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Abstract

The Revolution of 1848 mostly set off by liberal, socialist and nationalist thoughts, occurred as a result of American Declaration of Independence in 1776, French Revolution in 1789 and the Revolutions of 1830, and in reaction to authoritarian system built by Vienna Settlement in 1815. And it was a mass civil commotion, which was showed up because of old arrangements couldn’t meet the present conditions. The revolution waves, broke out in France in February 1848, sprung up more than 50 countries, including Germany, Italy, Austria and Poland. Revolution movements couldn’t succeed any of them. But the movements of thoughts, which arose following to the revolutions, played an important role occurring of the developments, which formed the world structure, such as unification of Germany and Italy, First and Second World Wars, modern democratic rights and freedoms, economic systems such as Capitalism and Socialism, and Cold War.
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fazla ülkeye yayılmıştır. İhtilal hareketleri hicbir ülkede başarılı olamamıştır. Ancak İhtilal sonucunda ortaya çıkan fikir akımları (liberalizm, sosyalizm, milliyetçilik vb. gibi) Almanya ve İtalya’nın birliğinin sağlanması, Birinci ve İkinci Dünya Savaşları, modern demokratik hak ve özgürlükler, Kapitalizm ve Sosyalizm gibi ekonomik sistemler ile Soğuk Savaş gibi dünyanın şekillendiren gelişmelerin ortaya çıkmasında önemli bir rol oynamıştır.
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Introduction
The Revolution of 1848 occurred in reaction to the quash of liberal riots in 1830, which raised against the system, established by conservative states of the Europe in 1815 Vienna Congress. Main impulses of the revolutions are especially intensifying of demands related to liberalize of the trade at the end of rising of the production and in this context forming of proletariat, who hadn’t got any social and political rights and trying to live in subsistence level in the big cities of the Europe. That’s mean, the conservative administration style, remained from old times, couldn’t keep up with the changes, occurred in the social and economic life of the new term, any more. So, we can refer to the revolution of 1848 as riot of the mercantile class, who demands liberalization of the trade and the proletariat, who demands social and political rights. These two class, who had different motivations, had collaborated for reaching their goals in a short period. But their interests resolved within the process and demands of the proletariat became main impulse of the revolutions.

These revolution movements spread to almost all the countries of the Europe and the conservative regimes of these countries had been forced to accept revolutionaries’ some main demands, especially in social and political areas (right to elect and be elected, constitutional monarchy, human rights etc.).

But the revolution attempts failed down because of differentiation of demands of mercantile class and proletariat as mentioned above and the rioters hadn’t got such a riot experience before. However, most of the thoughts’ and practices’ principles, which are the main principles of modern social and political structure, had been founded by the revolutions of 1848 (nationalism, socialism, liberal trade, constitution, democracy, human rights, right to elect and be elected, freedom of press etc.).
These movements led to unification of Germany and Italy, First and Second World Wars, forming of two rival economic systems (Capitalism and Socialism) and the Cold War. In other words results of the revolution directly affected forming of modern political systems and institutions.

In this context, we will try to evaluate reasons of the revolution of 1848 in the first part, development of the revolution on the basis of the European countries in the second part, conclusions of the revolutions in the third part and contribution of the revolutions to the modern political mentality in the conclusion part within the frame of our study.

1. The Reasons of Revolutions of 1848

1.1. What is the Revolution?

The revolution is a mass civil commotion for changing a country’s political, social and economic structure or its management order without obeying to law by using force.\(^1\) Also, it is a forcible overthrow of a government or social order, in favour of a new system.\(^2\) And it has been central to the formation of the modern world. The word itself refers to radical, transformative change and has many generic uses describing phenomena from the “industrial revolution” to the “sexual revolution.” As a historical process, “revolution” refers to a movement, often violent, to overthrow an old regime and effect complete change in the fundamental institutions of society.\(^3\)

In addition, the revolution is the name of the movement, what is contented with to purge the present government and change of the constitution and some main laws, without aiming at depth, continuous and long standing changes in a regime’s social structure according to Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. The regime will go on in his structure after compilation of these changes. There will call elections, if the regime is multi-party system with constitution and parliament.\(^4\)

