

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

**TEACHING CONTENT THROUGH
A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

Material for teaching history through English

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Vesa Tarkkanen

Department of English

1999

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Vesa Tarkkanen

TEACHING CONTENT THROUGH A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
Material for teaching history through English

Pro Gradu-tutkielma
Englantilainen filologia
Maaliskuu 2000

92 sivua + 2 liitettä

Viimeaikoina vieraalla kielellä opettaminen on lisännyt suosiotaan eri kouluasteilla. Teoreettisen taustan lisäksi tutkielmaani kuuluu opetuspaketti ja kysely. Vieraalla kielellä opettamisen tarkoituksena on , että oppilas saa ns. reaaliaineen opetusta muulla kuin äidinkielellään. Oppilas pyritään altistamaan mahdollisimman runsaalle vieraskieliselle puheelle ja teksteille; ns. rich input-periaate. Lisäksi oppilaan omaa vieraan kielen käyttöä pyritään edesauttamaan.

Opetuspaketin avulla on mahdollista opettaa Euroopan poliittista historiaa vuodesta 1848 vuoteen 1920. Opetuspaketin tarkoituksena on antaa yleiskuva tuon ajan poliittisista muutoksista ja syistä näiden muutosten takana; erityisesti Saksan yhdentymisen ja sen myöhempi vaikutus Euroopan historiassa tulee korostetusti esille. Tavoitteena on, että oppilaat ymmärtäisivät perusasiat muutosten taustalla ja syyt ensimmäiseen maailmansotaan. Opetuspaketti on suunnattu lähinnä lukiotasoisille oppilaille, joiden kielenhallinta on hyvä. Opetuspaketti sopii käytettäväksi lukion opetussuunnitelman (1994) mukaisten syventävien kurssien osana, käsiteltäessä Euroopan historiaa. Kielellisinä tavoitteina on asiategstin ymmärtäminen, sekä eri aikamuodot ja niiden käyttö; erityisesti korostuu menneen ajanmuodot. Menneen ajanmuotoja on runsaasti tekstissä ja lisäksi oppilaat joutuvat käyttämään niitä kirjallisissa tehtävissä.

Kyselyn avulla pyrin selvittämään mitä ongelmia vieraalla kielellä opettavat ovat omassa työssään havainneet. Kyselyyni vastasi vain 25 opettajaa, joten aivan täyttä kuvaa ongelmista en varmaankaan saanut. Vaikeimmiksi ongelmiksi osoittautuivat epäily oman kielitaidon riittävydestä (varsinkin lukoin opettajilla), erot oppilaiden taitotasossa sekä sopivan oppimateriaalin löytäminen. Sopivan oppimateriaalin saaminen koettiin ehkä ongelmallisimmaksi asiaksi, useimmiten opettajan piti tehdä materiaalinsa itse, joko kokonaan tai muokkaamalla alkuperäistä materiaalia.

Asiasanat: Teaching content through a foreign language. History

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	5
2	THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	7
2.1	Communicative Competence	7
2.2	Models of Content-based Language Teaching	8
2.3	Teacher's Role.....	10
2.4	Subject-matter Teaching.....	13
3	PLANNING CONTENT-BASED TEACHING	15
4	SCHOOLS AND TCFL-PROGRAMMES.....	19
5	RESULTS OF TCFL-PROGRAMMES	20
6	THE SURVEY.....	24
6.1	The study plan.....	24
6.2	Research question.....	24
6.3	General background information	25
	Age and gender	25
	What language was used in teaching	25
	What subject was taught through a foreign language	25
	How long had TCFL-programme been used.....	26
	What grade was taught in TCFL	27
	Were there other teachers in the school using TCFL-programme	27
	How many hours per week approximately was TCFL taught.....	28
	How many hours in a week were used to prepare lessons	28

6.4	Teaching material	29
	What kind of materials were used to prepare TCFL-lessons	29
	What sources were used to get the material for TCFL-classes	30
	What methods were used in helping students to understand the subject matter	30
6.5	Open questions	31
	How did the students react to TCFL-programme.....	31
	What was the reaction among other teachers and management towards TCFL-programmes.	32
	What were the three easiest aspects in TCFL and why were they found easy	33
	What three aspects proved to be difficult in TCFL and why were they found difficult.....	34
	If there were problems in TCFL-programme, what methods were used to seek assistance..	35
	If needed, were the teachers given enough assistance	36
	What were the aspects that were thought to be the most positive aspects in TCFL- programmes.....	37
	What aspects were thought to be the most negative aspects of TCFL-programmes.....	39
7	CONCLUSION	42
8	TEACHING PACKAGE - EUROPEAN HISTORY (PERIOD 1848 - 1920)	44
8.1	Introduction	44
8.2	The Rise of the Bourgeois in the 19th Century	45
	8.2.1 The industrialization	46
8.3	1848 : Year of Turmoil	49
	8.3.1 It all starts in France.....	49
	8.3.2 The heritage of 1848	50
8.4	The Crimean War	51
	8.4.1 The war on the Baltic Sea	52
	8.4.2 Ruler changes in Russia	53
8.5	Italian Unification	54
8.6	German Unification - the Rise of Bismarck	56
	8.6.1 The Iron Chancellor	57

8.6.2	Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71	58
8.6.3	Power and myth	61
8.6.4	Diplomacy.....	61
8.7	The Changes of the 1890's.....	63
8.7.1	The fear of war and the peace movement	63
8.7.2	The Dreyfus affair.....	64
8.7.3	Antisemitism in Europe	65
8.8	The First World War 1914-18	66
8.8.1	Germany before the war.....	66
8.8.2	Events leading to the First World War.....	67
8.8.3	The Schlieffen plan	68
8.8.4	Armsrace at sea	69
8.8.5	Sarajevo on June 28, 1914	69
8.8.6	The early years of the war.....	72
8.8.7	The overall experiences	74
8.8.8	War at sea.....	75
8.8.9	Victory for the surrounding powers	76
8.9	Germany after the War.....	80
8.9.1	The Spartacist rebellion in 1919	81
8.9.2	"Backstabbing"	82
8.10	The Making of the Versailles Peace Treaty	83
8.10.1	Wilson's 14 points	83
8.10.2	Versailles peace treaty	84
8.10.3	The League of Nations.....	85
8.10.4	Return to normal	86
9	BIBLIOGRAPHY	89
	APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire	92
	APPENDIX 2: Transparencies for the Teaching Package	99

1 INTRODUCTION

Teaching content through a foreign language has become more and more popular during the last few years (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:1). Even the terms that are used differ (Nikula and Marsh 1997:1), both terms 'content and language integration' and 'content and language integrated learning '(CLIL) are used. Also the term "plurilingual education" is used quite often. This term is used to emphasize that language teaching can involve more than one language, it is aimed at speakers of the majority language. The pioneer country in this kind of education is Canada. Canada being partly a bilingual nation, had the need to educate some of the French speaking students in English, so that they would be able to communicate also in English. The method that was selected for this purpose was called immersion. In this programme French speaking students were taught normal school subjects in English. This type of language teaching turned out to be very effective in both learning the language and the subject matter. The terms that are used differ (Nikula and Marsh 1997:1), both terms 'content and language integration' and 'content and language integrated learning' (CLIL), are used. The latter term has become widely used especially in Europe lately. Also the term 'plurilingual education' is used quite often. This term is used to emphasize that teaching can involve more than one language and that it is aimed at speakers of the majority language (Nikula and Marsh 1997:1). These programmes also seemed to lower the "hatred" towards the English speaking majority. This Canadian model soon became known also outside Canada.

There are not many studies on TCFL-programmes (Nikula and Marsh 1997:2) and their effectiveness, and even if there are studies on TCFL-programmes may differ from country to country, and therefore it is difficult to make generalizations from individual studies. In Finland this type of bilingual education is one of the key areas in developing the Finnish educational system. In fact, the Ministry of Education has a plan that aims to have foreign language

content instruction at primary, secondary and upper secondary levels in all Finnish provinces by the year 1996. The same applies also to vocational and polytechnical schools. (Räsänen and Marsh 1994: 1.) The Finnish models differ from the Canadian ones in that in Finland the foreign languages being taught have no native speakers; except Swedish, which is the second official language in Finland.

In this study I shall try to give an overall view of TCFL-programmes, the theory behind them and also what kind of results these programmes have produced. I shall also briefly discuss the difficulties in TCFL-education. One area of difficulty is how to get teaching material, and this is a question I am interested in. I suspect that the lack of material from Finnish publishers and the difficulty in obtaining suitable material from abroad, increases the teachers' workload considerably. Therefore I have put together a teaching package of my own to be used by myself in some TCFL-programme, and to give teachers who use TCFL-education a ready-made package to teach European history from the mid 1850s to the end of the First World War.

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Communicative Competence

All language learning strategies and language teaching are oriented towards the broad goal of communicative competence. In order to reach this competence learners must be exposed to meaningful, contextualized language. Communicative competence can be divided into a four-part definition (Oxford 1990: 4-8):

1. Grammatical competence; language user has mastered the linguistic code.
2. Sociolinguistic competence; appropriate usage of utterances in various social contexts.
3. Discourse competence; cohesion in form and in thought.
4. Strategic competence; "talking around" an unknown word, understanding the meaning of an unknown word from the context.

In order to achieve these goals learners need to take more responsibility of their learning process, because the teacher may not always be there to help them when they use the language. Also the role of the teacher is changing, the teacher should be more like a guide, an adviser and a consultant. This is true especially in 'classless' high schools in Finland. Oxford (1994:4-8) claims that the more the learners take responsibility the more they learn. It is also crucial for the development of communicative competence in a foreign language that the teaching process should facilitate both the formal knowledge of the language and knowledge of how the language can be used in real-life situations. In practice this means that formal language teaching should accompany the teaching of content using a foreign language. In TCFL-programmes (Nikula and Marsh 1997:13-14) language is regarded as an instrument of learning

rather than the object. Language is used to convey meaningful and authentic content-matter. TCFL-programmes try to create learning environments in which the learner is "surrounded" by the target language and can also use the language in meaningful utterances. This is further highlighted in recent studies that underline the huge importance that language competence plays in the forming of the child's communicative competence. It is easier for the children to use the language in various situations, when they know that they are not making too many mistakes. (Oxford 1990:4-8, Räsänen and Marsh 1994:15, Lauren 1994:13.)

2.2 Models of Content-based Language Teaching

Content-based language teaching has two goals (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:20); to teach content and to teach the foreign language. In Finland two different terms are used depending on which of the two is emphasized: language-enhanced content instruction (kielipainotteinen aineenopetus), in which teaching content is used as an instrument to learn a foreign language, and content-based language instruction (sisältöpainotteinen kielenopetus), in which a foreign language is used to learn content. Räsänen and Marsh (1994:20) argue that there is also a third goal, and that would be the development of the learners thinking skills. This means the systematic development of learning strategies and other skills necessary for academic achievement on all levels of education.

There are three basic prototype models within the content-based language teaching approach: theme-based, sheltered and adjunct models. (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:21) In these models the amount of content presented in the foreign language is not as strictly determined as in immersion programmes, in which the foreign language is used at all times, although research shows that a minimum of 25 % is required for a successful language learning. All three models share at least the following features (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:21);

1. Content is the organizing principle of the curriculum.
2. Objectives are both content mastery and foreign language development.
3. Authentic language materials and tasks are used, although teacher may supplement and adapt them.
4. Accommodations to the materials are made depending on the needs and proficiency levels of the learners.

A theme-based model focuses on language learning and it is usually the language teacher that presents the content.(Räsänen and Marsh1994:21) This model is developed around a specific theme relevant for learners. This model requires a considerable amount of co-ordination in material adaption and development. Nevertheless it is the most widely spread model, because it is easy to implement.

Sheltered courses(Räsänen and Marsh1994:22) have content mastery as their primary focus, therefore it is usually the content teacher, who is responsible for the instruction. In these courses learners are separated or 'sheltered' from native speakers of the target language. This kind of instruction requires sufficient proficiency in the target language from the content teacher. Co-operation with the language teacher is necessary for a successful sheltered course.

In adjunct models students take simultaneously a content course and a separate language course. The idea is that the two courses complement each other in coordinated activities. A lot of co-ordination and co-operation is needed to ensure the learners' development of both content mastery and language development.(Räsänen and Marsh 1994:22)

Whatever the model, one must remember that a distinction has to be made in bilingual education between programmes for assimilation and programmes for

pluralism, the latter ones do not try to change the the child's language, but to integrate him into a culture and a language that is necessary for him to learn (Lauren 1994:14) .

2.3 Teacher's Role

In studies on second language learners, it has been found that teachers de-emphasize the importance of memorizing abstract grammar. Instead they seem to concentrate on the ability to understand and convey meaningful utterances. Teachers also learn to accept that their students will probably never be as fluent in the target language as native speakers. Behind this finding is the notion that second language is seen as a means of genuine communication between people from different linguistic and cultural communities.(Krueger 1993: 4-5) This may not be true in Finland, where in my opinion grammar still has a major part in language teaching. Although communication skills are becoming important also here in Finland. The books that are used at schools for teaching , for example , English have a lot of grammar in them, and the matriculation exam requires good knowledge in grammar. However some books have also more communication exercises; for example communication cards, with various tasks. Nevertheless most exams still are grammar oriented, although one can take a voluntary exam in verbal communication at the end of the ninth grade.

This same kind of phenomenon of adapting the language in order to make it understandable for the students has also been noticed among subject-matter teachers, who often adapt their instructions to accommodate different levels of language proficiency in their classes.(Padilla et al.1990:191) To do these adaptations subject-matter teachers often use the help of language teachers. In some programmes students are instructed by two teachers: a language teacher, who concentrates on the reading and writing skills required for the subject-matter course, and a subject-matter teacher, who focuses on the students' development in the subject-matter, but who also tries to promote their writing

skills in co-operation with the language teacher.(Padilla et al.1990: 191) Marjorie Wesche (Ottawa: 51) writes in her article that students need time to understand all the new linguistic signals that they are faced with when subject-matter is taught through a foreign language. She also points out two ways of helping this understanding: teachers must speak in a speed that is the same as the students' speed for processing the new matterial, and the teacher must make every effort to speak the target language as clearly as possible during the lessons. This simplification and redundancy of presentation helps the students in understanding the context of the subject-matter (Ottawa: 934). In fact Takala claims (as quoted in Räsänen and Marsh1994:83) that it is not even necessary for a teacher, who is interested in content-based teaching, to have a native-speaker accuracy or fluency. Because the teacher's simplified language helps language learning and comprehension.(Räsänen and Marsh 1994:83.)

A study by Wong Fillmore (as quoted in Krueger and Ryan 1993:46) provides a good description of the strategies teachers use to make content understandable to foreign language learners. One finding was that the separation of languages was important; the use of both languages was not beneficial. Wong also noticed that the teacher never used ungrammatical or "reduced foreigner-talk" forms, however the teachers' language was not as complex as that of a native speaker. Successful teachers adopted patterns or routines for their lessons, which helped students to comprehend new words.

One way to help students to understand the content is to have a language teacher present during the actual lesson. In a study carried out in Canada, it was noticed that the role of the language teacher emerged as one of a facilitator. The language teacher was able to help students to understand the subject matter lesson by explaining some words and parts of the content to the students. The anxieties of the students were also reduced, because of this assistance by the language teacher. The language teacher also helped the content-matter teacher in making these content lectures.(Ottawa: 47) Language teachers saw their

main role in subject-matter teaching as making the content more accessible to the students (Ottawa: 14). According to Nikula (1997:49) there are four different roles given to language teachers in TCFL-education: 1) language teacher takes no part in the TCFL-education, 2) to function as a resource person for the TCFL-teacher (translating texts, valuating the difficulty of the texts etc.), 3) language teacher is actively involved in the planning of the TCFL-education, 4) language teacher is the one giving the TCFL-education.

Padilla et al. (1990:196) claim that currently there is too little attention paid in language teacher education to the ways of integrating language and content instruction. As a result of this negligence language teachers may feel inadequately prepared to structure and teach a content-based course.(Ottawa: 196.) This is true in Finland as well, although there are courses for teachers who want to teach content in a foreign language. The problem is that these courses are taught in Continuing Education Centres, and the participants are mainly content teachers. This is quite opposite to what was suggested in a research report from the University of Ottawa. In this report (Ottawa: 208) it was suggested that the integration of language and content instruction must be planned and carried out mainly with the foreign language teacher as the leader. Kohonen (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:69) points out that teaching content in a foreign language will necessarily involve a clear change in schools toward collegial collaboration between language teachers and content teachers. Unfortunately this co-operation between teachers is easier said than done. Therefore it is important to bear in mind that the entire school personnel have to believe that bilingual schooling can work. In some programmes students get instructions from two teachers: a language teacher and a subject matter teacher. The language teacher focuses on on the reading and writing skills required for the subject -matter lessons. The subject matter teacher concentrates on subject matter development while promoting students' writing skills in co-operation with the language teacher.(Padilla et al. 1990:191-192, Beardsmore 1993:13.)

