

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION: NATURE AND IMPACT

Unit Structure

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Meaning of the Industrial Revolution
- 1.3 Nature of Industrial Revolution
- 1.4 Causes of Industrial Revolution
- 1.5 Development of Industrial Revolution
- 1.6 Impact of the Industrial Revolution
- 1.7 Growth of Socialism and Communism
- 1.8 Summary
- 1.9 Questions
- 1.10 Additional Readings

1.0 OBJECTIVES

- To understand the meaning of the Industrial Revolution.
- To examine the nature of the Industrial Revolution.
- To know the causes of the Industrial Revolution.
- To study the course of the Industrial Revolution.
- To review the development of the Industrial Revolution
- To assess the impact of the Industrial Revolution.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of history until the Industrial Revolution the work in the world was done with hand tools. During this time power was supplied by human or animal muscles with the help of pulleys or levers. It was also supplemented by force of running water or moving air. The process of shifting from hand tools to power machinery for substitution of manual work by machines can be termed as Industrial Revolution. The earlier revolutions were turbulent and affected political, religious and social life. Many of them were destructive and were accompanied by executions, imprisonments and wars. The Industrial Revolution was slow and quiet but when it gained momentum, it became the most noisy, affecting every aspect of the life of man.

Looking back over the past, to the times when men lived the life of hunting and food gathering, one marvels at the progress men have made since then. Inventions of fire, cultivation, wheel and metals were on themselves magnificent achievements for the ancient men. Industrial Revolution has proved to be even a greater achievement. It transformed the agrarian society into an industrial one and totally changed the life of man. It also led to the conquest of the forces of nature and harnessing them for the good of mankind.

1.2 MEANING OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

1.2.1 Meaning of a Revolution:

A revolution does two things in the first place, it overthrows the old order, i.e., the existing state of affairs and in the second place, it establishes or introduces new order, i.e., new state of affairs, in place of the old one. In other words, the word "revolution" means and implies a fundamental change- a radical and remarkable change. Accordingly, when we talk of a political revolution, we mean a complete change of government; similarly, a diplomatic revolution means an entire re-arrangement of international alliances; likewise an agrarian revolution is fundamental change in the technique and organization of agriculture; and a social revolution stands for a radical change in the relative importance of certain social classes and values of life.

1.2.2 Meaning of the Industrial Revolution:

The Industrial Revolution is one of the most significant landmarks in the history of mankind, the consequences of which revolutionised the social, economic, cultural and political life of the people. No other revolution has so profoundly influenced the destiny of mankind or opened up wider vistas of human progress as the Industrial Revolution. The term Industrial Revolution was first used and popularised by the English economic historian, Arnold Toynbee in 1884, to describe the economic development of England from 1760 to 1840. However, the Industrial Revolution is regarded more as a "process than as a period of time."

The Industrial Revolution means fundamental, radical and remarkable changes in industrial method as well as in industrial organization. In the words of Charles Beard, "By the industrial revolution, we mean that great transformation, which has been brought about real change during the past one hundred and fifty years, by discoveries and inventions, which altered fundamentally all the methods of production and distribution, of life, and consequently revolutionized all the economic functions of society." In other words, the Industrial Revolution was a series of changes in the means of production and distribution.

Check your progress

Q. 1. What do you understand by the 'Industrial Revolution'?

1.3 NATURE OF INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Following were Nature of the Industrial Revolution:

1.3.1 A Change from "Domestic System" to "Factory System:

The Domestic System, in the words of Prof. P.A.M. Taylor, "was a form of industrial organization, in which people worked in their own homes with hand-operated machinery, often owned by themselves. The raw material was distributed to them and their product was collected from them for marketing by a capitalist, who therefore, became in large measure their employer, though he exerted no detailed supervision." Such an employer paid wages to the worker making an article. The Factory System, on the other hand, according to Dr. J.F. Swain, "is characterised by the assembling of a great number of workmen in one unit, by the careful supervision and division of labour, by the introduction of machines driven by motive power, by the concentration of capital, and by the establishment of a cash nexus (wage tie) between capital and labour."

1.3.2 A Change from Small Output to Mass Production:

When a man worked under the domestic system, he could produce very little at a time, because he worked at home with hand-operated machinery. But once he began to work under the factory system, he could manufacture articles and goods in large quantities, because he worked in factory in co-operation with others on machines, driven by machine power such as steam or electricity.

1.3.3 New Basic Materials:

The manufacturers began using new basic materials, mainly iron and steel.

1.3.4 New Energy Sources:

They used, not only new basic materials but also new energy sources, including both fuels and motive power, such as coal, the steam engine, electricity, petroleum etc.

1.3.5 Inventions:

The Industrial Revolution is characterised by numerous inventions, the early inventions being the spinning jenny, the powerloom, cotton gin, Davy's safety lamp, steam engine, bealze-bub, seed drill, etc.

1.3.6 Application of Science to Industry:

Finally, the Industrial Revolution led to an increasing application of science to industry.

Check your progress

Q.1 What were the nature of the Industrial Revolution?

1.4 CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

1.4.1 Abundant Money:

For Intensive industrialization, huge capital is essential to construct factories and machines, to hire workers, and to buy raw materials. England had abundant money to finance large enterprises. The naval supremacy of England encouraged overseas trade, commerce and industry, through which the English merchants and traders amassed great wealth in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Moreover, the use of capital was expedited by the Bank of England and other joint stock banks, which were legalized in 1826, by efficient handling of governmental finances, and by the rise of a London money market, where bills could be discounted and shares bought and sold. Finally, much of England's industrial capital was self-generated, i.e. a manufacturer, starting with a small capital, enlarged his plant by ploughing back his profits into the business.

1.4.2 Abundant Labour:

Great Britain enjoyed the benefit of abundant labour which served well in newly-established mills, mines, factories and workshops in towns. Labour came from three sources. First, the British population almost doubled in the eighteenth century, and doubled again in the nineteenth century. Second, there was some immigration into England of Continental European labour in the eighteenth century, and of Irish in the nineteenth century. Finally, thousands of agriculturists became unemployed on account of the Agricultural Revolution and migrated to towns in search of gainful employment in mills, factories and workshops. Further, these workers were free men and hence could move freely from place to place for jobs in factories. This was, however, not so in the case of France, which was still an agricultural country with peasants attached to the land, bound to their masters in a number of ways. Hence, they could not leave the land and go over to cities to seek employment in mills and factories.

1.4.3 Rich Resources:

England was well endowed with just the resources required for industrialization. Its climate, being damp, was highly suitable for mechanical spinning and weaving. It had abundant water. More important, England had enjoyed the benefit of an abundance of coal- a cheap fuel which was required in large quantities for running factories, mills and workshops. Of course, France, too, had coal mines, but she was very late in tapping such resources. It had also abundant iron.

1.4.4 Manufacture of Inexpensive Products:

England had begun, quite early, the manufacture of in-expensive and more practical products such as woollen and linen cloth and iron and wooden articles of various types for which there was an ever-increasing demand from the people, particularly of the middle class. Further, foreign markets would automatically grow if she could supply these manufactured articles

at cheap rates, which was possible only if the articles were produced on a very large scale.

This naturally led the English to invent new techniques of production and new machines, with the help of which they could produce, in large quantities, various types of manufactured articles. However, this was not so in the case of France, the country which had specialised in producing luxury goods, the demand for which was quite limited, because, firstly it depended more on individual taste and secondly they were quite expensive and hence were meant only for the rich.

1.4.5 Immigration of Artisans:

On account of religious persecution, a large number of protestant artisans in Spain and France fled their countries and went to England, where they permanently settled down. Their skill, accompanied with money, gave a fresh impetus to the English industries.

1.4.6 Markets:

Since the Act of Union (1707). England and Scotland had formed a consolidated open market, free of tariffs. To them, Ireland was united in 1800; thus, English industry came to enjoy still more extensive home market. Moreover, before the mid-eighteenth century, English merchants had opened up channels of trade to all Europe, to North America, to Africa, and to the Far East. British markets continued to expand. The United States continued buying British goods even after the American War of Independence (1775-1783). From the beginning of the nineteenth century, all over the world, from Canton to Buenos Aires, and from Capetown to North Cape, British commerce had no serious competitor.

1.4.7 Continental System of Napoleon Bonaparte:

Napoleon Bonaparte adopted the Continental System. i.e. economic blockade of England, under which English goods were prevented from being imported into any part of Europe. But Napoleon could not enforce the system. No wonder, the European countries, some secretly and others openly, defied Napoleon and imported English goods. In retaliation, Great Britain blockaded the continental ports. Hence, England could purchase, at extremely low rates, the raw materials from overseas and sell finished products in her colonies at quite high prices. Thus the Continental system boosted the English industries at the cost of the French.

1.4.8 Political and Social Stability:

Unlike in France, there was political and social stability in England and, hence, people invested their savings in new enterprises for earning more in the future.

1.4.9 Inventive Genius:

Finally, in spite of the existence of all these favourable factors, the Industrial Revolution could not have taken place first in England, had

there been no inventive genius. "Necessity is the mother of invention", and when the English felt the necessity of new techniques of production, new machines, tools and implements, they could invent them, because they had an inventive genius. England was fortunate in producing great inventors such as Sir Humphry Davy, George Stephenson, Dr. Edmund Cartwright, James Watt and many others.

Check your progress

Q. 1. Examine the causes of the industrial Revolution.

1.5 DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

1.5.1 The Textile Industry:

The textile merchants got what they were looking for when the industrial revolution began with various mechanical inventions that took place in the manufacture of textiles. The first important advance was made when Kay's flying shuttle was patented in 1733. As a result, weaving became faster. The invention of flying shuttle led to scarcity of thread. This led to the need to produce thread faster by improving spinning.

a. Spinning Jenny:

The inventions of the Spinning Jenny made of wood by James Hargreaves in 1764 ushered in a new era in the textile industry of the world. Hargreaves was an intelligent carpenter and weaver. One day, he happened to see his wife upsetting her spinning wheel. What interested him most was the fact that the spinning wheel continued to turn even after it had fallen over. Being an imaginative carpenter, he developed the idea of turning eight spindles at the same time with the help of one wheel. He fabricated a wooden machine that could produce eight threads, instead of one, at one and the same time with the help of eight spindles by profession, was an imaginative inventor and businessman. Almost during one operator could now produce as many threads as eight persons could do. He named his machine after his wife Jenny as he got the idea when she upset her spinning wheel.

b. Arkwright's Waterframe:

Richard Arkwright, though a barber by profession was an imaginative inventor and businessman. Almost during the same time when the Spinning Jenny was being produced, he invented in 1769, his own spinning machine which was first run by horse power but was later made to run by water power. His machine came to be known as Arkwright's Waterframe. The speciality of his machine was that it could produce wool or cotton strands which were twisted tightly by spindles after drawing them out from between pairs of rollers. This thread was strong but coarse while the thread produced by Spinning Jenny was fine but weak.

Arkwright became a factory owner and soon became one of the first wealthy men produced by the industrial revolution.

c. Crompton's Spinning Mule:

Samuel Crompton studied the working of both the Spinning Jenny and the Arkwright's Waterframe and produced in 1779 a new spinning machine called Spinning Mule. He avoided in his machine the defects of the earlier two, so that the Spinning Mule could produce fine and strong thread. Since his machine was hybrid, he called it the Spinning Mule. As a result of this invention, England began to produce fine cloth in large quantities and stopped importing calicoes from India.

d. Cartwright's power loom:

Edmund Cartwright, an English clergyman, succeeded in producing an automatic weaving machine (power loom). His machine was patented in 1785 but took some more time to perfect its working. By 1813 England had as many as 2,400 such looms. Power looms gradually replaced hand-looms. These inventions made the factory system inevitable.

e. New Machines in Textile Manufacture:

In 1785 Thomas Bell invented the process of printing cloth by cylinders. The method of printing cloth by hand blocks was given up. In 1794, the cotton "gin" was invented by Eli Whitney, an American from Massachusetts. His invention revolutionised the cumbersome process of cleaning cotton. The machine separated cotton fibres from the seed more easily and faster. As a result America and other countries began to produce more cotton. In the 18th century, most of the textile machines were run by hydro power and therefore textile factories sprang up on the banks of fast flowing rivers.

1.5.2 Coal and Iron Industry:

The second important feature of the industrial revolution was characterised by the inventions made in the production of coal and specially in the manufacture of iron and steel. So far, only small quantity of coal was produced. Iron was a costly metal and was not available in large quantities because the process of its manufacture was not well developed.

For the purpose of proper smelting of iron, a great amount of heat was necessary. Only charcoal was used in the furnaces for smelting iron. This method was expensive and slow. At the same time, forests came to be cut down in order to produce charcoal. In the 17th century, an Englishman thought of using coal instead of charcoal. Coal was available easily in Birmingham. The coal mines, as more coal was mined out, became deeper. This necessitated the invention of steam engines to pump out and remove water from the bottom of the mines.

a. Henry Cort's Process:

Henry Cort (1740-1800) was responsible for inventing the method of manufacturing purer and stronger iron known as wrought iron and steel from pig iron. The pig iron produced with the help of blast furnaces contained lot of impurities and was brittle. In 1784, Cort found that pig iron when heated in a special furnace and stirred, produced purer iron and steel. This process is known as "puddling" by which the impurities were removed. By a process of "rolling", molten iron bars and sheets were made.

The manufacture of stronger and cheaper iron was a great blessing, because iron could be used with advantage for the manufacture of tools machines, engines, tanks and boilers. It certainly helped the development of the steam engine. The invention of the lathe or the turning machine and the "Slide-rest" further contributed to the manufacture of different parts of machines. Cylinders are an essential part of most machines. Cylinders and pistons could be made smooth only with the help of "Sliderest" which was invented by Mandslay in 1794.

1.5.3 Construction of Roads:

The inventions in textile industry and the production of coal and iron helped to increase textile and iron production. For collection of raw materials and distribution of finished goods, better transportation facilities were necessary. The 18th century English roads were bad. It was towards the end of the century that two Scottish engineers, Macadam and Telford, developed the science of good road building. Macadamised roads with a foundation of broken stones or ballast covered with crushed stones came to be built in England. The new roads were smoother and faster. Similarly, many canals were built to serve as water ways for transport.