At a minimum, the revolution involves the use of or the threat of the use of force either to recover a political system that appears to have been eroded or
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to bring into being a new political system. In many cases, revolution also involves the creation of different social or economic arrangements. In some cases, it may even entail thorough going cultural change.⁵

1.2. The Reasons of Revolution of 1848 and Its Evaluation

It was quite clear to contemporaries that the economic crisis of the years 1845–47 was the precursor to and precondition for the revolution of 1848. Historians have seconded this judgment, but can add to it three important points. What happened in 1845–47 was not an isolated event but part of a broader range of economic difficulties, occurring over a fifteen-year period, running from the early 1840s through the second half of the following decade. Within this broader period, 1845–47 were particularly difficult years, because they saw the interaction of three separate but interrelated crises: a run of very poor harvests; a trade cycle downturn what would today be called a recession; and a financial and banking panic, not only reflecting the first two difficulties, but also showing the insufficiency of existing financial institutions.⁶

While ideas and institutions undoubtedly contribute to our understanding of the general preconditions for the upheaval of 1848, they fail to explain the timing, simultaneity, or regional distribution of the events. There could be a more economic perspective might be helpful. Many contemporary observers interpreted much of what was going on as a direct consequence of the serious shortfall in basic food supplies that had shaken the Continent in 1845–1847 and triggered famine and hunger riots throughout Europe, especially in Ireland, Flanders, and Silesia.⁷ In this context the agriculture crisis became acute in 1845. The potato blight of that year had it most dramatic manifestations in Ireland, where it eventually accounted for the loss of up to a million human lives, but the failure of the crop also cut a swath of hunger and suffering across Europe, in Belgium, Holland, Germany and Poland. The following year the unusually hot, dry weather caused the failure of the grain

harvest, and as the failures continued it became impossible to make good the shortfall from the previous harvest.8

By the spring of 1847, both wholesale and retail prices of basic foodstuffs had jumped to an average of twice their levels of the early 1840s; the specter of famine, seemingly banished from Europe, was poised for a reappearance. Throughout the continent, there were bread – or potato – riots as crowds gathered to mob speculators, prevent foodstuffs from leaving the vicinity, or to force their sale at prices well below market levels.

Rather, the high grain prices of 1845–47 were the prelude to the next stage of the economic crisis. The more people spent on food, the less they had available for manufactured goods, or for the products and services of artisans. Decreased demand for these products, in conjunction with the normal workings of the business cycle, produced a sharp downturn, beginning in 1847, running through that year and into 1848. Recovery only proceeded sporadically in 1848, the revolutionary events of that year not being encouraging to business, and was not completed until well into 1849. Unemployment was substantial in large cities and manufacturing regions; crowds of the unemployed and columns of workers employed in public relief projects would be a characteristic sight in the 1848 revolution, playing a significant role in the revolution’s outbreak and its further development.9

On the other hand following to growth of industrial revolution and capitalism, labour communities growing, too. The mechanization dropped the price cost of lots of the products and raised the labour wage a little.10 There is no doubt that the condition of the industrial worker was grim. He could expect to die sooner than an agricultural worker, although in Lille the expectation of life of an industrial worker rose from twenty-eight years to thirty-two in period 1830 to 1848. His diet was extremely monotonous and even the better-paid “spend at least half their income on starches alone”. The evidence on working-class living standards and industrialization is not conclusive – for example, the total meat consumption per capita appears to have remained unchanged between 1812 and 1840.11 Labours and small producers hadn’t got any
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political rights. Rising on labours’ wages around %10 percent was funny, besides to huge capital stocks. Also working days were around 14-15 hours. Above mentioned conditions expose the labours socialist and revolutionary ideas in the big industrial center, where population was rising gradually.\textsuperscript{12}

This was the 'spectre of communism' which haunted Europe, the fear of 'the proletariat' which affected not merely factory-owners in Lancashire or Northern France but civil servants in rural Germany, priests in Rome and professors everywhere and with justice. For the revolution which broke out in the first months of 1848 was not a social revolution merely in the sense that it involved and mobilized all social classes. It was in the literal sense the rising of the labouring poor in the cities—especially the capital cities—of Western and Central Europe. Theirs, and theirs almost alone, was the force which toppled the old regimes from Palermo to the borders of Russia. When the dust settled on their ruins, workers—in France actually socialist workers—were seen to be standing on them, demanding not merely bread and employment, but a new state and society.\textsuperscript{13}

Surely, we need to assume keep on consolidate of Liberalism movement as being head of these changes and developments following to 1830s. Liberalism couldn’t get any victory in the Revolution of 1830, but effect of the victories, gained some of the centuries, were extensive. European emperors, especially Eastern Block, failed Liberalism some of the countries in the Revolution of 1830. But these attempts couldn’t avoid the liberal movement, contrary make it much more stronger in reaction to these interferences.

