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Chapter 1
The Emergence of The Modern State System
The Modern State System - Characteristics

❖ Current population on the planet Earth: 7.1 billion (source CIA Factbook, July 2013, est.)

❖ The world’s territory: about 58 million square miles

❖ Number of states: 196 (Taiwan, Vatican, Palestinian Territories, Western Sahara officially not the UN members)

❖ The Modern State System is, hence, marked by a relatively small number (196) of relatively large independent political units recognizing no higher political authority.

❖ Before we look at the possible consequences of this apparently “anarchistic” situation, let us discuss why Shimko considers the number of 196 independent states “small.”
The Modern State System - the Birth

- The modern state system has been around (at least in the Western world) for about four hundred years. Some date the beginning of the modern state system to 1648, the year the Thirty Years War (1618–1648) ended with the Peace of Westphalia.

- Thirty Years War - Name given to a series of bloody and devastating wars fought largely on German lands between 1618 and 1648. Though several complex causes and motivations fueled these wars, the conflict between Protestants and Catholics over the authority of the Catholic Church and the pope was a central issue.

- Peace of Westphalia - The agreement that officially closed the Thirty Years War (or wars). Significant in that it marked the origins of modern principles of sovereignty.
Before the Modern State System there was a Feudal Order

- In the Middle Ages, before the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, Europe was divided into a lot of smaller political unites ruled by some member of the nobility—princes, dukes, or other potentates—who ran them largely as personal property.

- They did not enjoy formal independence but rather were connected to one another in a complicated, chaotic, and often confusing pattern of obligations. Even though one might look at a map of the period and see a few larger countries (e.g., France or England), their appearance is misleading. Political power was not as centralized as the maps suggest. Central governments and rulers were usually very weak and struggled constantly with lesser nobles over whom they supposedly held authority.
This map of Europe in 1300 illustrates the political fragmentation of the medieval period.
Lack of Supreme Authority
Holy Roman Empire

- As if this local division of power were not messy enough, much of Europe was theoretically united under the Holy Roman Empire. The basis for unity was Europe’s common Catholic identity.

- To make things even more complicated, the Holy Roman Empire had both religious and secular leaders (the pope and Holy Roman Emperor), and it was not always clear where their authority began and ended.

- Furthermore, the empire itself was a very weak entity in which local nobles and religious figures enjoyed substantial independence from the Emperor and Rome.

- Thus, feudal Europe was a fragmented place of numerous small political entities entwined in a confusing and complicated mishmash of political authority.
Sources of Transformation from Feudal to Modern State Order

- Three major developments began to transform Europe beginning in the 1200s or 1300s. These three “revolutions” would ultimately create much larger political units, organized on the basis of sovereignty and independence.

- First, the commercial revolution provided a powerful economic impetus for the creation of larger entities.

- Second, the gunpowder revolution dramatically altered the requirements for defense in ways that gave substantial advantages to larger entities.

- Finally, the Protestant Reformation and the resulting Thirty Years War (1618–1648) destroyed the Catholic unity of Europe and led to the modern notion of sovereignty.
The Commercial Revolution

❖ The commercial class faced obstacles in its development, because an extremely fragmented Europe was unable to provide many of the prerequisites for commerce (weak law enforcement, deteriorated infrastructure, currencies unreliable.) Small fiefdoms did not possess the resources to build the infrastructure, and political fragmentation made coordination very difficult.

❖ The emerging commercial class realized that larger political units with more effective central governments were essential. Ambitious rulers also desired larger kingdoms and increased power over local nobility. The result was a convergence of interests in favor of larger political units with more powerful central governments. A tacit alliance emerged between the commercial class and rulers who wanted to expand and centralize their authority. The commercial class provided the resources in the form of taxes, and in return the rulers provided the roads, ports, markets, law enforcement, and reliable currencies needed for trade. Thus, the economic imperatives of trade and commerce contributed to the emergence of larger political units with more effective central governments.
The Gunpowder Revolution

- Before 1430s, war between kingdoms often turned into long sieges, with the attackers surrounding a fortified castle within which people sought safety. Once surrounded, the goal was to harass and starve the inhabitants until they surrendered. The military problem was that the attackers could do little about the thick castle walls—spears and arrows did not make much of a dent, though catapults might propel fireballs over the walls to wreak havoc within. This type of warfare began to change with the introduction of gunpowder from China.

- Gunpowder weapons such as guns and cannons significantly altered the military equation. Most importantly, a kingdom could no longer resist attack by retreating behind castle walls because “from the 1430s onwards the cannons deployed by the major states of Western Europe could successfully reduce most traditional vertical defenses [i.e., walls] to rubble within a matter of days.”

- Consequently, an adequate defense required much more complicated (and expensive) fortifications and/or enough land to be able to absorb an attack and marshal one’s own forces in time to meet the attack and defeat it. A kingdom only 40 or 100 miles across with a castle in the middle was now extremely vulnerable. Only larger states had the land and wealth necessary to conduct war and defend themselves in the gunpowder age.
The Protestant Reformation

- Until 1517, Christianity was synonymous with Catholicism. Because the Catholic Church was such a central feature in the social and political life of feudal Europe, the rise of Protestantism had a profound effect on European societies and politics.

- **Martin Luther**’s challenge to the authority of the Catholic Church marked the emergence of a Christian alternative to Catholicism that spread throughout Central and Northern Europe. The political problem was that many of the newly Protestant areas were located within the Catholic Holy Roman Empire. Protestants eventually sought freedom from the authority of the pope and Catholic rulers, resulting was a series of wars known collectively as the **Thirty Years War** (1618–1648).
The Thirty Years War (1618-1648)

- Though most of Europe was involved, the fighting occurred largely on German lands. By any measure, it was a war of unusual brutality and savagery. **Estimates of the German population killed in the war range from 30 to 50 percent.**

- Part of the barbarity and savagery of the war can be traced to its religious underpinnings:

  “Combatants on all sides thought that their opponents were, in a literal sense, instruments of the devil, who could be exterminated, whether they were soldiers or not. Indeed extermination of civilians was often preferred, precisely because it was easier to do away with civilians.”

- One need look no further than Martin Luther’s German translation of the Bible to see the depth of this hostility. The only illustrated section was the book of Revelation, which foretells the coming of the Antichrist. Illustrations made the identity of the Antichrist perfectly clear— the pope.

- After thirty years of devastating and unspeakably brutal warfare, not much of Europe’s sense of a common Christian identity survived.
Pope Leo X as the Antichrist, as pictured in a Reformation era flyer.
The Pope as the Whore of Babylon (1545)

This image from the 1545 edition of the Luther Bible shows the whore of Babylon (from the Book of Revelation) wearing the papal tiara. The identification of the whore of Babylon with the Roman Catholic Church was quite common in Reformation writings, as evidenced, for example, by Luther’s 1520 pamphlet Babylonian Captivity of the Church. This woodcut was based on one of Lucas Cranach the Elder’s illustrations for Luther’s German translation of the New Testament (1522), the so called “September Testament” printed in Wittenberg. Woodcut by Master M.S. (from Cranach’s workshop), 1545.
Martin Luther as a Seven-Headed Beast by Johannes Cochlaeus, 1564

Cochlaeus was a Catholic polemicist who was also Luther's first (very critical) biographer.
Photo: Luther House and Museum, Wittenberg
Luther as Anti-Papist Angel (1618)
The Peace of Westphalia (1648)

- The Thirty Years War ended in 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia, which solved the religious question by granting rulers the right to exercise authority over their territories.

