
UNIT 10 LIBERAL DEMOCRACY*

Structure

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Background
- 10.3 Versailles and After
- 10.4 The Weimar Republic and Liberal Democracy
- 10.5 Social Struggle and Search for Stability: Britain and France
 - 10.5.1 Britain
 - 10.5.2 France
- 10.6 The Crisis of Diplomacy
- 10.7 The Economic Crisis
- 10.8 Understanding the 1920s
- 10.9 Let Us Sum Up
- 10.10 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

10.0 OBJECTIVES

This Unit discusses the major developments in the period between the end of the First World War and the economic crisis of 1929. After reading this Unit, you will be able to explain:

- the nature of the new regimes in countries like Britain, France and Germany in this period;
- the nature of the crisis that gripped the whole of Europe in this period;
- the factors that led to the economic depression of 1929; and
- how the developments of the 1920s shaped the political happenings in the 1930s and even later.

10.1 INTRODUCTION

If you were to study and compare the Europe of the 19th century with that of the 1820s, you would find fundamental changes between the two periods. This was so because the First World War and the subsequent developments in the field of economy and diplomatic relations transformed the Europe of the 20th century beyond recognition. This Unit discusses the nature of changes that occurred in Europe in the 1920s and their impact on the history of the subsequent period. In particular it focuses on the nature of the liberal democratic regimes which functioned in Britain, France and Germany. It also informs you about the crisis in economy and politics which fundamentally affected the course of events in Europe.

*Dr. Ravi Sundaram, Fellow, CSDS, New Delhi

10.2 BACKGROUND

The historian and critic Eric Hobsbawm once referred to the period 1914- 1945 as the Thirty Years War. Hobsbawm was speaking of the unresolved crisis of Europe after the First World War, thus resulting in the catastrophe of fascism and World War II. The inter-war period may be seen as attempt by various regimes to overcome the crisis, with various solutions being posed ranging from radical revolutions on the Left and fascism on the Right.

What about liberal democracy? Liberal Democracy also emerged from World War I beset with the sense of crisis. Various factors contributed to this. The brutality and savagery of the war, and the mobilization, privation and dislocation all over Europe had led to a considerable radicalisation of the European populations, with revolutions in Russia and failed revolts in Germany and Hungary. In England and France, the main liberal democracies, the old elite model of liberal democratic politics was confronted with movements of workers alienated from the social order, and of women demanding the vote. The economic crisis which obtained with the stock market crash of 1929 further increased pressures on liberal democracy.

The major liberal democratic experiment was the Weimar Republic in Germany. Born out of Germany's defeat in World War I, the Weimar Republic was Germany's first attempt at liberal democracy with a broad adult suffrage. Though crisis-ridden from its very inception, the Weimar period in Germany produced some of the pioneering debates on philosophy and politics and brilliant cultural experiments that made Berlin the cultural capital of Europe in the 1920s.

Internationally, the liberal democratic regimes of France and England pursued in different ways policies of dealing with the main threat perceptions posed by Germany and the Russian Revolution. In the case of Germany, the French were particularly forceful in demanding severe reparations and later pursuing a policy of security pacts with states in Central and Eastern Europe to encircle Germany. The Russian Revolution and the ensuing radical upsurge all over Europe and the world posed particular problems for the liberal democracies. The British were the most aggressive in the campaign against the Russian Revolution, often seeing it as the main threat to security in Europe.

10.3 VERSAILLES AND AFTER

Discussions on the Treaty of Versailles give us an interesting window into the liberal democratic experience in the inter-war period. As we know from the previous discussions, the Versailles conference was the conference of the victorious Allied powers to extract the terms of defeat from Germany. The conference was dominated by three major actors: President Woodrow Wilson of the United States, Georges Clemenceau of France and Lloyd George of Britain. The real debate was between Wilson's liberal vision over the post-war settlement and Clemenceau's nationalist insistence on extracting harsh terms from Germany. Clemenceau was obsessed with what he saw as France's security needs, given that France as a mainland power had suffered the most from the war. Hence the need to break Germany's might once and for all.