It is also important to note that different types of models require different teacher qualifications. (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:22) In theme-based courses the language teacher needs training in content, language curriculum design and material development. For sheltered courses the content teacher needs knowledge of second language development. In Finland (Nikula and Marsh 1997:43, Nikula and Marsh 1996:55-56) TCFL-programmes in secondary and upper secondary schools are usually run by content-teachers. In some countries (Christ 1996:88) TCFL-teachers are required to have qualifications in both the language and the subject being taught in that language. In Finland this kind of combination is quite rare. In middle schools TCFL-programmes (Nikula and Marsh 1997:43) are mostly taught by the language teacher, because the emphasis is probably more on verbal communication than it is on higher levels of education. Adjunct model requires that both the language and content teachers are trained in curriculum and syllabus design, as well as material development. (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:22) One important factor that must be kept in mind is parental involvement. If a bilingual programme is to be successful, it is important to keep the parents well-informed and reassured about their children's development. (Beardsmore 1993:13) Communication with the parents helps to make sure that there is co-operation between parents and teachers. It is the schools responsibility to get the parents involved and to co-operate in this kind education.

2.4 Subject-matter Teaching

In this chapter I shall look more carefully into the different aspects concerning the actual subject-matter teaching. There are three different types of subject-matter teaching: theme-based, sheltered and adjunct (Krueger and Ryan 1993:61). I shall only deal with the sheltered model, because it is the one that is mostly used in Finland and it is also the one I am interested in. In this model language is not the main thing, the subject-matter that is being taught is. A non-language discipline is taught in a foreign language to students, who are not

native speakers of that language. The focus of this model is on the discipline, not the language, although there might be a short period of language instruction by a language teacher integrated into the lessons. Despite their differences all three models share certain common features (Krueger and Ryan 1993:61):

1. Content is the organizing principle of the curriculum.
2. Teaching has two objectives: mastery of content and development in the foreign language.
3. Materials and tasks should be in authentic language adapted by the teacher if necessary.
4. The needs of foreign language learners should be accommodated: e.g. increased redundancy and exemplification.

When content is taught in a foreign language the emphasis should always be on the content itself, the foreign language functions only as a means to the learning process.

The content –matter that the students need is given to them via a foreign language. Language learning is often secondary, it is taught and learned to serve communication needs in the pursuit of academic goals. Nevertheless it is clear (Genesee 1987:177) that students taking part in these kinds of lessons also learn the foreign language: it is still unclear how this language learning takes place. Content-based lessons demand a great deal from the foreign language learners, because they have to concentrate on both the language and the content at the same time. (Nikula and Marsh 1996:7)

3 PLANNING CONTENT-BASED TEACHING

When one starts planning a content-based language programme, it is impossible to know in advance the appropriateness of the given teaching programme for a particular context. There should be clear goals (Met 1991:284) put forward in the TCFL-programmes. Schools should be able to give out the goals that the students are expected to reach in their TCFL-education. There are certain facts that have to be taken into account in this planning. If the students have limited skills in the target language the content lesson must be carefully organized. This is especially true in secondary and upper secondary schools (Morgan and Simpson 1995:108, Nikula 1997:45,80), where the subjects taught are more abstract, and therefore require more from the students and teachers. Language is learned best when there are clear written outlines and topic related readings. (Krueger and Ryan 1993:72) It is obvious that the teacher's correct use of the target language is of great importance. It is also clear that good content-based language instruction requires good content teaching in order to give positive results. (Krueger and Ryan 1993:72.) Co-ordination of the subject-matter content and the concurrently presented language teaching content is of great importance. In the best situation, the non-language subject classroom reinforces the kind of skills that have been or are being focused upon in the language classroom. This interdisciplinary approach requires joint planning and takes a lot of time. (Räsänen and Marsh 1994: 35.)

The best activities for language learning in content- based programme include oral and written production for communicative purposes. These usually mean the verbal reworking of the information given during the lesson in other formats or channels; for example: written exercises, critiques, summaries of main points and group discussions. In a study by Krueger (Krueger and Ryan 1993:74-75) it was found that the most effective language teachers were those, who made sure that students used the target language to understand or express learned subject matter information in a number of different ways and in a

variety of situations. In order to help the students to use the foreign language even outside the classroom, the language activities used in teaching these students must be involving, linguistically demanding and varied, even in content-based language teaching.

When content is taught in a foreign language, it is important to make sure that students also learn the subject matter, not only the foreign language. There is one important area where language and subject-matter learning overlap, and that is reading of the subject matter in the target language. Reading researchers (Krueger and Ryan 1993:170-173) agree that learners gain interpretive competence through interaction with written text, this interaction is necessary for increasing language competence. The difference between oral and written discourse is the fact that only written text provides learners with certain structural features of the language. People tend not to use complicated structures in their verbal communication, especially if they are uncertain of their foreign language capabilities, therefore reading subject-matter in a foreign language is an important part of TCFL-programmes. In this way the students can receive more complicated language and thus increase, hopefully, their foreign language competence. There are some problems in the usage of foreign language text in content-based language teaching. It is not enough to choose a text, but you have to know what to do with it once the text has been selected. The normal methods used in native language subject-matter teaching do not apply in TCFL-programmes. The content language instructor must help the students to understand the text by using, for example, group discussion of the text, summaries and outlines of the content. (Krueger and Ryan 1993:170-173.) At the moment there is a difficulty in obtaining suitable materials and textbooks for bilingual education that would satisfy its specific requirements. In Nikula (1997:66-67) it was reported that the lack of material for TCFL-programmes, was the biggest problem among TCFL-teachers. All TCFL-teachers that took part in the study reported that it takes a lot of extra time to prepare suitable material . In some cases schools that offer TCFL-education to large amount of

students, material has been obtained from Britain or the U.S.A. Getting material from abroad carries also a certain amount of risks, because the material is always a product of its culture and values, and this is something the TCFL-teacher must take in to account in his/her TCFL-teaching. In TCFL-programmes teachers rely far less on "normal" textbooks than teachers that teach content in the students' own language. TCFL teachers are expected to devise much of their own material. It might be necessary to make slight modifications and provide glossaries of the specific subject-matter terminology. (Beardsmore 1993: 14) Commercial ready-made material for TCFL does not, in general, exist.. The material designed for native speakers of the target language are often unsuitable for wide- spread use in the Finnish classroom. Nevertheless "native" material is very useful as a source material, when it is adapted and further developed. The direct translation of the previous Finnish material will probably not work in the new context. (Räsänen and Marsh 1994:35)

The best sources for authentic target language texts in the subject-matter are those textbooks that are written for or by native speakers of that language (Krueger and Ryan 1993:174 175). The teacher must decide whether the text is suitable for the group of students he teaches. It is important that the teacher does not "dummy down" the text in order to help the students. In doing so the teacher also destroys the text's discourse features, with guidance the students can understand texts the teacher thought were much too advanced. The text book should not be the only text students use as a source of information about the subject-matter: newspapers, magazines, cartoons and advertisement can all be viable sources for studying the subject-matter area. It can be also very rewarding for student motivation to encourage them to try to find out alternative sources of information. TCFL-programmes require a lot of extra work from the teachers, and they must also learn new teaching methods. (Nikula and Marsh 1996:57, Nikula and Marsh 1997:47)

Very few studies have been made on teacher-pupil communication in the classroom in TCFL- programmes. A study by Salomone (Lauren 1994:50) in 1992 defines the general pedagogical and linguistic strategies used by six teachers. The categories can roughly be divided into four: 1) general techniques of comprehension of contents; this means, for example, certain routines and contextual support , 2) techniques of comprehension of specific contents; e.g symbolic representation , 3) techniques to facilitate the input and output of the second language; e.g giving pupils time to respond and not to consider errors in the second language as a problem , 4) techniques for improving the self-esteem of the pupils;e.g. emotional support, allowing the pupils to express themselves with their own linguistic resources and to value the pupil's response in regard of the particular pupil's own level of competence in the target language.

4 SCHOOLS AND TCFL-PROGRAMMES

The amount of content teaching using a foreign language varies greatly depending on the school level, at middle school (children between ages 9 and 13) level 8% and at upper secondary school (children between ages 16 and 19) level 23.6% of schools have TCFL-programmes. The difference in these programmes is that the higher level you get the more abstract the subject matter gets. One must also remember that students, who are on a upper secondary school level, also probably have higher proficiency in the target language; e.g. vocabulary, grammar. It would therefore be beneficial for the student to be able to get TCFL-education at all levels of education.(Nikula and Marsh 1996:27,30,35,40) Because this way the students, who take part in TCFL-education, would be able to get continuity to their foreign language education. In order to get good results in TCFL-programmes (Nikula and Marsh1997:87) students need to get this kind of education on all school levels, even small amounts of TCFL-education can be beneficial. Cummings and Swain (1986:105) argue that TCFL-education should not be short-termed and temporary, because learning a foreign language is a time consuming process.

The amount of foreign language usage in the classroom varies quite a lot from school level to school level. It is obvious that at middle school level teachers have to resort to native language more often than on secondary or upper secondary school levels, because the foreign language competence of the students on the middle school level is weak and therefore in order to help the students to understand the content native language has to be used. After all the students need to learn the content also. (Nikula and Marsh 1996:46-47)

5 RESULTS OF TCFL-PROGRAMMES

Because of the dual nature of content-based teaching, the effectiveness of these programmes have to be analyzed in regard of both language and content proficiency. There are several studies that deal with these areas of interest. (Krueger and Ryan 1993:69) According to these studies teaching content in a foreign language is not a hindrance for either content or language learning. Overall it can be said that students in content-based courses improved their language proficiency significantly and also mastered their content matter at a level comparable to that of students who were taught content in their native language. The content-based foreign language courses were seen as more enjoyable and satisfying than courses in native language. However these courses were also regarded more difficult by both the teachers and students. A recent study report from Monterey Institute (Beardsmore 1993:3) shows that students in a content-based course learned as much as students in a native language course, but not necessarily the same content. This is one reason to justify content-based courses: foreign language texts can provide a richer content matter learning as well as language learning. (Nikula & Marsh 1996:58.). Some studies show (Nikula and Marsh 1997:35) that this kind of teaching does not hinder the less talented students, in fact, they get the same kind of benefits as the gifted students. In all school levels in Finland (Nikula and Marsh 1997:71) teachers say that students learn sometimes the subject-matter better in TCFL-programmes. Teaching takes more time, but at the same time it is more effective and concentrates more on the important issues. In some schools it has been noticed that TCFL-education has increased the students' interest in the subject-matter and this leads to better learning results.

It is not enough to know that students learn their subject matter well, what is also important is whether they learn the target language the way they are supposed to. There are several studies made in this respect, and they all seem to support the fact that students in TCFL-programmes will make as great ,if not

greater, language gains than students in a regular language class. (Ottawa: 54.) A study carried out in 1982 by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (Ottawa:202) indicates that the time students spent in classes that participated in TCFL-programmes provided more effective second language instruction than a normal language class alone.

From all this evidence it is clear that students, who have required initial second language proficiency suitable for each course, and who want to take part in these courses, are very successful. Nevertheless it must be pointed out that typical content teaching is not necessarily good second language teaching, but it seems that good content teaching is essential if students are to have maximum progress in developing their skills in the second language (Ottawa: 14). A study done in Spain of their Catalan immersion programme (Lauren 1994:17-18), shows that while learning to read and write in Catalan, the Spanish-speaking pupil also learns to read and write in Spanish as well. The pupils also grow accustomed to frequent language switching, which is important for the learning of foreign languages. A bilingual child, in general, develops metalinguistic concepts earlier (Lauren 1994:77) than a monolingual child, however some studies show that it takes longer for bilingual children to reach control over their communicative success than monolingual. Yet bilingual children seem to benefit from the enriching effect of two languages and cultures, the reason for this may be that the mastery of two languages result in a more conscious understanding and use of linguistic phenomena in general.

Most studies (Lauren 1994:24) on immersion programmes have indicated three factors that determine whether the primary learning of a second language has positive or negative results. These factors are: 1) the social status of the pupil's home language and culture, 2) the motivation of the pupil in respect of the new language and 3) the pedagogical approach adopted in the teaching of the foreign language.

According to Nikula (1997:85-87) all school levels reported that TCFL-education has a positive effect on the students' foreign language ability. Especially on secondary and upper secondary schools the students' vocabulary and the ability to understand texts in the foreign language is better than average. Also students' ability to understand and follow spoken foreign language seemed to develop rather quickly. (Nikula & Marsh 1997:87). One of the biggest challenges of TCFL-education is to make the students use the foreign language. (Nikula and Marsh 1997:88) Especially in Finland where people are traditionally reluctant to use any foreign language in either written or oral form. However both teachers and students in TCFL-programmes have reported (Nikula & Marsh 1997:88) that the usage of the foreign language has increased.

The affect of TCFL-education on grammar seems not to be as good as on communication skills.(Nikula and Marsh 1997:90). The ability to use the language is good, but students make mistakes in their grammar. According to Swain (1996:94) studies show that students in TCFL-programmes have problems in forming grammatically correct sentences. The reason for this may be that (Nikula 1997:90) teachers who give TCFL-education try not to pay attention to the grammatical correctness, they are more concerned about the learning and teaching of the subject-matter. Therefore it would be important to pay attention also to the correct language forms in TCFL-education, if the students are to learn to use proper grammar. This does not mean that grammar should be taught in TCFL-programmes (Nikula and Marsh 1997:90-91). Instead TCFL-teachers could use more subtle ways to let the students know the proper usage of the language (Nikula and Marsh 1997:91, Allen 1990:77), teachers could repeat the answer in the correct way, teacher could rephrase short answers into longer ones and teachers could ask the students themselves to rephrase wrong answers with new ones.

All school levels report more or less the same kind of problems: lack of material, making material takes time and effort, some teachers are against TCFL-programmes, student groups are too heterogenous. At upper secondary school level there were other problems as well: students seem to underestimate their language competence, teachers are not certain if their own language proficiency is good enough and are therefore reluctant to even start teaching content in a foreign language, especially special vocabulary causes problems. (Nikula and Marsh1996:66-68, Nikula and Marsh1997:66). It has also been found (Nikula and Marsh 1997:71) that TCFL-education requires more time than normal subject-matter teaching. Some teachers fear that students in TCFL-education do not learn as much as those, who are not in TCFL-education. This may take place despite the fact that most students have a native language study book on the subject taught in TCFL-education. Sometimes students claim (Nikula and Marsh 1997:73) that TCFL-education makes learning more difficult than normal education, although TCFL-education can be more interesting.

6 THE SURVEY

6.1 The study plan

For the survey a questionnaire (appendix 1) was used to find out what teachers, who teach TCFL-programmes, get out of these programmes. The questionnaire was sent to 50 teachers, who had taken part in TCFL-education programmes in the Continuing Education Centre of the University of Jyväskylä. The questionnaire was sent out in the spring of 1995. The teachers chosen taught various subject and were both men and women, nevertheless there were more women than men. The answers were dealt anonymously. Out of 50 questionnaires that were sent, unfortunately only 25 were returned, and of those only 3 were from men. The reason for this survey was that I wanted to find out what difficulties, if any, teachers have in TCFL-education, but also at the same time to get an overall picture of the TCFL-programmes in Finland. I did not survey the possible results the TCFL-education might or might not have on the students, only the opinions the teachers have through their experience.

6.2 Research question

The aim of this study was to find out what kind of problems, if any, teachers, who teach content through a foreign language, have in their everyday work. These problems may relate to the teaching material, the support the teachers receive and to the motivation of the students. I would suspect that there are problems in all the above mentioned areas, however, the area I am more interested in is the area of obtaining sufficient material to fulfill the needs of a successful TCFL-class. I would speculate that there are not enough materials readily available for TCFL-teaching. Instead, the teachers have to sacrifice a lot of their own time, and in some cases own money, in order to produce suitable materials for their classes. With this study I am trying to find out whether this

is the case or not. However I shall discuss other problematic areas if need be. The questionnaire is appendix 1.

6.3 General background information

Age and gender

Only 25 questionnaires were returned. Out of these 25 only 3 were men, and none of these men were younger than 29 no older than 50 years of age. This outcome is not surprising considering the ratio between men and women in teaching profession, and it is also possible that women are more likely to take on new ideas, as TCFL-programmes.

What language was used in teaching

Of the teachers, who answered the questionnaire all but one had English as the language they had chosen to use in their TCFL-classes. The one exception was a teacher, who teaches at the German school and therefore uses German in her teaching. It was surprising to find that English had a such dominant role in TCFL-programme. I had expected that most of the teachers use English, but nevertheless the outcome was a surprise. I had assumed that there would have been at least some teachers who teach in Swedish. I can only speculate why English was so overwhelming, but one reason may be that the 'reshold' to teach and to be taught in English is lower than in any other language. Student motivation is also probably higher when the language used is English.