1.5.4 Revolution in Power:

a. Steam Engine:

The invention of the steam engine in the eighteenth century was the third most important feature of the industrial revolution. James Watt is considered to be the inventor of steam engine. But it may be pointed out here that before him some efforts had been made to make use of steam power. Edward Somerest (1601-1667), after many experiments made a "water commanding" engine which helped to raise water from the mines. The next important invention in the use of steam power took place when Thomas Newcomen (1663-1729) made a steam engine in 1705 to pump out water from coal mines. Newcomen's engine was defective as time and energy were lost in moving the piston again after one stroke. It was James Watt who improved this defect of Newcomen's engine.

b. Steam Locomotive:

Watt's engines were used mostly for pumping out water from the coal mines. The next important development after Watt's engine was the

invention of the steam locomotive. If an engine could move any machinery, it would also move itself. On this basis, Watt had planned to produce a locomotive. But it was Richard Trevithick who prepared the first locomotive in 1803. Trevithick's locomotive ran on wooden rails and was used for handling coal wagons. It was further improved upon by William Hedley when he manufactured his "Puffing Billy" in 1813. It was powerful enough to draw eight coal wagons at a speed of about five miles an hour.

c. Steam-boat:

The new idea was to use the locomotive engine to drive ships. In 1788, Miller built the first steam-boat which could go at a Speed of 5 miles an hour. William Symington improved upon Miller's steam-boat and manufactured a new steam-boat named Charlotte Dundas which was used on Forth and Clyde canal to pull two barges of 70 tons each. The experiment was not very successful. The first successful experiment in this regard was made by Robert Foulton (1765-1815). His steam-boat Clemont made its maiden voyage up the Hudson river between New York and Albany in 1807, a distance of 150 miles. In 1819, the ship Savannah crossed the Atlantic and sailed from Savannah (in the USA) to Liverpool in twenty nine days with the help of sails. In 1838, two steam boats the Sirius and the Great Western crossed the Altantic without sails. But it was after 1870 that steamship navigation became more popular.

1.5.5 Agriculture:

a. Tull's seed Drill:

Jethro Tull (1674-1740) experimented with farming on a scientific basis. He invented a Seed Drill that would distribute the seeds evenly in rows, over a large piece of land.

b. Townsend's Crop Rotation:

The discovery of a new method of 'Crop Rotation' was made by Viscount Townsend (1674-1738). This enabled one to keep land always under cultivation, without letting it lie idle for a season. This helped to double the yield per acre.

c. Scientific Breeding of Animals:

Robert Bakewell (1725-1795) introduced scientific breeding of farm animals. He found through experiments, that by selective breeding of farm animals, he could improve the quality of cattle, horses and sheep..

1.5.6 Spread of the Industrial Revolution:

Though the Industrial Revolution started in Great Britain, it soon spread to Europe and the U.S.A. Thus, Belgium, France and Germany imported machines for industry from England. In these countries, bobbin lace machines, textile machines, as well as industries for making the machines, led to the spread of the Industrial Revolution on the Continent. England

maintained her industrial lead. However, the French textile manufacturers produced cloth that was excellent in design and quality. So also Germany was renowned for fine metal products. A huge industrial empire was also established in the U.S.A. With further inventions of the automobile, airplane, radio, telephone and television in the 19th and 20th centuries, the Industrial Revolution spread throughout the world, where it still continues as an ongoing process in various countries.

Check your progress

Q.1 Discuss the development of the Industrial Revolution.

1.6 IMPACT OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The Industrial Revolution revolutionized industry, art, architecture, literature and Science and also social, economic, political and cultural life of the people. No other revolution in the history of mankind has so profoundly affected human life as the Industrial Revolution.

1.6.1 Economic Impact:

1. Mass Production

Under the Factory System, production on a large scale took place. Mass production in factories, naturally, led to the low cost of production per unit. Further, uniformity and high quality could be introduced into the production of goods at a cheaper rate.

2. Growth of Joint-Stock Companies:

It led to the growth of joint-stock companies or corporations. The big enterprises required more capital than any one individual possessed; ownership, therefore, passed from individuals or partnerships to joint-stock companies or corporations. Under it a shareholder was responsible for his company's debts, only to the extent of his share.

3. Growth of Industrial Combinations:

The Industrial Revolution led to the growth of industrial combinations of independent firms. In Britain, this came to be known as the Trust Movement.

4. Commerce and Banking Development:

The Industrial Revolution enlarged to a very great extent commerce and banking which became truly world-wide in scope.

5. Growth of Capitalism:

Capital is money or any other form of wealth including land, machines, and factories, used productively in business. A capitalist is an owner or manager of such wealth, land, machinery, and such other means of

production. He invests his wealth, owns machines and factories, employs skilled as well as unskilled workers, buys raw materials, transforms them into finished products, and sells them at a handsome margin of profit. Capitalism, thus, is a business system in which capital as well as capitalists are the sole controlling factors. The Industrial Revolution led to the development of capitalism and made capitalists the supreme masters of industry.

The capitalists were always motivated by a lust for huge profits. Hence, they bought raw materials and employed workers as cheaply as possible, and sold finished products as dearly as possible.

6. Growth of Economic Liberalism:

The growth of capitalism led to the growth of economic liberalism. The capitalists were deeply influenced by the laissez-faire doctrines of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. It emphasized the individual and made individual self-interest the supreme interest in the economic life. Hence, it stood for freedom i.e. freedom of trade which implies no tariffs and no subsidies, freedom of contract between individuals (hence, no labour unions), freedom from government interference or regulation, and freedom of competition.

Economic liberalism gained firm foothold and most triumphs in Great Britain. Between 1800 and 1860, nearly all the long-standing British restrictions on private industry and trade were repealed by parliamentary enactments.

Economic liberalism won some converts in France and Germany but it completely triumphed in the United States.

7. Capitalist and Labouring Classes:

The Industrial Revolution created two new types of classes the capitalist class and the labouring class. The masters of industries, the managers of mills and the proprietors of workshops were capitalists, who amassed great wealth by a high margin of profit on goods sold and by paying very little wages to workers and compelling them to put up long hours of work in their factories. The labouring class acted merely as a tool in factories. Under these conditions, the poor became poorer and the rich richer. Thus, the gap between the rich and the poor, between the capitalists and the workers, between the haves and the have-nots went on widening with the passage of time. This caused social disharmony.

8. England Rolled in Wealth:

England, the mother of the Industrial Revolution, began to roll in wealth on account of its early industrialization. She became a leading country in the field of industry, trade, commerce and finance so much so that she was able not only to withstand the strain of the various wars she participated in, but could also afford to give financial assistance to those countries that approached her.

Check your progress

Q.1 What was the economic impact of the Industrial Revolution on Europe?

1.6.2 Its Impact on Society:

The Industrial Revolution caused numerous social changes of vital significance.

1. Urbanisation of Culture:

The most harmful effect of the Industrial Revolution was on family life. Before the Industrial Revolution, all members of the family helped the head of the family in the family profession. But after the Industrial Revolution the father and sometimes the entire family shifted to the nearby city in search of gainful employment in factories, mills or workshops. The shifting of population from the rural areas to the urban centres was very much noticeable. This led to the growth of many new cities in Great Britain such as Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham and Sheffield, which became centres of industry, trade and commerce. Similar changes occurred on the Continent with sensational growth of such cities as Brussels, Paris, Berlin, or Lille. Moreover, hundreds of towns grew into cities, and villages grew into towns all over Europe, Russia and the U.S.A. Moreover, city life broadened the outlook of persons, and our culture and civilization became fundamentally urban in character.

2. City Slums:

With the establishment of factories, very soon, the cities got overcrowded partly because of migration from villages and partly because of the high rate of birth. The great shortage of houses in cities forced many of the families to stay in dull, dark, dingy and dirty quarters and sometimes underground houses which looked like cheese-boxes without sanitation and ventilation. This situation, no doubt produced slums, the number of which went on increasing, as factories sprang up in cities. These slums caused fevers and a variety of diseases and premature deaths.

3. Women and Children in Factories:

Many a times the father was either too old to adapt himself to the new factory system or could not find a job in factories. Hence, children had to serve in order to feed their parents. Easy availability of women and children for work in mills, industries and workshops led to low wages and unemployment. The factory managers wanted to employ unskilled workers, preferably women and children because they were cheaper and could easily be managed. In most of the cotton mills, young children of about 5 to 6 years were employed. They began their work before dawn at 3.00 a.m. and continued upto 10 or so at night. Under these circumstances, "stunted bodies, deformed backs, horribly twisted legs, sunken chests and savage natures resulted."

4. Immorality:

Such conditions, naturally, poisoned home life and lowered the standards of morality. As women began to work for 15 hours or so a day and lived in extremely congested quarters, it became extremely difficult for them to maintain modesty and virtue. The women and children imitated the vices of men and began to drink alcohol more than what was necessary. "What family life was like under such circumstances," writes Professors Hayes, Moon and Wayland, "in one of the cellar or cheese-box homes of an industrial city, with ignorance, poverty, hunger, dirt, disease, and vice as enemies, may be left to the reader's imagination."

5. Comforts and Luxuries of Life:

The inventions in the various fields during the period of the Industrial Revolution multiplied the comforts, conveniences and luxuries of our lives. The life became more comfortable, more secure, more convenient, more luxurious, fuller and richer because of the Industrial Revolution. New means of transport and communications, new methods of production, railway locomotives, automobiles, steamboats and ships, etc. proved to be boons to mankind.

6. Man-Dominant over Natural Obstacles:

The most striking thing in the Industrial Revolution is that man has been made dominant over the natural obstacles, which hitherto had helped him bound. Prior to 1850, famine was the horror of almost every country. Famine in one European country was generally "the herald of a scarcity in all Europe." However, after that date, the failure of the harvest in Europe could be made good, with mechanical transport, by the harvest of Argentina, Canada, Australia, or India. There is the whole world to draw upon, and the nineteenth century had a sense of security which was previously unknown. Nothing now seems impossible of accomplishment. Rivers can be dammed; water can be conserved for irrigation by great engineering works, as in Egypt and India; mountains can be pierced by tunnels as in St. Gothard and Simplon; oceans can be licked up by waterways such as the Suez and Panama canals and thereby new trade routes established; and railways can cross the rocky mountains and penetrate into the desert. The development of the Industrial Revolution and the modern scientific and technological advances have thus enabled man to conquer the forces of Nature.

Check your progress

Q.1 Examine the impact of Industrial Revolution on society.

1.6.3 Colonial Imperialism:

The Industrial Revolution encouraged Great Britain and other European countries to follow the policy of colonial imperialism. Hence, England, France, Russia and many other European countries and also the U.S.A. built large colonial empires. They needed colonies, first to acquire raw

materials at low prices for feeding their huge industries; and second, to capture markets for the purpose of selling the finished products at high prices. Thus, the Industrial Revolution led to colonialism and imperialism, which caused untold miseries to colonial peoples."

1.6.4 Problems of the Labour:

The Industrial Revolution created numerous problems for labour, which were of vital significance from the social, industrial, economic and political points of view.

1. Labour Movements:

The Industrial Revolution made the life of working men wretched, poor, miserable and unbearably burdensome. A factory or mill worker became a beast of burden, working from dawn to dusk between 14 and 16 hours a day, with wages miserably low. As pointed out earlier, child labour was brutally exploited in the form of pauper apprentices. Most factories, mills, and workshops were without sanitation and safety guards on machinery, causing frequent accidents. Moreover, no provisions were made to care for the injured and the sick; and the continuous insecurity of service always hung over heads of the working people. The correction of all these evils required a long, hard and rigorous struggle by workers.

2. Formation of Trade Unions:

It was extremely difficult for them to organise and unite into labour unions, for the formation of labour unions in 1800 was forbidden by parliamentary law in England,

It was only in 1825 that some liberals and sympathizers of the workers persuaded the British Parliament to legalise the formation of trade unions. Soon thereafter, several trade unions sprang into existence all over the country.

In the last quarter of the 19th century, trade unions came to be formed everywhere in Europe and in the U.S.A. In most European and American countries, the main demands of these trade unions were:

- (1) an eight-hour work a day;
- (2) the right of the trade unions to bargain collectively with the employer;
- (3) sanitary and safer working conditions;
- (4) enhanced wages; and
- (5) prohibition of child labour.

3. Political Rights for Working Men:

Formation of trade unions was not enough; the workers must enjoy political rights and force Parliament to pass laws in their favour. The Chartist Movement championed the cause of the workers but it fizzled out in 1848. It was not until 1867 when the Reform Act was passed that the workers of Great Britain were allowed to enjoy these political rights. Even

in the U.S.A. as well as in most of the industrialized countries on the continent of Europe; workers came to be permitted to enjoy political rights, irrespective of their religion or property qualifications."

4. Legislation for Social Betterment:

Having secured political rights, the workers then agitated for social legislation that would improve their working as well as living conditions. In this matter, Germany took the lead. In the 1880's it was Chancellor Bismarck who was responsible for some social legislations which provided for accident insurance, regulation of child labour, maximum hours of work, old-age insurance, and inspection and supervision of factories and mines by government. Other countries, later on imitated Germany's attempt to aid labour. More or less, such laws came to be enacted by British Parliament under the leadership of Winston Churchill and Lloyd George, and also by State Legislatures of some States in the U.S.A.

Check your progress

Q 1. Discuss the problems of Labour created by the Industrial Revolution.

1.7 GROWTH OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

It was generally believed that the workingmen's troubles and most of the social evils sprang into existence mainly due to the introduction of factory system and the consequent development of capitalism. To remove these troubles and social evils, some of the early socialists like Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Charles Fourier (1772-1837), Louis Blanc (1813-1882)-all Frenchmen-and Robert Owen (1772-1857), an Englishman, proposed some constitutional and peaceful schemes, by means of which the capitalist class would be abolished and the key means of production like wealth, land, mines, and machines would be owned and controlled in some form by the community.

