowest rates of unemployment in Europe. The Kreisky governments carried through a host of reform programs, among which the reorganization of the legal code under the minister of justice Christian Broda had truly historic dimensions.

In 1978 Kreisky suffered his first defeat when a majority voted against the opening of a nuclear power plant. The late 1970s also witnessed the first of a series of scandals, many of them related to the technocratic wing of the Socialist Party. This wing centred around Kreisky's minister of finance and political heir-apparent, Hannes Androsch. In particular, the dubious link between Androsch's tax-consulting firm and the contractors building Vienna's new general hospital began a series of setbacks for the Socialist Party; these were aggravated by the troubles of the nationalized industries.

The scandals that plagued Austria in the 1980s overshadowed the considerable reforms enacted by the Kreisky government. Voters grew increasingly dissatisfied with a stagnant sociopolitical system in which all important decisions were made behind closed doors by the interest groups represented in the "Social Partnership" (i.e., the chambers of industry, trade, and agriculture and the labour unions). A growing environmental awareness intensified voter frustration.

After the Socialist Party lost its absolute majority in 1983, Kreisky resigned, and the Socialists, under Chancellor Fred Sinowatz, entered into a coalition with the Freedom Party. The coalition stumbled from one scandal to another until it was finally brought

down by the election of Kurt Waldheim, who was alleged to have been a Nazi war criminal, as president in 1986. Although an international historians' commission found no evidence that Waldheim had personally committed war crimes, it proved his indirect complicity. With Waldheim's insistence that he had only done his duty, the domestic political intrigue, the not-altogether-hidden anti-Semitism of some of his supporters, and the U.S. government's decision to place Waldheim on its watch list of undesirable aliens, the incident undermined Austria's domestic consensus more than any other event since 1945.

After the Waldheim debacle, Sinowatz resigned as chancellor, and the Socialist Party under Franz Vranitzky called for new elections, which resulted in a grand coalition of the Socialist and Austrian People's parties. This government introduced partially successful budgetary and tax reforms and a privatization scheme for the nationalized industries. These reforms promoted the economic growth and social stability of the late 1980s. However, more scandals (notably the Noricum affair, involving the illegal sale of arms to Iran by a state-owned company), division within the Austrian People's Party, and the public's continued dissatisfaction with backroom deals weakened support for the coalition, while the environmentalist Greens (in parliament since 1986) and the Freedom Party enjoyed growing appeal.

In the 1990 elections the Socialists avoided disaster only through a combination of Vranitzky's popularity and the weakness of the Austrian People's Party. The reshaped coalition of the Socialist Party (renamed the Social Democratic Party in 1991) and the

Austrian People's Party faced new problems that were largely due to the dramatically changed international situation: Austria's application for membership in the EEC (which, renamed the European Community, was embedded in the European Union [EU] in 1993) renewed heated debates over domestic repercussions and over membership's compatibility with neutrality. The latter issue was raised again in connection with the breakdown of the Warsaw Pact and the turmoil in Yugoslavia. In 1990 the Austrian government unilaterally revoked some of the provisions of the 1955 State Treaty governing Austria's neutrality. During the Persian Gulf War in 1991, in a controversial decision the government permitted air-transit rights to Allied planes and the transportation of U.S. salvage tanks through Austrian territory.

With the end of the Cold War and the opening of Austria's eastern borders, the country was faced with an explosive increase of refugees (particularly from the Balkans) and immigrants (especially from Turkey). Many Austrians blamed the now-suffering Austrian economy on the influx of newcomers. In the early 1990s, heavy industry struggled, national debt rose, and unemployment reached a 40-year high. Popular discontent was reflected at the polls, as the right-wing Freedom Party and smaller opposition parties made gains against the ruling coalition.

Austria in the European Union

In a historic referendum in June 1994, Austrian voters indicated their desire to join the EU, and in January 1995 Austria became a member. The following year, Austrians commemorated 1,000 years of common history. The festivities highlighted

Austria's stature in Europe historically, while the country's increased regional cooperation underscored its current role in newly restructured Europe.

The Austrian economy, however, was not yet ready to meet EU criteria for financial stability. Further austerity measures were launched as Austria prepared to adopt the single European currency, the euro. In 1999 the majority of EU members began to replace their national currency with the euro, and by 2002 Austria, with its economy once again among the strongest in Europe, retired the schilling.

Meanwhile, the ongoing concern about immigration paralleled fears of foreign (particularly German) ownership of Austrian businesses, especially as Austria began privatizing more state-owned operations. Reflective of these fears was the ascendancy of Freedom Party leader Jörg Haider, whose extreme brand of conservatism regularly drew international censure but whose party narrowly eclipsed the Austrian People's Party in the parliamentary elections of 1999. By 2000 the People's Party had deserted the weakened Social Democratic Party to form a right-of-centre coalition government with the Freedom Party. The participation of the Freedom Party in the government brought condemnation from both the Austrian left and the international community, and the EU imposed sanctions on Austria. This move backfired within the country, where the governing parties mobilized patriotic support by portraying Austria as the victim of an international conspiracy. By the end of 2000 the EU had withdrawn its sanctions.

The government was buoyed by a surging economy, but the Freedom Party, inexperienced in matters of state and beset by internal turmoil, stumbled in the 2002 elections. Its losses were primarily the gains of the Austrian People's Party, which became the largest party for the first time in 36 years. But rather than renewing its traditional partnership with the Social Democrats, it again formed a coalition with the Freedom Party in 2003.