What subject was taught trough a foreign language

The subjects that were taught in TCFL-classes were surprisingly varied. I had expected a higher number of teachers who would teach subjects that are more practical (e.g home economics) than theoretical. But to my surprise there were

a few teachers , who taught, for example, mathematics in their TCFL-classes. I had suspected that the number of teachers, who taught science would have been quite low. The reasoning behind this claim is that the terminology in these subjects is very specific and you have to have a very good competence in the target language that you use in order not to give wrong information to the students. The teachers of more theoretical subjects, on the other hand, have the advantage of being able to use terminology that can easily be found, for example, in native language text books and dictionaries. The subjects that were taught were as follows: History was taught by six teachers, Geography by eight, Biology by four, Religion by one, Mathematics by two, Science by 2, ADP by one, Philosophy by five. However you have to bear in mind that some teachers teach more than one subjects in a foreign language, five teachers fall into this category. Usually these subjects were Mathematics and Science in one case the subjects were History and Philosophy.

How long had TCFL-programme been used

It is clear from the answers that TCFL is a relatively new idea in our normal school system, special schools like the German school are an exception, and therefore nobody has been teaching TCFL for only a few years. Of those who answered thirteen had been teaching TCTL for less than a year, nine between one and three years, and three between four and six years. From the relatively low number of years most of the teachers had, it could be argued whether the results are reliable, because the experience they have had so far is quite limited. I personally do not think that this is a problem, because you do not have to teach for too long a time in order to find the positive and negative features of TCFL-programmes. I think it is rather a good thing that most of the teachers are new to TCFL, because in this way they have fresh ideas and experiences, and are not yet bored with the programme. It is also important to bear in mind that these teachers may estimate that they have put too much work into TCFL compared to those with more experience. This is quite understandable

because the 'new' ones have to start from the scratch and therefore they have no ready made material or curriculum, and all the work they have done is fresh in their memory, contrary to those with more experience in TCFL. Therefore it could be said that being new in TCFL-education is both an advantage and a disadvantage.

What grade was taught in TCFL

In this case what is meant with grade is the school's stage of education (comprehensive school, upper secondary school etc.), not the specific class level (first, second, third ...) the TCFL-education takes place. Most of TCFL-education was done either at comprehensive school or at sixth form. This result was expected, only two teachers taught TCFL somewhere else, namely one at vocational school and one at business administration. It is interesting to notice that there are not many TCFL-programmes in the school levels after comprehensive school or sixth form. The reasons for this division are not clear. It is possible that it is easier to introduce TCFL-programmes into the curriculum in comprehensive school and in sixth form than in vocational schools, due to the now increasing voluntary courses. Also students in vocational may not have an interest in TCFL-education, because they usually do not have such good marks in languages in comprehensive school. Nevertheless, it can be argued that TCFL-programmes could be very useful also in vocational schools, especially in polytechnical schools, because of the ever increasing demand for workers, who can communicate well in at least one foreign language. Fortunately, the trend at the moment is to increase the number of TCFL-programmes also in vocational schools.

Were there other teachers in the school using TCFL-programmes

The number of teachers who had colleagues also teaching TCFL was sixteen. Therefore the number of teachers who had no TCFL-colleagues was nine.

Perhaps the relatively high number of teachers who had TCFL-colleagues shows that when someone starts a TCFL -programme others follow suit. It could be argued that it would be easier to find support for one's TCFL-teaching, if there were other colleagues who also used TCFL-education. It is also probable that the schools principal and other school administrators in those schools with a high number of TCFL-teachers are more supporting of new ideas than perhaps their colleagues in other schools or municipalities.

How many hours per week approximately was TCFL taught

Eleven teachers taught TCFL between one and three hours and fourteen between three and six hours per week. However, it must be noticed that most of these teachers teach also other subject or the same subject, but not in a foreign language, therefore the average teaching hours per week may seem a bit too low. The questionnaire did not inquire the total teaching hour that the teacher teaches in a week, because some may have 'normal' classes along with TCFL-classes.

How many hours in a week were used to prepare lessons

Only two teachers used less than an hour, twelve between one and three hours, seven between four and six hours, two ten to twelve hours, and one over twelve hours. One person did not give any answer to this question. The average amount used was about three hours per week, which was a bit surprising, because I had expected that the average amount would have been higher. Only three teachers used more than ten hours for their preparations, and I would suspect that this is the amount a teacher who has just started to use TCFL-education and has to use a lot of time to prepare the material for the TCFL-classes. I would also suspect that TCFL-programmes, especially in the beginning, require a lot of time for the development of the material. Those teachers who do not use many hours to prepare their TCFL-classes have

probably already taught TCFL-classes for some time, and therefore do not need so much time for preparations for their classes.

6.4 Teaching material

What kind of materials were used to prepare TCFL-lessons

When answering one could choose from three options out of nine possible. Therefore, this section has more possible answers than the previous ones. Of course, there might have been more than three possibilities, but the teachers had to pick only the three options that they considered to be the most important ones for their preparations. Seventeen teachers used a target language textbook as their source for material. Target-language sources were used by sixteen, target-language magazines were the source for six teachers, target-language newspapers were used by only two. TV - programmes, video- and audio tapes in the target language were used by five. Target- language encyclopedias were the source for three teachers. A target-language dictionary was used by no more than fourteen teachers. Six teachers had translated native language (Finnish) texts into the target-language. One teacher had made a textbook of his/her own to be used in class, and one used target-language manuals as the source. The results were more or less as expected, namely that native-language materials were the ones most often used. This is encouraging, because in this way students probably get the most authentic language presented to them, and therefore get the most out of TCFL-classes. The only problem that might result from the use of target-language material, is that it may be difficult, in some cases, to obtain suitable material regarding the level of competence of the students the material is aimed at. After these answers and after talking to TCFL-teachers, I would suspect that the obtaining of material is one of the main problems facing TCFL-education.

What sources were used to get the material for TCFL-classes

Here again the teachers had the opportunity to choose more than one possible answer, but no more than three. Twelve teachers were able to get their material from the school; nine used the library; twenty teachers had to get their source material themselves, without the help of the school or the library; one teacher used manuals that came with the machines and one co-operated with other teachers in creating suitable materials. It seems that schools do support TCFL-education, but still almost half the respondents did not get the material from the school. Furthermore the high number of teachers, who had to find out the material themselves, shows how dedicated the teachers are, but it also shows that it is difficult to get suitable material unless you sacrifice your own time and money in order to get them.

What methods were used in helping students to understand the subject matter

Even with simplified texts, it may be necessary to provide additional help to students so that they could understand what they are reading, and also to help them to digest the information they have received. It is interesting to see how much teachers use simplified texts (texts that has basically the same context as the original one, but that is written in a way that makes it easier for the students to understand) and how much the original text, because the simplification process takes alot of time and also makes the text less authentic. This time, the teachers had also the opportunity to tick three possible alternatives out of five. Fifteen teachers had prepared a word list of unfamiliar words in the text; thirteen used simplified texts sixteen teachers used the original target-language text without any alternations; thirteen used group discussions in the target-language to promote understanding; eight used other activities. These other activities include various things: making students do target language assingnements; working in the language laboratory; drawings and target-

language plays; target-language videos and cassettes; target-language games; working in groups and pairs, and making demonstrations.

The use of original target-language texts was, at least to me, surprisingly popular. I had expected that teachers would adapt the original texts more, perhaps this is a demonstration of the high standard the students, as well as, the teachers have. The methods used to help student understanding were quite varied, which is a positive phenomenon. This ensures that students get the most out of the education, especially the group discussions are beneficial, because in this way students get to use the target language, at least in theory, in real life situations.

6.5 Open questions

The next six questions were open questions and no choices were given, so the teachers had to write down their ideas. In each question the alternatives have been limited to no more than four for each question. Each alternative is, however, discussed in more detail, and in this way the possible variations in the alternatives are discussed in more detail.

How did the students react to TCFL-programme

Nineteen teachers reported that the students were enthusiastic about TCFL-programme; four teachers said that students had reservations and one group of students were negative towards TCFL-programme. It was positive to notice that most students liked TCFL-programme, some students had even demanded a TCFL-programme and wanted to continue it in the future. However, it was not surprising that it was the most talented students, who usually wanted TCFL-programmes and also they were the ones who felt that they got the most out of it. Nevertheless, at least one teacher said that even students with low grades in the target language felt positive about TCFL-programme, because

they had noticed that they were able learn two things at the same time; the language and the subject matter. Students also wanted the teacher to be fluent in the target language, something that teachers felt to be quite demanding.

Those teachers who reported that the students seemed to be a little reserved towards TCFL-programmes said that those with low grades in the target language were the ones that had most objection towards this kind of education. One teacher said the TCFL-programme was easier in the secondary school, because the vocabulary is easier than in the upper secondary school. The one teacher who said the reaction was negative claimed that the reason for this was that the TCFL-groups were too heterogeneous, and therefore there were so many students with low grades that they were not interested in TCFL-education, because they were not able to understand it. Reading between the lines I did get the impression that the teacher was also feeling negative towards teaching these TCFL-groups, because he had been ordered to do by the principal of the school.

On the whole, one could say that the overall attitude among the students towards TCFL-programme was very positive, and the teachers seemed to feel that with TCFL-programme they were able to help the students in their future studies.

What was the reaction among other teachers and management towards TCFL-programmes.

Ten teachers said that both their colleagues and the management had been supportive towards TCFL-programmes, in some cases the management even pressured the teachers to give TCFL-education. However twelve reported that only the management had been positive about TCFL-programmes and encouraged these programmes, the other teachers either were not even interested in knowing about TCFL-programmes or felt negative towards this kind of education. Only two teachers felt that they had not received any support

from either the other teachers or the school management, the reason for this was probably that the others did not know enough about TCFL-programmes and therefore were reluctant.

It seems that in most cases the attitude towards TCFL was more or less positive, however, some teachers seemed to be reserved and this may be because either they did not know enough about TCFL and therefore felt insecure or this negative attitude was just a normal reaction to something new.

What were the three easiest aspects in TCFL and why were they found easy

Despite the fact that the teachers could have given three different aspects, they usually named only one that they apparently considered to be the most important.

Student motivation was one thing that was regarded by four to be easy to achieve. The reason for this that the students had, in most cases, voluntarily taken TCFL. The groups were usually quite small and the students the best in the school. The teachers themselves felt motivated, because they had discovered new ways to teach and were able to use foreign textbooks.

Also concrete things in the subject were said to be easy to teach by seven teachers. These things were usually easy to demonstrate and therefore one did not have to use the target language and all the students were able to understand. Also the fact that when teachers prepare material for TCFL-classes they had to find out the essential, and in this way the central themes have to be clearly presented and this helps the students to learn the most important facts, unlike in Finnish classes where there is a lot of material, all of which may not be so important to the students. Many words that are used in Finnish speaking classrooms of, for example, biology are almost the same in the target language (e.g. Biodiversity(Eng.) and biodiversiteetti (Fin)). It was also reported in

seven cases that students had found that they understood the target language, and if the target language was English the students seemed to regard English as a universal language, and therefore were highly motivated. Students also understood spoken language quite well and did not mind small mistakes made by the teacher. One teacher said that students seem to speak the target language with more ease with a non-language teacher and the reason for this was that the language teacher corrects the students' utterances more often. Good teaching material was also mentioned in three papers, especially material in English was easy to find and usually it was easy enough English for the students.

What three aspects proved to be difficult in TCFL and why were they found difficult

In four cases the more abstract things in the subject matter were considered to difficult to explain in a foreign language, especially when some of the things were difficult to explain even in the native language. Also the vocabulary proved to be an obstacle, some students did not understand all the words in the texts, and translation from Finnish texts into the target language was also problematic, especially in History with its sometimes old-fashioned style.

The fact that students had different levels of competence was mentioned by four to be an obstacle, even in the upper secondary school. Because the students were so heterogeneous, it took a long time to prepare suitable material for these classes, and as one teacher put; there was no compensation for the extra work. One of them also mentioned that it was difficult to evaluate the progress the students made in the target language during TCFL-classes. Also the target language competence should not affect the evaluation of the subject being taught in that language, but according to at least one teacher it was hard avoiding not to do that. In TCFL-classes there was usually no time to repeat vocabulary the way it was possible in normal language classes, this means that

conversation was far more limited due to the lack of vocabulary than it would have been in native language classes.

The target language proved to be a serious problem even for the teachers. Seven teachers complained that their own competence in the target language was inadequate for TCFL purposes. Especially the communicative skills needed improving, as one teacher said: "I have not used the language, I have only learned the grammar." The lack of target-language competence was a serious problem, because this was one contributing factor in increased workload that affected TCFL-teachers, because this increased the need to check everything you write, and that took a lot of extra time and effort. This lack of competence in the target language could turn teachers away from TCFL or some might quit teaching TCFL-classes altogether.

The lack of proper material seemed also to be a problem that many teachers reported. In most cases the teachers had to prepare the material themselves, which turned out to be quite workable. Occasionally teachers had to rely on three different target-language textbooks in order to make suitable material for TCFL-lessons. The overall shortage of funds can be seen in TCFL-programmes, the lack of money means that either you cannot buy the material you need or you have to pay them out of your own pocket. Also the different levels of student competence either in the target language or in the subject matter causes problems in preparing suitable material for all the students, especially in the middle and secondary schools.

If there were problems in TCFL-programme, what methods were used to seek assistance

Thirteen had received help from a target-language teacher, one teacher had even an English teacher assigned to assist in TCFL-programme by the principal. It was obvious that the target language teacher was the most likely

source for assistance. However, it is not clear how the target language teacher helped in TCFL-classes, only one teacher said that he had received help in vocabulary, whether the target-language teacher had helped in the preparation of the material for the TCFL-classes is not clear.

Eight teachers had other colleagues who also taught TCFL-classes. It was apparent that a lot of material exchange goes on between TCFL-teachers who also teach subject matter. This kind of information exchange was expected, because it is very likely that other teachers giving TCFL know best the problems that there are in TCFL-programmes. Therefore discussions about these problems between TCFL-colleagues may turn out to be the most effective way to reduce stress and sometimes frustration among TCFL-teachers; you do not have to be alone with your problems. In fact, at least two teachers had received TCFL-training, which usually is given at Continuing Education Centres of some universities. This training provides TCFL-teachers with basic knowledge about TFL-programmes, and more importantly with a network of other TCFL-teachers to whom you can turn to if assistance is needed.

Native-language source material have to also play a part as a source of information, but it can also provide facts about using the target language and vocabulary. Only two teachers actually named target-language books as helpful, but I would suspect that they are an obvious source of information especially considering the vocabulary.

If needed, were the teachers given enough assistance

All except one had not received enough help, and this was due to a teacher's sickleave, and because you weren't allowed to hire a substitute, the work load of other teachers increased and therefore they did not have to help the TCFL-teacher. Most teachers did not specify were they had received assistance, but looking at the the previous question I would conclude that the main source was

the target-language teacher. Only one teacher mentioned that he had required material and taken courses in TCFL-programmes at his own expense.

It is encouraging that TCFL-teachers did get help when it was needed and that there was not much jealousy among colleagues, at least no one mentioned it, but I would suspect that, as in any profession, there were those who felt suspicious of anything new and may have felt that it was not their job to help those with new ideas of TCFL- programmes.

What were the aspects that were thought to be the most positive aspects in TCFL-programmes

According to eighteen TCFL-teachers, one important aspect about TCFL-programmes was that it provided students with a better ability to use the target language in real-life situations. The use of the target-language became natural and fluent, because ideally TCFL-programmes provided the students with the possibility to use the target language in as realistic situations as possible. Some teachers also pointed out that TCFL-programmes prepared students to be more "international", and students can get used to reading foreign-language material other than language text books and so the target language becomes a natural part in gaining information, this can be very useful especially if the students go to study at universities, as probably most high school student do. Students also seem to realize that the language is a mean of communication, not only a subject you have to learn at school. The understanding of the target-language also increases, this allows the possibility of using native target-language speakers as lectures or in panel discussions as chairpersons. In a way TCFL-programmes differ from the regular target-language education by providing students with more exposure to the target-language, and according to one teacher, students found it easier to be in a TCFL-class than in normal language class, because the TCFL-teacher did not correct mistakes as eagerly as the language teacher. In TCFL-classes to be understood is important, not the

grammar. Of course, grammar is important, but in TCFL-classes the aim is usually to increase the output from the students, and if they are corrected all the time the willingness to communicate diminishes.