All these early socialists were labelled Utopians- a name which was derived from a book, known as Utopia on the ideal society authored by Sir Thoomas More in the sixteenth century. The Utopian Socialists were thus only idealists, laying emphasis on the art of persuasion, voluntary co-operation of all classes and people, and an appeal to the Christian doctrine for eliminating the capitalist class and for creating and forming voluntary socialist societies.

Scientific Socialism-Karl Marx:

Until 1838, Socialism was a peaceful working-class movement aiming at the elimination of the capitalist class and the substitution of some form of working class ownership and control of the key means of production by peaceful methods. However, it was Karl Marx (1818-1883), a German Jew by birth, a man of action, and the Father of Marxism or Scientific Socialism, also called Communism, and his close friend Friedrich Engels,

who issued in 1848 an irresistible appeal to world labour, in their celebrated pamphlet, called the Communist Manifesto. The Communist Manifesto called upon the workers of the world to unite together and overthrow the capitalist system by a bloody revolution,

To quote it, "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of the world Unite!"

In 1867, Marx and Engels published the first of three celebrated volumes, entitled 'Das Capital'. In these books, they explained in great detail their theories which were known as Marxism or Scientific Socialism or Communism.

Check your progress

Q.1 Analyse Karl Marx's role as a Socialist.

1.8 SUMMARY

Socialism as a concept was a product of the 'Industrial Revolution'. It aimed at bettering the prospects of the exploited working class. Since it was not able to achieve much, extreme socialism or communism was born. It manifested itself as a working philosophy in the Soviet Union first, and then to other countries. However with the disintegration of the Soviet Union the whole concept of socialism as a working model is under review.

Socialism as a concept, was born at of the need of the day. Problems that arose due to the Industrial Revolution needed to be readdressed. Philosophers, therefore, began to dream concepts of the 'Ideal Society' for mankind. Thus socialism was born.

This concept passed through various phases. The earlier socialist were known as UTOPIANS. They were seeking the establishment of an ideal society where there would be planning, common ownership, tolerance and equality. These socialist were Robert Owen, Saint Simon, Fourier etc.

When their pleas were not heard, Socialism took a more practical turn. The person heading this change was Karl Marx, Marx's dictum to the exploited working class was 'To unite' and overthrow the capitalist. So that a dictatorship of the working class could be established.

Other forms of socialism was also established in the form of Fabian Socialism, Anarchism, Leninism etc.

1.9 QUESTIONS

1. What do you understand by the Industrial Revolution'?
2. What were the nature of the Industrial Revolution?

3. Examine the course of the industrial Revolution.
4. Discuss the factors that led to the Industrial Revolution.
5. Discuss the development of the Industrial Revolution.
6. What is the meaning of 'Socialism'? Describe the essentials of Socialism
7. Analyse Karl Marx's role as a Socialist.
8. What was the impact of the Industrial Revolution on Europe? What new problems were created in European society?
9. Review the impact of the Industrial Revolution.

1.10 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Beik, Paul H. & Lavouvre, L., Modern Europe: A History Since 1815, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1959.
- Bennis Lee, Europe 1870-1914, Appleton ten Century Crafts, New York, 1965.
- Breace, Richard M, The Making of the Modern World, New York, Reinehart & Co., Inc. 1956.
- Comwell R. D., World History In the Twentieth Century, Longman Group Ltd., London, 1977.
- Croce Benedetto , History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century, Unwin University Books, England, 1965.
- Garraty, J., and Gay, Peter(Ed.), A History of the World, New York, Harper & Row, 1972.
- Gressy Eduard, An Outline of Industrial History, Macmillan & Co. London, 1929.
- Ketelbey C.D.M., A Brief History of Modern Times from 1789, Oxford University Press, Calcutta, 1984.
- Lipson E., Europe in the 19 and 20 Centuries, English Language Book Society, London, 1960.
- Palmer, R.R., and Colton, Joel, A History of the Modern World, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Weech W. N.- History of the World, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (1776)

Unit Structure

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Nature of the American Revolution
- 2.3 Causes of the American Revolution
- 2.4 Course of the American Revolution
- 2.5 George Washington (1732 - 1799)
- 2.6 Causes of Success
- 2.7 Effects of the American Revolution
- 2.8 Summary
- 2.9 Questions
- 2.10 Additional Readings

2.0 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this lesson are as follows:

- To examine the nature of the American Revolution.
- To understand the causes of the American Revolution.
- To briefly survey the course of the American Revolution.
- To assess the consequences of the American Revolution and its impact on the history of the world.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It may be briefly mentioned here that Columbus discovered the new continent in October 1492, America received its name from Amerigo Vespucci who popularised the discovery of the new continent. Europeans, especially the British, French, Spanish and Portuguese took a prominent part in the colonisation of the Americas. During the early years of the 17th century, there was large-scale emigration of Englishmen because of scarcity of land, unemployment and discontentment among the Protestants especially Puritans regarding the political and religious policies of the Stuart Kings who were Catholics.

By 1642 nearly 65,000 Englishmen had settled in different parts of America, beginning with their first establishment in Jamestown in Virginia in 1607. Another important group known as Pilgrim Fathers came in the ship Mayflower in 1620 and established a colony in Plymouth in the northeast. Soon there were 13 English colonies located on the east coast of America from Connecticut to Virginia which had close connection with the mother country. Though they were governed by the King and the Parliament in England, they were allowed to develop their own way of life and political, judicial and other institutions in America.

The thirteen colonies had their own independent elected legislative assemblies which passed laws on matters of local importance in each colony.

However, the Governor of each colony was appointed by the King of England but was paid by the colonial government. Though he had many powers, in reality he could not exercise them. The British government had ultimate authority over the colonies, However, since America was far away, the Americans created their own institutions so that they could enjoy a large measure of self-government with minimum interference from England.

2.2 NATURE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The American Revolution was an ideological and political revolution that occurred in colonial North America between 1765 and 1791. The Americans in the Thirteen Colonies formed independent states that defeated the British in the American Revolutionary War (1775–1783), gaining independence from the British Crown and establishing the United States of America, the first modern constitutional liberal democracy.

American colonists objected to being taxed by the British Parliament, a body in which they had no direct representation. Before the 1760s, Britain's American colonies had enjoyed a high level of autonomy in their internal affairs, which were locally governed by colonial legislatures. The passage of the Stamp Act of 1765 imposed internal taxes on the colonies, which led to colonial protest, and the meeting of representatives of several colonies in the Stamp Act Congress. Tensions relaxed with the British repeal of the Stamp Act, but flared again with the passage of the Townshend Acts in 1767. The British government deployed troops to Boston in 1768 to quell unrest, leading to the Boston Massacre in 1770. The British government repealed most of the Townshend duties in 1770, but retained the tax on tea in order to symbolically assert Parliament's right to tax the colonies. The burning of the Gaspee in Rhode Island in 1772, the passage of the Tea Act of 1773 and the Boston Tea Party in December 1773 led to a new escalation in tensions. The British responded by closing Boston Harbor and enacting a series of punitive laws which effectively rescinded Massachusetts Bay Colony's privileges of self-government. The other colonies rallied behind Massachusetts, and twelve

of the thirteen colonies sent delegates in late 1774 to form a Continental Congress for the coordination of their resistance to Britain. Opponents of Britain were known as Patriots or Whigs, while colonists who retained their allegiance to the Crown were known as Loyalists or Tories.

Open warfare erupted when British regulars sent to capture a cache of military supplies were confronted by local Patriot militia at Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775. Patriot militia, joined by the newly formed Continental Army, then put British forces in Boston under siege by land and their forces withdrew by sea. Each colony formed a Provincial Congress, which assumed power from the former colonial governments, suppressed Loyalism, and contributed to the Continental Army led by Commander in Chief General George Washington. The Patriots unsuccessfully attempted to invade Quebec and rally sympathetic colonists there during the winter of 1775–76.

The Continental Congress declared British King George III a tyrant who trampled the colonists' rights as Englishmen, and they pronounced the colonies free and independent states on July 4, 1776. The Patriot leadership professed the political philosophies of liberalism and republicanism to reject rule by monarchy and aristocracy. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed that all men are created equal, though it was not until later centuries that constitutional amendments and federal laws would increasingly grant equal rights to African Americans, Native Americans, poor white men, and women.

The British captured New York City and its strategic harbor in the summer of 1776, which they held for the duration of the war. The Continental Army captured a British army at the Battle of Saratoga in October 1777, and France then entered the war as an ally of the United States, transforming the war into a global conflict. The Royal Navy blockaded ports and captured other cities for brief periods, but they failed to destroy Washington's forces. Britain also attempted to hold the Southern states with the anticipated aid of Loyalists, and the war moved south. British general Charles Cornwallis captured an American army at Charleston, South Carolina in early 1780, but he failed to enlist enough volunteers from Loyalist civilians to take effective control of the territory. Finally, a combined American and French force captured Cornwallis' army at Yorktown in the fall of 1781, effectively ending the war. The Treaty of Paris was signed on September 3, 1783, formally ending the conflict and confirming the new nation's complete separation from the British Empire. The United States took possession of nearly all the territory east of the Mississippi River and south of the Great Lakes, with the British retaining control of northern Canada, and Spain taking Florida.

Among the significant results of the war were American independence and the end of British merchantalism in America, opening up worldwide trade for the United States - including with Britain. The Americans soon adopted the United States Constitution, replacing the weak Confederation by establishing a comparatively strong national government structured as a federal republic, which included an elected executive, a national judiciary,

and an elected bicameral Congress representing states in the Senate and the population in the House of Representatives. It is the world's first federal democratic republic founded on the consent of the governed. Shortly after a Bill of Rights was ratified as the first ten amendments, guaranteeing fundamental rights used as justification for the revolution. Around 60,000 Loyalists migrated to other British territories, particularly to (Canada), but the great majority remained in the United States.

Check your progress

Q.1 Describe the nature of the American Revolution.

2.3 CAUSES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Relations between the 13 American colonies and England, the mother country began to break down during the mid eighteenth century. The colonists had become accustomed to governing themselves and had developed a sense of unity and independence. England passed laws that taxed the colonists and restricted their freedom. As a result, the colonists deeply resented what they considered British interference in their affairs. Friction between the colonists and British increased and on 19th April 1775, the Revolutionary War broke out between the two sides. The chief causes of the American Revolution may be summarized as the following:

2.3.1 Political Causes:

1. Spirit of Self-reliance and Enterprise:

The colonists developed a spirit of self-reliance and enterprise. They had established their own political institutions. Each colony had its own legislative assembly elected by the colonists. The assembly performed a number of duties such as enacting laws of local importance. Each of the 13 colonies was administered by governor as the nominee of the British King. Colonial assemblies sanctioned the salary of governors of their respective colonies. However, George III and the British Parliament did not give any political rights to the colonies, which in turn felt like slaves in the political field. Each colony had a legislative assembly and a governor appointed by England. They gained great political experience by running their political institutions. Thus, they resented the political control of England and had a strong desire for self-government. They did not consider it necessary to be under the control of England, their mother country.

2. Political Grievances:

The colonists had a number of political grievances against the mother country. They did not like the interference of England in their internal affairs. They were denied political rights. Laws meant for the colonies were passed by the British Parliament in which they had no representation. The British kings and their governments did not attempt to develop cordial relationship with the colonists. The kings insisted on treating these colonies as their private estates. These factors along with the long distance

between the colonies and England led to lack of affection and loyalty among the colonists towards their mother country.

3. Lack of Affection and Loyalty:

The colonists held neither affection nor loyalty towards England. The religious intolerance of the English rulers had forced them to leave England. Further, England did not attempt to maintain good relations with the colonies.

2.3.2 Social Causes:

1. Heterogeneous Character of the American Colonies:

The Colonies could be divided into 3 categories:

a. The Northern colonies: viz New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island were fired with a burning desire for political independence and hatred for any kind of external control and interference. They had migrated to the America's' to seek their destiny away from restrictions..

b. The Middle Colonies: viz. New York, Pennysylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware were Catholic and resented control from Protestant England.

c. The Southern Colonies: viz. North Carolina, South Georgia and Virginia were mostly loyal to the British government.

In such heterogeneous character of the colonists, England needed a wise, sound and tactful leader, who could keep the British Empire intact by granting timely concessions. But, king George III, and his Prime Minister Lord North lacked these qualities.

Check your progress

Q.1 Explain the political and social causes of the American Revolution.

2.3.3 Economic Causes:

The Colonies were considered valuable chiefly for economic reasons- as a source of raw materials and as a market for exports. But the cost to the mother country for defence and administration probably equaled or exceeded the commercial returns. After 1750, therefore Parliament tightened up the regulation of trade and the collection of duties.

Until this time, the colonists had part with more than the local taxes levied by their colonial legislatures. They had achieved this 'immunity' by means of wholesale smuggling and a flagrant disregard of the British Navigation acts. At the same time they showed little interest to provide for their own military defence.

The English, therefore, began to impose a number of new taxes, and also to collect existing taxes more strictly. This was resented by the colonists. Some of them are as follows:

a. The Navigation Acts:

These contained 3 main provisions (i) all goods were to be exported only through British Ships. (ii) Certain goods and commodities were to be sold only to British merchants. (iii) Commodities were first to be shipped to Britain and from there to any part of the world. This made the process of shipping long and increased the prices of goods and commodities.

b. Prohibition of Manufacture of Certain Goods:

The manufacture of certain commodities like cloth was disallowed in the colonies. This was done to boost industrial production in England. However it was a death blow to industries in the colonies.

