History 4c
Lindemann

Questions for Discussion and Review (Week IV)

Nota bene: This fourth discussion and review sheet is the last before the midterm examination. The four sheets you have been given so far cover the material in the first four weeks of lecture and reading; the midterm exam will also cover that material. Overall, the reading that should be done is McKay, chapters 21 through 24, and Chapter 25, pp. 848-855 [the section dealing with Marxism; the earlier parts of Chapter 25 will be taken up after the midterm]; and Perry, chapters 3 through 6, and chapter 7 pp. 173-183 [again, the selections dealing with Marxism, as well as with liberalism in its later 19th century forms]

RELEVANT LECTURES: “1848 and the Mystique of Revolution”, “Marx and European Socialism”


1. Identifications.

   a. Mazzini 
   b. Frankfurt Assembly 
   c. Louis Pasteur 
   d. Communist Manifesto 
   e. “immiseration” 
   f. Lamartine 
   g. Louis Phillipe 
   h. Louis Blanc 
   i. Emile Zola 
   j. surplus value 
   k. Madame de Staël 
   l. Louis Napoleon

2. Review Questions

   a. The revolution of 1848 in France has been called a “revolution without a cause.” Does that seem justified to you? Is it any less justified in application to the revolutions in central Europe? Can you describe the “objective factors” that led to revolution? How important was the character of the monarchs in each case? What about “utopian-ideological” factors, or the role of institutions? How would you compare 1848 to the revolution of 1789 in these regards?

   b. Why did liberal parliamentarism succeed relatively well in Great Britain but have almost no success in eastern Europe? Provide an economic and social foundation for your answer. What effect did political developments in the eighteenth century have upon the evolution of political institutions in the nineteenth century in eastern Europe?

   c. What are the main differences between romanticism and realism? What historical developments help to explain the shift from one to the other, from the 1840s to the 1850s? Give examples of realism in art, literature, and politics.

   d. What is the miasmic theory of disease? Compare it to the germ theory of Pasteur and Koch. What does pasteurization accomplish? What were the implications for European society of the discovery of the link between germs and disease?
3. Discussion Questions

a. “Marx was not an original thinker. Everything in his theories comes from some other, more original thinker.” Do you agree? How would you define “originality”? Do you think Darwin, too, might be charged with a lack of originality, of borrowing everything from other thinkers?

b. The term “bourgeois” has been used repeatedly in the course, both in lecture and in the reading. It is also a key term in Marx’s theories (indeed, those theories are a principal reason for the term’s popularity). Can you see any consistency, or underlying meaning, in its many applications? Is it appropriate to term the culture of the 1850s and 1860s “bourgeois”? What is “bourgeois morality”? What would be the difference, say, between the values seen in a bourgeois family as compared to a working-class family? Or, a bourgeois economy as opposed to one the working-class might establish? May we appropriately speak of a bourgeois state form?

d. While classic liberals were singing the praises of the benefits of free enterprise, much of the urban population was, in words quoted by McKay “living in shit” [797] Were such conditions not overpowering proof of the need for economic planning, at least for what was later termed “municipal socialism”? How did nineteenth-century liberals respond to the charge that economic freedom meant misery for the common people? Can you distinguish important divisions within the ranks of the liberals on such issues? In other words, distinguish between different kinds or spheres of freedom—economic, social, political, intellectual, etc.—and consider how one might be an “intellectual liberal,” yet be attracted to some of the arguments of socialism in regard to political and economic statism.