- Each ruler would now determine questions of religion on their territory. They no longer had to answer to any higher, external authority such as the pope.

  - *Cuius regio, eius religio* (Whose realm, his religion) - the principle from the Peace of Augsburg (1555) reinforced.

- This new freedom, however, did not imply religious tolerance or freedom—rulers often brutally suppressed religious dissidents in their countries. (Read Martin Luther’s treatise *On the Jews & Their Lies*.)

- What the treaty established was the modern notion of sovereignty—that rulers were not obligated to obey any higher, external authority.
The Evolution of
The Modern State System
The Age of Absolutism and Limited War
(1648-1789)
The Age of Absolutism and Limited War (1648-1789)

- The period between the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and the French Revolution (1789) was relatively uneventful compared to what came before 1648 and what was to come after 1789.

- There were no major continent-wide wars or political revolutions. Though frequent, wars tended to be modest affairs—small professional armies fighting limited wars for limited objectives, with limited casualties and destruction.

- This period is sometimes viewed as a golden age of diplomacy in which negotiation, compromise, and the balance of power prevented any repetition of the horrors of the Thirty Years War. This relative calm, however, depended on a certain political and social order that would not long survive the erosion of that order in the decades after the French Revolution.
Absolutist Monarchism

- Between 1648 and 1789, monarchs claiming absolute power and authority ruled virtually every nation in Europe. They claimed authority under the **doctrine of the divine right of kings**, which held that their legitimacy was derived from God, not the people over whom they ruled.

- The prevalence of absolutist monarchism helps explain the relative calm of the period. Domestically, this was not a form of government that fostered loyalty between rulers and their **subjects**. Indeed, the very term subjects hints at the critical point. **People who lived in France during this period were not in any meaningful sense “citizens” of France; they were “subjects” of the monarch.**

- But even though their power was absolute, in reality **monarchs** made limited demands on their people. They **did not**, for example, expect their subjects to serve in the military and fight wars. For this task the **monarchs of Europe maintained professional armies.**
On the eve of the French Revolution in 1789, for example, nearly a quarter of the French army consisted of foreign paid soldiers. Professional armies were very expensive to maintain. Even the wealthiest rulers supported armies of only around 100,000 in peacetime, though this could swell to 400,000 in wartime. Given armies of this size, it was quite rare for battles to involve more than 80,000 soldiers.

The professional and mercenary nature of European armies of the period reveals a reality in which the masses of people were excluded from politics, which was synonymous with royal court scheming and intrigue, not elections, political parties, interest groups, opinion polls, and so on.

In the absence of any emotional sense of loyalty and connection between people and their rulers, nationalism as we know it did not exist.

It was an era of dynastic nationalism, not popular or mass nationalism. Wars during this period were not conflicts involving entire nations; they were conflicts among royal families. France as a nation did not go to war with Spain or Austria; instead, the Bourbons, France’s ruling dynasty, went to war with Austria’s Hapsburgs.
Causes of Wars between 1648-1789

❖ The major issues leading to war were territorial disputes, economic and commercial interests, and questions of dynastic and royal succession.

❖ Because European monarchs adhered to the same basic principles regarding how societies should be organized and ruled, wars were not waged over ideology. Consequently, “they were not concerned with religion as their seventeenth-century predecessors had been, nor political ideology as their post-1789 successors were to be.”

❖ The monarchs fought over things, not ideas, and wars over things are often less intense and bloody than wars over beliefs.
Balance of Power between 1648-1789

- A final reason wars did not erupt into incredibly destructive affairs was the ability of European monarchs to maintain a balance of power through a constantly shifting pattern of allegiances and alliances.

- Throughout this period there were usually five or six major powers in Europe—some combination of England, France, Spain, Prussia, Russia, Austria, the Ottoman Empire, Sweden, and the United Provinces (i.e., Holland)—that were successful in preventing any one power from becoming powerful enough to dominate all of Europe.

- Whenever one became too powerful or ambitious, the other major powers would align against it. Because the power of monarchs was absolute and they had no real ideological differences, allegiances could shift rapidly when the balance was threatened.

- Absolutism, hence, did have its advantages.
The Evolution of The Modern State System
The Age of Revolutions (1789-1914)
The Age of Revolutions
(1789-1914)

- The American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 signaled the introduction of a new idea that would in time unravel the political order of European societies.

- Before these revolutions, the rulers of Europe claimed divine sources of legitimacy: Louis XVI ruled over the people of France not because they wanted him but because God willed it.

- At the core of the American and French revolutions was the dangerous, indeed revolutionary, idea of popular sovereignty—the notion that governments needed to derive their authority and legitimacy from the people over whom they ruled.
The Origin of the Age of Revolutions

- The story of how the comparatively genteel world of the 1700s gave way to the horrors of World War I’s trenches involves two interrelated developments.

- The first was **the rise of modern nationalism**, which altered the relationship between people and their governments, thus eroding the foundations of absolutist monarchism. And as absolutist monarchism faded, the international order it supported began to change.

- The second development was **the industrial revolution**, which would alter the social and political character of European societies and increase dramatically the destructive potential of warfare.

- **Modern nationalism** would eventually combine with **industrialism** on the bloody battlefields of World War I.
The French Revolution of 1789

❖ The French Revolution did not start as a revolution but merely as resistance to King Louis XVI’s attempts to raise taxes (largely to pay off debts incurred when the French sided with American colonists in their war for independence).

❖ The resistance rapidly snowballed into a revolt against the monarchy itself, resulting in the overthrow of Louis XVI in 1792 and the establishment of the French Republic.

❖ A “Reign of Terror” eventually ensued in which thousands of nobles and supposed enemies of the revolution met with a gruesome end, usually via the infamous guillotine. Even Louis XVI and his queen, Marie Antoinette, were not spared the blade.

Watch the History Channel Documentary The French Revolution.
The Significance of the French Revolution

- The most powerful monarch in Europe, Luis XVI was dethroned. As a result, the Revolution and overthrow of the French monarchy came to be seen as a threat to the entire system of absolutist monarchism.

- The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen) is a fundamental document of the French Revolution and in the history of human rights. Influenced by the doctrine of "natural right," the rights of man are held to be universal: valid at all times and in every place, pertaining to human nature itself. Egalité, fraternité, liberté.

- As it became apparent that the Revolution would succeed and maybe even spread, the neighboring monarchs concluded that they had a vested interest in crushing the revolt and restoring the French monarchy. The revolutionary government anticipated hostility and prepared to defend itself. France’s first step was the creation of a massive citizen army. The call went out for volunteers, with the appeal being made not on the basis of financial reward but rather loyalty to the revolution and nation.
Levée en masse

- When the call failed to produce sufficient forces, the government instituted **the levée en masse** in 1793, conscripting all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 25 into military service.

- As a result of the levée en masse, “by the summer of 1794 the revolutionary army listed a million men on its rolls, of whom 750,000 were present under arms—a great force which, in terms of social class, occupation, and geographical origin, accurately reflected French society.