C. The Sugar Act of 1764:

This act imposed a prohibitive duty on the import of foreign colonial molasses. The enforcement of this act would cripple if not destroy the extremely important trade of the Northern British colonies with the foreign, colonial possessions in the West Indies and South America

d. The Stamp Act of 1765:

Under this Act, every document in order to be 'legal' should carry a 'stamp'. The legislatures of the leading North American colonies petitioned against this Act, but it was of no use. The colonist realised the only way to halt further encroachments on colonial self-government was to resist this Act even at the risk of war.

e. Quartering Act (1766):

In order to enforce various laws, the British Government stationed British troops in the colonies. The Quartering Act was passed by the British Parliament with the intention of making the colonists to pay part of the cost of stationing British troops in the colonies. The act ordered the colonies to supply the troops with living quarters, fuel, candles, and cider or beer. Most colonists half-heartedly obeyed the Quartering Act. Often they provided fewer supplies than stipulated. The Quartering Act also invited great resentment from the colonists.

f. Townshend Acts (1767):

The defiance of the colonists angered many members of the British Government. They included Charles Townshend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He devised a new plan for raising additional revenue from the colonies. Accordingly, the Parliament passed the Townshend Acts in 1767. One act imposed duties on glass, paper, lead, paint and tea imported into the colonies. Another Act set up a customs agency in Boston to collect these import duties efficiently.

The Townshend Acts as other previous acts met with a hostile reaction from the colonists. As a protest against the duties, the colonists boycotted the British goods. British merchants, who suffered loss of business due to the boycott, appealed the British government to withdraw the duties. In 1770, the Parliament withdrew duties on all the commodities covered by the Townshend Act except the one on tea. A nominal tax on tea was continued to assert the right of the British government to tax the colonies.

g. Writs of Assistance:

This empowered British officers to search the house for smuggled goods as well as ships for taxable goods. This was viewed by the colonists as violation of their basic human rights.

h. English officers to be tried in England:

English Officers accused of violations of the law were tried in England. This was viewed by the colonists as an act of acquittal of the criminals, because the English courts would naturally favour the accused.

2.3.4 The Spirit of Liberty:

The colonists had become accustomed to governing themselves, and had developed a sense of unity and independence. Each of the colonies had gained political training and experience in the art of self-government. Each colony had a popularly elected legislative assembly and a Governor, whose salary was voted by the members of the legislative assembly. This assembly passed acts on matters of local importance. Thus, the colonies had a taste of self-rule. Therefore, they desired that their legislative assemblies should be treated on par with the British Parliament. Hence, it aroused in the minds of the colonists the spirit of liberty, a burning desire for complete independence.

2.3.5 England's Victory over France:

For security reason the 13 colonies had to depend on the military protection of England. There was a constant threat from the French who had been in occupation of Canada, to the north of the colonies. However, the situation changed with the victory of England over the French in the Seven Years' War (1756-1763). Thus, the French threat to the security of the colonies vanished and the colonies were no longer required to look forward to the military protection from England. Thus, the colonists did not hesitate to defy and agitate against the unpopular and exploitative laws of the British government and assert their independence.

2.3.6 Unsympathetic Attitude of British Kings:

The British kings followed harsh and unsympathetic policy towards the colonies. King George III, who ascended the throne of England in 1760, wanted to rule on the model of absolute rulers of Europe. He asserted his right to govern the colonies as he liked. He never tried to understand the hopes and aspirations of the colonists neither were he keen in solving their

problems. He lacked statesmanlike qualities and was carried away by the sinister advice of his ministers,

2.3.7 Influence of Ideas:

The American Revolution was influenced by philosophers and thinkers of the period. John Locke had strongly advocated that a government must be based on the consent of the governed and it must not only serve the interests of the people but also protect their freedom. Whenever a government acts contrary to the interests of the governed and fails to uphold their liberties, the people have a right to overthrow such a government.

Thomas Paine did much to advance the cause of rebellion in America. In his work 'Common sense', declared that America's subjection to England was 'contrary to reason'. He therefore advocated his fellowmen to fight for total independence from England.

There were other writers like, Thomas Jefferson, Franklin Benjamin, Alexander Hamilton etc. whose writing led to the rise of American nationalism.

2.3.8 No Taxation Without Representation:

To the American colonists, a direct tax such as the Stamp Act was outrageous and riots broke out. They believed that the British Parliament could regulate the trade of her colonies but it had no right to levy direct taxes when they had no representation in the Parliament. The cry "No taxation without representation" was raised. This led to all round discontentment leading to protest against Britain and the boycott of British goods. In order to make the grievances known, delegates from nine colonies met at New York in June 1765 and sent a petition to the British Crown to repeal the Stamp Act.

Stamp Act was a direct attempt by England to raise revenue in the colonies without the consent of the colonial assemblies. The Americans feared that if such direct tax as Stamp Act was accepted it will open doors for more burdensome taxation.

The British Parliament responded and repealed both the Sugar Act and the Stamp Act in March 1766.

2.3.9 Immediate Cause:

a. Boston Tea Party, 1773:

The East India Company which had suffered losses was sitting on a large stock of unsold tea. The Company was on the verge of bankruptcy. In an effort to save the company the British Parliament passed the Tea Act of 1773 and allowed the Company to import tea into the American colonies without paying any of the regular taxes. In fact, this tea was cheaper than the tea which the Americans imported, but since, being cheaper, it was undersold which adversely affected the interests of the American tea

merchants who suffered losses. Three English ships, loaded with Indian tea, were stationed at the Boston Port. When the Governor ordered the tea to be unloaded, a group of Americans disguised as Mohawks boarded the ships and emptied all the chests of tea into the ocean. This rebellious incident gave a clarion call to the American Revolution.

b. Intolerable Acts of 1774:

The Boston Tea Party enraged the British King, George III and his government and in response the British Parliament passed a number of laws to punish the colonists early in 1774. These punitive acts came to be known as the Intolerable Acts. One act closed Boston Harbour until Bostonians paid for the destroyed tea. Another act restricted the activities of the legislature of the Massachusetts and placed the colony under the direct control of England. The colonists were directed to house and feed British soldiers. These factors ultimately led to the American Revolution.

Check your progress

Q.1 Explain the economic and immediate causes of the American Revolution.

2.4 COURSE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

2.4.1 First Continental Congress (1774):

The Intolerable Acts broke the patience of the colonists. On 5th September 1774, delegates from all colonies except Georgia met in the First Continental Congress at Philadelphia. The Congress did not call for independence from England. However, it passed a resolution calling the colonies to cut off colonial trade with England unless Parliament abolished the Intolerable Acts. The Congress drew up a Declaration of Rights. The delegates hoped that the colonies would regain their rights, which Parliament had taken away from them. The Congress agreed to hold another Continental Congress in May 1775 if England did not change its policies by that time.

2.4.2 Second Continental Congress (1775):

Fighting broke out between the colonists and British troops at Concord and Lexington on 19th April 1775. This event led to the beginning of the American War of Independence. As decided in the First Continental Congress, colonial leaders met in the Second Continental Congress at Philadelphia on 10th May 1775. The chief task of the Congress was to prepare the colonies for a war of independence against England. It organized the Continental Army. On 15th June 1775, the Congress named George Washington of Virginia as the Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

The Congress constituted a committee consisting of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and other important leaders to draft the Declaration of

Independence, which was adopted by the Congress on 4th July 1776. Thus, the Second Continental Congress officially declared independence and formed the United States of America. The declaration put forward certain self-evident truths that were basic to the revolutionary cause. It said that, all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To protect those rights, men organized governments, and the governments derived their powers from the consent of the governed. But when a government ceased to preserve the rights, it was the duty of the people to change the government, or abolish it and form a new one.

2.4.3 Revolutionary War:

The American colonies entered the Revolutionary War without an army or navy. Their fighting forces consisted of militia units in the various colonies. They lacked a well-trained army and experienced officers to command the soldiers. They also did not possess good weapons and other material and monetary resources. But they had the advantage of fighting on their home territory. On the other hand the British had well-trained and well equipped troops and officers. However, they were fighting in an unfamiliar land thousands of miles from home. The colonists were fortunate to get material and monetary assistance from France, Spain and Holland, who were the enemies of England.

The Revolutionary War continued for nearly eight years. The colonial troops led by Major General Horatio Gates scored a brilliant victory over the British army under the command of Lieutenant General John Burgoyne at Saratoga in eastern New York (17th October, 1777). The last major battle of the Revolutionary War was fought at Yorktown. The colonial army with the support of the French forces delivered a crushing defeat to British forces under the command of Cornwallis. The surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown on 19th October 1781 did not bring a sudden end to the Revolutionary War. The fighting dragged on in some areas for two more years. However, there was fear among the British leaders that they might lose other parts of British Empire if they continued the war in America. Following the defeat and surrender of Cornwallis a new group of British ministers came to power early in 1782. They began peace talks with the Americans.

2.4.4 Treaty of Paris (1783):

Following the peace negotiations between the British representatives and American delegates in Paris in April 1782, the Treaty of Paris was signed on 3rd September 1783. The Treaty of Paris recognized the independence of the United States and also established the borders of the new nation. The treaty also granted fishing rights to the Americans off the coast of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

Check your progress

Q.1 Explain the Course of the American Revolution.

2.5 GEORGE WASHINGTON (1732 - 1799)

Recognition of the true greatness of George Washington, as a man and a general, has somehow been diminished over the years. Born in 1732 in the state of Virginia, Washington was a self-made man, though he came from a background of being a plantation owner. At the age of 27 he married Martha Curtis, a rich widow with children. He was fond of socializing and was also a champion for the fights of the colonist.

In recognition of his great patriotism, and his qualities of leadership, the Congress elected him as it's Commander-in-Chief. This he accepted mainly as "a kind of destiny," as he told his wife.

When Washington reached the American camp at Cambridge on July 2, 1775, the problems that he faced were practically impossible to solve. He needed to create an army from a mixture of forces raised by the four New England states-Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island-and the southern regiment yet to come. These soldiers were volunteers, rugged individuals, resentful of discipline, ignorant of military procedure, lacking clothing, weapons, ammunition and other supplies with which to wage a prolonged war. As Washington wrote to his brother that the officers in general were "the most indifferent kind of people I ever saw".

Washington also faced a crisis in the form of finance for the army. Yet along with help of Robert Morris, Washington was able to inspire his men in the field and also to raise money to finance the army.

He spent six years in the field with his troops, without once returning to his beloved Mount Vernon. His labour bore fruit with the triumph of the Colonist armies over the British forces led by Lord Cornwallis. The final victory of Washington at Yorktown on October 19, 1781, vindicated Washington's fundamental strategy - to harass the enemy at every point, but never to allow them the opportunity of crushing his army.

The British evacuated New York on November 23, 1783. Washington marched in leading his ill-clad, ragged army. It was there he bid farewell to his officers and soldiers.

In recognition of his leadership capabilities, the new Constitutional Government that was formed elected George Washington as the first President of the United States of America.

2.6 CAUSES OF SUCCESS

It is surprising that Britain with all her resources of a world empire at its command was defeated. Britain, however, had many handicaps.

- (i) Not all Englishmen favoured the war and as a result it was a half-hearted attempt on the part of Britain. Persons like William Pitt and Burke favoured the colonists.
- (ii) There was a threat of rebellion in Ireland. Britain at that time was fighting against Spain, France and Holland.
- (iii) The long distance between Britain and America hindered the regular and timely supply of reinforcements,
- (iv) The British soldiers and generals were not as well-conversant with geography and topography of the colonies as the colonial army and their general George Washington.
- (v) The dynamic and determined leadership of George Washington contributed a great deal to the success of the Americans.
- (vi) French help by way of money, men and military supply greatly improved American fighting capacity.
- (vii) Above all, the Americans were inspired by the spirit of patriotism and their heroic and determined fight to protect their rights was a powerful force in itself.

Check your progress

Q. 1 Examine the role of George Washington in the American Revolution.

2.7 EFFECTS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The American Revolution is one of the most important landmarks in the history of the world. It had far reaching consequences not only on the history of the United States of America but also on the British Empire and the world at large. The effects of the American Revolution are as follows:

2.7.1 Birth of a New Nation:

As a result of the American Revolution, the 13 British colonies emerged as an independent nation, the United States of America. The military success of the colonists against England was confirmed by the Treaty of Paris (1783) when England recognized the independence of the colonies. In the place of royal rule they established governments ruled by law and dedicated to the guarantee of certain basic rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The new nation of the United States controlled all of North America from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River between Canada and Florida. Canada, to the north, remained British territory. England returned Florida to Spain, and Spain continued to control the area west of the Mississippi river. The original 13 colonies made up the first 13 states of the United States.

2.7.2. The American constitution:

At the end of the Revolutionary war, the new nation was still a loose confederation of states. But in 1787, American leaders got together and wrote the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution became the basic law of the country that welded it together into a solid political unit. The men who wrote the Constitution were some of the most famous and important figures in American history. They included George Washington and James Madison of Virginia, Alexander Hamilton of New York, and Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania. The authors of the Constitution, along with other early leaders such as Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, won lasting fame as the Founding Fathers of the United States.

2.7.3 Human Casualties:

It has been estimated that about 7, 200 Americans were killed and more than 8, 200 were wounded in battles during the Revolutionary War. About 10,000 others died in military camps from disease or exposure. Nearly 8,500 died in prison after being captured by the British. American military deaths from all causes during the war thus, numbered about 25,700. Many of the soldiers in the Continental Army came out of the war penniless. They had received little or no pay while they served. Soldiers who had enlisted for the Revolutionary War were given certificates for western land. However, many veterans had to sell the certificates, as they needed money before western lands became available. It was only in 1818 that Congress agreed to pay pensions to needy veterans..

2.7.4 Huge Cost of the War:

The United States was deep in debt to finance the Revolutionary War. A new Constitution, approved in 1788, gave the Congress power of taxation. By the early 1800s much of the war debt was cleared the Congress through taxes. The Revolutionary War severely strained England's economy. There was great apprehension in England that the war might bankrupt the country. But after the war, the increased trade with the United States helped the British economy to recover. Taxes on trade reduced England's debt. However, of all the warring nations, France suffered huge financial loss during the Revolutionary War. By 1788, the country was nearly bankrupt. The financial troubles of France helped in bringing the French Revolution in 1789.