Seven teachers reported that students were more motivated in TCFL-classes than in normal subject-matter classes. This higher level of motivation may be due to the fact that most students in TCFL-classes are among the so-called best students, and are therefore easy to teach and interested in challenging new ideas. The students were also more observant, probably because they had to concentrate more in order to understand the content of TCFL-lessons. As many as nine teachers said that TCFL-classes were beneficial for themselves as well as to the students. The teacher's competence in the target language increased, because he had to, first of all speak the language, and secondly read in it, when he prepared material for TCFL-classes. In addition, the teacher's increased motivation was said to be an important factor, TCFL-classes bring much wanted variety into the otherwise dull normal routine school work. However, one teacher's enthusiasm towards TCFL-classes was more of a practical nature than idealistic, the only reason she was teaching TCFL-classes was to get enough hours to fill her teaching quota.

The possibility for co-operation between different school subjects was mentioned as a positive aspect by three teachers. Co-operation between the subject-matter teacher and the target-language teacher was necessary for the success of TCFL-classes. In addition, the fact that the subject matter was taught in a foreign language may bring down the barriers both in the minds of the students and of the teachers. In one school, however, the target-language was the language everyone used, because it was the school's official language, and therefore this may have affected the final findings.

What aspects were thought to be the most negative aspects of TCFL-programmes

This question also produced many and quite long answers, and therefore it was necessary for me to try and find the core of each answer. I also had to categorize them into four groups accordingly.

Eight teachers were concerned about their own competence in the target language, especially the possible absence of different variations within the language, due to weaknesses in vocabulary. The teachers were not sure if they were able to give the students enough input that would contain enough different grammatical and vocabular variance. The teacher's uncertainty of his own competence in the target language maybe be the reason why some teachers do not want to teach TCFL-classes, however interesting and challenging TCFL-programmes may otherwise be. Some teachers who teach the last year students in the upper secondary school, expressed great concern about the target language competence, there is always the danger that the teacher gives students wrong examples and models, due to lack of knowledge in the target language. This way students may learn the improper usage of the target-language, and it may be difficult to repair the damage later on. In order to increase the knowledge one should get more education and to be able to travel to countries where the target language is the native language. To do this, however, requires money and only few teachers can afford them and the municipalities do not have resources either, as one teacher put it: "You cannot get grants into the wilderness beyond Tampere."

The most frequently mentioned negative aspect of TCFL-programmes was the lack of suitable material, a total of sixteen teachers said that they lack suitable material. The material may exist, but it was not easily available. For example, publishers do not have such material available and therefore teachers have to rely mostly on themselves, both in materials and in planning the classes, if they want to give TCFL-classes. This self-reliance means that they have to prepare

the material themselves in co-operation with other TCFL- teachers, and this requires a lot of extra work without extra pay. One teacher was especially critical to the payment system, he wanted a lot of money for pioneering work in TCFL-programme, however, more than money he wanted to reduce his teaching quota. The material that was available was in most cases too difficult to be used as such. Also in order to get material to be used in preparing TCFL-classes are hard to get, and sometimes it requires going abroad and that takes money, which, unfortunately, in most cases is a rare commodity. Only one teacher mentioned that the extra work may also be a positive thing, because one needs new challenges in order not to be stuck to the same routines year after year. Teaching TCFL-classes brings change into old routines. Some teachers took courses to improve their TCFL-education competence, but one or two courses a year seemed to be too little.

As many as twelve teachers were afraid that students with a poor proficiency in the target language are the ones who suffer the most in TCFL-classes. These students, especially if the TCFL-class has a lot of students, tend to go unnoticed, this may happen in normal classes as well, but in TCFL-classes the risk for misunderstanding everything is even greater. The subject matter itself can, of course, be too difficult even in the native language, but the same subject in the target language only increases the possibility for the student to be left behind in the subject-matter. This kind of student segregation is, of course, possible only in TCFL-classes where students are a heterogeneous group. In case of voluntary TCFL-classes students are more likely to be on the same competence level in the target language, and therefore the chance of some students being left behind in the subject-matter is not that great. With these voluntary TCFL-classes there is the danger that other students, and even some teachers, feel that these students are somehow better than the rest of the students. This fear of being labelled as being elite can turn some students away from TCFL-classes. Those classes that are heterogeneous can contain students who simply hate foreign languages as such and therefore hate TCFL-classes as

well, and do not even want to try and learn in TCFL-classes. However, they can learn the subject from their textbooks on their native language, and therefore are able to learn the subject-matter that way. Therefore, one could argue that by reducing the hostility of some students towards foreign language education, one, at the same time, could increase the number of students who would like to take part in TCFL-classes. On the other hand, the opposite may apply as well; students who otherwise would be interested in the particular subject, lose interest, because they do not understand the target language well enough. It is not clear how students who do not like the subject matter react to TCFL-classes in that subject. Nonetheless, one could say that teaching that subject in a foreign language hardly increases positive feelings towards that particular subject.

7 CONCLUSION

It is becoming more and more popular to teach content in a foreign language, nowadays even children in the kindergarten are sometimes taught in a foreign language. Also increasing number of comprehensive schools and sixth form school have somekind of education in a foreign language.

TCFL-programmes have become so popular that even the Minister of Education has expressed concern about the quality of this kind of education, especially when given by a content teacher. Therefore it could be beneficial for TCFL-education that the TCFL-teacher has qualifications for both the language and the subject being taught.

TCFL-education can be divided into at least four gatecories; immersion, theme-based, sheltered and adjuct models. The main emphasis of the programme can be either teaching content or teaching language I concentrated on the content-based models. In TCFL-classes the teacher uses various means to help the students to understand the teaching. They use added vocabularly, somewhat adapted useage of the foreign language, even if authentic material is used in the class.

The results from TCFL-education so far have been quite positive; students do learn both the language and the subject well, when compared to other "normal" classes. The students usually have a positive attitude towards this kind of education.

In this study I tried to find out what kind of attitudes teachers who teach TCFL-classes have on the whole towards TCFL-programmes. My goal was to find out both positive and negative aspects related to TCFL-education, and my hypothesis was that the most important negative factor in TCFL-programmes was the lack of suitable material. According to the answers I got it is quite true;

these TCFL-programmes do take a lot more time and effort than normal classes, and as one teacher put it, without extra pay for the effort. Teachers have to do this extra work, because there is very little or no ready made material that would be suitable for TCFL-education. This lack of suitable material and the additional work that comes with it can result in that teachers who otherwise would be interested in TCFL-education decide not to start teaching TCFL-classes. I only hope that the National Board of Education will continue to support the internationalization process of education, as Vilho Hirvi (as quoted in Räsänen & Marsh 1994:4.) has suggested.

8 TEACHING PACKAGE - EUROPEAN HISTORY (period 1848 - 1920)

8.1 Introduction

This teaching package deals with European history from the mid 1850s to the end of the First World War, and it is aimed at the upper secondary school level. In upper secondary school there are five compulsory and three voluntary courses in history. This teaching package is probably best suited as a part for course three that deals with international relationships in the 20th century. (Lukion opetussuunnitelma 1994) This package starts already from the mid 19th century, because it is important to know the events behind the turmoils in the early 20th century, and this package attempts to do that. This package could, of course, be a part of an applied course in history that deals with international relationships. As regards the English language, this package attempts to provide exercises that allow students to speak English as much as possible, either in groups or individually. The texts provide the background information needed for the discussions

The questions are not simple yes/no-questions, they require students to write down the facts and sometimes students have to give information to support the answers, especially if the answer requires expressed opinions. In this way students get a lot of writing exercises during the course.

The material for this course has been adapted from various sources originally in both English and Finnish. I have abridged the texts in order to make them more accessible to students, in other words, less academic. Certain words and phrases from English have been changed to make the texts a bit easier to understand.

I chose this subject for this package, because I wanted to concentrate on the political history of Europe of that time period. There are some references to social history, but only to give background information for some of the political events. The unification of Germany and Germany in European history is the framework for this package. I left out the Russian revolution and events before and after it, because it is such a vast phenomenon that it would require a teaching package of its own.

At the end of the teaching package, there are some ready-made transparencies for the teacher to use during classes as a support for the students. The transparencies help students to follow the course of the class and also gives them some vocabulary already written from that they can use when writing down notes into their notebooks.

8.2 The Rise of the Bourgeois in the 19th Century

Tries to give students an overall view of this period. Read this text and answer the questions at the end.

The general population in Europe grew enormously in the period from mid 18th century to mid 19th century. For example, the population in England alone grew from 9 million in the beginning of the 19th century to 33 million in the end of that century. This growth in population meant both social and political pressure in the whole of Europe. Emigration to the United States, especially from England, Ireland, Germany and Italy, commenced. People also began to move into cities.

During the 19th century the standard of living increased on every social level, however the thing that caused problems, was the uneven distribution of this growth; the relative differences between social classes grew all the time. There had always been poverty, but people did not look kindly to the growing wealth

of the bourgeois, this was the basis for the dissatisfaction and revolt mindedness. In England the crisis caused by this social difference, culminated between years 1830 – 32. During this time hunger and poverty were always present among the lower classes. Also at this time in England the bourgeois finally emerged as a political and economic power

8.2.1 The industrialization

The Industrial Revolution began in England in the middle of the 18th century, the process itself is long and complicated. To start this "Revolution" required that money was put into technology instead of military and the courts, and this meant that there had to be peace and that the power of the aristocracy and the courts had to be small. In continental Europe this was caused by the Napoleonic wars. In England, on the other hand, the circumstances were already there at the 18th century, a few years earlier. Many reasons have been given to why the protestant countries, especially England, rose to the leadership position during this time in history. The geographic location was favourable to England, because this was a time when seas were the most important passage ways, England had long ago abolished customs in inner trade. In France it took the Revolution to do the same. It was not until 1888, after Germany's unification, that the same happened in the many German dutchdoms , it was only after this that Germany began to catch up with British industrial technology.

During the 19th century, radical technological changes not only spread to almost every established branch of manufacture, but also created vast new industries. This was the age of coal and steam, railroad was the new and fast form of transportation. This was also the age when British leadership in every phase of technology and industry remained unquestioned. Textile machinery and steam engines, railroads and steamships, all were first introduced or attained their earliest large-scale development in Great Britain; for example in

Britain in 1830 there were 15 000 steam engines, whereas in France only 3000 and in Prussia 1000. One interesting episode in England during this time were those people, who wanted to destroy these new engines. They were called luddites, according to their leader Ned Ludd.

Iron- and steel industries developed immensely by new improved techniques such as the Bessemers-method of making steel even stonger. This enabled men to build even bigger and more powerful machines. The improvements in communication were as important as those in the industry. Newspapers with large circulation came into being in the 1850s, because the price of paper became cheaper. This in turn affected politics and diplomacy, making it necessary for statesmen to play upon and respond to public opinion as generated and expressed in the pages of newspapers. One turning point in the history of communication was the laying of a telegraph cable across the English Chanal in 1851, the first trans-Atlantic cable was layed in 1866. By the end of the 1870s the telegraph had already spread all over the world.

In general the industrial revolution increased the wealth of the western world, and allowed fundamental improvements in standards of cleanliness, health and comfort. Of course in the beginning the great influx of people into the old cities from the coutryside created social problems with which the traditional institutions were not able to cope. A second basic feature was the great growth in population, this was caused greatly by a reduced death rate, and this in turn depended partly on improvements in medical science and public sanitation, partly on the enlargement of the food supply, and partly on a general improvement in the material conditions of life. The industrial revolution was an important historical event that fundamentally changed the western world.

The influence of banks increased during the industrial revolution, because of the need for loans by companies grew. In order to fullfill this need banks collected more many from investors and savers, the capital that cumulated in

this way was put to any industry where the banks thought they could get the best profits. Free trade led to concentration, which sometimes led to cartels that fixed prices and reduced competition. Concentration also led to mergers between different companies.

Family, as the basic unit of the society, also went through changes; because of smaller houses in the industrial cities. Grandparents and in-laws could no longer live with the rest of the family as they had used to do in the past. From now on the family consisted mainly of parents and children.

The consumer society was also brought about by industrialization. Mass production, standardisation and lower prices enabled mass consumption, the first signs of which were noticeable in the mid 19th century. It was the middle class people, who spent money, not the working class, however with the higher standard of living also the working class began to follow the living habits of the bourgeois.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailman historia

Questions:

- 1. Name at least three reasons why the Industrial Revolution started.*
- 2. Why do you think it started in England?*
- 3. What were consequences of the Industrial Revolution?*
- 4. Do you think the Industrial Revolution was the beginning of capitalism, give reasons for your opinion.*
- 5. What changes did the Industrial Revolution cause in the society?*

8.3 1848 : Year of Turmoil

Read the text and answer the questions at the end.

In 1848-49 popular risings overthrew constituted authority in many important parts of the continent. Yet the revolutionaries failed to create a united Germany or Italy as they had hoped for. The 1840s in Europe was a decade somewhat similar to the 1960s, it was a decade of turbulence and political debate. The revolutionary movement started, in fact, already in the beginning of the decade; the weather had been bad the whole of the 1840s. Food prices went higher and people no longer had money for anything else. Therefore many textile factories went out of business, and in the end even banks went bankrupt. There were food riots all over Europe. In France landowners were killed because they did not sell grain in a low price. In Krakow a rebellion was put down by Austrian and Russian troops.

8.3.1 It all starts in France

The demonstrations and the revolution in Paris on 21-24 of February 1848 began when prime minister Guizot did not allow a reform banquet to be held in Paris. These banquets originated from the revolution of 1789, and were a place for political speeches. Guizot eventually allowed the banquet to be held outside of Paris, and later the organizers agreed to postpone it, but they decided to go ahead with the demonstration that was part of the banquet. In the end the National Guard that was ordered to put down those demonstrations did not do so, instead the Guard turned against the government and forced it to resign. Nobody wanted to form a new government and so the king abdicated the crown in favour of his grandson. However, nationalistic demonstrators were able to persuade the parliament to approve a temporary government that consisted of their representatives. This new government declared that it wanted France to become a republic once more.

The revolution moved easily and without too much of resistance. When the news from Paris reached Berlin and Vienna, the same thing happened there as well. From the first of March onwards there were demonstrations in all of the German states, and governments decided to go along with the liberal demands, but also the idea of German unification came up. In Vienna the demonstration forced chancellor Metternich to resign. The news of his resignation meant a symbolic ending to the old period in Europe. There can be seen three different lines of development in the revolutionary movement in Europe: in Germany the interest was in the unification of the country; in France the revolution started to have a clearly social agenda; in Austria nationalism in the non-German areas raised its head and these areas demanded regional parliaments and limited autonomy.

The uprising never got much support in either Britain or Russia. In Britain the government prepared itself for possible trouble by mobilizing 70 000 men under the command of Wellington. Russia not only isolated itself from European affairs, but it began to restore order in Europe by using its military power like it had done in 1813-15 and 1830-32.

8.3.2 The heritage of 1848

The reputation of the "mad year" of 1848-49 can be divided into two; on the one hand it has been seen as a great turning point in world history, on the other hand it can be said that only few changes made during that time became permanent, and it is difficult say whether this revolutionary period made it any easier to carry out those reforms that were demanded then, later. Those countries touched by the revolution that did not have a constitution, got one, and those, who had got one, a more liberal constitution. For example, in France men got permanently the right to vote. In its radical stages the revolutions attempt were made to carry out socialistic and communistic theories, but these experiments ended in complete failure, mainly because people in the countryside

did not get excited from those these new ideas, they were more conservative and wanted to own land themselves. Nationalism was the one idea that got support in most countries, language of the ordinary people and their education got support. But nationalism did not lead to any permanent results; neither Germany nor Italy were unified yet.

Adapted from: a world history, Otavan suuri maailman historia

Questions:

- 1. Compare the situation in Europe in the 1840's and in the 1960's, and try to find out similarities in the events and the reasons behind them.*
- 2. Why did the revolution not have a lot of succes either in Britain or in Russia?*
- 3. Explain in Finnish in your own words the actual events that lead to the unrest.*
- 4. How did the revolution develop in Europe; name three different paths.*
- 5. What changes did the unrest of 1848 cause in Europe? Which changes were lasting and which changes were not?*
- 6. Why do you think people living in the country were more conservative than those living in cities?*

8.4 The Crimean War

Read the text and then answer the questions at the end.

The war started in summer of 1853, when Russian troops marched to Moldavia and Valakia, thus threatening Turkey. With the support of both Britain and France, Turkey declared war on Russia in October the same year. In January 1854 British navy sailed into the Black Sea, and in February Britain and France officially allied themselves with Turkey. The reason behind this alliance was that Britain and France felt that Russia's influence in the area was growing too large, in fact the western countries had their own interest there. From the Russian's part the war was a war of religion, as well as political, Russia regarded itself as the protector of the orthodox religion in the area; protecting the heritage of the Byzantium.

Both sides of the war had their share of trouble; during the winter of 1854-55, British and French troops had to live in wet clothes and got only cold food, many infectious diseases, such as cholera, caused casualties. Difficulties on the Russian side were also serious; lack of food and ammunitions, logistics did not work properly. Despite these difficulties a lot of courage and will of sacrifice was shown on both sides.