Another strong movement came up in 19\textsuperscript{th} century is Nationalism. That is to say national freedom movement. This movement developed especially in Italy and Germany and revealed a “Nation” theory, now. There is different views related to what is the Nation and explanation of it. But the fact is that now a “Nation” theory start to work. Italian Mazzini was one of the leading theorist of it. Rising of nation theory strengthened the nationalism movement and nationalism and liberalism combined by the idea gathering the people, who are from same nationality in a one territory and self-determination for the each nation if there is a different type of nations in a one territory.\textsuperscript{14}
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Before the revolution of 1848 appearance of the Europe as follows. For, like the other crises in European ruling-class politics, it coincided with a social catastrophe: the great depression which swept across the continent from the middle 1840s. Harvests—and especially the potato crop—failed. Entire populations such as those of Ireland, and to a lesser extent Silesia and Flanders, starved. Food-prices rose. Industrial depression multiplied unemployment, and the masses of the urban laboring poor were deprived of their modest income at the very moment when their cost of living rocketed. 1846-8 were bad years, but not so bad as 1841-2, and what was more, they were merely a sharp dip in what was now visibly an ascending slope of economic prosperity. But, taking Western and Central Europe as a whole, the catastrophe of 1846-8 was universal and the mood of the masses, always pretty close to subsistence level, tense and impassioned.

A European economic cataclysm thus coincided with the visible corrosion of the old regimes. A peasant rising in Galicia in 1846; the election of a 'liberal' Pope in the same year; a civil war between radicals and Catholics in Switzerland in late 1847, won by the radicals; one of the perennial Sicilian autonomist insurrections in Palermo in early 1848: they were not merely straws in the wind, they were the first squalls of the gale. Everyone knew it. Rarely has revolution been more universally predicted, though not necessarily for the right countries or the right dates. An entire continent waited, ready by now to pass the news of revolution almost instantly from city to city by means of the electric telegraph. In 1831 Victor Hugo had written that he already heard the dull sound of revolution, still deep down in the earth, pushing out under every kingdom in Europe its subterranean galleries from the central shaft of the mine which is Paris'. In 1847 the sound was loud and close. In 1848 the explosion burst.¹⁵

2. The Revolutions in the Basis of the Countries

The wave of political upheavals in Europe originated in France in February of 1848. Almost overnight revolutions sprung up throughout parts of Europe. In total, there were over 50 countries that participated in, or were affected by the 1848 Revolutions. The major areas of revolutionary struggle were in France, Germany, Poland, Denmark, Italy, and the Austrian Empire. Russia, Great Britain, Spain, Sweden, and Portugal were indirectly affected by

the revolutions taking place around them, but they did not actually experience revolution within their own borders. Although all of the revolutions shared a similar ideological background, there was no concerted effort or central coordination between the revolutions in the various countries.\textsuperscript{16}

At this chapter we will examine the revolution at country basis. So in this context we will try to explain Italian, French, German and Austrian revolutions, which are most important of them, one by one.

\section*{2.1. Italy}

Italian liberals lacked a corresponding state in which to place their hopes. Italy’s most populous state, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, was also economically the most backward, and ruled by a very conservative Bourbon dynasty strongly opposed to nationalist ideas. The most prosperous, urbanized, best educated, and economically most advanced regions of the peninsula, the northeastern provinces of Lombardy and Venetia, were directly under the rule of the Austrian Empire. Almost all the other Italian states were subject to substantial Austrian influence, and their rulers had no hesitation in calling in Habsburg soldiers to suppress uprisings and conspiracies against their rule. It seems legitimate to use twentieth-century terminology here and call the Italian states Habsburg satellites.\textsuperscript{17}