2.7.5 Inspiration to the French Revolution:

The principles of American Revolution inspired the revolutionaries. French volunteers, who participated in the Revolutionary War such as Lafayette, on their return, played a crucial role in the making of the French Revolution. The French Revolution broke out six years after the signing of the Treaty of Paris (1783). The ideals of the French Revolution, liberty, equality and fraternity were the reflection of American idealism of democracy and rights of human beings.

2.7.6 Setback to the Absolute Monarchy in England:

The humiliating defeat of England by the colonial forces in the Revolutionary War discredited the English monarchy. It brought about liberal changes in English constitutional policies. The autocratic monarchy of George III gave way to a constitutional monarchy. The Tories (conservatives) who had dominated the government during the reign of George III lost their credibility because of their poor handling of the American affairs. The Tories were replaced by the Whigs (liberals) who were to introduce Parliamentary democracy and social reforms. Thus, the American Revolution indirectly contributed in the transformation of the English absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy,

2.7.7 Change in British Colonial Policy:

The loss of 13 American colonies following the American Revolution forced England to change her attitude towards other colonies in Asia and Africa. England learnt the bitter lesson that colonies like ripe fruits were bound to fall in the long run. She realized that any excessive interference in the internal affairs of a colony would ultimately lead to a revolution in the colony. Hence, England followed cautious and sympathetic policy towards her 'white' colonies of Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. These colonies were gradually granted autonomy, and they remained within the British Empire as Dominions. Even the 'coloured' colonies of Asia and Africa, after their independence in the middle of the 20th century continued their relations with England leading to the formation of the Commonwealth of Nations.

2.7.8 Victory of Democracy and Liberty:

The American Revolution marked the victory of democracy and liberty. The Declaration of American Independence is a document of great historical importance. Admiration for the principles that guided the American Revolution led people elsewhere to demand political reforms.

Check your progress

Q.1 Examine the consequences of the American Revolution.

2.8 SUMMARY

The American Revolution brought about the first expulsion of a European colonial power replaced monarchical government with a viable republic and established the practice of popular sovereignty (democracy). As a result of those achievements, the American Revolution was seen as a hope and a model to latter revolutions round the world.

America was colonised by the Europeans who came in search of better prospects of all the Europeans. The British soon got mastery of all the 13 colonies that were established.

Over the period of time the colonists turned hostile to British rule. This was mainly due to the fact that Britain believed in the 'Mercantilist Policy'. According to the policy, Colonies existed only for the benefit of the 'mother country'. As a result, rules were framed and taxes imposed which were against the interest of the colonies.

As grievances of the colonies grew, Britain did not change. As a result one event led to another, and in 1776 the war for Independent started. The war dragged on for 7 years, till the other European powers helped in bringing the war to an end in 1781. By the treaty of Paris 1783 America was at last recognised as an Independent nation with the right to choose her own destiny. American established a democracy was a concept that was to extend not only to Europe but to the rest of the world.

2.9 QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the causes of the American Revolution.
2. Explain the political and economic causes of the American Revolution.
3. Briefly describe the causes and results of the American Revolution.
4. Examine the consequences of the American Revolution.
5. Describe the nature of the American Revolution.
6. Explain the Course of the American Revolution.
7. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Economic causes of the American Revolution
 - (b) Navigation Laws (c) Boston Tea Party
 - (d) George Washington

2.10 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Beik, Paul H. & Lavouvre, L., Modern Europe: A History Since 1815, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1959.
- Benns Lee, Europe 1870-1914, Appleton tan Century Grafts, New York, 1965.
- Breace, Richard M, The Making of the Modern World, New York, Reinehart & Co., Inc. 1956.
- Comwell R. D., World History In the Twentieth Century, Longman Group Ltd., London, 1977.
- Croce Bendetto, History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century, Unwin University Books, England, 1965.
- Garraty, J., and Gay, Peter(Ed.), A History of the World, New York, Harper & Row, 1972.

- Gressy Eduard, An Outline of Industrial History, Macmillan & Co. London, 1929.
- Ketelbey C.D.M., A Brief History of Modern Times from 1789, Oxford University Press, Calcutta, 1984.
- Lipson E., Europe in the 19 and 20 Centuries, English Language Book Society, London, 1960.
- Platt, Nathaniel., and Drummond, Muriel J., Our Nation From Its Creation, History of the United States, New York Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Palmer, R.R., and Colton, Joel, A History of the Modern World, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Weech W. N.- History of the World, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.

munotes.in

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Unit Structure

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Nature of French Revolution
- 3.3 Causes of French Revolution
- 3.4 Course of the Revolution
- 3.5 Rise and fall of Napoleon Bonaparte
- 3.6 Effects and Significance of the French Revolution
- 3.7 Summary
- 3.8 Questions
- 3.9 Additional Readings

3.0 OBJECTIVES

1. To introduce to the students the importance of the French Revolution as a landmark in the history of the world.
2. To examine the nature of the French Revolution.
3. To understand the causes for the outbreak of the Revolution.
4. To study the course of the Revolution.
5. To evaluate Napoleon Bonaparte's role in history.
6. To assess the effects of the French Revolution.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The American Revolution helped to spark the French Revolution of 1789- which proved to be the most violent and far reaching of all the liberal upheavals. Not only were liberal ideas ushered in, but also drastic changes in the legal, social and economic order was introduced in France the most populous country in Western history. As Tocqueville later wrote: 'The French Revolution had no territory of its own; indeed, its effect was to efface, in a way all old frontiers. It brought men together, divided them, in spite of laws, traditions, character and language-turning enemies sometimes into compatriots and kinsmen into strangers.....'.

The French Revolution formed a significant landmark in human history. A struggle arose between the French people and the French monarch which resulted in the victory of the people over the king. Monarchy came to be abolished and the first French Republic was born. It was the French Revolution that really shook the European social, political, economic and religious systems.

3.2 NATURE OF FRENCH REVOLUTION

The French Revolution was a period of radical political and societal change in France that began with the Estates General of 1789 and ended with the formation of the French Consulate in November 1799. Many of its ideas are considered fundamental principles of liberal democracy, while phrases like Liberté, égalité, fraternité reappeared in other revolts, such as the 1917 Russian Revolution and inspired campaigns for the abolition of slavery and universal suffrage. Its values and the institutions it created dominate French politics to this day.

The Revolution precipitated a series of European wars, forcing the United States to articulate a clear policy of neutrality in order to avoid being embroiled in these European conflicts. The French Revolution also influenced U.S. politics, as pro- and anti- Revolutionary factions sought to influence American domestic and foreign policy.

The French Declaration of Rights when the first rumors of political change in France reached American shores in 1789, the U.S. public was largely enthusiastic. Americans hoped for democratic reforms that would solidify the existing Franco-American alliance and transform France into a republican ally against aristocratic and monarchical Britain. However, with revolutionary change also came political instability, violence, and calls for radical social change in France that frightened many Americans. American political debate over the nature of the French Revolution exacerbated pre-existing political divisions and resulted in the alignment of the political elite along pro-French and pro-British lines. Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson became the leader of the pro-French Democratic-Republican Party that celebrated the republican ideals of the French Revolution. Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton led the Federalist Party, which viewed the Revolution with skepticism and sought to preserve existing commercial ties with Great Britain. With the two most powerful members of his cabinet locked in opposition, President George Washington tried to strike a balance between the two.

The causes are generally agreed to be a combination of social, political and economic factors, which the existing regime proved unable to manage. In May 1789, widespread social distress led to the convocation of the Estates-General, which was converted into a National Assembly in June. The Assembly passed a series of radical measures, including the abolition of feudalism, state control of the Catholic Church and extending the right to vote.

The next three years were dominated by the struggle for political control, exacerbated by economic depression and social unrest. External powers like Austria, Britain and Prussia viewed the Revolution as a threat, leading to the outbreak of the French Revolutionary Wars in April 1792. Disillusionment with Louis XVI led to the establishment of the First French Republic on 22 September 1792, followed by his execution in January 1793. In June, an uprising in Paris replaced the Girondins who dominated the National Assembly with the Committee of Public Safety, headed by Maximilien Robespierre.

This sparked the Reign of Terror, an attempt to eradicate alleged "counter-revolutionaries"; by the time it ended in July 1794, over 16,600 had been executed in Paris and the provinces. From 1790 to 1794, the French Revolution became increasingly radical. After French King Louis XVI was tried and executed on January 21, 1793, war between France and monarchical nations like Great Britain and Spain was inevitable. These two powers joined Austria and other European nations in the war against Revolutionary France that had already started in 1791. The United States remained neutral, as both Federalists and Democratic-Republicans saw that war would lead to economic disaster and the possibility of invasion. This policy was made difficult by heavy-handed British and French actions. The British harassed neutral American merchant ships, while the French Government dispatched a controversial Minister to the United States, Edmond-Charles Genêt, whose violations of the American neutrality policy embroiled the two countries in the Citizen Genêt Affair until his recall in 1794.

In 1794, the French Revolution entered its most violent phase, the Terror. Under foreign invasion, the French Government declared a state of emergency, and many foreigners residing in France were arrested, including American revolutionary pamphleteer Thomas Paine, owing to his British birth. Although U.S. Minister to France Gouverneur Morris was unable to obtain Paine's release, Morris was able to intercede successfully on behalf of many other Americans imprisoned during the Terror, including the American Consuls at Dunkirk, Rouen, and Le Havre. Once the Terror ended in late July of 1794, the arrests ended, and Paine, who had been scheduled to be executed, was released.

As well as external enemies, the Republic faced a series of internal Royalist and Jacobin revolts; in order to deal with these, the French Directory took power in November 1795. Despite a series of military victories, the war caused economic stagnation and political divisions; in November 1799, the Directory was replaced by the Consulate, which is generally seen as the end of the Revolutionary period.

Although the French Revolution had ended its radical phase, Federalists in the United States remained wary of revolutionary ideology infiltrating the United States. Many French citizens, refugees from the French and Haitian revolutions, had settled in American cities and remained politically active, setting up newspapers and agitating for their political causes. A French spy, Victor Collot, traveled through the United States in 1796, noting the

weaknesses in its western border. When a breakdown in diplomatic negotiations resulted in the Quasi-War with France, the Federalist-controlled Congress passed a series of laws known as the Alien and Sedition Acts, intended to curb political dissent and limit the political participation of immigrants by easing deportation and lengthening the time required for citizenship. A number of political radicals were arrested for sedition, including Congressman Matthew Lyon and newspaper editors James Thompson Callendar and William Duane. Many refugees, sensing American hostility, chose to return to France and Haiti since the political situation had temporarily calmed in both places.

The Alien and Sedition Acts, originally intended to prevent a growth in pro-French sentiment, actually backfired for the Federalists. Taken aback by such extreme measures, swing voters in the presidential election of 1800 instead backed the pro-French Thomas Jefferson and his Democratic-Republican Party, instead of the Federalist John Adams, who was running for re-election as President. Adams had also alienated the anti-Revolutionary wing of his party by seeking peace with France, whose revolution had already been brought to a close by General Napoleon Bonaparte.

Despite Federalist warnings that electing Jefferson would bring revolution to the United States, Jefferson instead chose to distance himself from political radicals and win over political moderates. The revolution in France was over, and while many Americans voters sympathized with the revolution in the abstract, they did not want the revolution's most radical changes put into effect in the United States.

The French Revolution was a watershed event in modern European history that began in 1789 and ended in the late 1790s with the ascent of Napoleon Bonaparte. During this period, French citizens razed and redesigned their country's political landscape, uprooting centuries-old institutions such as absolute monarchy and the feudal system. The upheaval was caused by widespread discontent with the French monarchy and the poor economic policies of King Louis XVI, who met his death by guillotine, as did his wife Marie Antoinette. Although it failed to achieve all of its goals and at times degenerated into a chaotic bloodbath, the French Revolution played a critical role in shaping modern nations by showing the world the power inherent in the will of the people.

Check your progress

Q.1 Discuss the nature of the French Revolution, 1789.

3.3 CAUSES OF FRENCH REVOLUTION

Many factors led to the outbreak of the French Revolution, viz, political, social, intellectual and economic. The general conditions in France were in no way different from those in the other countries of Europe. Then why did the Revolution break out in France and not in any other country?

The revolution broke out first in France because the French monarchs had become inefficient and ineffective. The French philosophers and thinkers made the people of France more conscious of the miserable conditions of the people and also made them aware of their rights. The Glorious Revolution in England and the American Revolution provided the best models for the French people to follow,

3.3.1 Political Factors:

(a) Weak Rulers:

The success of monarchical government depended upon the efficiency of the monarch himself.

i) Louis XIV:

After Louis XIV, the French monarchs were not efficient administrators. Louis XIV had indulged in constant wars during the latter part of his life. When he died in 1715 he left an empty treasury to his successor.

ii) Louis XV:

Instead of improving the French finances, he wasted wealth by living a life of luxury. He did not reform or strengthen the administration but spent his time with his many mistresses. He even allowed them to dictate to him his domestic and foreign policies. His long rule (from 1715 to 1774) ruined the French economy and loosened the administrative machinery. It was during his rule that France lost the Seven Years' War (1756-63) and her colonies.

iii) Louis XVI:

His successor, Louis XVI was young and inexperienced when he came to the throne in 1774. He was well intentioned but inefficient and ineffective. Moreover, under the feudal system, the influential nobles controlled the king and his court. Unfortunately, the king was not interested in administration. When Malesherbes, a minister of the interior, came to tender his resignation, Louis XVI said, "How fortunate you are, I wish I could resign too."

iv) Marie Antoinette:

His wife, Marie Antoinette was a more forceful personality than the King but lacked political wisdom and statesmanship. Young and vivacious, she brought more harm to her husband than good. The French monarchy had become blind to the realities of the worsening situation in the country.

(b) The Central Administration:

There was excessive concentration of power in the hands of the French kings. In such a situation, only an able monarch could manage the state of France. There were other problems such as absentee landlordism, oppressive taxation and corrupt and indifferent administration. When

France went bankrupt, Louis XVI did not have the ability to solve her financial problems. This brought about the Revolution.

3.3.2 Social Factors:

a) Social system:

The French social system was feudal and was based on class distinction and privileges. The society was divided into three estates. The clergy formed the first estate. The nobles formed the second estate. The third estate consisted of the rest of the people of France such as peasants, serfs, the businessmen and the professional class.

