

Paper on the book

[History](#)



Questions from Norman's Europe transformed, 1878-1919" To avoid viewing human events on an exaggeratedly generalized level, the years 1878-1919 include actions that speak more of internal commotions and less tranquility. Norman excessively sojourns to elucidate on the events that clearly indicate that the period cannot be equated to a period of international tranquility. For instance, during the period, individuals, anarchists, and other groups attempted many assassinations. Many of the assassins were successful enough to disturb the military forces and police of many European countries. Significant incidents include the 1881 murder of Alexander II, the Russian tsar, and the June 1914 homicide of Franz Ferdinand which triggered the WWI. Notably, the later attack was one of the four years attacks against the lives of Habsburg officials prior to 1914. A clear analysis of the period reveals that Ferdinand's assassination was a less aberrant attack and more typical of the times, and challenges the argument of those who perceive the years prior to the war as relatively tranquil. Several other occurrences during the period indicate that the period was quite abnormal than one might think. These events include the assassination of protuberant figures including Australia's empress (1898), president of French republic (1894), king of Italy (1900) and the 1901 killing of American president. Additionally, the outrageous fact that terrorists in those days killed millions of people by driving explosive-laden vehicles into buildings indicates technical restrictions (Stone, 196). However, these were not anomalous events during the period considering the many activities that had transpired and disrupted peace in Europe. Although the first three quarters of the 19th century were quite tumultuous, the evidence presented by Norman comprehensively convinces readers that terming the period 1878-1919 as a

<https://assignbuster.com/paper-on-the-book/>

turning point in Europe on the basis of the tranquil that was experienced is merely a misrepresentation of facts. The internal commotions and raucousness experienced were so much.

Germany failed to win WWI due to poor military strategies, poor Kaiser's coordination, and was fighting against a highly tactical and military powerful entente that could balance means and will with ends.

German naval tactics reveal misappropriation and misallocation. Considering that it had greatly been weakened by the Britain naval in the years prior to WWI, the navy could be better organized and resources allocated effectively if Germany's dream of winning the war were to materialize. Instead, 1895-1914, billions were irresponsibly used for surface fleets, scoffing funding for inventions such as submarines, while only twenty five of its submarines were in a good condition by august 1914. Additionally, it fatally weakened its army (on land) by allocating naval productions a great percentage of resources, neglecting other important aspects (Stone, 157). Germany was striving to be a great power both in sea and land, not knowing that it could not afford the extortionate costs associated with such a move. Moreover, Kaiser erroneously failed in coordinating the leadership to effectively handle the war and assure Germans a win.

The entente demonstrated military proficiency that could match Germany's in 1918, and this greatly contributed to its success. They employed bloody, dreary, but operative combination of abrasion combat on land and economic rivalry in marines. Additionally, they could wage coalition warfare more effectively than the comparatively weak Germany. Norman indicate that while Germany might have had the best military prior to WWI, its many misdoings ostensibly lead to its failure in the war.

<https://assignbuster.com/paper-on-the-book/>

Works Cited

Stone, Norman. *Europe Transformed, 1878-1919*. London: Fontana, 1985.

Print.