- It was the nation in arms composed of the best young men France could offer.

- Unlike the pre-Revolutionary French army, French citizenship was a prerequisite for service. This was now **the nation’s army**.
Populist Dictatorship

- Though the citizen army of the French Republic successfully defended the revolution against its foreign enemies, the Republic had other problems. Constant fighting, some military setbacks, domestic political conflicts, and economic difficulties led to political instability.

- Exploiting domestic strife, Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821), an ambitious revolutionary general known for military brilliance and personal arrogance, staged a coup in 1799.

- Though he eventually crowned himself Emperor, there was a critical difference between Napoleon and his monarchical predecessors. Echoing the ideals of the Revolution, Napoleon maintained that his right to rule was derived from the French people (germane to constitutional monarchy). In claiming nearly absolute power while also insisting that his rule derived its legitimacy from the people, Napoleon became the first (but certainly not the last) populist dictator in modern Europe.
Napoleonic Wars (1802–1815)

- After consolidating power, Napoleon Bonaparte embarked on a program of conquest cloaked in the rhetoric and ideals of the French Revolution.

- The Napoleonic Wars (1802–1815) plunged Europe into another thirteen years of war. Given the unprecedented size of the French army motivated by emotional appeals to spread the revolution, it was war on a grand scale.

- Napoleon’s forces swept across Europe until France controlled most of the continent. It was not until his armies reached the outskirts of Moscow in 1812 that the tide finally turned.

- Napoleon’s ambitions had gotten the better of him. His invasion of Russia proved to be a fatal mistake. A series of military defeats for France ended with the final failure at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815.
Battle of Waterloo by William Sadler
A number of wars fought against Napoleon Bonaparte and his French Empire by European coalitions.
1815 saw the start of 100 years of relative peace in Europe, know as the Pax Britannica.
The Peculiarities of the Napoleonic Wars (1802-1815)

- In many respects, the battles of the Napoleonic Wars looked very much like those of the 1700s—the soldiers and their weapons all looked the same. **The major difference was scale.**

- France’s ability to mobilize and conscript men by the hundreds of thousands forced the other nations of Europe to respond in kind. Before the French Revolution, a battle involving 80,000 troops would have been extremely rare.

- Such battles were dwarfed by the major clashes of the Napoleonic Wars. The Battle of Leipzig (1813) involved more than 200,000 French and another 300,000 Austrian, Russian, Prussian, and Swedish forces. With more than half a million troops on the field, the Battle of Leipzig involved at least five times as many men as a very large battle of the pre-Revolutionary era. **The scale of war had changed to the point where it was no longer just a different level of warfare but a fundamentally new way of preparing for and waging war.**
The Birth of Nationalism

❖ This expanding scale of war was possible because people were increasingly willing to fight and make sacrifices for their governments—and governments were more willing and able to ask people to make these sacrifices.

❖ The French Revolution was a turning point because it marked the beginnings of modern nationalism.

❖ The willingness of people from all levels of society to make sacrifices on behalf of their nation was a profoundly important development because “it was this psychological change—this popular sense of identification with the nation—that enabled the French to wage the new kind of war.”
After the Napoleonic Wars, the victorious monarchs of Europe formed the **Concert of Europe**, promising to resolve their disputes without resort to force and maintain a balance of power so that no one power would be tempted to dominate the whole continent, trying to recreate the order of pre-Revolutionary Europe.

But no matter how much they yearned for the days of *absolute monarchism*, professional armies and limited wars, a permanent return would prove to be impossible. The nationalism of the French Revolution and the knowledge of how to organize and fight wars on a grand scale could not be forgotten. Furthermore, Europe was poised on the brink of another revolution (1848) that would transform the domestic societies and international order they sought to preserve.

Its founding powers were **Austria**, **Prussia**, **the Russian Empire** and **the United Kingdom**, the members of the Quadruple Alliance responsible for the downfall of the First French Empire. In time, **France** was established as a fifth member of the concert.
The Meaning of Nationalism

- Born with the French Revolution, **modern nationalism** has three major components.

  - First, nationalism entails an **emotional or psychological sense of affinity** among people who share an ethnic, cultural, and linguistic heritage. A Frenchman who lives in Paris may never meet a countryman from Lyon, but they nonetheless feel connected as part of a distinct social grouping.

  - Second, modern nationalism embraces the **doctrine of popular sovereignty**, according to which the only basis for legitimate government is the will of the people. This was the essence of the French and American revolutions.

  - Finally, modern nationalism places a high value on **ethnic or national self-determination**. Each ethnic or national group has a right to determine its own destiny, have its own government or state, and rule itself.
The Implications of Nationalism

Thus, nationalism has both domestic and international implications. Domestically, it defines what is considered a legitimate political order. Internationally, it demands that political boundaries coincide with ethnic or national boundaries.

The idea of national or ethnic self-determination was a political time bomb in nineteenth-century Europe because its political map did not reflect its ethnic composition and distribution.

There were a few places, such as France, where political and ethnic boundaries overlapped fairly well. Even in this case, however, the fit was not perfect: there were small populations of Germans as well as Basques and others in parts of France. The ideal of self-determination is hard to meet in reality.

However, should colonized peoples or those in imperialist geo-political spheres be expected to give up on their national independence?
Multinational States & Multistate Nations

More problematic were Europe’s major multinational states or empires, incorporating many ethnic and national groups within the boundaries of a single state. Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman (or Turkish) Empire, and the Russian Empire were the most prominent examples. Within Austria-Hungary, for example, there were at least ten different ethnic groups [Germans, Hungarians (also called Magyars), Romanians, Slovenes, Croats, Czechs, Poles, and so on] (see Map 1.2).

In addition to the multiethnic empires, there were also several multistate nations in which one national or ethnic grouping was divided into several states. The Germans were the most significant example of a multistate nation through most of the nineteenth century. Before 1871, no such country as Germany existed; the area that we know as Germany was divided in several states (Prussia, Bavaria, Hannover, etc.).
The Impact of Nationalism

- Nationalism would have a different impact depending on the particular ethnic or political configuration.

- In the case of the **Austrian-Hungarian** and **Ottoman empires**, nationalism was a disintegrative force. As different ethnic groups demanded greater autonomy, power, and even independence, central governments found it necessary to expend resources and effort to suppress nationalist movements. The spread of nationalism would gradually weaken states composed of many different ethnic groups.

- But nationalism proved to have the opposite effect in places like **Germany**, where it led to the creation of new, larger, and more powerful political entities. The **unification of Italy in 1861** and **that of the German states in 1871** were logical consequences of the doctrine of ethnic self-determination.

- Thus, nationalism was both a destructive, disintegrating force and a creative, integrating force.
Germany - the New European Power

- Between 1864 and 1871, the Prussian general Otto von Bismarck waged a series of quick and decisive wars to unify the German states. This was a monumental geopolitical development.

- The unification of Germany in only seven years marked the almost overnight creation of a new great power in the heart of Europe. With its substantial population, industrial output, efficient government administration, and military power based on the renowned Prussian army, Germany was a force to reckon with, and German power only increased in the decades following unification.
By the turn of the century, German industrial output had soared past Great Britain’s.

“Germany’s enormous growth was the disturbing element in European affairs. It was a development that could not be accommodated within the existing order.... Although surpassing the other powers in military and economic terms, they lagged behind in what were supposed to be the fruits, as well as the sources of power: territorial possessions.”