(b) Injustice :

The main problem of the French society was that its first two estates (nobles and clergy) enjoyed all the privileges, owned most of the land in France, did comparatively little work and paid no taxes. All high posts in the government were reserved for the first two estates. Important positions in the army were occupied only by the nobles. A person from the third estate, however, wealthy or intelligent, could not rise to higher status in society. The people of the third estate paid all kinds of taxes and bore the economic burden of the country. For example, the peasants paid direct and indirect taxes to the king, tithes to the church and feudal and other dues, including the corvée (forced labour) to the nobles. Because of absentee land-lordism, the nobles never lived on their lands but sent their agents regularly to collect dues from the peasants. There was no love lost between the peasants and the noble.

(c) Social inequality:

The bourgeois or the middle class people who were professionals or businessmen, though not as worse off as the peasants, suffered hardships because of restrictions on their business or professional activities. Many of them were as wealthy as some of the nobles, as such they resented the fact that they did not have any privileges. In the first estate the clergy who held higher positions in the church enjoyed all privileges and power while the lower clergy who looked after parishes were poor and uncared for. Under the circumstances, the third estate and many of the disgruntled members of the first two estates had no hope or opportunity to get their grievances redressed.

Check your progress

Q.1 Examine the political and social causes of the French Revolution, 1789.

3.3.2 French Thinkers:

The French philosophers, writers and intellectuals inspired by the ideas of individual freedom advocated by John Locke were mainly responsible for making the people conscious of their natural rights and the injustice done to them and of their sufferings. At the same time, they were also made aware of their individual rights. Once the people became conscious of

their rights, they began to look for an opportunity to secure them. The following were the prominent philosophers and writers responsible for the spread of the new ideas.

(a) Montesquieu (1635-1755):

He was born in a wealthy family. Though not a revolutionary he criticised the moribund social and political system in France. He criticised the corrupt practices and abuses of the Church and the inefficient despotism of the State. He also criticised the so called superiority of French manners and customs which helped nobody. He compared the French government with that of the British and pointed out the advantages of the free institutions of Britain based on liberty and equality. However, he did not suggest the abolition of monarchy or the Church.

(b) Voltaire (1694-1778):

He was a highly respected intellectual of his times in Europe. Voltaire was a great poet, historian, philosopher satirist and a dramatist. He severely attacked the despotism of the Church and the corrupt practices of the higher clergy. Though he attacked the abuses of the Church, he was not an atheist. He knew the importance of religion in the life of people and said, "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to create him." He was also not against monarchy, for he believed that the popular government could create more problems and bring chaos. He advocated freedom of expression and pointed out the advantages of British democratic system as compared to French autocracy.

(c) Rousseau (1712-1778):

Rousseau was mainly responsible for sowing the seeds of the French Revolution. He went one step ahead of Voltaire. His book, the Social Contract influenced the French people the most. He argued that man is naturally free and equal but in the course of history, his rights and privileges had been taken away. Man has been deprived of his right to liberty and happiness. It is necessary that he should regain what he had lost. He wrote, "Man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains." The existing social and political institutions, he argued, had deprived man of his natural rights.

In addition to these philosophers, there were others like encyclopaedists, physiocrats and dramatists who also helped in fanning further the flame of the revolution. A special mention should be made here about the philosophers like Diderot and Condorcet who emphasised on remaking society in accordance with the laws of nature. They believed that man has capacity for unlimited progress.

Check your progress

Q.1 Explain the contribution of the Philosophers to the French Revolution, 1789.

3.3.4 Influence of British and American Revolutions:

The influence of the English revolutions of 1642 and 1688 and of the American Revolution cannot be underestimated. French General Lafayette and the French soldiers who had returned after the American War of Independence inspired the French people with the idea that if the American people could rebel against their king in England and succeed, why not the French people? These French troops had returned from America with the words liberty, equality and fraternity on their lips. These three words became the watch words of the French Revolution.

3.3.5 Economic Factors and Financial Crisis:

The immediate cause for the outbreak of the Revolution was the bankruptcy of the French treasury. French participation in the American War of Independence had cost France too dearly. The impoverished treasury was further depleted.

Louis XVI, who came to the throne in 1774, inaugurated an era of economic reforms which lasted for seven years. Turgot was appointed finance minister in 1774. He was succeeded by another able finance minister named Necker. He further tried to improve the French economy but when he failed in 1781, the Revolution was hastened. Turgot and Necker could not succeed in giving France a stable economy because of the king's vacillating attitude and the vested interest of his nobles and the courtiers. The nobles and aristocracy opposed tax reforms and obstructed the government in its efforts to restructure nation's financial system.

During the three years before the revolution broke out, Louis XVI tried every possible method to improve French finances but failed. The French finance minister, Colonne, appointed in 1783, adopted the policy of bluff and spent more to borrow more. In 1786 he introduced a radical reform by proposing a direct tax on all land holders, nobles, clergy and commoners. Colonne's reforms were opposed by the land holders consisting of numerical nobles and clergy and a few others as it was not in their interest.

When he failed miserably in his strategy the revolution became certain. In order to save the situation, the king recalled Necker but it was too late and nothing could save the French monarchy. When all the measures had failed, the king was forced to call the Estates-General, a national body that consisting of representatives from the three estates. Louis XVI believed that this body would be able to help him to raise money and avoid the disaster. The elections were held and the Estates-General met at Paris on 5th May 1789. The national body, instead of helping the king to solve the financial problem and avoid a national disaster, brought about the Revolution

3.3.6 Agrarian Crisis and Famine:

Agricultural economy in France suffered in 1787 and 1788 because of poor harvests and famine conditions. The poor peasants who only subsisted began to starve because of poor crops. Grain shortage led to

sharp increase in prices particularly of bread. For a decade prior to the revolution French trade and economy were on the decline. Agricultural profits were reduced. The noblemen and big farmers in order to make up for their losses in agricultural income began to ask for more dues and revenues which the tenant farmers could not afford. The countryside in France was ripe for a revolution.

Check your progress

Q. 1 Discuss the causes of the French Revolution, 1789.

3.4 COURSE OF THE REVOLUTION

3.4.1 Summoning of the Estates General

The Estates-General, the French national body, had not been called since 1614. It was called after 175 years, as a last resort by the king to help him to solve the financial problems of the country. The third estate took the opportunity to help itself, and put an end to the monarchy.

Little did Louis XVI realise that the disaster was to come when the Assembly met on 5th May, 1789 at Versailles. There were 308 representatives of the clergy (the first estate), 285 representatives of the nobles (the second estate) and 621 representatives of the common people (the third estate).

3.4.2 Voting as One Body:

When the Assembly met, the third estate was conscious of its strength. The king was not trained in the art of handling an assembly. The mood of the third estate was best expressed by Abbe Sieyes in his pamphlet *What is the Third Estate*. He argued that the real French nation was made up of common people i.e. the third estate also, and not merely the clergy and the nobles. Nobility was a useless estate which could be abolished without loss. Therefore, the voice of majority that is of the third estate should be decisive. The trouble started on the question of voting. The king and nobles insisted that as per the custom the voting on any proposal of the assembly be done estate wise, i.e., on any question, each estate was to be allowed to vote separately. In such a case, the first two estates could pass such laws as would be favourable to themselves which could be passed against the interests of the third estate. Therefore, the third estate demanded that the Estate-General must vote as one body so that they could have a better say because of their strength. The clergy first opposed, but later agreed to join the third estate. The nobles resisted and influenced the king not to yield to the demands of the third estate. This brought about the catastrophe.

3.4.3 Tennis Court Oath:

On June 20, 1789 when members of the third estate went to meet in the Assembly hall, they found the doors locked by the orders of the king.

Then they moved to an adjacent room which was sometimes used as a tennis court by the royal family. There, under their leader Bailly, they took an oath and constituted themselves as the "National Assembly." They also decided not to retire until they prepared a constitution for France. The Tennis Court Oath struck the first blow at monarchy and from then onwards the authority began to pass gradually from the hands of the King into the hands of the Assembly.

3.4.4 The National Assembly:

The third estate now became the National Assembly under the chairmanship of Mirabeau, and later on took up the task of preparing a Constitution for France, therefore, the National Assembly came to be called as the Constitutional Assembly. On 27th June 1789, the king ordered that the three Estates must sit together as a National Assembly. However, due to pressure of the first two estates, the King continued to suppress the third estate with the help of the army.

3.4.5 Fall of Bastille:

The King felt helpless and yielded to the demands of the third estate. They now sat as the National Assembly and voted as one body. But soon they saw the movement of the royal troops towards Paris and Versailles. When the King refused to withdraw the troops, the members of the third estate saw the danger. The mob of Paris who had been suffering because of the shortage of food, now came to the help of the National Assembly. From 11th to 14th of July, there were riots in Paris and on the 14th of July 1789, the mob stormed the Bastille, an ancient fortress and prison of the Bourbon rulers of France. The destruction of Bastille became symbolically the destruction of the Bourbon monarchy. Since then, 14th of July, every year is observed by the people of France as a day of liberation and National holiday.

3.4.6 "If they have no bread, let them eat cake":

The food shortage in France was so severe that on 5th October 1789, thousands of women marched on Versailles, shouting slogans "Bread, Bread, Bread". on hearing that the people had no bread to eat, Queen Marie Antoinette was reported to have remarked callously, "If they have no bread, let them eat cake". 6th October 1789 marked invasion of the royal palace by the mob. 20th June 1791, the King and the Queen tried to flee from France but failed. The National Assembly proclaimed the declaration of Human Rights as prepared by Lafayette. The National Assembly prepared a new Constitution for France, which came into effect on 14th September 1791. The three principles, liberty, equality and fraternity, as well as separation of powers formed the basis of the French Constitution. The right to vote was granted only to the taxpayers.

3.4.7 The National Convention:

It was established in 1790. It had two main groups - Girondists and the Jacobins. Girondist were democratic and their main leaders were Mirabeau

and Marat. Whereas, the Jacobins were radicals and their leaders were Danton and Robespierre. On 21st January 1793, Louis XVI was executed on the charge of treason. This was followed by a reign of terror in France. Thousands of persons were guillotined. Lafayette, Didero, Mirabeau, Abbesieye, Danton and Robespierre were the main leaders of the French Revolution .

Check your progress

Q. 1. Describe the course of the French Revolution, 1789.

3.5 RISE AND FALL OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

The French Revolution destroyed the monarchy, but ended in the dictatorship of Napoleon Bonaparte. When the experiments of the National Convention and Directory failed, Napoleon Bonaparte emerged as the new dictator of France. If Rousseau was the father of the French Revolution, Napoleon is regarded as the child of the French Revolution'. With his eyes on India, Napoleon conquered Egypt (1798) and thought of a plan to construct Suez Canal. However, he got himself involved in the continental wars and invited his own doom by invading the frost-covered Russia. Britain gained maximum from the conflicts among the European powers. She captured all the Dutch colonies in India, Sri Lanka (Ceylon) and many islands on way to India. Britain emerged as the leader of anti-Napoleon European coalition. It was under the leadership of Arther Wellesley that Napoleon met his final defeat at the battlefield of Waterloo (1815). The defeated Napoleon was made a prisoner and exiled to the island of St. Helena, where he breathed his last. The Napoleonic wars led to the unification of Germany. They brought the unity of France, England, Austria and Russia. They also led to the Industrial Revolution in England.

Check your progress

Q.1 Form an estimate of Napoleon Bonaparte

3.6 EFFECTS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The French Revolution produced effects of worldwide importance. It shaped the destiny of mankind to a very great extent. it became a guiding light to the oppressed people throughout the world to struggle for their rights and liberties. The main results of the French Revolution are as follows :

3.6.1 End of the "Old Order":

The French Revolution resulted in a complete collapse of the Ancient Regime. All the elements of feudalism, serfdom, the privileges of the clergy and the nobility, socio-economic inequalities, the absolute

autocracy of the monarchy received a death blow at the hands of the revolution. A society based on the principle of democracy and equality was established.

3.6.2 Declaration of Human Rights:

In August 1789, The National Assembly proclaimed the declaration of Human Rights. It said that all men being born equal should have equal rights. Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally or through his representative in the formulation of the laws. Law must be the same for all. The three principles, liberty, equality and fraternity formed the basis of the French Constitution prepared by the National Assembly. This declaration occupies a significant place in human history along with other documents such as, the Magna Carta in England and the American Declaration of Independence. Like all the other liberal democratic documents, it upheld civic liberties.

3.6.3 "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity":

The central theme of the French Revolution was "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity." To the French, Liberty means securing personal rights such as the right to property, the right to security of life, the right to resistance, and the freedom of speech, expression, press and faith. All were made to pay the taxes. Feudalism was abolished. Privileges of the aristocracy and the church were replaced by equality of social classes and of opportunity. Peasants were given the ownership of the lands they tilled and the large estates belonging to the nobility were confiscated and redistributed among the farmers. Restrictions on business activities were removed. While these changes helped in the growth of small freehold farmers, they enabled the French businessmen to expand and develop their enterprise. The notion of equality came to have greater meaning in social relations. Every man should have an equal chance with other men to pursue happiness. Fraternity means a feeling of brotherhood and sisterhood among all French men.

3.6.4 Nationalism and Democracy:

The French Revolution spread the idea of nationalism and democracy throughout the length and breadth of the world. The French democratic slogan "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" became the watchword of the suppressed and the oppressed of the world. The idea that "Sovereignty comes from the people from below and not from above" was a fundamental principle that the Revolution put into practice. Absolute monarchy was replaced by representative government. Suffrage was granted to the adult male population. This democratic movement proved to be an enduring form of government. Further, political parties developed and expressed themselves through pressure groups, the press and other instruments of public opinion. The state assumed greater power over the people than the kings had exercised, through the principle of "Nation in arms", which meant public education for citizens, distribution of responsibilities and welfare of the population.