On the other hand, Wilson's vision was a broader one. His Fourteen Points stressed the ideals of self-determination, sovereignty and justice. Wilson's idea was to

provide for a new programme stability for the modern state system (which had been put into place by the Treat of Westphalia in the 17th century). This stability had been destroyed beginning with the intra-European rivalry in the 19th century culminating in World War I. The American historian Charles Maier has spoken of how the ideals of Wilson and those of the Russian revolutionary leader Lenin (who was obviously not at Versailles) offer differing yet new ways of perceiving the modern state-system. Thus while Wilson's was a liberal programme speaking of a new world order, world government (the League of Nations), Lenin's was a radical cry to overturn the old state system through world revolution. Further Lenin's call for the self-determination of non-European peoples enlarged his internationalist programme and questioned the foundations of the Westphalia system which had privileged the power of Europe over others. At any rate, the internationalisms of Wilson and Lenin, articulated around the time of Versailles were important as the first significant global statements in the 20th century.

At the Versailles conference itself, it was Clemenceau's hard-nosed policies that carried the day. Severe reparations were imposed on Germany. Germany's military strength was crippled. Her army was cut down to 100,000 men based on voluntary service, the old General Staff was destroyed, and no tanks or heavy weaponry could be produced. Her navy was vastly reduced and the submarine programme abolished. Territorially, Germany was divested of all her colonial possessions totalling a million square miles, as were the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine (which had been taken from France in 1871). Germany ceded the coal mines of the Saar to France for 15 years, the territory itself was administered by the League of Nations.

As the terms of the treaty show, the harshness with which the victors treated Germany and the unwillingness to give freedom to the colonies gave considerable weight to Lenin and the Bolshevik's assertion that World War I was essentially a war among imperial powers to re-divide the world among themselves. In this sense, despite the publicity of the Wilsonian programme of liberal internationalism, Versailles led to considerable disillusionment among colonial peoples with Western liberalism. Nationalists in the colonies now looked to Bolshevik Russia for answers.

Most importantly, Versailles failed to deal with the radically changed situation in the wake of World War I. As the writer Karl Polanyi points out in his classic, *The Great Transformation*, World War I destroyed the foundation of 19th century Europe, unleashing a long period of crisis. Versailles only resulted in deepening this crisis and culminating in the tragedy of World War II.

10.4 THE WEIMAR REPUBLIC AND LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

The Weimar Republic refers to the political system that came into place in Germany after World War I and continued till the Nazi take-over in 1933. The name comes from the town of Weimar in Germany where the Republic's constitution was promulgated.

The Republic was born in the background of defeat, and attempts by revolutionary socialists to emulate the example of the Bolsheviks in Russia. The early days of Weimar were marred by the brutal murder of noted revolutionary socialists Rosa

Luxembourg and Karl Liebknecht by militia men in Berlin. The threat from revolutionary socialism, which became the Communist Party, was to be a constant feature in the Weimar period till the rise of the Nazis.

The very fact that the Republic was established on the principles of universal suffrage, formal political freedom and a democratic parliament was an important step in European history. The old electoral clause which prevented the reformist Social Democrats from expansion were now removed giving the party an important voice. New laws on individual freedoms and social policy were enacted in Weimar largely under Social Democratic influence.

However, the German social democrats were never strong enough to form a government on their own. In the event a coalitional culture resulted, giving parties of the Centre-Right prominence, far more than their actual strength. The major beneficiary of the peculiar situation was the People's Party and their leader Gustav Stresemann. Having become Chancellor with the elections of 1924, so great was the weight of his presence that the short period was called the Stresemann era in German politics.

Stresemann's project was to unite the various fractions of the German elite under the Weimar banner, while fighting off the more radical challenges from the Communists and the Nazis. Internationally, Stresemann was committed to rolling back the legacy of Versailles and paving the way for Germany's re-emergence as a world power. In order to regain the glory of Germany lost at the treaty of Versailles, Stresemann did the following:

- He vigorously opposed the French occupation of Germany's Ruhr valley.
- He got the Dawes plan of 1924 for the economic reconstruction of Germany ratified in the Reichstag of Parliament.
- He gained German admission to the League of Nations in 1926, and
- He also encouraged and helped stimulate German economic recovery by rationalising German industry through a series of cartels, and an aggressive export drive to overcome the balance of payments crisis. By carefully balancing the often contradictory interests of various fractions of the German elite, Stresemann sought to preserve the cause of old style conservative nationalism, now grafted to the liberal constitution of Weimar.

'The Weimar experiment collapsed under the weight of the economic crisis after different factions of Germany's capitalists was destroyed with the collapse of the economy. As the elites retreated from the culture of compromise that is integral to any democratic politics, they saw the Nazi radical right-wing programme as the only solution to the crisis. The historian David Abraham, in his book, *The Collapse of the Republic*, shows us in detail how this compromise among elites worked in Weimar, and when the elites despaired of any other solutions and fearing revolutionary change, opted for the Nazis.