Germany formed an alliance with Austria-Hungary and Italy in 1882. After years of searching for a partner, France finally formed an alliance with Russia in 1892. This basic division of Europe remained intact until the outbreak of World War I.

To truly understand the causes of WWI, see these two short documentaries.
Europe, 1914

The Triple Alliance
- German Empire
- Austria-Hungary
- Italy

The Double Alliance
- France
- Russia
The Industrial Revolution

- The industrial revolution changed European societies in ways that reinforced many of the developments associated with nationalism, particularly the erosion of monarchical rule and the rise of mass politics.

- The industrial revolution allowed for the production of commodities cheaply and in vast quantities. Not just clothes, canned goods, and railroad cars poured off the assembly lines but also guns, cannons, ammunition, and military uniforms.

- The wealth, weapons, and technology created during the industrial revolution widened the power gap between Europe and the non-Western world, contributing to the expansion of European influence to all corners of the world.

- The industrial revolution also created new economic and social classes — a small elite of wealthy barons of industry; a substantial middle class of managers, entrepreneurs, and skilled workers; and an ever-increasing and organized urban working class.
Second Wave of Imperialism

- Historians differ on what forces drove the second wave of imperialism.

- Some argued that the major cause was industrial capitalism’s need for overseas markets and access to cheap raw materials, resources, and labor.

- Others saw imperialism as a primarily cultural phenomenon, arguing that notions of ethnic, racial, and religious superiority led Europeans to conquer the “backward” parts of the world in a missionary attempt to spread the virtues of Christianity and Western culture.

- Whatever the motivation, “Europe’s domination of the world...reflected the ability of sophisticated weapons and advanced techniques to overcome the inherent advantages of native populations.... The machine-gun was only the most concrete military expression of the tactical superiority enjoyed by European armies in Asia and Africa.

- Nationalism and the industrial revolution allowed governments to create war machines capable of unparalleled destruction. European political and military power had spread to even the most remote reaches of the world.
The Thames Tunnel (opened 1843)
Cement was used in the world's first underwater tunnel
technological advancements and improved life style for higher classes
The first general laws against child labour, the **Factory Acts**, were passed in Britain in the first half of the 19th century. Children younger than nine were not allowed to work in textile industry and the work day of youth under the age of 18 was limited to twelve hours. Only in 1893, the employment of children under 13 was ended.

See: The Life of the Industrial Worker in Nineteenth-Century England and Child Labor in the British National Archives
"Chained, belted, harnessed like dogs...black, saturated with wet, and more than half-naked, crawling upon their hands and knees, and dragging their heavy loads behind them..."

Ivor Brown, British journalist.
(1891-1974)
See the movie:
The Children Who Built Victorian Britain
Cotton Mill Girls, Tifton, GA, 1909, photo by Lewis Hine

Lewis W. Hine’s (1874 – 1940) photographs are credited with bringing to the national consciousness the plight of child laborers in early twentieth century America. Social historians consider these images a major influence on much-needed child labor reform.
Two girls protesting child labour (by calling it child slavery) in the 1909 New York City Labor Day parade.

An estimated 1.7 million children under the age of fifteen were employed in American industry by 1900. In 1910, over 2 million children in the same age group were employed in the United States.
The Evolution of
The Modern State System
The Age of Total War
(1914-1945)
Basic info on WWI

- The emergence of the powerful German Empire in 1871 disrupted the European balance of power.
- June 28, 1914 - the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his pregnant wife Sofia assassinated in Sarajevo by Gavrilo Prinzip (17 yo) - a young Serbian nationalist from Bosnia.
- Austro-Hungarian Empire declares war to Serbia - the Russian (Orthodox Christian) ally.
- German Empire was allied with the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
- Germany decided to attack France via Belgium first. Britain was committed by treaty to Belgian independence, so it declared war on Germany. World War I had started.
- **World War I became the first total war**, in which every element of society and every aspect of national life were consumed by the conduct of war.
- **total war** - A war in which participants mobilize all available resources, human and material, for the purpose of waging war.
- The French and British called the war “the Great War”
- German military strategists understood that the war was being waged among rival empires with worldwide interests.
- These empires depended on their colonial possessions to maintain their strategic position and economic well-being. Colonies were also indispensable for the French and British military efforts.
- Therefore, it could be said that the cause of WWI, in its essence, was *imperialist rivalries*, *the arms race* made it possible, *the network of alliances* made it global, and *nationalism* was used by the large powers to mobilize their own people for the cause and to mobilize the minorities in the opposing powers to help their demise.

See the movie: The Origins of WWI - part 1 & 2
Alliances during WWI

- CENTRAL POWERS
  Germany, Austro-Hungary, Ottoman empire, and Bulgaria

- ENTENTE POWERS
  Britain, France, and Russia. From 1915, Italy. From 1917, the US.
  Associated forces were also Australia, Canada, Indian Empire,
  New Zealand, Newfoundland, South Africa; Belgium, Greece,
  Japan, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Portugal, Romania, Serbia.

- NEUTRAL STATES
  Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.
### WWI Casualties - Entente Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Mobilized Forces</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Prisoners and Missing</th>
<th>Total Casualties</th>
<th>Casualties as % of Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>4,950,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>9,150,000</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Empire</td>
<td>8,904,467</td>
<td>908,371</td>
<td>2,090,212</td>
<td>191,652</td>
<td>3,190,235</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8,410,000</td>
<td>1,357,800</td>
<td>4,266,000</td>
<td>537,000</td>
<td>6,160,800</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5,615,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>947,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>2,197,000</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4,355,000</td>
<td>116,516</td>
<td>204,002</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>323,018</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>335,706</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>535,706</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>707,343</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>133,148</td>
<td>152,958</td>
<td>331,106</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td>13,716</td>
<td>44,686</td>
<td>34,659</td>
<td>93,061</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>7,222</td>
<td>13,751</td>
<td>12,318</td>
<td>33,291</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,188,810</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,142,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,800,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,121,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,062,427</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [WWI Casualties and deaths Tables - PBS](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wwi/wwiindex.html)
## WWI Casualties - Central Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Mobilized Forces</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Prisoners and Missing</th>
<th>Total Casualties</th>
<th>Casualties as % of Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>1,773,700</td>
<td>4,216,058</td>
<td>1,152,800</td>
<td>7,142,558</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>7,800,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>3,620,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>7,020,000</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,850,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>152,390</td>
<td>27,029</td>
<td>266,919</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22,850,000</td>
<td>3,386,200</td>
<td>8,388,448</td>
<td>3,629,829</td>
<td>15,404,477</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>65,038,810</td>
<td>8,528,831</td>
<td>21,189,154</td>
<td>7,750,919</td>
<td>37,466,904</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [WWI Casualties and deaths Tables - PBS](https://www.pbs.org/)
As a comparison: U.S. Casualties in Major Wars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War</th>
<th>Number Serving</th>
<th>Battle Deaths</th>
<th>Disease &amp; Accidents</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Total Casualties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary War</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War of 1812</td>
<td>286,730</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican War</td>
<td>78,718</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>4,152</td>
<td>17,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>2,213,362</td>
<td>140,414</td>
<td>224,097</td>
<td>281,881</td>
<td>646,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American War</td>
<td>306,760</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>4,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War I</td>
<td>4,743,826</td>
<td>53,513</td>
<td>63,195</td>
<td>204,002</td>
<td>320,710*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>16,353,659</td>
<td>292,131</td>
<td>115,185</td>
<td>670,846</td>
<td>1,078,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean War</td>
<td>5,764,143</td>
<td>33,651</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>103,284</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam War</td>
<td>8,744,000</td>
<td>47,369</td>
<td>10,799</td>
<td>153,303</td>
<td>211,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Gulf War</td>
<td>467,539</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = Not available
* Does not include the number of soldiers missing in action
Source: U.S. Department of Justice