3.6.5 Restrictions on the Church:

With the French Revolution, functions of the clergy were modified. The Church not only was deprived of its privileges and property but also its position was reduced with the promotion of the ideals of the Rights of Man. This was followed by the secularization of education. The church property was confiscated to solve the financial problems faced by the revolutionary government. The church officials were made subservient to the state. They were to be appointed by the central government and were to be paid fixed salaries. The clergy was required to take an oath of loyalty to the state. Thus, the control of the church was transferred from the Pope to the State.

3.6.6 Impact on Other Countries:

Like the Glorious Revolution in England and the American Revolution, the French Revolution also inspired the downtrodden and oppressed masses of people in other countries. Following their example, the movements for democracy began in other countries of Europe such as Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany and Ireland. Here the people rose in revolt against their despotic or foreign rulers and tried to establish constitutional Governments. Several revolutions broke out in Latin American countries during the first quarter of the 19th century. During the later part of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, revolutionary ideals of France, such as nationalism, democracy, republicanism along with liberty, equality and fraternity inspired the subject people under the colonial rule of the European nations to initiate freedom struggle. Following their independence, many of these countries including India incorporated the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity in the preamble of their constitutions.

3.6.7 Social and Economic Reforms:

It Abolished the Negro Slavery and Imprisonment for Debt. It guaranteed protection to women in their property claims on par with men. Further, new laws of inheritance were passed, by which all heirs were to inherit the ancestral property equally.

3.6.8 Metric System:

Code Napoleon laid the basis for a modernized legal system in Europe. It introduced a metric system, a system of weights and measures based on number ten. The entire European world and some of the Asiatic countries adopted this system.

Check your progress

Q.1 What were the effects and significance of the French Revolution, 1789?

3.7 SUMMARY

The French Revolution was the inspiration for all revolutions of the 19th century. It opened a new epoch in the history of mankind. It paved the way for individualism as it proclaimed equality for mankind. The French Revolution was an important landmark in the history of mankind. The causes for this revolution can be traced to the social, economic and political conditions of the old Regime. Along with these the Influence of the American Revolution failure of reforms also Contributed its share in bringing about revolution in France.

The beginnings of the Revolution can be traced to the summoning of the Estates general in 1789. The confusion that ensued in the processes of elections to this body and the voting procedures to be adopted led to disturbances and turmoil. This was especially because the king Louis XVI refused to listen to the voice of the 3 estate despite the fact that they represented the bulk of the population in France.

This led to expulsion of the 3rd estate from the proceedings in the estate-general. Angered by this the 3rd estate took the 'Tennis Court Oath' Vowing to establish a Constitution for France. They, also constituted themselves into a National Assembly.

Fortunately, the National Assembly was able to survive due to Paris Mob who were able to capture the 'Bastille', thus foiling the attempts of the king to overthrow the National Assembly with the help of his troops.

From here there was no stopping the revolutionaries. A constitution was established for France in 1791 with the king as a constitutional Monarch. Unfortunately, the king along with his family were caught trying to escape France. They were caught and put to the guillotine.

The next phase was the 'Reign of Terror' when Robespierre was the dictator of France. Ultimately, Robespierre was put to death thus ending revolution in France.

The 3rd phase was that of the Directory. The 5 Directors sincerely tried to bring order out of the turmoil but were unsuccessful. They were usurped from power ultimately by Napoleon Bonaparte who established himself as the first Consul of France and then the Emperor (1804) of France.

The most enduring of Napoleon's achievement was to make France 'secular' and his 'codes' were copied by the many countries of Europe. Unfortunately, Napoleon's overambition, caused his downfall. He tried conquering the continent. But a coalition of European powers was formed against him. He was defeated in 1814 and expelled to the Island of Elba. He escaped and once again was able to raise an army for war. He was again defeated by the coalition at Waterloo. He was banished to the island of St. Helena (1815) where he ultimately perished.

The French Revolution had to impact all over the world especially as the words 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' turned the keywords, engineering the right to revolt against exploitation, and establishing a new world order.

3.8 QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the causes of the French Revolution, 1789.
2. Examine the political and social causes of the French Revolution, 1789.
3. Analyze the social and economic causes of the French Revolution, 1789.
4. Explain the contribution of the Philosophers to the French Revolution, 1789.
5. What were the effects of the French Revolution, 1789?
6. What were the causes and consequences of the French Revolution?
7. Form an estimate of Napoleon Bonaparte.
8. Discuss the nature of the French Revolution, 1789.
9. Describe the course of the French Revolution, 1789.

3.9 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Beik, Paul H. & Lavouvre, L., Modern Europe: A History Since 1815, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1959.
- Bennis Lee, Europe 1870-1914, Appleton tan Century Grafts, New York, 1965.
- Breace, Richard M, The Making of the Modern World, New York, Reinehart & Co., Inc. 1956.
- Comwell R. D., World History In the Twentieth Century, Longman Group Ltd., London, 1977.
- Croce Bendetto , History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century, Unwin University Books, England, 1965.
- Garraty, J., and Gay, Peter(Ed.), A History of the World, New York, Harper & Row, 1972.
- Gressy Eduard, An Outline of Industrial History, Macmillan & Co. London, 1929.

- Ketelbey C.D.M., A Brief History of Modern Times from 1789, Oxford University Press, Calcutta, 1984.
- Lipson E., Europe in the 19 and 20 Centuries, English Language Book Society, London, 1960.
- Palmer, R.R., and Colton, Joel, A History of the Modern World, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Weech W. N.- History of the World, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.

munotes.in

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Unit Structure

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Nature of the Russian Revolution
- 4.3 Causes of the Russian Revolution
- 4.4 Course of The Russian Revolution
- 4.5 Nature of the October Revolution (1917)
- 4.6 Problems of The Provisional Government
- 4.7 The Bolshevik Revolution of 25th October (7th November) 1917
- 4.8 Effects and significance of the 1917 Russian Revolution
- 4.9 Summary
- 4.10 Questions
- 4.11 Additional Readings

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After the completion of this unit the student will be able:

- To understand the causes responsible for the Revolution in Russia.
- To discuss the main events that led to the February Revolution of 1917.
- To understand the nature of the February Revolution and the problems faced by the Provisional Government.
- To examine the ideology of Lenin's Bolshevik Party, and its success in capturing power in the October Revolution 1917.
- To discuss the policy, programme and problems faced by the Bolshevik Government.
- To appreciate the significance of the Bolshevik Revolution, and its impact on the rest of the world.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The Russian revolution of 1917 ranks as the greatest revolution in the history of mankind. The consequences of the revolution were immense. It affected at least two beginning of another.

World War I had seen the principles of nationalism and democracy triumph in Central Europe. But in Russia it led to a revolution which shook Russian society to its very foundations. It caused not only the political structure but also the social order to collapse in ruins.

Russia until 1917, was an autocratic and despotic monarchy. Socially, economically, politically and even militarily she was lagging behind all major European countries. As regards the cause of the revolution there were many and similar in many respects to those of the French revolution of the 18th century.

The revolution took place in two phases. The political phase took place in February (March) 1917, and it sealed the fate of autocracy: the social phase or the Bolshevik revolution followed in October (November) 1917, and it brought into existence the first Worker's Republic.

4.2 NATURE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

I. Nature of the February Revolution (1917):

Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution:

The February Revolution of 1917 was essentially democratic in spirit. This was reflected by the nature and activities of the Provisional Government, that was established after the Tsarist Regime had been overthrown. The Provisional Government was led under the chairmanship of Prince George Lvov, a liberal big landlord, a member of the Constitutional Democratic Party. The first thing that the Provisional Government did was the proclamation of the freedom of association of the press, and of religion, and liberation of thousands of political prisoners. It at once removed the ban on political exiles. It conferred complete autonomy on Finland, and assured to extend it to Poland. It promised that very soon a National Constituent Assembly would be elected by universal manhood suffrage to frame a Constitution for Russia on a permanent basis. There was rejoicing all over Western Europe, and also in the U.S.A. that the ancient Tsarist autocratic regime has overthrown, and in its place a democratic government had been established. Thus, at the outset, the February Revolution of 1917 in Russia was democratic in nature. In May, power byer, Prince Lvov was succeeded by a radical, Alexander Kerensky, who promised immediate, radical reforms within Russia.

Check your progress

Q.1 Explain the nature of the February Revolution, 1917.

4.3 CAUSES OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OCTOBER 1917

Revolutions are not made; they come. A revolution is as natural a growth as an oak. It comes out of the past. Its foundations are laid far back. The Russian Revolution was caused by the economic, social, and political order, the roots of which were deeply embedded in the ancient autocratic Tsarist regime in the soil of Russia. This order caused alarming dissatisfaction to a breaking point all over the Russian empire. Let us now briefly examine the various factors and forces that led to the Russian Revolution of 1917.

4.3.I Economic Causes of the Revolution:

The seeds of the Russian revolution lay in Russia's backward, decadent economic life. In spite of economic and industrial progress registered at the turn of the twentieth century, Russia remained basically a poor, backward, and wretched country in relation to her population, her vast territorial expanse, and the economic potential available with her. This resulted in acute mass poverty, misery and grinding exploitation of the masses.

1. Russian backward and decadent Agriculture:

Russia was basically an agricultural country but highly backward and decadent. When the whole of Western Europe had adopted improved methods and scientific techniques of farming, the Russian peasant farmers were desperately striving with their primitive tools to draw a livelihood from the soil. Most of the farmers did not even have their own tools and horses to draw the plough and had to hire them from the nobles at exorbitant rates. The per acre agricultural production in Russia in 1913, was the lowest in Europe and except China in India the lowest in the world. The Tsars and the nobles gave no incentives to the peasants to improve the techniques of agriculture. On the contrary, they discouraged enterprising farmers from employing better tools and improved techniques of production. Famines were frequent. For example a severe famine occurred in 1891. Russia had immense potentialities for boosting agricultural production but those who wielded economic power, wanted the backward agriculture to continue as it was, so that they could continue the exploitation of the peasantry. However, whenever the peasant tried to better his farming by introducing some new innovations, the Tsarist officials often frowned at it.

2. Serfdom:

Until 1861, most of the peasants were tied down to the land as 'serfs' and could be bought and sold like any other commodity. Serfdom was painful and depressing. The master could then make work as domestic servants, or could drive them to factories or mines, where they had to sweat for long hours for the master's profit. Cruel masters flogged them severely and interfered in their personal and family matters. Serfs lived on their

master's whims. They could not marry or leave the estates without their master's consent. Serfs, who tried to escape, were pursued, brought back and severely punished. The prosperity of a noble was measured in terms of how many serfs he had. The emancipation Decree issued by Tsar Alexander II in 1861, had freed 40 million peasants from serfdom. Therefore, in Russian history, he came to be known as 'Tsar the Liberator'. But this was illusory, as the peasants were bound to the village (Commune), which they could not live without the police permission.

3. Heavy Rates of Taxes and Land- Revenue:

The village, the province, and the state collected heavy land revenue, and imposed crushing direct and indirect taxes which made "the Russian village a spectacle of poverty, hunger, disease and deaths."

4. Unequal distribution of Land and Wealth:

About 60 percent of Russia's agricultural land was owned by the big landlords, the imperial family, and the monasteries, who represented hardly 10 percent of the Russian population. About 70 percent of her peasants owned less than 10 acres of land. In 1913, there were 17 million harrows and 10 million wooden archaic ploughs for 17 million farms. Poor agricultural production and unjust distribution of land resulted in unfair distribution of wealth, which caused great discontent among the peasants. Soon, violent revolts of the peasants began in the rural areas.

5. Russian Industry:

Before the Emancipation Decree of 1861, Russian industrial progress was hampered by the feudal structure of economy. But after Emancipation industry was marked by the "creeping character of development, and its 'sudden flashes of activity'". After 1890 Russia outstripped many Western countries in the rate of growth of the most important basic industries, viz., iron, steel and coal. Even then, Russia was industrially a highly backward country. In 1913, the iron production of Russia was 20 per cent of the French, 19 per cent of the German, 9 per cent of the American production and her production of coal in comparison to population was 20 per cent of the French, 7 per cent of the German, 4 per cent of the U.S.A. and 3 per cent of the British production. In the field of railway construction, there was only 500 kilometers of railway in the whole of Russia in 1850; however, in 1914, great progress was registered, and the number shot up to 73,000 kilometres. Even then it was 25 per cent of the U.S.A. and 8 per cent of the British and the German railways.

6. Penetration of foreign capital:

Further, the Russian economy was characterised by the penetration of foreign capital to very great extent. In 1914, one-third of the total capital of Russia represented foreign investment which controlled 45 per cent of her oil production, 54 per cent of her iron, 50 per cent of her chemical industry and 74 per cent of her coal production. Further, as much as 60 per cent of the capital of the 6 prominent banks, which controlled nearly 72

per cent of all banking capital and 50 per cent of all bank deposits in Russia, was foreign investment. Thus, the Russian economy was fundamentally dependent on foreign capital, and it was highly feudal and agrarian in character with a very low technical level.

7. Exploitation of Factory workers:

With the growth of transport in industries in Russia, the number of the proletariat went on increasing. There was a need to introduce labour-welfare legislations. But this was not done. The Tsarist government did not take necessary steps to prevent the exploitation of workers. The position of the workers was very pathetic. They had to work on low salaries and live in unhygienic conditions. These urban workers were receptive to a growing variety of new social and cultural influences. The disgruntled workers established trade unions and agitated for getting their grievances redressed. But the Tsars tried to ruthlessly suppress the trade-union movement. The political parties like the RSDLP championed the cause of the workers. From 1903, strikes, demonstration, slogans and violent clashes with the police became frequent. The workers played the most vital role in the 1917 revolution in Russia.

Check your progress

Q.1 Examine the economic causes of the Russian Revolution.

