Lectures do not repeat the textbook or the readings. Material presented in lecture is, generally, one of the following:

- a question (“Why start with Napoleon?”)
- an answer (“image management”)
- evidence, an example that supports the answer (“invasion of Egypt”)
- an explanation of a difficult conceptual term (such as “Orientalism”)

— lecture slides often also contain further information to help you understand the answer or example being presented [for instance, the caption of one of the Napoleon caricatures refers to Revelations, book 13; I cited a bit of that text on the slide so you would have it while looking at the caricature]

— historians often confront source materials (texts and images from the past) that contradict each other [for instance, Napoleon is the savior of Europe or he is the spawn of the devil]; when you review the lecture slides, you should ask yourself whether all the source materials support a single interpretation

— your job is to know the material and to think about it, not to “memorize” it
History 104: Europe from Napoleon to the Present

How to read for this course:
Your job is to understand the material and to *think* about it, not to “memorize” it. Concentrate on the following when you read any source:

**WHAT** was happening when a particular source (text, image, data set, etc.) was produced? In other words, what is its “historical context”? Was it produced in peacetime or during war? Where was it produced? For what *audience*?

**WHO** is its author? What else did he or she write? What can you find out about the author? Remember that some of our evidence about the past has no named author—it is anonymous. Still other sources are produced by collective bodies such as committees.

**WHY** was this text or image produced? Authors always have some *intention* for what they write, though often they have multiple, perhaps competing motives. (For example, in writing a paper, you may *intend* to get an “A” and you may also have a deadline to meet.) Remember that people do not always fully know or understand their own intentions and that writers/painters/architects (etc.) cannot control how other people *respond* to what they have produced. An author’s intention and his or her work’s impact may be very different. (For instance, I am writing this to try to help you, but if you are anxious about your grade it may have the effect of scaring you, instead!)
How to read the textbook for this course:

Your job is to understand and think about the material, not to “memorize” it. Your strategy in reading John Merriman’s *A History of Modern Europe* should be similar to the way you approach the primary sources we read. You should concentrate on the following:

**ARGUMENT** In each section of the book, Merriman is offering his interpretation of a particular event or development in history. Because this is a textbook, he is unlikely to write “This chapter argues that….” Instead, he makes his points in a more subtle fashion, by the way he organizes the material and the examples he uses.

**EVIDENCE** In order to support his interpretation, Merriman uses examples. Some of these are very obvious: “For example, the growth of the linen industry in Porto, Portugal stemmed from villagers in the countryside.” Others may be slightly less so: “in Germany, there were twice as many ‘home workers’ as workers employed in factories.” Merriman uses these, and other examples, as evidence to support his contention that the Industrial Revolution was a gradual and uneven process.

**LANGUAGE** “Slowly but surely, factory production transformed the way Europeans worked and lived.”
Culture, Politics, and Class
Questions historians ask about the Industrial Revolution

Why England? (see the last lecture)

Does it really make sense to understand factory-based manufacture as the defining feature of a “modern economy”? (most of nineteenth-century Europe doesn’t fit this model; and/or, industry might be one stage, followed by finance capitalism and consumerism)

Did it improve people’s lives? (this is called the “standard of living” debate)
The “standard of living” debate: did things get better or worse?

- **timing**: was there a long period of stagnation (or decline) followed by rise in the 1830-1840s?

- **distribution** of wealth: that is, did the rich get richer and the poor did so as well? Or did the rich get richer and the poor get poorer? Was there a significant difference between sectors of the economy (cotton weaving vs. wool; coal mining vs. toy manufacture)? To what extent were incomes age and sex specific?

- **how to measure** “standard of living”: height as an indicator of nutrition/malnutrition? mortality and fertility rates? housing quality (can *this* be measured mathematically)? how many hours worked/week, in what conditions? If someone’s weekly wages increase, does that mean s/he is automatically “better off”?

Questions historians ask about the Industrial Revolution

Why England?

Does it make sense to understand factory manufacture as the defining feature of a “modern economy”?

Did it improve people’s lives?

What is the relation of social-economic change to political and cultural transformations?
How do social-economic changes relate to political-cultural transformations?

Whig/Liberal answer: everything is improved; everyone can benefit from the improvements—if someone fails to do so, there must be something morally wrong with that individual.

Marxist answer: in every era, the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class*; the “bourgeois” property owners benefit from enclosure and industrialization; they then use political institutions and the law to ensure their continued domination (they do not necessarily know that this is what they are doing, but nonetheless it is).

“cultural history” answer: focus on what they meant to people at the time.

*class= a group of people defined by their relation to the “means of production”

What does “means of production” mean?
- It means “how most stuff is made.”
- agricultural society = land
- industrial society = factories

History 104: three basic MODELS of how to relate economic growth to culture and politics.
Nineteenth-century European Liberals

**Liberals support:**

**LIBERTY:**
- free press, free speech, free education
- free trade (no limits on imports, even if they undersell domestic producers)
- freedom of movement

**EQUALITY:**
- formal equality as established by a *written* constitution (abolition of privilege)

Guizot: “enrichissez-vous!”

**Liberals do not usually support:**

- REPUBLICANISM or DEMOCRACY (any form of universal participation in public/political life)

- SOCIALISM (the idea that it might be *social structures* that need to change, rather than individuals)

---

many key features of European “liberalism” are central to “conservative” politics in the USA today

History 104: DEFINITION of a term from the previous slide
Specific historical examples ("case studies") for considering how social-economic changes relate to political-cultural transformations

Liberal model of improvement and progress
“great” Reform Act, 1832

Marxist account of law as an ideological tool used by the ruling class
New Poor Law, 1834

“cultural history”
both “class” and the “independent individual” are gendered categories created through representations (compare: “the Orient”) and in the family
The “great” Reform Act of 1832

British Parliament – bicameral (two house) body
House of Lords: inherited positions (aristocracy)
House of Commons: elected positions (unpaid)

Two issues for reform: suffrage and districting

the situation, 1815-1830
at most 300,000 people qualified to vote (approx. 3.1 % of total population)

no secret ballot (until 1872)

“counties” and “boroughs” each had representatives—suffrage restricted
in the former to owners of substantial property; based on *various* rules in latter

most “boroughs” were defined centuries ago [none in Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow]
re-districting abolished many of the “rotten boroughs”

standardized voting qualifications across all boroughs

more “male property owners” qualified to vote based on amount they paid in property taxes

“With the Reform Act, ‘the sovereignty of the people’ had been established in fact if not in law.”

George Macaulay Trevelyan,* *British History in the Nineteenth Century* (1922).

*Thomas Babington Macaulay’s grand-nephew
New voters elected a heavily Whig (Liberal) Parliament, which passed further reform laws in 1833-1834

- 1832 Anatomy Act (licensed “teachers of anatomy” can take and dissect unclaimed bodies)
- 1833 Abolition of slavery in the British Empire
- 1833 Child labor law regulates by age:
  - 0-9 prohibited from working
  - 9-12 eight-hour day maximum
  - 13-18 twelve-hour day maximum
- 1834 New Poor Law

Whig explanation of history: growing middle class means everybody benefits
To be continued...