Source: [WWI Casualties and deaths Tables - PBS](https://www.pbs.org)
Some civilian losses during WWI

- Per capita, losses in the Ottoman Empire and Persia among the highest of all nations.
- Germany lost 9% of its population
- France lost 11% of its population
- Ottoman Empire lost almost 25% of its population or 5 million people out of 21 million
- 4/5 of Ottoman victims were non-combatants
Bolshevik Revolution (1917)

❖ Largely because of the devastation of the war, the demoralization of the army, and the weakness of the government, the Bolsheviks (the communists) seized power in the Russian Revolution of November 1917 and quickly made good on their promise to withdraw Russia from the war.

❖ The Bolsheviks were anti-imperialists and did not see any sense in waging an imperialist war, as it was WWI. They did not want to sacrifice the lives of their workers and peasants.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1870-1924) - the leader of Russian Bolsheviks
Versailles Treaty (1919)

- WWI was brought to a formal end with the Versailles Treaty.

- The treaty was in many senses a quintessential “victor’s peace”—harsh on the losers, easy on the winners. Germany was required to accept conditions that applied to no one else—1. relinquishment of territory, 2. restrictions on the size of its armed forces, and 3. payment of huge reparations.

- Most important, Germany was forced to accept sole and total blame for the war. This provision was particularly galling and humiliating for the Germans, who came to feel that they had been unfairly singled out for harsh treatment.

- As a result, “all German parties and statesmen ... took it for granted that the Treaty of Versailles required drastic revision.” A decade later, Hitler and the Nazis were able to take advantage of and exploit these sentiments during their rise to power. See a movie on the Versailles Treaty
New European Borders after the Treaty of Versailles
German Territorial Losses after the Treaty of Versailles

**German Territorial Losses 1919-1921**

NORTHERN SCHLESWIG voted to join Denmark (75% to 25%)

SOUTHERN SCHLESWIG voted to remain German (81% to 19%)

DANZIG Declared a "Free City" administered by League of Nations

MEMEL LAND seized by Lithuania 1920

ALLENSTEIN voted to remain German (97.5% to 2.5%)

MARIENWERDER voted to remain German (92.8% to 7.2%)

SO-CALLED POLISH CORRIDOR (WEST PRUSSIA and POSEN) transferred to Poland without a plebiscite

EUPEN-MALMEDY transferred to Belgium

SAARLAND Administered by France under the League of Nations until a Plebiscite to be held in 1935

ALSACE-LORRAINE Ceded to France without a Plebiscite after 47 years of German rule.

DEMILITARIZED RHINELAND Administered by Germany, but no fortifications or military forces allowed in the area.

UPPER SILESIA Unexpectedly divided into two zones: Western and Eastern, after a plebiscite produced a majority favoring remaining German (68% to 32%)

Legend:
- **Black** Territory lost by Germany after her defeat
- **Gray** Territory retained by Germany following voting by the local population
- **Yellow** Territory retained by Germany, but within which no fortifications could be built or soldiers stationed
League of Nations

- Many yearned for the creation of a postwar order that might prevent another war, and **U.S. President Woodrow Wilson** attempted to provide one. The cornerstone of his postwar order was **the League of Nations** to provide a collective, international response to future threats to peace. The League eventually proved ineffective. Several obstacles doomed the League:

- First, despite the organization’s connection to Woodrow Wilson, **the United States failed to join** when the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the treaty.

- Second, **the Soviet Union retreated into isolation**.

- Third, and most important, **the League’s members were unwilling to do what was necessary to respond to threats to peace**. The League was a voluntary organization of states, not a world government. It did not have its own military forces. If it were to mount a credible response, it would need to convince its member to do so. In the end, they were unwilling to respond when needed.
The Interwar Period (1918-1939)

- Traditional accounts date the start of World War II to Germany’s invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, although Japan’s takeover of Manchuria (part of China) in 1931 or its invasion of China in 1937 can also mark the starting point. As Japan was expanding its empire in Asia, Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933.

- Ravaged by the Great Depression and limited by the Treaty of Versailles, Germany remained too weak in the early years of Nazi rule to cause much trouble. By 1935, however, the German economy was recovering and Hitler began to implement his plan to restore and expand German power. Conscription was resumed and the new German air force (the Luftwaffe) was unveiled. Though both actions violated the Treaty of Versailles, Germany’s neighbors did nothing.

- Hitler’s first major international move occurred in 1936, when German forces reentered the Rhineland (German territory on the border with France), violating the Treaty of Versailles. Again, Germany’s neighbors did nothing.

See the movie on the Ruhr Crisis 1922-24
The Policy of Appeasement

- Hitler became increasingly bold. Between 1936 and 1938 German military spending increased dramatically and went largely unmatched and unchallenged. Instead of resisting these initial German moves, Western nations engaged in a policy of **appeasement**.

- **Appeasement** - A policy in which nations deal with international conflicts by giving in to the demands of their opponents. The term acquired an extremely negative connotation as a result of attempts to appease Hitler and Nazi Germany in the years before World War II.

- Rather than risk war over demands that could be seen as legitimate, France and Britain acquiesced. Though a few lonely voices, such as Winston Churchill in Britain, expressed concern, the policy of appeasement remained popular, in part because the idea of another war was so unpopular.

- Most importantly, neither France nor U.K, recovered after WWI sufficiently and were militarily incapable of starting another war.
The Munich Agreement 1938

- The most infamous act of appeasement occurred in the fall of 1938 in the form of the Munich Agreement.

- The problem (or pretext) was the presence of ethnic Germans living in a part of Czechoslovakia known as the Sudetenland. With the encouragement of Hitler and the German government in Berlin, the Sudeten Germans demanded to be unified with Germany.

- As the situation approached war, a conference was held in Munich in which France and Britain (without the consent of the Czechs) gave Hitler what he wanted. Upon his return home, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain waved the agreement aloft, proclaiming proudly the achievement of “peace in our time.” A few months later, in March 1939, Germany surprised the world again by invading and capturing the rest of Czechoslovakia. The Munich Agreement had not satisfied Hitler. Now it was clear to all that his goals went well beyond revising the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler wanted the entire eastern Europe for himself.
WWII
Basic info on WWII

- For all practical purposes, WWII can be considered a continuation of WWI. In that regard, imperialist rivalries could be considered its cause.

- **The Allies:** USSR, US, UK, China, France, Poland, Canada, Australia, New Zeland, South Africa, Yugoslavia, Greece, Denmark, Norway, Netherlands, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Brazil, Mexico, Indonesia, India, French Indochina, Burma, etc.