For all those who wished to change the economic and political condition of Italy, the main problem had long been liberation from Habsburg rule. The entire three years of revolution were characterized by all kinds of hostile demonstrations against Austria, often in the form of genuine mass movements, including assemblies, protests and uprisings, the formation of volunteer corps, and military action. The anti-Austrian movement of 1846/49 was above all characterized by strong popular support and clearly liberal features, namely by its identification with civil liberties and with a constitutional and parliamentary reform of the individual states. The goal on the horizon was no longer “independence at any price”, but an independence rooted in freedom.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{17}] Sperber, \textit{The European}, 96.
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] Simonetta Soldani, \textit{Approaching Europe in the name of the Nation: The Italian Revolution, 1846/49}, Dieter Dowe (Ed.), in \textit{Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform} (59-91), (United States: Berghahn Books, 2001), 60.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Kingdom of Piedmont-Savoy was only independent Italian state from Austria. As was the case in Prussia, the Piedmontese royal family had a long history of dynastic rivalry with the Habsburgs. So far so good, only in most other respects, it was less well suited to play the role of national unifier. Unlike Prussia, the Piedmontese kingdom was small, having scarcely more than a third the population of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. With its third rate army, Piedmont-Savoy was no Great Power fit to challenge Austria militarily, as Prussia had done and would do in the future. Finally, Piedmont’s king, Carlo Alberto, and his closest advisors were strongly conservative, hostile to constitutional government, doubtful of nationalism and sympathetic to the particularly devout wing of Italian Catholicism, which saw the Habsburg Emperor as the primary defender of the faith.

In spite of all these disadvantages, Italian liberal nationalists were stuck with Piedmont for lack of anything better, until, in 1843, the Abbe’ Vincenzo Gioberti wrote his work On the Civil and Moral Primacy of the Italians, in which he proposed the creation of a federal Italian state under the leadership of the Pope. Following the death of the arch-conservative Gregory XVI in 1846, and the election of the liberal (or at least reputed to be so) Bishop of Imola to the Papacy as Pius IX, Gioberti’s idea of reconciling liberalism and Catholicism, the supra-national Papacy and Italian nationalism seemed about to be realized. “Viva Pio Nono! (long live Pius IX)” became the battle cry of liberalism and nationalism in the Italian peninsula.19

For all the themes and theories of the previous years, the chance for nationalist action in Italy had been provided by the disruption of European status quo, and especially by the distraction of the Austrian forces. The turn of European stability and the recovery of Austrian government spelled the doom of Italian freedom. A month after the triumph of Windischgratz in Prague, the Piedmontese army met the forces of Marshal Radetzky at Custoza (July 25, 1848), The Papacy and Naples had already withdrawn their contingents of troops, and defeat badly undermined Piedmontese morale. Although the army survived substantially intact, the pessimism of the generals and Charles Albert’s own fear of radical activity at home led to a precipitate retreat from Lombardy.

Renewed pressures upon the king only led to another defeat at Austrian hands at Novara (March 23, 1849). The price paid this time was the permanent

19 Sperber, The European, 96-97.
removal of Charles Albert from political life his abdication in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel.\textsuperscript{20}

2.2. France

France had become a constitutional monarchy in 1814, when Napoleon was packed off to his genteel exile on Elba, and then again in 1815, after which the incorrigible Emperor was held under stricter conditions on the remote island of Saint Helena until his death in 1821. The Bourbon monarchy was restored, represented first by the portly Louis XVIII, younger brother of the guillotined King Louis XVI, and then, on his death in 1824, by their younger brother, the slender and ultra-conservative Charles X. The French constitution, the Charter of 1814, provided a parliament whose lower house, the Chamber of Deputies, was elected by the wealthiest 110,000 taxpayers. In 1830 Charles’s royal intransigence in the face of repeated liberal electoral victories provoked the final overthrow of the Bourbon dynasty. It is said that Charles had once declared that he would rather be a hewer of wood than rule like a British monarch. It was therefore a sublime irony that, as he made his way towards exile (he would live in Holyrood Palace in Edinburgh), at one staging-post Charles’s courtiers had to cut a table down to size so that everyone in the royal retinue could be accommodated in the small dining room. Back in Paris the Charter was retained by the new regime. This was the ‘July Monarchy’, named for the month when the Revolution occurred, under King Louis-Philippe, the scion of the rival Orléans dynasty. The Charter was slightly modified, so that the electorate swelled to include only 170,000 of France’s richest men: this was a mere 0.5 per cent of the French population.\textsuperscript{21}