The Freedom Party splintered in 2005 as Haider and other leaders left to form a new party, the Alliance for the Future of Austria. The split followed a period of especially acrimonious fighting between moderate members and hard-liners over the party's direction. The Alliance for the Future of Austria replaced the Freedom Party as the junior partner in the coalition government.

In 2006 the Social Democrats won an unexpected victory in the parliamentary elections, narrowly defeating the Austrian People's Party. In January 2007 those two parties formed a coalition government, with Alfred Gusenbauer of the Social Democrats as chancellor. However, the unpopularity of Gusenbauer, who was perceived as an ineffective leader, as well as disputes over social policy, soon weakened the coalition. It collapsed in July 2008 following the withdrawal of the People's Party. Parliamentary elections held that September—the first in which 16- and 17-year-olds were allowed to vote—resulted in a narrow win for the Social Democrats over the People's Party. However, the Freedom Party and the Alliance for the Future of Austria enjoyed a resurgence: combined votes for the two right-wing parties exceeded those for the People's Party. Nevertheless, the Social

Democrats and the People's Party agreed to form a new coalition government, excluding the far right, in November 2008. Werner Faymann of the Social Democrats was selected as chancellor.

The most pressing concern for the "grand coalition" was the precarious state of the European economy. Beginning in 2009, the euro-zone debt crisis acted as a persistent drag on Austria's economic health, as consumer confidence sagged and exports declined. The Austrian financial sector was heavily exposed to the southern European economies that were at the centre of the debt crisis, and the government adopted a policy of robust intervention to shore up the country's ailing banks. Faced with these challenges, the coalition exhibited a degree of cooperation unseen in previous years, as it implemented a series of austerity measures designed to bring Austria's deficit into compliance with the EU's Stability and Growth Pact. These policies, which included a public-sector wage freeze and a package of tax increases, did little to endear either of the ruling parties to voters, and each saw a steady erosion of support in state and local elections.

While the economy showed signs of stabilizing in 2011, corruption scandals and a leadership vacancy in the People's Party fueled support for the Freedom Party. Although it remained outside the government, the Freedom Party's Euroskeptic and anti-immigrant rhetoric influenced discussions at the national level, and the party ranked even or ahead of the ruling parties in opinion polls. Controversial statements made by Freedom Party leader Heinz-Christian Strache drew criticism from the mainstream parties. Those

denouncements intensified in August 2012, after Strache posted a cartoon to the social media site Facebook that was widely characterized as anti-Semitic. Support for the Freedom Party was diluted when Austrian-born Canadian billionaire Frank Stronach announced in September 2012 that he was forming a new political party. Called Team Stronach, the party promoted an antiestablishment, pro-business agenda that favoured lower corporate taxes and disengagement from the weaker euro-zone economies. The Freedom Party suffered a series of reverses in regional elections in 2013, and it was unable to capitalize on a collapse in support for the Social Democrats in Salzburg. A financial scandal there triggered early elections, and the Greens, running on an anti-corruption platform, boosted their national standing with an impressive finish in the last regional contest before the scheduled September 2013 general election.

That election saw the “grand coalition” returned to power, with Faymann as chancellor, albeit with a slightly reduced majority. The Freedom Party posted a strong third-place finish, ahead of the Greens, Team Stronach, and the neoliberal New Austria (NEOS). Low unemployment and a stable economy had fueled support for the governing parties, but a worsening migrant crisis, the military conflict in Ukraine, and a series of terrorist attacks on European soil caused that foundation to erode throughout 2014–15. In January 2016 Austria suspended its participation in the Schengen Agreement, reintroducing border controls in an effort to stem the tide of refugees (principally fleeing turmoil in Syria, elsewhere in the Middle East, and in Africa).

Many dismissed that effort as too little, too late, as evidenced by the Freedom Party's landslide victory in the first round of presidential balloting in April 2016. Although the office of president was largely ceremonial, the rejection of the two ruling parties—both of which had failed to advance to the runoff election—signaled a major shift in the mood of the Austrian electorate. Stating that he had lost the support of his party, Faymann announced his resignation in May 2016. The second round of the presidential election, held on May 22, was narrowly won by Green candidate Alexander Van der Bellen. The closeness of the outcome led the Freedom Party to challenge the results, and Austria's Constitutional Court ruled that irregularities had occurred in a majority of polling districts. The election was annulled and rescheduled for October 2016, but faulty glue on postal ballots forced the postponement of the election until December. On December 4, 2016, Van der Bellen won a clear victory, capturing 54 percent of the vote and offering a glimmer of hope to Europe's centre-left at a time of growing support for far right and Euroskeptic parties.

In May 2017 a deadlock over policy within the “grand coalition” led Social Democrat Chancellor Christian Kern to call for early elections. Support for the Freedom Party remained high, but the People's Party, under telegenic new leader Sebastian Kurz, tacked hard right in the months prior to the election and embraced much of the Freedom Party's anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim rhetoric. Kurz, who had served as foreign minister in the “grand coalition” government, revived the flagging fortunes of the mainstream conservative party, and he carried it to victory in the general election held on

October 15, 2017. The Social Democrats were second, and the Freedom Party finished a strong third. Party infighting led to the spectacular collapse of the Greens, who, for the first time in nearly four decades, failed to clear the 4 percent threshold necessary for parliamentary representation. After months of talks, the People's Party and Freedom Party agreed to form a coalition, and in December 2017 Kurz, at age 31, became Europe's youngest head of government. Before swearing in the new chancellor, Van der Bellen took the extraordinary step of securing a pledge to maintain Austria's pro-EU stance and to acknowledge the country's responsibility for the scourge of Nazism.