- **The Axis Powers:** Germany, Japan, Rumania, Hungary, Italy.

- The vast majority of the fighting in Europe between 1941 and 1944 took place on the Eastern Front between Germany and the Soviet Union. Stalin pressured Churchill and U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to relieve the burden of fighting on the Soviet Union by opening a “second front” in Western Europe, but this would not happen until June 1944. In the meantime the Soviet Union suffered massive casualties.
World War II Military Deaths
(Axis)

- Germany 64%
- Japan 24%
- Italy 4%
- Romania 4%
- Hungary 4%
- Bulgaria <0.3%
World War II - visual scale of military deaths by theater, year

Europe:

- West
  - 1945
  - Germany, Italy - 0.8 mln.
  - Western Allies - 1.5 mln.
    - including:
      - Yugoslavia - 0.45
      - UK - 0.37
      - France - 0.22
      - USA - 0.18
      - Canada - 0.04

- East
  - 1945
  - Germany, Italy, Romania, Hungary, ROA, UPA - 5.2 mln.
  - USSR, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria - 10.65 mln.

Asia:

- Pacific
  - 1945
  - Japan - 0.48 mln.
  - USA - 0.23 mln.

- Manchuria
  - 1945
  - Japan - 0.32 mln.
  - USSR - 0.02 mln.

By Sergey Mavrody
Total casualties of WWII for the entire world including the countries not listed here is estimated to be c 61 millions.

Sources:
WWII statistics
WWII casualties
The Evolution of The Modern State System
The Cold War (1945-1989)
The Beginning of The Cold War

- After waging two wars (WWI & WWII) in the span of thirty years with combined casualties approaching 100 million, the obvious concern was avoiding yet another war.

- Though no one knew how to avoid yet another world war, most realized everything depended on whether the United States and the Soviet Union would be able to build on the cooperative relationship established during the war. Everyone knew that these two countries would emerge from the war as the dominant powers, and the general character of any international order is usually defined by the nature of relations among its major powers.

- Before World War II, the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union had been strained; the United States had refused even to recognize the Soviet government until 1933. Nonetheless, some hoped that their wartime alliance might form the basis for a better relationship. Others remained doubtful, seeing the wartime alliance as a product of unusual circumstances—namely, the presence of a common threat in Nazi Germany. Once that threat was eliminated, conflicts between the United States and the Soviet Union were expected to resurface.
Mistrust & Alliance of Convenience

- Already during the war, there were indications of future trouble. One can look to the U.S. atomic bomb program, the Manhattan Project, for one sign of the problems to come. Even though Great Britain was kept informed about the progress of the project, Britain and the United States decided not to share the information with the Soviet Union, though Stalin certainly knew about the project from spying. Despite the alliance President Roosevelt saw no reason to take the Soviets into American confidence about a weapons system of potentially great significance in the post-war years.

- Another problem between the U.S. and the USSR was the delayed opening of the second front in Europe. The Soviets felt that they were not treated as allies. And indeed, the United States–Soviet alliance during World War II was more a product of a common threat than of broader common interests and outlooks. To use a familiar adage of international politics: the enemy of my enemy is my friend. It is more accurate to view the United States and Soviet Union as co-belligerents in the war against Germany, not allies in any deeper sense of the term.
Disagreement about the future of Eastern Europe

- Another sign of trouble between the US and the USSR was disagreements about the postwar fate of Eastern Europe (e.g., Poland, Romania, Hungary, and others).
- The military reality was that at war’s end Soviet forces would control these countries. The United States insisted that Stalin hold free elections in Eastern Europe after the war. In fact, Stalin signed the Declaration on Liberated Europe (1945), which called for free and open elections. Stalin, however, wanted governments friendly to the Soviet Union.
- Given Soviet losses in World War II, Stalin thought this was a reasonable demand to protect Soviet security in the future. Unfortunately, these two objectives could not be met simultaneously: freely elected governments in Eastern Europe would not have been friendly to the Soviet Union.
United States–Soviet relations deteriorated rapidly after WWII. The impossibility of reconciling the Western desires for free elections in Eastern Europe with Soviet expectations of friendly regimes became obvious as Stalin moved to impose communist governments. It was increasingly clear that Stalin had no intention of abiding by the democratic provisions of the Declaration on Liberated Europe. Political dissent throughout Eastern Europe was ruthlessly crushed.

Soviet actions prompted Winston Churchill’s famous warning that “from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent.”
The Policy of Containment

❖ An American diplomat in Moscow, George Kennan, composed an analysis of Soviet policy. Conveyed to Washington as a diplomatic telegram in early February 1946, it argued that the United States needed to understand the expansionist nature of Soviet policy and the threats it posed to U.S. interests. The sources of Soviet expansion, he argued, were deeply rooted in Russia’s historical insecurity, Stalin’s paranoid personality, the communist regime’s need for external enemies, and the imperatives of Soviet ideology.

❖ Though in the long run these expansionist tendencies could be modified or tamed, the only immediate option available to the United States was a policy of containment. The United States needed to use its power—political, economic, and military—to prevent further expansion of Soviet influence.

❖ Even those who were less concerned with a direct military attack worried that postwar economic hardship would provide fertile ground for communist parties loyal to the Soviet Union to come to power. Virtually everyone agreed that the economic reconstruction of Western Europe was vital to its security. The primary instrument for recovery was the Marshall Plan, announced in May 1947.
After WWII, communism was gaining momentum against capitalism throughout Europe due to suffering economies and post-war food shortages. To turn the tide, the U.S. introduced the Marshall Plan to help rebuild allied nations in Europe in order to keep communism at bay, a program which remained in effect for 4 years. The U.S. motivation was also to reconstruct international markets it depended upon for trade, especially export trade, as U.S. had developed a massive agricultural and industrial capability. By 1951, every nation but Germany which received aid had grown their respective economies to pre-war levels. As part of the plan, tariffs were eliminated, and more capitalistic policies were adopted west of the Soviet Bloc. Rising from ashes, Europe experienced unprecedented economic growth after WWII. Germany continued to struggle economically due to punitive measures put into place against it after the war. By the early 1950s, despite encouraging growth, European economies had reached a point of stagnation. It was determined that an inability to trade with Germany was a major reason. Alleviating penalties resulted in a positive impact for the rest of Western Europe. However, the initial adjustment was to simply reduce penalties, while still imposing manufacturing limits. When all production limits were lifted, Germany and the rest of Western Europe realized a much greater economic surge since Europe depended on Germany's manufacturing and industrial capabilities. The USSR rejected contributions from the Marshall Plan, due to the conditions that accompanied it, such as allowing U.S. supervision of the participant's economy, and to be part of unified European economy based on free trade.
Marshall Plan (cont’d) The resulting integration of European nations would set the stage for the European Union in later years. Spain would be the only western nation excluded, as it attempted to rely (unsuccessfully) on self-sufficiency. Spain would recover in the 50s when the embargo was lifted, and it received some U.S. aid dollars. Criticism of the plan includes claims that it helped western nations build militaries more than it helped grow economies. It also contributed to at least some government corruption since aid dollars are typically used much less efficiently (and honestly) than investment dollars. Japan did not receive any aid, yet its economy grew more rapidly than Europe in the 1950s. Even if such criticisms are true, the plan nonetheless increased U.S. influence in Europe, increasing capitalistic tendencies in countries that had previously been resistant to it, such as France, Italy, and later Spain.