The revolution started in France in February 1848 in the context of above mentioned conditions and it became successful in a short period of time. Popular dissatisfaction with government, and with Guizot in particular, had been growing during 1847, but the opposition campaign had been led by middle-class politicians who were seeking to reform government rather than overthrow the monarchy of Louise Philippe.\textsuperscript{22}

Initially both King Louis Philippe and his chief minister, Guizot, had underestimated the seriousness of the unrest. After just one day of clashes they
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fled, and a Second Republic embodying many of principles of the first – including universal suffrage – was established. However, by this time the middle classes who made the revolution no longer possessed a monopoly over revolutionary fervor. At their side there had risen a numerous, politically conscious working class, for whom the establishment of a liberal republic did not go far enough. When the new regime, led by Lamartine, prove unwilling or unable to meet the demands of the left for far-reaching social and economic reforms, a second and much more violent revolution broke out in Paris in June 1848. It was brutally suppressed by the army under the command of General Cabignac, whose reputation as a butcher had been made in Algeria; the number of those who died is estimated at 1,500, whereas 12,000 more were arrested. Now thoroughly frightened, the middle classes as well as peasantry gave their votes to an adventurer, Louis Napoleon. Gaining an enormous majority at the polls, he was elected president of the republic and later (1851) made himself emperor by means of a coup d’etat.

2.3. Germany

As Germany was economically, politically and militarily dominated by the states of Prussia and Austria, the Revolution could not be complete without victory in Berlin and Vienna. The March days in Vienna led to the forced resignations of count Metternich, which in conjunction with the widespread nationalist revolutions in the Habsburg domains effectively neutralized Austria’s dominance over Germany for the time being. The revolution spread quickly through the German states and halfway March Prussia, too, was the locus of serious urban and rural disorder.

Under the impact of developments in Paris in February 1848, the revolution in Germany started with a double burden and only a temporary union of revolutionary activists: the constitutional liberals’ aim was to elect a national parliament on the basis of a constitutional monarchy and to create a German nation-state.

---

Frederick William IV, faced with numerous petitions for reform and alarmed by the collapse of Metternich’s regime, decided to make concessions. A further escalation of the unrest after a bloody confrontation with the military ensured that these concessions would have to go as far as the establishment of a constitutional monarchy.\textsuperscript{26}

This situation encouraged nationalists from all over Germany to convene in Frankfurt. Here they made endless speeches and agitated in favor of national unification. The Frankfurt Congress was, however, anything but United. Some of those present – they included a remarkably large percentage of professors – wanted a liberal republic modeled on the one which had just been established in France. Others wanted a “small” German monarchy under the King of Prussia, whereas others still looked to a “large” German empire ruled from Vienna and including also the non-German parts of the Austrian monarchy, i.e., what are now Czechoslovakia, Croatia, Northern Italy and parts of Romania, in the event, the congress decided to offer the crown to Prussia’s Frederick William IV. The latter hesitated and in the end declined the offer because, coming from a democratic assembly, it was incompatible with his standing as the absolute king of Prussia, his refusal delayed the unification of Germany by another two decades. When it finally came, it was carried out by the Prussian military rather than by liberal professors.\textsuperscript{27}

2.4. Austria

Between 1840 and 1848 a distinct development of the spirit of unrest was to be observed in various part of the Austrian Empire. If the dominions of the Emperor had been inhabited by peoples of one race and language this movement might have taken the form of a demand for constitutional monarchy on the English pattern, with a Parliament representative of every part of the state and with ministers responsible to it. Or it might have gone farther and aimed at the establishment of an Austrian Republic. But the Austrian Empire contained many peoples, and the desire of most of them was for independence, partial or complete, from the Austrian yoke. Had the revolutionary movements of 1848 and 1849 been completely successful the ramshackle Empire would have split up into a number of separate states, either fully independent or owing no more than a nominal allegiance to Vienna. To no
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small extent the success of the Austrian Government in averting such a catastrophe in 1848-9 was due to its ability to its rebellious subjects – to play off one group against another. 28