8.4.1 The war on the Baltic Sea

When the war was iminent in the summer of 1853, the British Navy regarded the Russian fleet on the Baltic Sea as a threat to the English coast, especially when the majority of the British fleet was on the Mediterranean. Therefore in March 1854 a combined British and French fleet sailed into the Baltic Sea, it wanted to be there before the Russian fleet could leave its naval base at Kronstadt. The goal of the Anglo-French fleet was to tie down the Russian fleet and prevent it from getting to the North Sea. There were also political goals; to influence Sweden and Denmark's politics so that they would join Britain and France or at least would not join with Russia. Also, one must not forget that the Russian capital St Petersburg was located by the Baltic Sea.

The Anglo-French fleet caused considerable damage to coastal towns along the Finnish west coast, in particular in Oulu and Raahen, the fleet also destroyed the Finnish commercial fleet all together. In Ahvenanmaa the British and French navy and ground troops conquered and destroyed Bomarsund fortresses after a short siege in August 1854. In the summer of 1855 the Anglo-French fleet tied a lot of Russian troops and the whole of the Baltic fleet to the Baltic area. The Viapori fortress outside Helsinki was bombarded in August 1855, but the Anglo-French forces did not try to land in Helsinki and the bombing was only a demonstration, however the most important offices of the Grand Duchy were removed inland in fear of occupation.

8.4.2 Ruler changes in Russia

Despite the great effort from the Allied part, Russia was able to hold its ground in the Crimean peninsula. Things changed when Emperor Nikolai I died suddenly in March 1855. The new Emperor Alexander II continued the war for another year, truce was signed in February 1856 and peace was signed in Paris in March the same year. This peace caused a change in Russia's role in Europe, it more or less lost the influence it received during the turmoils of 1830 and 1848. From now on Britain and France got the leading role in European politics, thus creating a good springboard for outward expansion from Europe.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailman historia.

Questions:

- 1. Was the Crimean war an easy war for both sides, give reasons for your answer.*
- 2. How did the war effect the Baltic region and Finland?*

3. *What motivated the Franco-English fleet to come to the Baltic Sea?*

8.5 Italian Unification

Read the text and then answer the questions at the end.

By joining the western alliance in the Crimean War, Sardinia-Piemonte now had the support of especially France, and the French army was still in Rome after they went there in 1848 to stop unrest there. Giuseppe Garibaldi, a revolutionary, who had already fought in revolutionary wars in Italy and South-America, decided to support the way Sardinia-Piemonte was handling the unification process. On international level Napoleon III of France and Camillo di Cavour, prime minister of Sardinia met in secret in Plombier in the summer of 1858, and as a result of this meeting France and Sardinia formed an alliance in January 1859, this alliance meant in practice that France would now support Sardinia against Austria.

The war started in April 1859, the French won in Magenta and occupied Milan, the battle of Solferino forced Austria to a ceasefire, in it Austria was forced to give Lombardia and Parma to Sardinia. However, Toskany, Modena and Venice remained in Austria, and caused dissatisfaction in Sardinia and Cavour resigned as a protest. Nevertheless, the unification process (risorgimento) had already gained enough momentum not to be stopped by his resignation. Revolts in the many Italian states forced the rulers to escape, and in March 1860 Tuscany, Emilia-Romagna, Parma and Modena held a referendum and decided to join Sardinia. Therefore Cavour, once again prime minister, was able to hold the first negotiation of the "Italian" parliament in Turin the second of April 1860; a united Italy was becoming a political reality. The idea behind this unification was to restore the alleged greatness of the ancient Rome, nonetheless the city of Rome was not going to join the liberal and more and more industrialized Italy of Turin and Milan, the more traditional Southern-Italy was

supporting Rome's conservatism. In order to bring forward the revolutionary ideas the South was labelled as old-fashioned repressed by Sardinians. On the other hand, one just could not accuse the Pope in that way and get away with it, therefore the rulers of the Kingdom of Both Sicilies, the Bourbons, were blamed for being against reform.

Garibaldi and his troops (*la spedizione dei mille*) landed in Sicily, with the support of the people. He was able to defeat the royal forces in several battles. Garibaldi's expedition was revolutionary in nature, and this did not entirely suit Cavour, who had secretly supported Garibaldi. After Garibaldi declared himself dictator of Both Sicilies, many European countries started to have revolutionary movements; the Sardinian army began to move south and conquered central Italy and defeated an army sent by conservative forces in Europe to help Pope Pius IX. After that Vittorio Emanuele, the king of Sardinia, led his troops to Naples, which had already been conquered by Garibaldi. Garibaldi agreed to use his popular support in favour of the king as he marched into the city. At the same time Cavour had already sent Sardinian officials to take over the administrative businesses of both Sicily and Calabria.

In March 1861 the parliament in Turin declared the Kingdom of Italy established and Vittorio Emanuele as the first King, however Italy was not the same as it is today; Venice was annexed in 1866 and Rome in 1870. A united Italy was born with the help of nationalism and international politics, the restraining of Garibaldi's semi-revolutionary ideas into the way of constitutional monarchy, calmed European governments. Italian unification did not happen without problems; in some areas, especially in the south, people felt that they had been suppressed by the northern conquerors. This dissatisfaction resulted in the growing support of *camorra* in Naples and *mafia* in Palermo. The unification was also followed by a huge emigration from the south to the United States, and despite all efforts to help Italy to become more united, e.g

the development of railways, local governments and education, this separation into north and south can even be seen in contemporary Italy.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailman historia

Questions:

- 1. What was France's role in the unification of Italy?*
- 2. What was the role of Cavour in the unification process?*
- 3. What were the Bourbons blamed for?*
- 4. Garibaldi's succes caused changes in the situation in Europe, name a few.*
- 5. What problems did the unification process have in Italy?*

8.6 German Unification - the Rise of Bismarck

Read the tex and then answer the questions at the end.

The German unification happened also so that northern Germany took over the south, and the force behind it was the army, not the popular opinion or liberal ideas. The reason behind the unification was the co-operation between economical powers and political determination. The competition for the leading role in Germany was between two countries: Austria and Prussia. Prussia had gained substancial areas of land in Rhein Germany, this area represented a huge economical basis for growth; Prussia had the coal and industrial areas of Schelsia, Saar and Ruhr. Prussia was also a large country with poor transportation possibilities due to lack in waterways. This however changed with the invention of the railways. Railways enabled Prussia to become a united ecomic area. Customs in domestic trade had been removed in

Prussia in 1818 and by 1834 18 countries had joined the German customs union (Zollverein), which was dominated by Prussia. Music, philosophy, language and traditions made Vienna and Munich part of Germany as well, however the leadership in the economics and the military had shifted to Prussia.

8.6.1 The Iron Chancellor

When Prussia's king Wilhelm I was thinking of abdication in 1862. Because of trouble with the liberal elements in the parliament, he was persuaded not to do so by war-and naval minister general von Roon, and instead to nominate Otto von Bismarck as prime minister. With the help of Roon and Bismarck, the king was able to complete an army reform, which, in effect, meant increasing the power of monarchy and decreasing of parliamentarism. Bismarck ruled without a budget and without the parliament. His goal was to strengthen Prussia and the monarchy. In 1863 Prussia secured its eastern frontier by supporting Russia in its crushing of the Polish uprising. The fact that Wilhelm I was Alexander II's uncle must have also had its effect on the matter. From now on Russia could rely on Prussia in keeping Germany and central Europe calm, because this would also help Alexander to keep Russia in order.

The population in the duchy of Slesvig-Holstein consisted of people with either German or Danish origins, and this caused considerable problems, because both sides wanted to join their "native" countries. Therefore when the king of Denmark and duke of Slesvig-Holstein Frederik VII died in 1863, the idea of annexing the duchy into Denmark was put forward. In the war that eventually started between Prussia and Denmark; Denmark, although fighting heroically, could not win, partly because she did not receive any outside help, only sympathy. This war ended in 1864, as a result Prussia took over Lauenburg and Slesvik, and Austria, which had supported Prussia in the war, took over Holstein. This sharing of the duchy was an attempt to give both Austria and

Prussia an equal position in German affairs; this, however, did not last long. From quite early on Bismarck started to secure his back in the eventual war against Austria; Bismarck had made pacts with Russia, Italy, France and Hungarians. Then in June 1866 Prussian troops marched into Holstein causing an all-German crisis. The German Union, lead by Austria, declared war against Prussia. Nonetheless the Prussian army proved better than others, Prussia quickly occupied the duchys of Saxony, Hannover and Hessen, and in the battle of Königgrätz the Austrian main army was defeated by the Prussians. In only a few months after the war had started, Austria had to sign a peace treaty. After this treaty more countries joined Prussia; e.g Wurtemberg, Bavaria and Baden. Prussia was now the only major force in Germany; Hannover, Hessen, Nassau and Frankfurt were annexed to Prussia, and all areas north of the river Main were joined together in a union, North-German League, lead by Prussia. Bismarck's diplomatic geniusness can clearly be seen in these treaties. Prussia did not humiliate Austria too much. This was done in order to make sure that Austria would support Prussia in Bismarck's next operation, which was to be against France.

In Austria this defeat resulted in one major change regarding the position of Hungary. 1867 the Hungarian parliament accepted a law creating an Austro-Hungarian double monarchy. Monarchy had two politically responsible governments, one in Vienna and one in Budapest, but one sovereign, one foreign policy and one army. Consequently Emperor Franz Josef of Austria and his wife empress Elizabeth, were crowned as king and queen of Hungary on the 8th of June 1867, eventually they became more popular in Hungary than in Austria.

8.6.2 Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71

After securing his back, Bismarck was now ready to deal with France. The excuse for this conflict was somewhat classical, who would be the king of

Spain. The queen of Spain Isabella was overthrown by dissatisfied army officers in 1868, and in 1870 general Prim offered the throne to prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. The French were afraid that by giving the Spanish throne to Leopold, who was related to the king of Prussia Wilhelm I, the Hohenzollern family would become too powerful, comparable to the Habsburgs. France made an ultimatum to Prussia not to put Leopold into the Spanish throne and to promise that no Hohenzollern would ever be put there in the future. Naturally the Prussian king Wilhelm refused to give such a promise. In fact both Prussia and France wanted a war, France had suffered some losses in its foreign policy and traditionally regarded Prussia as its enemy. As a result France declared war on Prussia on the 19th of July 1870. France had done exactly what Bismarck wanted it to do, because in order to unite the south of Germany with the north required a national war, in particular a defensive war against France.

The German, at this point it is safe to use that name, mobilization was extremely effective. As early as in early August three separate German army groups crossed the French border. By mid-August the border areas were in their control and in the end of the month marshal Bazaine, with the main force of the French army, was surrounded by the Germans in Metz. King Napoleon III tried to bring more troops to their rescue, but was forced to withdraw to Sedan, where he surrendered to the Germans on the 2nd of September 1870. A rather interesting episode followed in Paris. It was declared a republic with Leon Gambetta as the leader. Parisians, with his leadership, started to fight the Germans. The siege of Paris began on 19th of September 1870 and ended on January 28th 1871, when the French Republic surrendered in Versailles, where the Germans had their headquarters. This war had many consequences; France lost the area of Elsass and parts of Lothringen, France also had to pay 5 billion gold francs as war compensation and Paris would remain occupied until the sum was paid in full. The German unification into an empire had been official in the 18th of January 1871, at the same time the king of Prussia was declared

the emperor of Germany. The new Germany was a federal state, but in reality Prussia had the leading role in politics, economics and it was also the spiritual leader of the new nation.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria

Questions:

1. *What was different in the German unification compared with that of Italy's?*
2. *Why did Prussia get the leading role in the German speaking area?*
3. *What were Bismarck's goals?*
4. *After the war with Denmark, why did Prussia give Austria the Holstein area?*
5. *What did Bismarck try to achieve with his lenient policy towards Austria?*
6. *How did the situation in Hungary change after the war?*
7. *What was the official reason why the war started?*
8. *Both Prussia and France wanted to have a war, why?*
9. *What was so special about the situation in Paris during the war?*
10. *What consequences did the war have on France?*
11. *Germany was now a federal state with an Emperor as the leader, but what was the situation in reality?*

8.6.3 Power and myth

Read the text and answer the questions at the end.

The idea of an all powerful German military power was more due to three victorious wars against Denmark, Austria and France, than pure numbers; the Prussian army was not huge by the standards of those days. Behind this reputation was fieldmarshall Helmuth von Moltke. He realised early on the strategic use of railways. The railways in Germany were built with regard to its usefulness in a war as a way to transporting troops, food and other supplies. In this way Moltke was able to gather divisions into large army groups faster than anybody before him, and this of course was important if you wanted to surprise the enemy. The rather long period of peace in Europe compared to the earlier times, was largely due to the fact that most armies of that time were larger and better equipped than before. Therefore no country wanted to go to war without a proper cause. Moltke's victories were useful tools for Bismarck in his diplomatic games, however they also were the reason behind some of Bismarck's future problems; for example Danish royal household, with its hatred towards Germany, was able to marry one of their princesses to the Prince of Wales and one the crownprince of Russia, thus creating a strong personal alliance between these countries.

8.6.4 Diplomacy

Bismarck was an excellent diplomat, one of the best of all times. Bismarck had a few principles and goals he wanted to follow. He always tried to stop Austria and Russia from getting into a conflict, because that could mean that France might get out of its political isolation, and to keep France isolated was important to Bismarck. Austria and Russia were able to sustain from hostilities until 1875, at that time the unrest in the Balkans began to reflect on the situation in the whole eastern Europe. After Turkey had defeated the rebellious Balkan states, Russia, which wanted to help these states, declared war on

Turkey. Russia did not get the easy victory it had anticipated, instead Turkey put up a good resistance. With pressure from Britain, both sides agreed to a peace. Bismarck offered to act as a mediator, and this led to the Berlin congress in 1878. This congress, which divided the Balkan states into spheres of interest, planted the seeds for the First World War of 1914.

Bismarck also tried to keep Austria close to Prussia in order to avoid it joining alliance with France, which was something Bismarck was afraid of. He was able to connect Austria to Germany with a defence pact directed against Russia. However Bismarck worked hard to be able to avoid the implementation of that pact. One way to do this was the so-called three emperor agreement (dreikaiserbund) in 1881. In it Austria, Germany and Russia agreed to neutrality in case one of the parties would be in a war against a country, which had not signed this treaty. With regard to France, Bismarck tried to keep it out of European politics by supporting its goals outside Europe, for example, in northern Africa. Bismarck's interest in colonies lasted only for years 1864-85, at which time he was able to get areas that were five times larger than the area of Germany, but more or less worthless.

As a whole Bismarck's era in European politics was an era of Realpolitik, politics of realities. The alliances that would in the end lead to WW I, were created at this time and as Bismarck once said that war between Germany and Russia would lead to the collapse of one of the countries. This proved to be true in 1917 and 1945. Bismarck left office in 1890, after that German foreign policy turned uncertain and clumsy. Bismarck had lead the foreign policy alone, and therefore there were not anybody to take over the foreign policy after him.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria

Questions:

- 1. What was the reason behind Germany's success in war?*
- 2. Bismarck's successful policy was largely based on Germany's military triumph, but it also had some negative effects as well, give an example.*
- 3. Why did Bismarck want to prevent a conflict between Russia and Austria?*
- 4. What was the "Dreikaiserbund", and what were its main points?*
- 5. Explain why Bismarck's remark about the results of a war between Russia and Germany turned out to be correct.*

8.7 The Changes of the 1890's

Read the texts and answer the questions at the end

8.7.1 The fear of war and the peace movement

The time period between 1871 - 1914 was the longest time of peace in European history so far. It was, however, characteristic of this period that all major powers were already preparing themselves for the next war; Eduard Bernstein, a German politician, used the term "the cold war" to describe the period already in 1893. If we look at that time in retrospect, it is clear that there was no clear threat of a war in Europe. Nevertheless, everybody talked as if a war was imminent. In fact negotiations were going on between France and Russia of an alliance between them against Germany. The advancements in military technology also seem to have made people more ready to go to war. These improvements led to an arms race in which the Russians felt they were going to lose, as a result the Russian Emperor Nikolai II proposed a peace conference, in which nations would agree not to get any new weapons. This

served Russia's interest since she had suffered great losses in the war against Turkey, because of Turkey's superior weaponry, and now Russia felt it was loosing the war even before it had started. This proposal took all other superpowers by surprise, but none of them dared not to reject it. The conference in the Hague in 1899 was attended by 26 nations, the representatives were divided into three committees; Main-, Disarmament-, and International Justice committees. Although the concrete results of the conference were small, the implication on procedure and organization were significant; in fact one could argue that the Hague conference was the starting point to the League of Nations, which was established after WW I.