Many discussions after the collapse of Weimar tend to attribute to German "particularity", or the distinctiveness of Germany vis-a-vis the experiences of liberal democracy in England and France. Here German particularity (or *Onderweg* in German) was seen as Germany's incomplete liberal transformation because German industrialists allied with conservative Junkers (an agrarian landlord class originating in Prussia) lacked the will to carry the transformation

to its full conclusion, hence the “backwardness” of Germany, its propensity to lapse into undemocratic rule. The particularity argument has been subject to strong criticism by many contemporary historians (see Eley and Blackbourn, *The Peculiarities of German History*), who point to the problems of using France and England as ideal yardsticks for liberalism. Whatever the debate, it is clear that the Weimar regime was to be replaced by an entirely new type of reactionary politics in Nazism with terrifying consequences in Europe.

Notwithstanding its collapse, the Weimar period will stand out as one of the most stimulating experiments in 20th century Europe. As the late German historian Detlev Peukert pointed out, Weimar’s limited social experiments in public housing and health were to be a model for the post-war reconstruction. Intellectually, there can be little doubt about the critical energy stimulated by the freedoms of Weimar. In the field of philosophy the Weimar period saw the publication of brilliant works by Martin Heidegger, Georg Lukacs (who was Hungarian himself), Karl Mannheim and a host of others. The Frankfurt School for Social Research was set up bringing together some of the best minds of the 20th century: Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Eric Fromm. The critic Walter Benjamin published his important book on German Tragedy, and Erwin Piscator and Bertolt Brecht introduced pioneering experiments in the theatre. The critic Siegfried Kracauer wrote about the role of the film audience in his essays on cinema. In cinema itself, the films of Fritz Lang brought a new voice of German cinema to the world. In other areas, the Bauhaus school of architecture was set up in Berlin pioneering new methods in modern design using building materials like steel and glass. Bauhaus architects like Walter Gropius and Mies Van der Rohe went on to the United States after the Nazi take-over to earn a world reputation. In the fields of fine arts and literature there was also considerable ferment and radical innovation, some of Europe’s best modern painters and writers flocked to Berlin in the Weimar period. The writer Walter Benjamin once called Paris the capital of the nineteenth century due to its ability to attract literary talent and inspire innovation. In a sense Weimar Berlin was the capital of the 1920s, the legacy of which was to live on long after the collapse of the Republic itself.

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) How was Lenin’s vision of the modern state system different from Wilson?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Write in brief about the main features of the treaty of Versailles.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

10.5 SOCIAL STRUGGLE AND SEARCH FOR STABILITY: BRITAIN AND FRANCE

Apart from the Weimar Republic of Germany, France and Britain were the other two important democratic regimes. There were many similarities between the two regimes but they were also different in some ways. Britain had been an economic super power but had lost its superior economic status by the beginning of the 20th century. France, on the other hand, had managed to retain economic prosperity in the post-war period. Let us now discuss the developments in the two countries in the realm of economy and politics.

10.5.1 Britain

The post-war position of Britain confirmed the long term decline of British dominance in the world economy. British dominance, based on the free-trade imperialism of the 19th century, was already in crisis towards the last decade of that century. In the 1920s Britain slowly gave way to the United States economically. At any rate the British dependence on the US during the war had grown, since the UK, was in no position to organise the war effort by itself. However, by 1924 a minor recovery did take place in Britain largely through the financial intervention of the state. Industries like the automobile and ship building revived and by 1925 Winston Churchill was able to restore the pound to its pre-war parity with the dollar and put Britain back on the gold standard. However even this recovery was mixed. Industry never returned to pre-war levels and Britain was increasingly challenged in the world market by the US, Germany and Japan.

This process of long-term decline could not but affect the political scenario. The Liberals, whose politics was based on 19th century free-trade doctrines, began to give way to the Labour. The new tasks were to incorporate the growing demands of social citizenship by the working class. This entailed a certain re-structuring of the 19th century socio-economic system. The Labour party as the main voice of the working class movement was the main beneficiary of this new situation. There were coalitions between Labour and liberal in 1924 and 1929, with the Labour party in a dominating position.