As was the case in Germany, the news of the February revolution in Paris ignited the tinder of political revolt in Austria. Middle-class liberals, student radicals and element of Viennese working class joined together in street demonstrations and the presentations of petitions to the Emperor in the first week of March. On 13 March clashes with regular troops led to loss of life and the Emperor, who had already lost his wits, now lost his nerve. Later that day, the 1848 revolutions gained their most notable “scalp” with resignation of Imperial Chancellor, Klemens von Metternich. With the departure of Metternich in to exile Ferdinand, like Friedrich Wilhelm, preferred concessions to flight. In April he conceded freedom of the press and gave permission for a constitution for the German speaking areas of the Empire. The following month he promised constituent assembly based upon universal manhood suffrage and accepted the arming of a volunteer Nation Guard in Vienna.

The revolution in Vienna suffered from a steady decline rather than from a sudden collapse. Fatal weakness were already becoming evident in the position of the revolutionaries. The dynasty remained in power and continued to be served by ministers of the “old school”. The Imperial army was not only undefeated, but actually victorious in the provinces. Worse, divisions began to appear in the ranks of the revolutionaries themselves. Some elements among the German-speaking radicals favored the cutting of links with the non-German provinces of the Empire, and aimed at a form of Grossdeutsch unity with other states represented at the Frankfurt Parliament. Other wished to see the territorial preservations of the Empire.

The regeneration of conservation government was steadily consolidated. In November a new government under Count Schwarzenberg took Office. In December, as the living symbol of regeneration, the 18-year-old Franz Josef ascended the Imperial throne upon his uncle’s abdication. The new administration was firmly based upon realism and upon power politics for, in

A.J.P. Taylor’s words, “Schwarzenberg was too clever to have principles, Franz Josef too blinkered to understand them”. 29

Using the army, he started by crushing the nationalist uprisings that had broken out in the outlaying parts of the monarchy, i.e. Bohemia and Italy; in the latter General Radetzsky also took the opportunity to defeat Sardinia, which had sought to profit from the disorder in Vienna in order to try and take over Lombardy. By September, imperial forces, made up largely of “wild” men from Croat frontier provinces and commanded by General Windischgraeetz, were besieging Vienna itself. As had happened in Paris, the Viennese revolution was becoming radicalized and its leadership was passing out of the hands of middle classes and into those of the workers; the former wanted order, the latter, bread. It took several days of brutal fighting, accompanied by massacres, to subdue the city. 30

3. The Conclusions of The Revolutions of 1848

An observer surveying Europe at the end of 1849 might have concluded that, expect in France, the revolutions had failed, but such an impression was misleading. In neither Prussia nor Austria were the hopes of the liberals realized; however, former adopted a constitution (the same which was to last until 1918) whereas, in the latter, the last remains of serfdom were abolished. Equally important, the aspirations of nationalists in Germany, Italy, Hungary and Bohemia were suppressed but not broken. By 1871 the first two had gained unification and independence, the third had become an equal partner with Austria under Habsburg rule, whereas the forth was continuing its agitation until success was eventually achieved in 1918. For all these reasons the revolution of 1848 marked a decisive step in the historical development of modern Europe, putting some countries on the way to liberalism and others on the route that eventually led to national unity. Though the rebels’ immediate goals were brought to nought by cannon-fire, the results of their actions are still wish us today. 31

As we consider above mentioned explanations, we can sum main results of the revolution in seven points:

1) Capital punishment and slave trade were abolished in France,
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2) Downtrodden peasantry (robot) were banned in Austria,
3) Socialist movements came into prominence and labour rights started to recover in Europe,
4) The revolution of 1848 formed a basis for ensuring political union of Germany and Italy,
5) Social law state understanding started to strengthen in European countries,
6) Germany and Italy, who lately completed their political union, so fall behind of the other countries for colonialism, accelerated to economic competition in world and caused to blocking of great powers,
7) Republic announced in France and while starting to adopt social democracy understanding, equality accepted in the field of political rights. 