Marshall Plan was named after Secretary of State, George Marshall.
Introduction of Truman Doctrine to Combat Communism (1947):

- Named after U.S. president Harry Truman.
- Represented an expansive vision of the policy of containment.
- Based on the philosophy that the U.S. would support any regime against communist insurgents, regardless of how repressive an alternative regime may be. It was first put into practice with the support of the Greek monarchy and pro-democracy groups against pro-communist factions in the Greek Civil War immediately following WWII.
- Later, in 1967, the U.S. helped to topple Greece's democratic government when it was suspected it was becoming sympathetic to communist influence. Unfortunately for Greece, it was replaced with an oppressive military authoritarian government.
The Fall of China & the Korean War

❖ The fall of China to the communists in 1949 and the North Korean attack on South Korea in 1950 would have the effect of expanding the scope of containment well beyond Europe.

❖ The United States decided to take military action under the aegis of the United Nations to prevent the expansion of communism into South Korea. The Korean War, which eventually involved China and Soviet Union as well, lasted four years at the cost of more than 50,000 American casualties.

❖ The net effect of the Korean War was to globalize containment. Even if a given country was not strategically very significant, the fear was that if any country fell, others were sure to follow. This became known as the domino theory.

❖ The critics of the U.S. foreign policy claim that the government was not honest when talking about “strategically insignificant countries.” Korea and Vietnam, for instance, had a significant population (today, Koreas have ~75 million and Vietnam ~90 million) and as such represented a significant, potential market that would be inaccessible or not completely accessible if these countries were ruled by anti-capitalist (anti-free trade) governments.
NATO vs. the Warsaw Pact

- The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established in 1949 by 12 Western nations: the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Iceland, Canada, and Portugal.

- The military alliance, which provided for a collective self-defense against Soviet aggression, greatly increased American influence in Europe.

- Greece, Turkey, and West Germany later joined NATO, but in 1966 France withdrew, citing American violations of the 1949 treaty.

- In 1955, the Warsaw Pact, a Soviet-led Eastern European alliance, was established to counter NATO.

- In 1994, three years after the end of the Cold War, NATO engaged in its first military action as part of an international effort to end two years of fighting in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, which all left the Warsaw Pact upon its dissolution in 1991, joined NATO in 1999. Today, there are twenty-six member states in total.
British Decolonization: At the end of WWII, the UK was in disrepair, like most of Europe. Its military was weakened, its economy in shambles, and the government nearly bankrupt. The U.S. and Soviet Union were the pre-eminent global powers, and both were opposed to colonialism, at least in theory. The British saw the writing on the wall almost immediately and began the process of voluntary decolonization, peacefully granting independence to nearly all of its colonies during the ensuing decades with the exception of a few incidents where the UK attempted to maintain possession. Some colonies chose to remain British colonies, with 14 still remaining under UK possession today. They are now referred to as British Overseas Territories. They are mostly island territories such as the Bahamas, British Virgin Islands, and others in the Caribbean.

British Empire Legacy: The British Empire brought about effects still felt today: the pervasiveness of the English language throughout the world, pervasiveness of parliamentary-style democracies, British-style universities, imperial system of measurement, English legal system, popularity of football (soccer), rugby, cricket and related sports, along with many other effects.
New Government in France and Loss of Most of Its Overseas Empire (1958): Public dissatisfaction with Fourth Republic government of France and its insistence on fighting for possession of overseas colonies results in its downfall. It is replaced by the Fifth Republic, which offers peaceful independence to all colonies. Most take advantage of the offer, including Algeria, which had been waging a war of independence against France since 1954.

Algeria gains independence from France (1960) after six years of struggle. According to most historians, about 1,000,000 Algerians lost their lives fighting for the independence of their country.
Note on French Decolonization: Like UK, France was devastated after WWI and especially WWII. During WWII, most of its colonies were possessed by other countries, weakening its position within these colonies when they were restored to France. However, most of its colonies had developed their own sense of nationalism independent of France (pride for their part in helping the war effort, being out from under France rule temporarily), and were acutely aware of the anti-colonial sentiment in the world, as many European colonies were quickly gaining independence. Unlike UK, France would fight to maintain possession of its colonies. Over the next 10-20 years, France would find itself fighting in Vietnam, Cameroon, Algeria among others. Yet, it would be forced to cede independence after each of these armed struggles. These wars would become highly unpopular even at home, where public sentiment was against violent repression of independence movements and colonialism in general (weary of war, moral argument against colonialism). By the fall of its Fourth Republic in 1958, the French public generally supported self-rule in its remaining colonial possessions, most of which were tenuously held anyway, which led to independence of most colonial possessions shortly thereafter (most by 1960).
The Vietnam War (1955-1975)

A former French colony, Vietnam was divided between the communist north, supported by China and the Soviet Union, and the noncommunist, though hardly democratic, south. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, a communist insurgency in South Vietnam supported by North Vietnam threatened the regime in South Vietnam. United States policymakers were determined to support the South Vietnamese government, first in the form of aid and military advisers. It was not long before the United States was actively involved in fighting, and by 1968 there were over 500,000 American combat forces on the ground. Despite repeated promises that victory was at hand, the war dragged on year after year. Public support eroded and protests against the war spread and grew. Despite more than ten years of fighting, the world’s most “powerful” nation was unable to prevail. In 1975, communist forces captured Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, and television screens around the world were filled with scenes of desperate people climbing to the roof of the U.S. embassy to reach helicopters carrying the last people out before the communist victory was total.
The Policy of Détente

- **détente** - the easing of hostility or strained relations, esp. between countries.

Elected president in 1968, **Richard Nixon** and his chief foreign policy adviser, **Henry Kissinger**, embarked upon a policy of détente toward the Soviet Union. They believed the United States possessed tools that could be used as leverage to moderate Soviet behavior. There were things the Soviet Union wanted from the United States. The Soviet Union sought recognition as a power on par with the United States and greater opportunities to trade. In return, the United States wanted greater respect for human rights and restraint in support for communist governments and insurgencies in the Third World, which would also open the markets for them, too. Détente was based on the assumption that these different interests and objectives of the two powers could be “linked” in order to create a relationship based not only on conflict, but also on cooperation.
Opposition to The Policy of Détente

- Détente was controversial, even within Nixon’s own party. A group of conservative Republicans and Democrats, including former governor of California Ronald Reagan, were convinced that détente was a one-way street and equated it to the policy of appeasement. They pointed in particular to a dramatic increase in the Soviet nuclear arsenal during the 1970s. To make matters even worse, the promised benefits of détente failed to materialize as the Soviet Union continued to expand its influence in the Third World, including Latin America.

- The opponents of the détente policy believed that Détente had merely lulled the United States into a false sense of security. Whatever the merits of this argument, the Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 seemed to lend it credence. The invasion was the death knell for détente, an end further ensured by Ronald Reagan’s election to the presidency in 1980.
Increase of Tensions

- Reagan was convinced that détente allowed the Soviet Union to surge ahead of the United States in military power and expand its political influence in the Third World while the United States naïvely waited for Soviet moderation.