In the 1920s Britain saw a series of prolonged working class struggles and strikes which were a striking break from the relative social peace of the past 50 years. These began in the 1920 with a bitter miners' strike involving a million workers and almost snow-balled into a general strike. The miners were the most militant section of the labour movement and their actions often played the role of catalysing other labour struggles. In May 1926 a new miners' strike began and this time it

led to a general strike. Iron and Steel workers, printers' branches of heavy industry, builders and various other sections of industry struck work. The situation soon grew to serious proportions with troops being sent by the Conservative government. With newspapers absent from the streets, government repression was severe. After nine days the Trade Union Congress called off the strike. The attacks on the labour movement continued with the Conservatives pushing legislation in 1927 which banned sympathetic strikes.

Despite the temporary victory by the Conservatives over the labour movement, it was clear that the decades of social peace which was characteristic of British 19th century liberalism, were now over. The working class whose loyalty had been purchased by colonialism and British dominance in the world economy was now vocal in demanding a new social arrangement with the state. Here Polanyi's words about the decline of the 19th century order ring particularly true, in Britain the Liberals were the first casualty of this new situation.

10.5.2 France

The French economic recovery after World War I was undoubtedly more substantial than that of the UK. Pre-war France was never as advanced industrially in terms of the world economy. French foreign trade was limited in terms of its share in national GNP. To be Sure, French industrialisation and modernisation of agriculture had been proceeding rapidly in the late 19th century, but the steadiness of such growth meant that there were no spectacular equivalents of the Industrial Revolution in England and Reconstruction in the United States.

However, World War I did lead to a substantial rationalisation in French industry to meet the demands of the war effort. This rationalisation continued after the war, the return of Alsace and Lorraine boosted the industrial potential available to France. In the war a decision was taken to develop hydro-electric power to make up for the loss of the coal regions. This in turn led to industrial growth in hitherto agrarian regions. From 1932 onwards there was a steady increase in productive capacity. By 1925 the index of industrial production was double that of 1919, the balance payments position seemed favourable. Yet problems remained. One of the long term legacies of the Revolution was high food prices and a protective agricultural policy towards the post-revolutionary peasantry. The increase in industrial production accompanied by the high wages (a result of high food prices) of French labour meant that French exports were not always competitive.

On the political front French politics in the 1920s was decisively shaped into the Left-Right divide — a feature which continues to this day. From the early 1920s onwards, the Left grew steadily- this included the new Communist Party in addition to the older Socialist Party. The Left first made its presence felt in the elections of 1924 when both the conservative Prime Minister Raymond Poincare as well as the right-wing President Millerand lost. A left coalition (but without Communist participation) came to power for the first time in France. But this coalition, like many of its ideological counterparts in Europe, proved unstable and Poincare returned in the elections of 1926.

The main problem in France as the Left perceived it was the concentration of power in the hands of a financial oligarchy linked to the bank of France. The Left argued that France's famous 200 families (composed of the 200 major

shareholders) constituted a political support for reaction. However in the 1920s social conflict in France remained at a manageable level — all this would change after the economic crisis of 1929.

10.6 THE CRISIS OF DIPLOMACY

The League of Nations was Wilson's great internationalist project for the new era. The League was to provide the foundation for order in the post-war scenario, to remark the international state system which had been successively undermined by conflicts among European powers. The League's main project was 'collective security', but in the European scenario this was subject to a number of twists and turns. Different countries in Europe perceived their security needs differently. For instance, Britain perceived Soviet Russia to be the main enemy, France saw the main threat from the neighbouring Germany.

The European scenario was complicated by a number of factors: the 'problem' of Germany and the unresolved legacy of the Versailles pact; the French clamour for security in Europe, and the Russian revolutionary threat.

Both the French obsession with security and the German problem were linked, since French intransigence often led to crisis in the reparations sought from Germany. The French search for security also led them to try and push their agenda in the League as well as conclude a series of independent pacts with states surrounding Germany. The French agenda in the League often came to naught, with the British expressing exasperation over what they saw as French intransigence over issues of disarmament. This led the French to move towards a policy of bilateralism.

The major consequences of this transition were the Locarno treaties of 1925. Locarno was born out of a previous German request that France and Germany conclude a pledge of not resorting to war between each other, something which would also involve Britain and Belgium. By 1925 the British agreed to guarantee such a treaty, which would also include the Belgian-German frontier. The sum total of the Locarno treaties was as follows: Britain would guarantee the frontier of Belgium against future (German) aggression while France would do the same in the east — protecting Poland and Czechoslovakia. Germany would join the League of Nations. The Locarno treaties were followed up by the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 also known as the Pact of Paris. The pact was universal in scope and the signatories renounced the use of war as an instrument of international relations. Sixty Five States ultimately signed the treaty.