**Conclusion**

If we set off from the explanations of the revolution; Revolution is a mass civil commotion for changing a country’s political, social and economic structure or its management order without obeying to law by using force. And if we consider that primary element in this explanation is changing organizational structure or management order of a state by a civil commotion, we could see that the movement in France, which was impulse for spreading the revolutions to all over the Europe, has all the elements of this explanations. In this context, at the end of the civil commotion, included force, King Louise-Philippe was obliged to abdicate from the thrown and fled to England. And following that revolutionaries declared the Republic. So there is not any doubt related to 1848 events is a revolution movement, which spread all over to Europe.

On the other hand the results of the revolution of 1848 has played very important role to shaping modern political mentality. We can sum these results as below in the context of the above mentioned aspects.

The one of the most important result of the revolution of 1848 was opening of the first Italian Parliament in Torino in February 18, 1861 - this process will be completed in 1870 by forming of independent Italian State by joining of Rome - and declaration of integrated German Empire in famous

---

Selim Kurt

Versailles Court in January 18, 1871 at the end of movements, which progressed with nationalism notion.

These two countries (Germany and Italia) set up their national unions after a long time comparing with France and England, and showed up European stage. Although it’s too late, this situation led to joining of these countries to colony seeking, which was quite important for Western countries, who considerably need raw materials and markets following to industrialization. So, European political balance reformulated because of this efforts and lighted the fuse of developments even get to First World War.

Another result of the revolutions; social ideas started to come into prominence because of social orientation of the revolutions, which showed up especially in England and France. Notably ideas of the Proudhon, who wanted to rule out of Louis Blanc and capitalist thoughts, laid the foundations of social understandings and the people, who accepted social thinking, defended Proudhon’s theories until 1870s. But along with appearance of Marx and Engels, who are unified main ideas of socialism as a theoretical frame, theories of Proudhon replaced by their ideas following to 1870s. The ideas of Marx and Engels caused to establishment of Soviet Socialist Republics Union instead of Russian Empire in 1917 and this new state affected the faith of the Second World War and following that it was one of the main trigger of the two-polar Cold War period until 1990s.

Also the revolutions – especially one of the main characteristic of the English revolution – initiated to settlement of free trade understanding in all around the world and so it caused to spread capitalist trade understanding, which is still main economic system in the world, to each part of world. Spread of this understanding caused to emergence of capitalist system as completely explained economic theoretical frame and an alternative to the socialist system. As a consequence of that the economically two-polar world led to Cold War following to Second World War.

On the other hand, the revolutions of 1848 was reflecting fighting of small & middle business, who had economic power but they hadn’t got vote and right of representation at the same level with their power as they weren’t big land owner, and labour class, who had appeared in European big metropolis following to industrial revolution with low salary, hadn’t minimum life standards and right to elect and be elected, against absolutist regimes for more freedom and right demand. Although liberal democratic demands and
thoughts couldn’t get an important victory against absolutist regime at the end of the process, but the absolutism started to lose his superior location against liberal democratic demands. At the end of the revolution movements, the most of the European absolutist regimes obliged to accept the constitution, which guaranteed main human rights and democratic rights and freedoms. The most of the European states started to evolve head towards constitutional monarchy with accepting chambers, which elected by public, and this process constitute beginning to establishment of modern sense democratic regimes. In this context, when the revolution of 1848 laid the foundations of democratic managements, elected by the public, it provided to accept of main rights and freedoms such as right to elect and be elected, press freedom, human rights etc., which are main conditions of the democratic regimes. Establishment of democratic regimes provided to founded of pluralist democratic constitutional regimes respected to human rights, which are the main actors of modern international politics.

As it is seen, all the ideas and applications such as nationalism, socialism, free trade, constitution, democracy, human rights, right to elect and be elected, press freedom etc., which are shaping modern political mentality, founded by the revolution of 1848.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


Jones, Peter; *The 1848 Revolutions*, Routledge, New York 2013.

Mourre, Michel and others; *İhtilaller ve Darbeler Tarihi*, trans. S. Bozbağlı, Yirminci Yüzyıl Yayınları, İstanbul 1966.


Soldani, Simonetta; *Approaching Europe in the name of the Nation: The Italian Revolution, 1846/49*, Dieter Dowe (Ed.), in *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (59-91), Berghahn Books, United States 2001.


Yılmaz, Hakan; *Tarih Boyunca İhtilaller ve Darbeler*, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul 2012.