- His administration pursued policies that many viewed as a return to the coldest days of the Cold War, including an ambitious increase in military spending in both the conventional and nuclear areas. Nuclear arms control with the Soviet Union was placed on hold. The administration increased assistance to anticommunist governments and insurgency movements in Third World countries.

- Most controversial was aid to the “contras” fighting to overthrow the communist government in Nicaragua. Opponents in the United States feared that Reagan’s policies risked an expensive and dangerous arms race with the Soviet Union as well as possible military intervention in a Third World conflict, another Vietnam. Administration supporters claimed these policies were a necessary demonstration of American power to deter an ambitious Soviet Union. Some may have even hoped that the Soviet Union, suffering from severe economic problems, could never afford to stay in a renewed arms race.
The Evolution of The Modern State System
The post-Cold War Era
(1989-currently)
Mikhail Gorbachev

- Soviet leadership was in a state of transition during Reagan’s first term. **Leonid Brezhnev**, in power since the 1960s, died in 1982. **Mikhail Gorbachev**, appeared on the scene. In 1984, Gorbachev impressed Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain as someone she could “do business with.” People realized quickly this was a new type of Soviet leader. Not only were he and his wife relatively young and outgoing figures, but he also appeared determined to reform the stagnant Soviet system through his twin policies of **perestroika** and **glasnost**.

- **Perestroika** (restructuring) was intended to loosen government control over the economy and move it in a market-oriented direction. **Glasnost** (openness) was designed to open the Soviet political system to greater dissent and discussion of the problems that plagued Soviet society.
Gorbachev’s loyalty to his ideals

- Gorbachev proved his loyalty to glasnost (change to democracy) in the case of Eastern Germany. East Germany’s leader, Erich Honecker, viewed Gorbachev and his reforms with alarm—and with good reason, because Honecker, his cronies, and the infamous secret police (the “Stasi”) were despised by the East German people.

- When Gorbachev visited in October 1989, crowds chanted “Gorby” as Honecker, utterly clueless, stood at his side. Within weeks, opposition to Honecker’s regime led to his ouster and desperate attempts to prevent an outright revolution. It was clear that Gorbachev was not going to save the East German regime from the wrath of its own people. By the middle of November, the Honecker regime was long gone and the Berlin Wall was being torn down.
Berlin Wall Erected by USSR (1961):
Before 1961, skilled workers left East Berlin (Soviet-occupied) to find employment in West Berlin, due to higher salaries and to escape political suppression. Berlin was located deep within East Germany (communist-controlled), but was divided between the USSR and the Western Allies. The Soviets recognized the problems of losing the majority of the skilled workers in East Berlin, therefore constructed the wall dividing the city in two, and drastically reducing the outflow of East Germans to West Germany.

Although Gorbachev did not order the wall torn down, he did not prevent it. People around the world watched in amazement as Berliners in 1989 streamed back and forth under the Brandenburg Gate between East and West Berlin, celebrating on the very spots where they would have been shot days before. The same forces that unraveled communism in Eastern Europe would eventually do the same in the Soviet Union. By 1991, the Soviet Union itself joined the list of former communist nations when Boris Yeltsin, Gorbachev’s successor, declared communism dead and the Soviet Union disintegrated.
1989 - The Fall of the Berlin Wall
The Curious Peace of the Cold War

- Why did the Cold War never turn hot?

- John Mearsheimer highlights two factors, the presence of only two major powers (bipolarity) and nuclear weapons. His argument is simple: The chances for war increase when there are more than two major powers because this increases the number of avenues through which war might break out. If there are five major powers, a war could break out between any two of them. When only two major powers are present, there is only one route to war. The more opportunities there are for something to happen, the more likely it will.

- Furthermore, the fact that the two countries had enough nuclear weapons to annihilate each other made them extremely cautious in their dealings with each other. Many scholars, however, remain skeptical that nuclear weapons were critical in preventing war from breaking out. John Mueller argues that conventional war had become so destructive that this alone was enough to make the two powers extremely hesitant to risk war.
The Balance of Power

- **A balance of power** between the two superpowers is also sometimes credited as the basis for peace. Because the countries were roughly equal in military strength, neither side could be confident of victory in war. As a result, neither side was tempted to start a war.

- Turning this argument somewhat on its head, Stephen Walt sees the peace as resting on a dramatic **imbalance of power**, claiming that the combined power of the United States and its allies (Japan, West Germany, France, Britain, etc.) was substantially greater than that of the Soviet Union and its allies (Poland, Hungary, Romania, etc.). Given this imbalance, it was never necessary for the United States to resort to war. Soviet leaders realized their inferiority and never challenged genuinely vital American interests, thus avoiding any direct confrontation.

- It is interesting that the policies of President Reagan (increased arming of the US, complaints of the Soviet expansions) does not support Walt’s views of Soviet military “inferiority.”

- Whatever the reason, the absence of war between the United States and the Soviet Union is certainly a remarkable (and a very fortunate) feature of the Cold War and its end.
What changed after the Cold War?

❖ The demise and eventual dissolution of the Soviet Union was unquestionably a major event that transformed critical aspects of international relations, especially in Europe.

❖ Germany is unified again for the first time since 1945.

❖ Former allies of the Soviet Union are now members of NATO.

❖ The division of Europe has ended; the iron curtain, lifted.

❖ According to Shimko, outside the confines of Europe, the United States and Russia retain only a fraction of the nuclear weapons they possessed at the height of the Cold War, and this number is set to go lower still.

❖ Let us see how big that “fraction” is.
# Nuclear Weapons: How many and Who has them

Source: The Guardian data from 2009

## Nuclear warheads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of warheads, 2009</th>
<th>Inter-continental missiles</th>
<th>Short-range missiles</th>
<th>Bombs</th>
<th>Submarines / non-strategic</th>
<th>In reserve/awaiting dismantlement</th>
<th>TOTAL NOW</th>
<th>TOTAL IN 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
<td>856</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>8150</td>
<td>12987</td>
<td>21000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>9552</td>
<td>10577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What didn’t change after the Cold War?

- The American influence in the world and the perpetuation of the institutions created under American tutelage during the Cold War.

- The ending of the Cold War did not bring any fundamental alteration in the scope of American military power and commitments throughout the world.

- NATO still exists although the Warsaw Pact has ceased to exist.

- In 2011, the United States accounted for more than forty percent of the world’s military expenditures, more than the next dozen biggest spenders combined (see Figure 1.1). Whether one wishes to refer to this as American “hegemony,” “dominance,” or “unipolarity,” the basic point remains the same.

- The United States also remains the world’s largest and most powerful economy, acc. to some U.S. sources. The EU disagrees. (see Table 1.1).
Figure 1.1. Global Military Expenditure 2011

Global Distribution of Military Expenditure in 2011

- United States: 41.0%
- Next 10 countries combined: 21.3%
- Rest of the world: 18.2%
- France: 3.6%
- UK: 3.6%
- Russia: 4.1%
- China: 8.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GDP (in millions of U.S. Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14,657,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5,878,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5,458,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,315,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,582,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2,247,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2,090,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,055,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,574,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,537,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,465,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,409,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,235,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,039,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1,007,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GDP (Gross Domestic Product) measured in millions of U.S. Dollars.

Source: International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, April 2011: Nominal GDP list of countries. Data for the year 2010.