8.7.2 The Dreyfus affair

Nothing affected peoples' minds more during this time of peace than the Dreyfus scandal. It began in 1894 when a cleaning woman in the German embassy in Paris carried the contents of a wastepaper basket belonging to the German military attach to the French counterintelligence. One piece of paper contained confidential information of a French canon, therefore an investigation was held, and a Jewish artillery captain Alfred Dreyfus was found guilty. He was convicted in a military court, and sent to the Devil's Island. At the same time the new head of the counterintelligence Picquart gathered new evidence and it became clear that the true culprit was a major Walsin-Esterhasy. Nevertheless, Picquart's superiors pressured him to be quiet and transferred him to a new post. Picquart could not be silent and after a while Georges Clemenceau, a politician with a lot of influence, got Esterhasy charged, but he was released. It was obvious that the authorities had agreed not to let this thing be cleared. Eventually Dreyfuses' supporters were able to get Emile Zola to write about the affair in a newspaper owned by Clemenceau; the title *J'accuse* (I accuse) became world famous. In 1899 the Dreyfuses conviction was overturned, but it took until 1906 for him to be declared innocent.

8.7.3 Antisemitism in Europe

During the Dreyfus affair antisemitism started to raise its head in Europe. Antisemitism did not originate from this case, it was there already, but the Dreyfus affair was one culmination in this respect. Antisemitism as a movement originates from eastern Europe, and Jews living there emigrated to the west causing resentment against Jews even there. Especially rich Jewish bankers, e.g. the Rothschilds, were considered to be behind the bankruptcy of a French bank. The end of the 19th century was a golden era for Jews in western Europe if one considers the positions they held; ironically in Austria Emperor Franz Josef was their protector and trusted them greatly. Therefore it is not a great surprise that antisemitism was quite strong in Austria, because people thought that the Jews were treated better than "ordinary" people. This kind of sentiment was a good breeding ground for anti-Jewish movements, Jews were easy to use as scapegoats when everybody was afraid of the new things to come and felt insecure about the future. Into the middle of this anti-Jewish sentiment in Vienna, came in 1907 an 18-year-old young man, with ideas of a great future, he read a lot of anti-Jewish literary and obviously liked the ideas they presented. The name of this young man was Adolf Hitler.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria

Questions:

- 1. What was the general atmosphere in Europe towards the possibility of a new war?*
- 2. What motivated the Russians to propose a peace conference?*
- 3. In the end Dreyfus was declared innocent, what was the process that led to this.*

4. *Why were jews so hated in Europe before WW I?*

8.8 The First World War 1914-18

Read the texts and answer the questions.

8.8.1 Germany before the war

At this time Germany may seem a somewhat haphazard nation consisting of several smaller states, in a sense it is true, the individual states were independent and sometimes made decisions that were not in the interest of the other states. However one must remember that Germany was a federal state with a strong central government. The economic growth in Germany, especially in the heavy industries, was second fastest in the world after the United States. However this growth did not help those who were already poor but increased the wealth of the upper- and middle-classes. This ever growing middle-class provided workers for the industries as managers and technical experts, not to mention administrators for the huge bureaucracy; for example in 1905 there was one bureaucrat per 216 citizens.

Germany's economic growth can also be seen when it is compared with that of Great Britain; between 1870 and 1914 production in Great Britain only doubled, when in Germany it grew five times larger and in the U.S seven times larger than before 1870. Germany had reached Britain in the production of coal and surpassed Britain in steel and iron production. Germany's share of the total world production in 1913 was second largest after the United States. Germany made also huge investments abroad, mainly to Europe and to its political allies Austria and Italy.

Germany's population increased as well, due to a drop in the death rate. This phenomenon is typical of western Europe at this time. It is also typical that

there was additionally a drop in the birth rate as well, this probably had nothing to do with economic growth, but more to do with the changing attitude towards having children, e.g some sort of family planning was taking place. This in turn resulted in an increase in the overall standard of living. In the turn of the century less than half of German population lived in the country and the capital Berlin had a population of over a million.

Compared with other countries in Europe, the living standards of the upper classes in Germany were quite similar to the rest of Europe, except that in Germany the role of military in society was important. Men, who were or had been officers in the army, had a lot of power and influence both in business and in the civil service.

8.8.2 Events leading to the First World War

The events and reasons that started WW I, are very complex; it is a mixture of liasion and agreements between rival states. Some have even argued that the whole war started by accident. The whole of Europe was divided into spheres of influence, and these usually caused problems between countries. For example, Austria tried to increase its influence in the Balkans, and this irritated Italians. In Austria it was assumed that all the actions that Serbia was taking in the Balkans were done in accord with the Russian objectives in the region. It is clear that these conflicts of interest did not improve the relations between Russia and Austria. Austria's annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 caused a lot of anger in the Balkans; Russia, France and Britain did not like to be faced with the facts unwarned. Germany gave its support to Austria in this matter, and even promised support in future conflicts as well. Recent studies suggest that without Germany's ambitions and the way the crisis in 1914 was handled, there probably would not have been a war. However it is not totally fair to put the blame on Germany and Austria alone, other European countries

share the guilt in that they miscalculated the actions the opponents would take regarding their political manouvers.

8.8.3 The Schlieffen plan

Before the war many countries had already made plans for the future war that nobody wanted. Planning was important, because the armies had grown so big that they could not be controlled without good advance planning. Armies had become so large due to general military service. Advances in military technology and improved transportation possibilities made planning a necessity.

The Germans were especially keen on meticulously planning the war that they thought was iminent. Germany anticipated a two front war even before the French and the Russians had formed their alliance. This idea originated from the assumcion that Austria could not beat Russia in the eastern front. Therefore Germany had to defeat swiftly the enemy that was closer to it; namely France. Germans also calculated that due to its huge distances, Russia could not mobilize its army very quickly, thus giving Germany time to deal with France. The battle plan that originated with these ideas in mind, was first put to paper in 1905 and named after its main architech General Alfred von Schlieffen, head of the general staff.

The main idea of this plan was that where ever in the world the war eventually started, Germany had to attack France and do it quickly. The plan called for a lightning attack from the west with a massive force partly through Belgium, inthis way avoiding the strong French fortification along the German border. Only a minimum force was to be left to the German border in order to tie down the French troops thus preventing the French forces from going to the help of the Belgians. The purpose was to surround the French army and to ensure a quick victory. To carry out this plan required careful planning of troop

movements and positions, and the railroads had an important part in this plan, because they enabled large troop movements with great speed.

It is interesting to know that the French knew already in 1906 the main points of the German plan, but when the military wanted to make a pre-emptive strike to Belgium, if a war broke between France and Germany, politician denied this; they believed in the Belgians ability to defend themselves.

8.8.4 Armsrace at sea

The British were traditionally more interested in the improvement of their navy than their land forces. The only way that the navy and land forces seemed to be linked was that the navy protected the supply routes for the land forces and provided transportation; as General J.A. Fisher said: "Army was a projectile, which navy had to fire". Therefore it is not a surprice that Britain got interested in European affairs when Germany started its naval build-up in 1897. In the early 1900s Germany was able to build a very impressive navy. They could build ships that out-matched the new British "Dreadnought"-class battleships. Between 1893 and 1914 the Germans built 38 large battleships. When one looks at this encreased naval power both in Germany and Great Britain, it is interesting to realize that both navies were ordered to protect the so-called "home waters". Neither side planned to use their navy in any major attack against enemy targets, therefore it seems like a waste of resourses to even build a large navy.

8.8.5 Sarajevo on June 28, 1914

Archduke Frans Ferdinand, the heir to the Austrian throne, and his wife Sophie were in Sarajevo to celebrate the Serbia's national day. The police had been warned of a possible assasination attempt by a Serb nationalist, who wanted the Serb areas of the Austrian monarchy to be joined with Serbia. A 19-year-old

Serb nationalist Gavrilo Princip was able to shoot and kill both Franz Ferdinand and his wife, after an earlier bomb attack had failed. The events leading to WW I have for a long time been largely debated; who actually started the war, and why did it start in 1914 and not earlier. No clear answer to either of these questions have been given.

The political atmosphere in the spring of 1914 was relatively calm; the arms race between Germany and Great Britain was no longer as intense as it had been, and there were no major crisis at hand at the moment. It is obvious that the murders in Sarajevo shocked the world. However the reactions were not as dramatic as one would imagine. The news disappeared quite quickly from the newspapers and editorials. Emperor Wilhelm travelled to Norway for vacation and the British Prime Minister sent his daughter for a vacation in the main land - so everything seemed to be business as usual.

Three and half weeks had passed from the assassination, when Austria suddenly sent an ultimatum to Serbia. Austria required an answer in 48 hours. Austria demanded Serbia to arrest those who were working against Austria, and Austria wanted promise to take part in the investigation and to take preventive measures in Serbia to prevent Serb nationalists from striking again. Serbia responded to the ultimatum with no clear answers, but refused to give Austria access to its internal affairs. Austria informed immediately that the answers were not satisfactory, and broke all diplomatic relations with Serbia. On the same day July 25th Austria's southern army was mobilized to be used against Serbia if need be.

Russia did not like the situation and wanted both sides to be calm. However, Russia was at the same time making some military preparations of its own; it was mobilizing troops and filling supply depots. This increased military activity in Russia caused concern in Germany and Austria. This was a decisive moment for Germany. The Russians were already doing things that threatened the

successful implementation of the Schlieffen plan. Some sort of military automation started to control the events, Germans could not tolerate the Russian mobilization if they were to follow their previous plans.

Austria declared war on Serbia on the 28th of July 1914. Even after Austria and Russia had mobilized their troops, Germany gave Russia an ultimatum to stop its war preparations within 12 hours. When no answer was received, Germany declared war on Russia on the first of August at 6.00p.m. Although Germany had already started to implement the Schlieffen plan and Luxembourg had been invaded, Germany nevertheless asked Belgium for the right to use its soil for troop movements and operation against France. On the third of August Belgium and Great Britain declared war on Germany, and the next day Austria did the same to Russia. Also France and Great Britain declared war to Austria.

It may be difficult to understand why politicians let things happen the way they did, but there may be some truth in the theory that politicians were too much used to solving problems over a negotiation table, and therefore did not realise how serious the developments in Europe actually were. Politicians noticed too late that the military automation had taken over control.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria, Muutosten vuosisata I Maailmansota, Suuri maailmanhistoria.

Questions:

- 1. What was the economic situation in Germany before WW I compared with other countries in Europe?*
- 2. The standard of living also increased, can you explain why?*
- 3. Can you explain why the military had such an important role even beyond its normal sphere of influence?*

4. *Why do you think that some people claim that WW I started by accident?*
5. *Explain in your own words what were the main points of the Schlieffen plan.*
6. *Why did railroads play an important part in the plan?*
7. *What was the planned role for the British navy in case of a war?*
8. *Explain why Britain got interested in European affairs in the late 19th century.*
9. *What were the first reactions to the murders in Sarajevo?*
10. *What was the content of the Austrian ultimatum?*
11. *Why was Russia's mobilization a threat to Germany?*
12. *Why do you think that things in Europe got out of hand in 1914?*

8.8.6 The early years of the war

Read the texts and answer the questions at the end.

According to a Prussian military strategist Karl von Clausewitz in war everything is simple and even the simplest things can be extremely complicated. Most people in Europe were excited over the war, the war was greeted with joy and relief. Usually people celebrated after a war, but this time it was the other way round; troops that headed for the fronts were sent off with parades. There can be many reasons for this kind of behaviour, one major one is that everybody thought that the war would be over very quickly. This thinking also affected the military and political leaders, despite all the careful military planning, they had not prepared their countries for a long war; there were no extra supplies of food or raw material.

Even before the war started Germany had modified the original Schlieffen plan, the amount of troops for the pincher movement had been reduced and the attack did not go as far west as in the original plan. When the war started, France according to its plans attacked Germany in Lorraine, Germany now had more troops there to stop them and even push them back. The German troops easily went through Belgium, destroying the Belgian army and the British territorial army of 100,000 men that was sent to help France.

Due to the German advances, the French government relocated itself to Bourdeaux, just like during the war of 1870-71. The French and the British troops were in retreat and suffering heavy casualties. By the end of August the German troops started to show signs of battle weariness and there were logistical problems. At this point the French launched a counterattack and were able to push the Germans slightly back north. During this attack the crucial battle of Marne was fought. It was in this battle that the taxi-drivers of Paris became legends, because at a critical point of the battle the commandant of Paris ordered taxis to transport troops to the front line, although the battle had basically already been won the French and these new troops had no bearing in it, the legend of the taxi-drivers was born.

After the Germans had to pull back at Marne, the so-called "race to the sea" began. Because the Germans wanted to go to Paris quickly they had neglected the Canal coast, thus giving the British a chance to use the ports there. This resulted in an effort from both sides to get to the coast and at the same time try to go around the enemy flank. In the end the French coast and a small part of the Belgian coast remained in the hands of the French and its allies, thus creating a frontline, which stretched from the Canal coast to the Swiss border. This front remained almost unchanged for the rest of the war. Therefore it is clear that the Germans did not get the quick victory in the west as they had expected, and the war would and did drag on for four more years.

In the Eastern front the Germans had expected that the Russians would not be able to mobilize its troops very quickly. However, the Russians attacked with a small force sooner than expected, but did not get much success. Nevertheless it did cause some concern in the German high command. The German commander was replaced with General Paul von Hindenburg and with Major General Erich Ludendorff as his chief of staff. Soon the Germans took over the initiative and the outnumbered German troops won two major battles at Tannenberg and at Lake Masuria, capturing 100,000 Russian prisoners.

The Austrian did not have the same success as the Germans. They had attacked Serbia and briefly occupied Belgrade, but were driven back with heavy casualties by the more experienced Serb army. Only after re-enforcements arrived and with the help of Germans, were they able to stabilize the front in the East.

New countries entered the as well; Turkey and Bulgaria joined the central powers e.g. Germany and Austria; and Italy, Portugal and Romania joined the surrounding powers e.g. Great Britain, France, Russia and Belgium. This development opened up new fronts in the Balkans and the Middle-East.

8.8.7 The overall experiences

The first war year caused changes in the high command on both sides, but did not led in to any changes in their strategies. The tactics that were used caused huge casualties on both sides, inflicted mainly by machine guns and artillery. The idea was to send the troops in mass over the front eventually to be killed by these effective weapons, one calculation is that 6400 men died every day. In two famous battles in Verdun and Somme in 1916 over two million men died in battles, which resulted in a draw. After the first attacks, the war came to a standstill; troops started to dig trenches and elaborate fortifications were built.

Another major concern was the lack and poor quality of ammunitions. This caused a populiic outrage in Britain and resulted in the founding of Ministry for Ammunitions. The Germans were probably quicker to understand the implications caused by an apparently long war, especially the industrial giant I.G. Farben were able to develop new weapons. For example, gas-masks and battle gases, which were first used by the Germans, were developed by them. Also the tank was introduced in 1916 by the British. At first tanks did not get much succes, but when commanders learned to use them more effectively results followed. For example, in an attack in Cambrain in 1917 the massive use of 381 British tanks surprised the enemy and resulted in a small victory that even surprised the British, who could have given the Germans a decicive plow, if they had had enough troops ready to continue the attack. It would be wrong to say that tanks were crucial for the victory, but they were an answer to the stalemate that had been going on for years. Aeroplanes, which were also a relatively new invention, were mostly used in reconaissance and in informing targets for the artillery.

8.8.8 War at sea

In the beginning there were only minor skirmishes, because the British knew that in order to survive and keep the supply routes open they had to keep the majority of their navy near their home waters. The Germans, in contrast, knew that their navy was no match for the British. Therefore they waited and hoped for the submarines and mines to diminish the number of British warships at sea in their favour.

The surrouding powers were able to effectively block the central powers at sea, both in the Baltic Sea and in the Mediterranean. The German navy was, however, able to make small attacks on the British coast; on December 1914 they bombed Scarborough and Hartlepool killing 137 and injuring 592 people.

The only result of these attacks was an increased hatred by the British towards the Germans, and more volunteers for the army and navy.

Germany used submarine warfare in order to protect its shores and to inflict casualties to the British navy. It was submarines that got Germany at odds with the United States, namely the sinking of a British passenger ship Lusitania in the 7th of May 1915 caused objection from the U.S. Moreover President Wilson of the United States was concerned about the German submarines attacking ships from neutral countries, and this might have hindered the Germans from further escalating the use of submariners.

Probably the biggest naval battle in WW I was fought at Skagerrak in 1916. The Germans had concluded that in order to destroy the British navy they had to use battleships, submarines were not effective enough. Therefore they planned to lure the British navy into a trap. However, the British could break the German cryptograms, and were able to surprise the Germans with a far more superior fleet. Both sides claimed victory, but in reality the battle ended in a draw, however the German fleet proved to be probably better than the British in seamanship and in firepower. Nevertheless for the duration of the rest of the war these great ships, which were built with great expense, were mostly idle in their ports.