This multitude of pacts and intensive diplomacy created a mood of quietude in Europe. The mood was soon to be broken.

10.7 THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

The immediate post-war period saw the rationalisation of European industry on the lines of American experiments. Ford's assembly line and horizontal integration methods along with a new regime of labour standards had vastly improved productivity in the United States. The success of the United States (which by the end of World War I had become the world's premier industrial nation) was held out as a model for emulation by Europe. Leaders as varied as Lenin and Mussolini

praised American factory reforms and labour regimes as worthy of emulation.

In fact, from Germany to Russia, and France to Italy, variants of American-style reforms took place. All this was often backed up by cheap American credits, by US machinery, and capital goods. In fact it must be underlined that the post-war revival of world trade was largely due to the huge volumes of credit pumped into the world-economy by US lenders.

In a sense the 'recovery' in Europe in the years after World War I was built almost entirely on US loans. The process also ensured a constant supply of liquidity back to US lenders. To take an example, the US lent money to Germany in the 1920s for her recovery. In turn Germany passed on money to the French and the British as part of reparation payments. The French and the British for their part re-routed money back to the US as part of repayment for war loans. The world economy was flush with money supply, most of it US-dominated. The atmosphere was ripe for speculation: a host of new fly-by-night players entered the scene. The period was in fact full of financial scandals and mismanagement, all of which would come to a head at the end of the decade.

The crisis actually began over the rapid drop in agricultural prices in North America. With European recovery the world agricultural surplus began to rise and the North American producers (who had vastly increased production during the war period) were convulsed by a rapid drop in prices. Bankruptcies began in US agriculture and saw a rapid drop in expenditure. It was only a matter of time before the stock market would be affected.

The actual events began to unfold in October 1929. On 24th and 29th of October 1929, thirteen and sixteen and a half million shares were sold. In that month US investors lost 10 billion dollars, a huge sum at that time. The meltdown had begun. The crash was followed by the world-wide fall in agricultural prices. Given the fairly advanced integration of the world — economy for agricultural products, millions of primary producers were affected. As prices of sugar, cotton, tobacco, wheat, rice and a host of other products fell, all monetised export-related parts of the world felt the effects. Plantations and farms closed down, and millions were thrown out from work. The purchasing power of millions of working people the world over crashed and demand for other commodities began to fall. Trade between nations began to dip. Factories closed down, workers were on the streets and incomes showed no signs of stabilizing. The world felt the effects of US hegemony in the global economy. Once American banks stopped lending money (they were the only ones who risked long-term loans) the credit squeeze was felt on a world scale.

This crisis had earlier been predicted by writers like Karl Marx who had spoken about the cyclical nature of capitalism: how its chaotic and unplanned character would lead to periodic crises of over-production. In fact, the tendency towards over-production in capitalism (coupled with low wages at home) had led some writers to deduce a theory of imperialism linked to underconsumption at home. However none of the previous downturns of the world economy had had such serious consequences as that beginning in 1929. The downturn of 1871 was significant in that it undermined British hegemony in the world-economy, but in no way did world-wide depression occur. The Great Depression of 1929 surpassed all the previous downturns in the world economy by its scope and depth of penetration. In a sense this was inevitable. The world-economy had expanded

tremendously in the period after 1871, and vast areas of the globe had been incorporated and monetised. As such the world was more vulnerable to crisis.

The only country that was relatively unaffected by the crisis was the Soviet Union, building “socialism in one country.” The Soviet economic model was now built on two inter-linked thrusts. The first was an agricultural collectivisation campaign aimed at destroying rural private ownership and channelling the surplus into industry. The second was a programme of industrialisation directed by a series of five-year plans. The First Five-Year Plan was launched in 1928, was characterised by a frenetic pace of quota fulfilment, in fact it was claimed that many of the quotas were over fulfilled by 1932 itself, a year early. Russian industry was reorganised, and agriculture was transformed through collectivisation. However, it must be stressed that the agricultural transformation was quite savage with large-scale deaths and dip in productivity.

Soviet planning tended to focus on heavy machinery and engineering goods to the detriment of consumer goods. The results here, though impressive in terms of official figures, were mixed. While production did increase, it did so at a tremendous cost in terms of quality, and large scale waste was not uncommon. The lop-sided development of Soviet industry was not however felt at that time: it would show prominently in the post-war era.