8.8.9 Victory for the surrounding powers

During the first few months of 1917 the food situation in Germany became very bad. The authorities had to cut down the rations for women and children. This is the reason why Germany started to consider an unlimited submarine warfare. The idea was to revenge the sufferings of the German people to the surrounding powers. The decision was made in January and at the end of the month the German ambassador to the U.S. informed them that in certain areas German submarines would sink any ship heading for Britain or France. This

change in tactics had tremendous results, the number of ships that were sunk increased dramatically. Several U.S. ships were sink as well. In order to counteract the surrounding powers had to develop new methods, and one of the most effective ones was to form larger groups of the commercial ships and protect them with warships: a similar technique was used in WW II.

The popular opinion in the United States was not in favour of the U.S. joining the war; for the neutral U.S. the war was good business. Nevertheless, the British propaganda machine worked hard to get the public to support the war in Europe. However it was only when the grain supply in Britain was critically low, did the U.S President Woodrow Wilson propose in his speech to the Congress that his country should join the surrounding powers. Wilson was able to get the support of the Congress, only six senators and 50 representatives voted against him.

The first American division arrived in France only two months after the U.S declared war on the central powers. However it was mostly a propaganda gesture without military importance. In the end of the war the U.S. had two million soldiers in France. The commander of the U.S. forces was General J.Pershing, and his first job was to insure that his troops were ready for war. Therefore he did not allow his troops to be used in combat immediately, as the French and British wanted, but trained them first. He also wanted the Americans to have their own section in the front, and not to be put under French or British command. Pershing managed to get things done his way, and in July 1918 an independent U.S. army was formed. Although the Americans did not have a significant military importance, their presence, however, made it clear to the Germans that in the long run the U.S, with its huge resources, would change the balance in favour of the Allied and therefore it would be useless to stubbornly continue the war to the end.

After Germany had made a peace agreement with Russia in Brest-Litowski in 1917, it now prepared itself for a major attack in the West, using the forces from the East. The German high command knew that this would be their last chance for victory, and therefore the attack was carefully planned. The attack began on the 21 of March 1918 and came as a great surprise to the surrounding powers, and the German troops were able to break through the frontline and advance deep into the enemy land; this was the only time a breakthrough of this magnitude was achieved in the war. At one point the German army was only 60 km from Paris. Eventually the surrounding powers were able to stop the German attack and pull them back.

The final episode of the war started in the Balkans; Bulgaria and Turkey were the first ones to surrender. Germany had already used all its reserves in the attacks in the fall of 1918, and when the surrounding powers started their attack on the 8th of August 1918; it was a sad day for the Germans. The British forces gained more 20 kilometres in one day in an attack supported by 400 tanks. Two days after the attack started the German headquarters informed the government that they could no longer attack the enemy, and the situation was getting bad on every front. The allied attack had not crushed the German army, the German army had seized to believe into its capacity to win. There had already been alarming reports of mass surrenders and of the collapse of the morale. At the end of September 1918 the surrounding powers started an overall attack on every front, the U.S army took part in it for the first time. The Germans were not able to give much resistance, all they tried to do was to retreat in an orderly fashion. Soon both the German and Austrian governments asked for a peace conference. The first one to surrender was Austria in early November after their front against Italy had collapsed, this caused Germany more problems, and she was also ready to surrender. An armistice was signed on the 11th of November 1918 at five o'clock and came to effect the same day at 11 o'clock; the war had ended.

Adapted from: a world History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria, Suuri maailman historia, Muutosten vuosisata I maailmansota.

Questions:

- 1. What shows that people were expecting a short war?*
- 2. Explain in your own words how the German attack advanced in the early stages of the war?*
- 3. Why did the taxi drivers become a legend?*
- 4. How did the formation of the front take place?*
- 5. How did the Russians surprise the Germans?*
- 6. What kind of success did the Austrians have in the war against Serbia?*
- 7. In the end what countries formed: a) the central powers b) the surrounding powers?*
- 8. What were the reasons behind the heavy casualties?*
- 9. Explain the difference in tactics of the British and German navies, and the reasons behind them.*
- 10. Submarines were first used in WW I, what was their role in it.*
- 11. Germany changed its submarine tactics, why and what were the results?*
- 12. What was the public attitude like in the U.S to the war in Europe?*
- 13. What made the U.S join the war?*

14. What effect did the U.S forces have in the beginning?

15. Which event made it possible for Germany to start an attack in the West and why?

16. Which events lead to the eventual surrender of both Germany and Austria?

8.9 Germany after the War

Read the texts and answer the questions at the end.

In November 1918 the monarchy was replaced by a temporary government, which started to oversee the development of parliamentary processes. Germany was declared a republic on the 8th of November 1918. The situation in Germany was chaotic, there was a severe shortage of food, and people were getting sick because of starvation. In these desperate times even revolutionary ideologies had a strong breeding ground, especially now after the Russian revolution; socialism and bolshevism were the trends of the time. The unrest started in Kiel where sailors began to revolt against the legal government. Several people were killed in the clashes between the rebels and the government forces. During the first week of November the turmoil spread all across Germany and the revolutionary wave was spreading fast, and in order to calm things down something had to be done and fast. The Emperor Wilhelm II was persuaded to abdicate and move to the Netherlands, where he died in 1941. Thus monarchy no longer existed in Germany. Germany was now a republic.

Now that the war was over, the army fulfilled its duty and was now more or less disbanded. Some of these now free soldiers joined the radicals, some remained loyal to the government. And some formed voluntary forces in order to keep things at least a bit under control, this group was led mostly by officers. The surrounding powers contributed to the chaos by not allowing food supplies

enter Germany's ports. They obviously did not realize how serious the situation was.

8.9.1 The Spartacist rebellion in 1919

The Spartacist movement consisted of people with very radical socialistic ideas. They had contacts with Soviet-Russia and their goal was to bring about a socialist revolution in Germany. The long awaited Spartacist rebellion started in early January 1919. It began with a general strike and with workers occupying strategic locations in Berlin. Members of the cabinet were isolated in the city centre, only defence minister Noske was outside Berlin and that was enough to squash the rebellion. Noske came back to Berlin with a large army of volunteers, and the Spartacist without clear military leader were no match for this force. Everything was over in nine days and the Spartacist leaders Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered.

Bavaria also had its share of unrest in late 1918 and early 1919; murders, riots and clashes with armed groups were part of the every day life. The government was barely able to keep the country under its control with the help of volunteer forces. The only thing that hindered the country from becoming socialist was the fact the various socialist movements were not able to agree on a common line of action.

The decisive showdown between the government forces and the revolutionaries took place in Berlin on March of 1919. When a general strike declared by the communist turned violent; the strikers attacked police stations, for example. The government started to crack down on the rebels using tanks and artillery, the government forces were lead by the defence minister, who had received dictatorial authority. In the aftermath many rebels were brutally murdered in revenge on the alledged atrocities they had committed.

8.9.2 "Backstabbing"

After the people in Germany started thinking reasons for why the war was lost, one of the most popular theories was the so-called backstabbing theory. According to this theory it was not the army that had lost the war, instead it was the home front that had collapsed. People at home had believed the propaganda spread by the surrounding powers and started to believe that there was no way the war would have been won. In this way the lack of support at home resulted in defeat. This theory also found its way into Hitler's book "Mein Kampf" (My battle), which he wrote in the Landsberg prison in 1924. The bitterness that people felt after the signing of the peace treaty, which they felt was unjust for Germany, was a perfect breeding ground for these kinds of theories. The peace was even more painful for the German soldiers, the radical disarmament and reductions in the armed forces caused concern especially among officers. It is obvious that the hard terms of the peace treaty made by the surrounding powers were a major factor in making the Germans feel this way. The terms made it very difficult for the German people to forget the lost war and the injustices they felt they had suffered because of it. It could be argued that if the surrounding powers had been a bit more sympathetic towards Germany, WW II might have been avoided.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria, Muutosten vuosisata I maailmansota, Suuri maailman historia.

Questions:

- 1. Why do you think the radical elements got so much support?*
- 2. Why did not the Spartacist revolution succeed?*
- 3. Explain the term backstaping.*

4. *How did the peace treaty contribute to WW II?*

8.10 The Making of the Versailles Peace Treaty

Read the texts and answer the questions at the end.

8.10.1 Wilson's 14 points

Long before the U.S had joined the war Woodrow Wilson had tried to mediate the conflict, and then when the U.S did join the surrounding powers, he still pursued the prospect for peace. When he declared war on the central powers in the Congress, he also mentioned in his speech his ideas on how a peace would be possible. Wilson's ideas were divided into 14 clear points; the first four points dealt with the principle of freedom in diplomacy, trade etc., the next nine points handled problems of nationality, the rights of independent countries and the last point was about the creation of a general alliance of nations. One result from Wilson's declaration was that the central powers used his proposals as the grounds for their first contact with the surrounding powers in an effort to stop the war.

France and Great Britain did not agree on all the points of the proposal, both countries were not happy with the idea that the U.S. would take the leading role in the peace negotiation, after all it was they who had suffered more in the war than the U.S. However France and Britain had to live with Wilson's proposal, otherwise the U.S would have conducted its own peace negotiations with the central powers without its allies.

8.10.2 Versailles peace treaty

The Versailles peace conference started officially on the 18th of January 1919 and ended on the 28th of June the same year, so it was a long and hard process. The Allied had four main goals in the negotiations;

1. Germany had to accept guilt for starting the war.
2. Germany and its allies had to pay war compensation to the winners.
3. The League of Nations should be formed and all borders in Europe should be officially recognised.
4. The spread of Bolshevism should be stopped.

It was clear from the very beginning that the allies could not agree on almost anything, especially the Wilson proposal was not popular among other allies. The peace conference was soon stalling and did not move forward, the issues that were not agreed upon were too complicated. In the end the leaders of the four major allied countries discussed the matters privately, and were able to put forward a proposal for the peace treaty. In the treaty the central powers and Wilson were the worst losers. Because Wilson wanted the peace treaty to include the founding of the League of Nations, he had to make a lot of compromises that were against the 14 points programme and the promises he had already made for the central powers. In retrospect it could be argued that France was the one that got the best deal; she received almost what she wanted. France got Alsace-Lorraine back and were given the control of the mines in the Saar district. In order to understand the hardline French one must bare in mind that France suffered probably more in the war than other Western countries; most of the battles were fought on French soil thus damaging French properties, and about 1.9 million French soldiers died in the war. Germany also had to demilitarize Rheinland and the allied forces would occupy the Western side of the river Rhein. Germany's armed forces would be reduced to no more than 100,000 men and it would not be allowed to have any "special" weaponry

such as tanks, aeroplanes or submarines. The Japanese wanted and received the German trade privileges she had had in China, and Italy received the city of Fiume, which was originally been planned to be given to the new country of Yougoslavia. When Germany was called into the conference in April of 1919, the delegation was relatively optimistic, they thought that Germany would be given a fair treaty following the principles laid down in Wilson's 14 points. In the end the delegation was given a peace agreement, and at that point they realised that they were not given a chance to negotiate, instead they would have to accept the accord the allied nations had agreed upon. The Germans had only two weeks time to respond. The Germans were shocked, they felt as if they had been deceived, all the promises that were given to them were broken. The German delegation wanted to make a lot of changes to the treaty, but managed to get only a few through. The signing of the peace treaty proved to be too difficult a job for the German government and it resigned, and the new government was forced to sign the treaty, when the allied nations threatened to march all the way to Berlin, if the new government did not sign it. One curiosity is that the U.S senate refused to ratify the peace treaty. It was in 1921 that the U.S made a separate treaty with Germany. This is also the reason why the U.S. never joined the League of Nations.

In the end the war compensations that the Germans had to pay did not have the wanted result. The Germans did not like to pay so much to the winners, and this attitude was eventually used in their favour by the National socialists. The peace treaty did not create a new mean for dealing with international affairs. In fact it did not even solve the problems that caused the war in the first place, only to start the hole process again in 1939.

8.10.3 The League of Nations

The first 26 articles of the Versailles peace treaty contained the rules for the League of Nations. In the beginning 29 countries, all of which were on the

winning side in the war, joined the League, after they had ratified the peace treaty (this is why U.S did not join). Soon membership was offered to neutral countries, and twelve of them signed up, in 1940 the League had 20 member states. Due to the fact that the central powers and Soviet-Russia were left out, and U.S did not enter the League, its representation as an organization with a global agenda was greatly diminished, especially now that the leading world power United States had not joined.

The League's headquarters was situated in Geneva, the executive branch consisted of a council with four permanent members: Great-Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and of non-permanent members, which were rotated after being in the council for three years. The council itself met usually three times a year. The general assembly, in which every member state had one vote, met once every year. These meetings were important forums for discussing international affairs that were regarded as significant. Some countries had doubts about the effectiveness of the League, however it did hand out some verdicts on international affairs that were fulfilled, e.g the Ahvenanmaa question. Nevertheless it is true that the League did not have the means to carry out its decisions with force, if they were not fulfilled; this might have one reason why in the end it could not prevent WW II, although the League was founded originally to do just that.

8.10.4 Return to normal

When it was clear that the peace was permanent, nations began to send their troops home. However it soon became clear that there would not be work for everybody and that caused delays in the repatriation; the last soldiers were discharged in 1922. In Great Britain some veterans protested against the government for not being given work and even threatened to burn down the Buckingham Palace. Many of the men who returned home felt that they did not belong there anymore. The war experience had made a profound impact on

their physical and mental health. Most veterans did receive a small pension, but that did not help remedy the social injustice they felt.

The number of people who died in the war varies according to the source that is used, but usually the total number of dead is approximately thirteen million; 22 % of officers and 18% of non-officers died in the war. This number does not include all the invalids of the war. Some estimate that their number is the same as for the dead. To further increase the misery the so-called Spanish flu spread across Europe in 1918-19 killing some 20 million people helped by the fact that many people were weakened by the food shortage caused by the war. There was nothing that could be done to stop the disease from spreading, although people used masks and disinfected public places. It was only in 1933 that the virus causing this influenza was isolated.

Adapted from: a World History, Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria, Muutosten vuosisata I maailmansota, suuri maailman historia.

Questions:

- 1. Why were Wilson's 14 points so important, and how did the allies feel about them?*
- 2. Form groups, one for each country and act out the negotiations and argue for the points that your country would like to get into the treaty.*
- 3. Try to compare the League of Nations and the United Nations, their differences and similarities.*

Adapted from:

Muutosten Vuosisata I Maailmansota 1994. Juva: WSOY .

Suuri Maailman Historia osa 13 koko Kansan Kirjakerho, 1982

Otavan suuri maailmanhistoria osat 14,15,16 1986. Keuruu: Otava.

A World History 1979. Oxford: Oxford university press.

9 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen (eds.) 1990. Aspects of classroom treatment: toward a more comprehensive view of second language education, in B.Hartley (ed.), *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge University Press, 57-81.

Beardsmore, Hugo Baetens 1993. *Bilingual learning: institutional frameworks - whole school policies council of Europe, 1993*.

Brinton, Donna M. 1989. *Content-based second language instruction*, New York: Newbury house.

Christ, I. 1996. Bilingual teaching and learning in Germany, in I. Christ(ed.), *Teaching content in a foreign language and perspectives in European bilingual education*.

Content-based language learning: double value for second language learners: bibliography and selected articles. 1990. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Canada

Cummins, J. and M. Swain 1986. *Bilingualism in Education*. New York: Longman.

Genesee, Fred 1987. *Learning Through Two Languages; Studies of Immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge Ma.: Newbury House.

Krashen, Stephen 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon Press.

Krueger, Merle and Frank Ryan (eds.) 1993. *Language and content: discipline - and content-based approaches to language study*. Lexington, Ma.: Heath.

Lauren, Christer (ed.) 1994. *Evaluating european immersion programs; from Catalonia to Finland*. Vaasa: Vaasan yliopiston julkaisu.

McNeill, William H. 1979. *A world history*. Oxford England: Oxford University Press.

Met, M. 1991. *Learning language through content. learning language through content*, *Foreign Language Annals*; 24, 4, 281-295.

Morgan, C. and S. Simpson 1995. Analysis of History in E. Thurman (ed.); *Bilingual education in secondary schools: learning and teaching non-language subject through a foreign language*. Second progress report of the research and development programme of workshop 12A. Council of Europe CC-lang (95), 8-11, 107-118.

Nikula, Tarja and David Marsh 1996. *Kartoitus vieraskielisen opetuksen tarjonnasta peruskouluissa ja lukioissa*. Helsinki, Opetushallitus.

Nikula Tarja and David Marsh 1997. *Vieraskielisen opetuksen tavoitteet ja toteutuminen*. Helsinki, Opetushallitus.