The frenetic pace of Soviet planning was partly a result of the threat perception of the Soviet leadership. Stalin said publicly that the Soviet Union needed to catch up with the West in 10 years or “they will finish us.” At any rate, in the background of the severe economic crisis that had gripped the capitalist world the Soviet Union did not seem to do so badly. Planning seemed to protect the Soviet Union from the severity of the Depression. At that time anyway, the flaws of Soviet planning were not apparent, and radicals in many parts of the world looked to the Soviet Union for hope.

10.8 UNDERSTANDING THE 1920s

As pointed out earlier Karl Polanyi argued that the First World War destroyed the foundations of nineteenth century Europe. In every sense the economic crisis completed this process. The crisis was the final nail in the coffin of 19th century economic liberalism based on British notions of a self-regulating world market and a free-trade regime. After the crisis the role of the state began to take on a new prominence. The heart of this transformation was a reading of the seminal works of the economist John Maynard Keynes, which would become a recipe for economic revival in Europe and the US. Keynes had argued that state intervention was needed in order to stimulate demand for commodities. Thus the state would now intervene to begin public works, take-over sick industries and provide an unemployment allowance to those without work. Here lay the crucial transition from 19th century liberalism: the state, as opposed to free trade and private capital, would now play a crucial role in demand stimulation. Keynesianism became active ingredient of centre-left politics in Europe and North America ranging from the Labour Party in Britain to Roosevelt’s New Deal in the US.

From the Right there were also critiques of the crisis. Most originated from Germany. Oswald Spengler wrote his *Decline of the West* in 1918, widely

distributed in the 1920s. Here Spengler argued that Western civilisation, characterised by industrialism had reached a period of decline in the 20th century. Spengler's alternative which drew from strands of *lebens philosophie* (philosophy of life), was to attack the rational strains of classical modernity and to pose 'life' as an alternative. The political theorist Carl Schmitt wrote his critiques of parliamentary democracy in the 1920s arguing for a plebiscitary dictatorship. The philosopher Martin Heidegger penned his important attacks on Western modernity which he identified as compromised by technological violence and a contempt for being. In various ways, the philosophies of the right were to become justifications for the Nazi regime in the 1930s.

The relative success of the Right pointed to the fragile nature of the settlement after the First World War. If the War signalled the first major crisis of 19th century liberalism, the collapse of the settlement in the 1930s would pave the way for the second.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Discuss the main features of politics and economy of France and Britain in the post-war period.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Write ten lines on the economic crisis of 1920.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

10.9 LET US SUM UP

This Unit explained major developments in the period between the end of the First World War and the depression of 1929. An important feature of Europe in the post-war period was its division along ideological lines into regimes of right, left and the centre. This Unit concentrated mainly on the 'centre', i.e., liberal democratic regimes of Germany, France and Britain. The three regimes had very specific problems to tackle. The treaty of Versailles had imposed humiliating conditions on Germany. The Weimar Republic of Germany, essentially a right-of — centre formation, attempted to restore the pre-war economic status to Germany. But the experiment failed, giving way to an extreme right-wing formation in the form of Nazism. Britain tilted towards a left-of-centre position with the Labour party replacing the Liberals as the dominant political force. France which had considerably improved its economic position after the war, opted for a right-left divide without any coalition, with both the forces alternating.

Apart from the triple ideological division, the other development of consequence was the unprecedented economic crisis that gripped Europe and the rest of the world. The economic boom of the post-war period, over-production of agricultural commodities and the US's domination of the world economy created conditions for the worst ever crisis to have hit world capitalism. Soviet Russia was perhaps the only country unaffected by the world crisis.

The 1920s was a turbulent period in the history of Europe. If the world war destroyed the foundation of 19th century Europe, the depression completed the process of Europe's transformation. Europe had changed irreversibly.

10.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) See Section 10.3
- 2) In your answer you should mention the harsh terms that were imposed on Germany like cutting down the size of German army, and depriving Germany of all her colonial possessions. See Section 10.3
- 3) You should refer to the impact of the economic crisis and the subsequent loss of elite support enjoyed by the Weimar Republic. See Section 10.4

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Whereas in British polity, the liberal domination gave way to control by the Labour party; in France, polity was divided more sharply between left and right. You should also mention the relationship between economics and politics. See Sub-sections 10.2.1 and 10.2.2.
- 2) See Section 10.7. Mention specially the emergence of US as a super economic power and its impact on world economy.