Oxford, Rebecca L. 1990. *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. The University of Alabama. New York: Newbury House.

Padilla, Amado M. (ed.) 1990. *Foreign language education: issues and strategies*. California: Sage Publications

Räsänen, Anne and David Marsh (eds.) 1994. *Content instruction through a foreign language: a report on the 1992-1993 TCE programme*. University of Jyväskylä, Continuing Education Centre. Finland.

Swain, M. 1996: *discovering successful language teaching strategies and practises: from programme evaluation to classroom experimentation*. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17, 2-4, 89-104.

Wesche, M in Padilla (ed.) 1990. *Foreign language education: issues and strategies*. California: Sage publications

APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire

Hei!

Opiskelen Englantia Jyväskylän Yliopistossa. Teen parhaillaan Pro Gradu-työtäni reaaliaineen opettamisesta vieraalla kielellä (TCFL). Tämä kysely on osa Graduani ja toivon, että löytäisit hiukan aikaa siihen vastaamiseen. Toivottavasti vastaat niin pian kuin mahdollista, mutta kuitenkin 15.5 menessä, jotta saisin oman työni valmiiksi mahdollisimman pian. Kiitokset jo etukäteen.

VESA TARKKANEN

YLEISTÄ

1. Ikä

___ - 29

___ 30 - 39

___ 40 - 49

___ 50 - 59

___ 60 -

2. Sukupuoli

___ mies

___ nainen

OPETTAMINEN

3. Millä kielellä/kielillä opetat?

___ englanti

___ ruotsi

___ saksa

___ ranska

___ venäjä

___ muu, mikä _____

4. Mitä ainetta/aineita opetat vieraalla kielellä?

- historia
- maantieto
- biologia
- matematiikka
- fysiikka
- kemia
- tietotekniikka
- uskonto
- musiikki
- kuvaamataito
- liikunta
- filosofia
- muu, mikä _____

5. Kauanko olet opettanut vieraalla kielellä?

- alle 1 vuosi
- 1 - 3
- 4 - 6
- 7 - 9
- 10 - 12
- yli 12 vuotta

6. Mitä astetta/asteita opetat?

ala-aste

yläaste

keskiaste

lukio

ammattioppilaitos

teknillinen oppilaitos

opisto

muu keskiasteen oppilaitos, mikä _____

muu aste, mikä _____

7. Onko koulussasi muita, jotka opettavat vieraalla kielellä?

kyllä

ei

en tiedä

8. Montako tuntia keskimäärin opetat viikossa?

1 - 3

4 - 6

7 - 9

10 - 12

13 - 15

yli 15 tuntia

9. Montako tuntia kaikkiaan käytät viikossa tuntien valmistamiseen?

alle 1 tunti

1 - 3

4 - 6

7 - 9

10 - 12

yli 12 tuntia

OPETUSMATERIAALI

10. Minkälaista materiaalia käytät tuntien valmistamiseen? Rastita ainoastaan kolme tärkeintä vaihtoehtoa!

kohdekieliset reaaliaineen oppikirjat

-" - lähdeteokset

-" - aikakauslehdet

-" - sanomalehdet

-" - tv-ohjelmat/videot/ääninauhat

kohdekieliset tietosanakirjat

sanakirjat

käännökset suomenkielisestä materiaalista

muu, mikä _____

11. Mistä saat kyseisen materiaalin?

koulusta

kirjastosta

omahankintaisista lähteistä

muuten, miten _____

12. Mitä seuraavista menetelmistä käytät helpottamaan opetettavan asian ymmärtämistä?

etukäteissanastoa

"yksinkertaistettua tekstiä"

kohdekielistä taustamateriaalia sellaisenaan

ryhmäkeskusteluja kohdekielellä

muita aktiviteetteja, mitä _____

SUHTAUTUMINEN OPETUKSEEN

13. Kerro, miten oppilaat ovat suhtautuneet vieraalla kielellä opettamiseen.

14. Kerro, miten muut opettajat ja johto ovat suhtautuneet vieraalla kielellä opettamiseen.

MUUTA

15. Nimeä kolme helpoimmiksi osoittautunutta asiaa vieraalla kielellä opettamisessa ja selitä lyhyesti miksi ne ovat helpoimpia.

16. Nimeä kolme vaikeimmiksi osoittautunutta asiaa vieraalla kielellä opettamisessa ja selitä lyhyesti miksi ne ovat vaikeimpia.

17. Jos sinulla on ollut ongelmia vieraalla kielellä opettamisessa, mistä olet hakenut apua ongelmiisi?

18. Oletko saanut apua?

19. Nimeä kolme asiaa, joita pidät vieraalla kielellä opettamisessa suurimpina hyötypuolina?

20. Nimeä kolme asiaa, joita pidät vieraalla kielellä opettamisessa suurimpina haittapuolina?

Appendix 2

Transparencies for the Teaching Package



**European history
1848 - 1920**

To the user of this teaching package

This teaching package is aimed at helping both the teacher and the students in TCFL-classes. The transparencies are there to be used as the basis and the framework for the lesson, they also help the students to follow the teaching and allows them to write down at least the main points of the lesson. This is important, because some students may have difficulties in following TCFL-lessons, and these transparencies can be used to give assistance to these students, as well, to the whole class. Students can add more information on their own as the teacher gives out that information verbally or in written form. The transparencies are to be used along side the verbal and written information provided by the teacher. Only that part of the transparency that is being discussed should be shown to students, in order not to confuse them with too much information. The transparencies contain only the main points and therefore students themselves have to add more facts under each heading as the lesson goes on. It is the teacher's job to give this further information in any way suitable to him or her.

Contents:

Chapter(s)	Title	Page(s)
8.2	The Rise of the Burgeois in the 19th Century	4
8.2.1	The industrialization	5
8.3	1848 a Year of Turmoil	6
8.3.1	It all starts in France	6
8.3.2	The heritage of 1848	7
8.4	The Crimean War	8
8.4.1	The war on the Baltic Sea	9
8.4.2	Ruler changes in Russia	10
8.5	Italian Unification	11
8.6	German Unification – the Rise of Bismark	12
8.6.2	Franco-Preussian war of 1870-71	13
8.6.3	Power and Myth	14
8.6.4	Diplomacy	15
8.7	The Changes of the 1890's	16
8.7.1	The fear of war and the peace movement	16
8.7.2 - 3	Antisemitism in Europe and the Dreyfuss affair	17
8.8	The First World War 1914-18	18
8.1	Germany before the war	18
8.8.2	Events leading to the WWI	19
8.8.3	The Schieffen plan	20
8.8.4	Armstrace at sea	21
8.8.5	Sarajevo 28.6.1914	22
8.8.6	The early years of the war	23
8.8.7	The overall experience	24
8.8.9	Victory for the surrounding powers	25 – 26
8.9	Germany after the war	27
8.9.1	Spartacist rebellion in 1919	28
8.9.2	"Backstabbing"	29
8.10	The Making of the Versailles Peace Treaty	30
8.10.1	Wilson's 14 points	30
8.10.2	Versailles Peace Treaty	31
8.10.3	The League of Nations	32
8.10.4	Return to normal	33

The Rise of the Bourgeois in the 19th Century

- Huge population increase; reduction in death rate
- Social and political pressure
- Emigration
- Standard of living increased
- Class distinctions grew wider; unrest of 1830-32
- Political and economic power to the bourgeois

The industrialization

- Began in England in the mid 1800's
- Required money to be put into technology
- Why was England the first one:
 - location
 - no inner customs
- New industries were created:
 - coal and steam engines
 - railroads
 - textile machinery
- Improvements in communications:
 - newspapers
 - telegraph lines
- Western world become richer:
 - banks influential
- The basic family became smaller
- The consumer society was born

1848 a Year of Turmoil

It all starts in France

- Reformbanquet demonstrations in Paris 21.-24.2.1848
- Demonstrations forced the government and the king to resign
- Temporary government wanted France to become a republic
- Demonstration against the governments spread across Europe:
 - In Germany local governments decided to follow the liberal demands
 - In Austria chancellor Metternich resigned
- Three lines of development:
 - 1) unification of the country (Germany)
 - 2) social reasons (France)
 - 3) nationalism in non-German areas (Austria and Hungary)
- Britain and Russia were not affected

The heritage of 1848

- Only few changes were permanent:
 - constitutions for some countries
- Socialistic and communistic experiments failed
 - people in the countryside did not follow
- Nationalism survived

The Crimean War

- Started in the summer of 1853
- Turkey declares war on Russia:
 - Britain and France support Turkey
- Both sides suffered great difficulties and casualties

The war on the Baltic Sea

- 1854 British and French ships entered the Baltic Sea:
 - both military and political goals
- Finnish west coast suffered heavy damages:
 - Oulu and Raahе
 - commercial fleet
 - Bomarsund in Ahvenanmaa
 - Suomenlinna in 1854

Ruler changes in Russia

- Does not want to continue the war
- Peace signed in Paris in 1856
- Russia lost its leading role in European affairs to France and Britain

Italian Unification

- The state of Sardinia-Piemonte was the force behind unification:
 - Camillo di Cavour
 - Garibaldi
 - France supported
- War between Sardinia and Austria 1859:
 - Lombardia and Parma to Sardinia
- Revolts in many Italian states
- 2.4.1860 the first "Italian" parliament in Turin
- Pope and the Church State caused problems:
 - conservative countries helped Pope against Sardinia
- 1860 Kingdom of Italy
 - Vittorio Emanuele as King
- There were problems:
 - the south of Italy was not happy
 - emigration to the U.S.A
 - mafia and camorra

German Unification – the Rise of Bismarck

- Prussia the leader: Bismarck the prime minister
- Bismarck's goal was to strengthen Prussia
- Russia and Prussia worked together
- War between Prussia and Denmark 1864
 - Duchy of Slesvig-Holstein
 - Prussia won
 - Austria and Prussia shared the Duchy
- Bismarck prepared for war against Austria
- 1866 Prussia and Austria at war:
 - Austria was quickly defeated
 - more states joined with Prussia
- Prussia gained leading role in Germany

Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71

- Who would be the King of Spain
- France was afraid that Prussia would gain too much power
- Both France and Prussia wanted war for political reasons
- France declared war on Prussia in 19.7.1870
- By mid August the French army was beaten
- France surrendered in 2.10.1871
- Bismarck was able to unite German states behind Prussia
- Siege of Paris 1870
- Consequences:
 - Elsas and parts of Lothinger to Germany
 - war compensations
- German Empire in 18.1.1871
 - King of Prussia as the Emperor

Power and Myth

- All powerful German army
 - the use of railroads
 - well equipped and trained
- Army gave Bismarck a good tool to use

Diplomacy

- Bismarck was one of the best diplomats of that period
- Bismarck's principles and goals:
 - to stop a conflict between Austria and Russia
 - to keep France isolated
- Bismarck tried to keep Austria close to Germany
 - a defence pact against Russia
- Dreikaiserbund in 1881
 - Germany, Russia and Austria
 - neutrality agreement
- Era of Realpolitik
- When Bismarck left there was no one as good to take over

The Changes of the 1890's

The fear of war and the peace movement

- 1871-1914 the longest period of peace in Europe so far
- "Cold war"
- Everybody was preparing for a war:
 - advances in military technology
- An arms race in Europe
- Conference in the Hague 1899

Antisemitism in Europe and the Dreyfuss affair

- Dreyfuss was accused of spying for Germany in 1894
- He was a French Jew
- The true culprit was covered- up
- Georges Clemenceau helped
- Dreyfuss was declared innocent in 1906
- During the Dreyfuss trial anti-Semitism gained ground
- Rich Jewish bankers accused of treason
 - the Rotschilds
- Anti-Semitism very strong in Austria
 - Adolf Hitler

The First World War 1914-18

Germany before the war

- Federal state with a strong government
- Huge economic growth in upper- and middle class
- Large bureaucracy
- Population increased
- Military had an important role in society

Events leading to the WWI

- Very complex reasons
- Maybe it was an accident
- Spheres of influence
 - the Balkans
 - annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria
- Germany and Austria are not the only ones to be blamed

The Schlieffen plan

- Germany was expecting a two front war
- The closest enemy (France) had to be defeated fast
- Planned by general Alfred von Schlieffen in 1905
- Lightning attacks via Belgium to France in order to surround the French army
- By 1906 France knew the main points of the plan

Armsrace at sea

- Navy important to Britain
- Germany started naval build-up in 1897
 - between 1893-1914 38 new battleships
- Waste of resources
- No major attacks even planned

Sarajevo 28.6.1914

- Archduke Frans Ferdinand of Austria and his wife Sophie murdered by Gavrilo Princip, a Serb nationalist, in Sarajevo
- The reactions in Europe were surprisingly dramatic, everything was business as usual
- Austria's ultimatum to Serbia:
 - Serbia gave no clear answer
 - Serbia did not allow Austria access to its internal affairs
- 25.7.1914 Austria broke relations with Serbia
- Russia wanted peace, but was preparing for war
- 28.7.1914 Austria and Serbia at war
- 1.8.1914 Germany declares war on Russia
- 3.8.1914 Belgium and Britain at war with Germany
- 4.8.1914 Austria at war with Russia, France and Britain
- Military automation had taken the control

The early years of the war

- People were excited over the war
- Nobody expected the war to last long
- Germany was victorious
- French and British troops retreated
- Battle of Marne
 - France won
 - stopped the Germans from advancing
- "Race to the sea"
 - created a frontline from the English Channel to the Swiss border
- In the east Germany won major battles against Russia
- Austria needed Germany's help against Serbia
- New countries joined the war:
 - Turkey and Bulgaria joined Germany and Austria (Central powers)
 - Italy, Portugal and Romania joined France, Britain and Belgium (Surrounding powers)

The overall experience

- New weapons caused heavy casualties
- Commanders used old cavalry tactics
- In Battles in Verdun and in Somme two million soldiers died in 1916
- The war became into a standstill
 - trenches and fortifications
- The British introduced the tank into the war

Victory for the surrounding powers

- In 1917 the situation in Germany was bad; not enough food
- Unlimited submarine warfare
- U.S to the war
 - ┆ popular opinion against joining the war
 - ┆ president Wilson wanted U.S to join with the surrounding powers
 - ┆ in the end two million U.S soldiers were in Europe
- Brest-Litowski 1917
 - ┆ peace between Germany and Soviet-Russia
 - ┆ German troops moved to the west
- German attack in 21.3.1918
 - ┆ the final effort to win the war
 - ┆ surprised the enemy
 - ┆ eventually Germany had to pull back

Victory for the surrounding powers ...continues

- Final episode of the war
 - Bulgaria and Turkey surrendered
 - 8.8.1918 surrounding powers start a major attack
- German army could not stop the enemy; mass surrenders, collapses of the morale
- In September of 1918 an overall attack by the surrounding powers:
 - U.S troops took part
 - German army had to retreat
- Austria surrendered first
- An armistice was signed on 11.11.1918 at 11 o'clock

Germany after the war

- In November 1918 temporary government replaced the monarchy
- 8.10.1918 Germany became a republic
- Germany was in chaos
 - not enough food
 - revolutionary ideas got a lot of support
- Sailors revolt on Kiel

Spartacist rebellion in 1919

- Radical socialistic ideas
- Contacts to Soviet-Russia
- Their goal was socialistic revolution in Germany
- Started in January 1919
 - a general strike in Berlin
- Volunteer army lead by defence minister Noske subdued the rebellion
- The state of Bayern had a lot of unrest in 1918-19
- Central government was barely in control
- In march 1919 the decisive showdown between government forces and rebels

"Backstabbing"

- Army had not lost the war
- The people at home were responsible
 - influenced by enemy propaganda
- The hard peace terms made people bitter

The Making of the Versailles Peace Treaty

Wilson's 14 points

- The U.S president mediated for peace even during the war
- Wilson had a 14-point-plan
- Central powers used Wilson's plan as a basis in their peace negotiations
- France and Britain did not like the leading role of the U.S

Versailles peace treaty

- Conference began in on 18.1 1919 and ended 28.6 1919
- Surrounding powers had four main goals:
 - 1. Germany was guilty
 - 2. War compensations
 - 3. The League of Nations
 - 4. Bolshevism must be stopped from spreading
- The surrounding powers could not agree on almost anything
- Finally a proposal was presented
 - Wilson had to give in
 - France was their winner
 - hard on Germany
- Germans expected a fair treaty
 - disappointed
 - no chance to negotiate
- U.S made a separate treaty with Germany in 1921
- This treaty planted the seeds for the Second World War

The League of Nations

- 29 countries joined
- U.S did not join, this weakened the League
- Four permanent members
- General assembly
- Could not force its decisions
- The League was quite weak

Return to normal

- War caused a lot of physical and mental problems
- 13 million people died in the war
- Spanish flu 1918-19
 - killed c. 20 million
 - people were weakened by the war