4.3.2 Social Causes of the Revolution:

1. Ill-balanced social structure:

The economic conditions created an ill-balanced social structure. The Russian social structure, in respect of education, medical relief, public health and morality, was "full of tensions and therefore tended to disintegrate". In 1914, there were hardly 20,000 doctors for a population of 17 crores, and more than 27 per cent of children died before attaining the age of 5 years. In the field of education, the Tsars purposely followed a negative policy in the belief that ignorance and illiteracy would hinder the course of revolt and revolution; and, therefore, in 1913, only 23 per cent of the school age children were at school, and expenditure on education per head was not more than one-sixth to one-eighth of that in Germany, Britain or France. About 75 per cent of the total population was illiterate.

2. Cruel and inhumane system of flogging:

Finally the Russian social life became unspeakably miserable, cruel, inhumane, and wretched by the system of flogging that prevailed there. According to Baron Hauxthansen: "Amongst the Russians, all social power makes itself respected by blows which do not change either affection or friendship. Every one deals blows, the father beats his son, the husband beats his wife, the territorial lord or his attendant the peasant, without their resulting from it any bitterness or revenge. The backs of the Russians are ever accustomed to blows."

3. Barbarous punishments:

The cruelties and barbarous punishments that were inflicted upon them made them totally indifferent and cold to human dignity. According to Dr. Damodaran Kurup, they were born in inhuman conditions, grew up under the shadow of a barbarous tyranny and faced the world knowing nothing about the human side of life. Even the Orthodox Church was an easy tool in the hands of the Tsars.

4.3.3 Political Causes of the Revolution:

1. Russia -A Politically Enslaved State:

Against such economic anaemia and an ill-balanced social structure, coupled with bottomless poverty, the people had no legal right of redress. In a parliamentary form of government, if the people are suppressed and oppressed by the government, the government can be overthrown by constitutional means through the ballot box. (However in the absence of such a government, the only course of action left is popular uprising and revolt) This is exactly what happened in Russia because the Tsarist government was autocratic and barbarous to its very core. In 1902, Lenin characterised Russia as "politically enslaved state in which 999 out of 1,000 of the population are corrupted to the marrow of their bones by political subservience." The practice of slitting the nostrils and running the gauntlet were the chief barbarous methods of punishment for the Tsar's disobedient subjects. Every serious political offender was exiled to Siberia or Caucasus. Commenting on the Tsarist terror after 1905, Masaryk thus remarked :

"It may be said without fear of exaggeration that during the white terror, the fear of death ceased to exist. It had been driven away by pogroms (tortures and liquidation), by the death sentences of the court-martials and field court-martials, by arrests and martyrisations in the prison and on the road to Siberia, by the extremities of cruelty and torture, by the frequency of suicide in the prisons, by illness, epidemic disease and famine."

2. Peasants' and Workers' Revolts:

All this resulted in the peasants' and workers' uprisings and revolts whose number multiplied from 248 in 1858-60 to 7,000 in 1905 and 13,000 in 1910-14, accompanied with terrorist activities of the revolutionaries such as throwing of the bombs, and retaliation of the government by using bullets without stint against the assassins and other revolutionaries. Between 1900 and 1914, strikes by industrial workers became the order of the day, although they were illegal and were treated as mutiny, and the strikers were shot dead. The Tsarist government was ruthless, autocratic and repressive.

Although Tsar Nicholas II had granted his people a Parliament, known as the Duma, with limited powers, it was reactionary, irresponsible, and an instrument of the Tsars. The nobles had enjoyed unlimited powers. Russia,

in the world of Lenin, was a military despotism embellished with parliamentary forms.

Check your progress

Q.1 Analyse the social and political causes of the Russian Revolution.

4.3.4 The Growing Dissatisfaction and Infiltration of the Marxist Ideas:

1. Ever increasing hatred for the Tsarist Regime:

The signs and symptoms of revolution were becoming manifest on all sides. The Tsarist governments terrors in the shape of imprisonment, exile, censorship, spying and torture, and also the industrial workers grievances of low wages, long hours of work, horrible working and living conditions, generated in the minds of the people an ever increasing hatred for the Tsarist regime.

2. Lack of Bourgeois and Intellectual classes

The Russian society failed to produce the bourgeois or the capitalist class or the class intellectuals strong enough to lead the people to overthrow the Tsarist autocratic regime and thus to perform the historic duty. The growing dissatisfaction in the masses, therefore, made them highly receptive to the Marxist ideas that were infiltrating into Russia. Foreign troops can be stopped, but not ideas.

3. Infiltration of Marxist ideas:

Despite the best and continuous efforts of the Tsars "to save the minds of their subjects from being "polluted" by ideas of liberalism, constitutionalism, nationalism, democracy, liberty, equality and fraternity, revolutionary Marxist ideas fired the imagination of the Russian people, and fully prepared them for a revolutionary march against their ruthless and autocratic Tsarist regime.

4. Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

In 1898, the Marxist socialists founded the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. In 1903, at its second congress held in London, the Russian Social Democratic Party split into two groups; the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks.

The following were two fundamental points of difference between the **Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks:**

a. Mensheviks Bourgeois Democratic Republic versus Proletariate Dictatorship Bolsheviks:

- i. The Mensheviks firmly believed in, and upheld, the doctrine of George Plekhanow, that is, the overthrow of the Tsarist monarchy must be followed by the establishment of a bourgeois democratic republic as a transitory stage for the ultimate establishment of socialism.

- ii. The Bolsheviks, under the brilliant leadership of Lenin, outright rejected the transitory stage of Bourgeois democratic republic; instead of that, they strongly advocated that the overthrow of the Tsarist monarchy must be succeeded immediately by the proletariat dictatorship, without the transitory stage of a home rule or a democratic republic. They assailed the democratic republic as an "implacable enemy".
- iii. The Mensheviks were, thus, evolutionary and were led by Martov, whereas the Bolsheviks were revolutionary, radical and violent and were led by Lenin, supported by Stalin.

b. Democratic Method:

Another significant point of distinction between the two parties was in the matter of party administration.

- i. The Mensheviks advocated the democratic method, that is, the right of the rank and file to take active part in the task of framing policies.
- ii. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, favoured authoritarian centralism. However, the entire course of the Russian revolution of 1917, was hard hit by the nature of the Bolshevik doctrine, which ultimately determined the shape and character of the Soviet State.

In 1905, the industrial workers of St. Petersburg and Moscow formed the Soviet—a Council of Workers' Deputies representing the factories of the given city. It were these Soviets which played a pivotal role in the February and October revolutions of 1917 in Russia.

4.3.5 Defeat and Disgrace in the Russo-Japanese War(1904-1905):

The Russo-Japanese war (1904-1905) added fuel to the fire. It was a war between Russia, a giant occidental country and Japan a dwarf oriental State, in which the latter inflicted a crushing defeat upon the former. This aroused the passions of the masses in Russia against the Tsarist regime. The people ascribed Russia's utter defeat and national disgrace on the battleground to the Tsarist regime, which failed to have a well-trained well-drilled, and well armed troops and fleet against Japanese. They, therefore, demanded an immediate overthrow of the Tsarist autocratic regime.

4.3.6 Experience from the Revolution of 1905:

Although the Revolution of 1905 failed to realise its objective, it was significant in the sense that it taught the people of Russia the art of organising themselves against rotten, stubborn, wholly corrupt and incorrigible Tsarist regime, which for centuries together had been treating most cruelly and mercilessly the people of the Russian empire. The Revolution of 1905 gave to the people a lot of experience in the field of popular uprisings against the Tsarist government. As a result of it, the Tsar was forced to agree to call a Duma (or Parliament) to advise the Government.

4.3.7 Demoralisation of Russia in the First World War (1914-1917)

The First World War set the ball of revolution rolling. Although the country was wholly ill-prepared, even then the Tsar entered the war on the side of the Allies. As Louis XVI was under the complete influence of Queen Marie Antoinette, Tsar Nicholas II was under the villainous influence of the Tsarina Alexandra Feodorovna Nicholas, who, in turn, was under the complete sway of the notorious so-called monk, Rasputin.

Lack of ammunition and equipment, poor transport facilities incompetent leadership, administrative corruption, excessive interference of the Tsarina, treason in high ranks-all of them created crisis after crisis. Prices of all kinds of commodities, articles, and goods shot up. Foreign loans, taxes, and inflation provided further impetus to rising prices, and caused general discontent. Everything became scarce. In 1915, Russia had to import 100 per cent of her cars and lorries, 70 per cent of her guns and shells, and 60 per cent of the rifles. "The shortage of rifles was so great that a considerable percentage of men had to wait unarmed until they could pick the rifles of their fallen comrades."

4.3.8 Persecution of National Minorities

1. National Minorities' Alliance.

Disaffection had developed among national minorities in Tsarist Russia. As early as September, 1904, representatives of six organizations of national minorities viz. Finland, Poland, Georgia, Armenia, and Latvia entered into an alliance with the Union of Liberation and the Socialist Revolutionaries against absolutism of Tsar. The alliance bound the member organizations:

- a. to work for the overthrow of the autocracy of the Tsar;
- b. to establish a representative government; and
- c. to safeguard the interests and rights of national minorities.

2. Demand for National Autonomy:

There were sixty to seventy representatives of national minorities like Polish, Ukrainian, Latvian, and others in the first Duma which was called after the Revolution of 1905. They worked together for national autonomy and were inclined towards political and economic radicalism. The law of June 3, 1907, substantially reduced the representation of national minorities both in the Third and Fourth Dumas. This naturally caused great resentment among national minorities.

3. Act of 1911 in favour of Russian Nationalities:

In 1911, an Act was passed; which not only disfranchised the Jews but also separated voters into electoral colleges based on nationalities so as to assure the predominance of the Russian nationality.

4. The Policy of Russification and Administrative Centralization:

The government of the Tsar followed the policy of Russification and administrative centralization among national minorities. Instruction in Ukrainian schools was imparted in Russian and the Tsar's government was hostile towards the Ukrainian national movement. The same was the case with Polish provinces. The law of June 17, 1910, in violation of the Finnish Constitution, was enacted and promulgated without the approval of the Finns. These incursions upon the liberties of Finns embittered and antagonized the law-abiding and freedom-loving Finns.

5. Disaffection and Separatist Tendencies among the National Minorities:

Thus, the persecution of national minorities like Finns, Poles, Ukrainians, and others caused great disaffection and bred separatist tendencies among them, which prepared a fertile ground for subversive propaganda and let loose disruptive forces. All these factors were jointly responsible for an all-round corruption, disorder, and incompetence at home, accompanied with great military setback and demoralisation at the front.

"Thus Russia was a heap of dry match-sticks and the fire was to be lighted by a mere rub which was there." The Revolution began with demonstrations and general strikes by the workers, and attack of the Kulaks by the peasants in February, 1917.

Check your progress

Q.1 Write a note on The Growing Dissatisfaction and Infiltration of the Marxist Ideas.

4.4 COURSE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

4.4. 1. February-March Revolution of 1917:

I. It began in Petrograd:

Street demonstrations, strikes, peasant revolts, and mutinies had been taking place sporadically throughout the autumn and winter of 1916-17, but it is generally accepted that the February Revolution of 1917 began on International Women's Day, February 23, 1917. That day was marked by serious bread riots that broke out among the Petrograd workers.

The revolutionary drama began on February 24, when the huge crowds of workers in Vyborg attacked the police while the regiment of Cossacks observed a neutrality. February 25th witnessed a general strike in Petrograd. This was followed by the Tsar's orders to General Khabalov, commander of the Petrograd garrison, to suppress the disorders by the use of force. On February 26, a Sunday, General Khabalov ordered the police to fire on the workers and reported to the Tsar that the situation was under control. However, to the great astonishment of General Khabalov and the

Tsar, by the evening of 28th February, the Petrograd garrison had already joined the workers in the Revolution; and by the morning of February 28, Petrograd was entirely in revolutionary hands.

4.4.2 Leadership of the Revolution:

i. Provisional committee of Duma and petrograd Soviet:

The February Revolution was the spontaneous outbreak of a multitude of workers and peasants. The revolutionary parties did not play direct role in the making of the Revolution. In fact, the revolution looked to leadership from the bodies which existed almost simultaneously on February, 27th." The first of these was a Provisional committee of the Duma (i.e. Parliament) which represented all the parties in the fourth Duma barring the extreme right-wing and the Bolsheviks. The second body was the Provisional Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet (i.e. committee) of Workers' Deputies. It was organised in the Tauride Palace on the pattern of the Petersburg Soviet, which had played a glorious role in the Revolution of 1905 was like its predecessor, 'a non-party organisation' elected by factory workers. Social-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks being all represented in it. The real power of the Revolution, in guiding the armed workers and soldiers came to be vested on the second body which was renamed the "Soviet of Workers and Soldiers Deputies" on March 2, 1917.

ii. Abdication of Nicholas II, and Death of Tsarism (March 2, 1917):

February 28th witnessed the arrest of the Tsarist Ministers and the appointment of Commissars in their place by the Duma Committee. To the great astonishment of the Tsar, the troops, on arriving at the capital, mutinied on March 1, 1917. There was, now great demand from every quarter for Tsar's abdication.

The Tsar, finally, in consultation with his generals, signed on March 3, 1917, a document of abdication in favour of his son with Grand Duke Michael as his regent. However, the document of abdication served as a death warrant of Tsarism. To put in Trotsky's words: "The country had so radically vomited up the monarchy that it could never crawl down the people's throat again". On March 4, when the Duma Committee approached Grand Duke Michael to accept the Crown, he refused saying that he would accept the Crown only from a Constituent Assembly. Thus, ended the Russian monarchical tradition. All the members of the imperial family remained under house arrest at Tsarskoye Selo until they were removed first to Tobolsk and then to Yekaterinburg, where they were assassinated on July 16, 1918.

II.

Check your progress

Q.1 Explain the course of the Russian Revolution

4.5 NATURE OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION (1917)

4.5.1 Dictatorship of Bolsheviks:

The term "Proletariat" is here used to mean the working class and particularly the urban working class. The term "Bourgeoisie" refers to the capitalist class, while "Petty Bourgeoisie" refers to the middle classes, such as small merchants, clerks, professionals, etc.

The Provisional Government of Kerensky was overthrown by the October Revolution, engineered by the Bolsheviks or Communists under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. The October Revolution claimed to be essentially "proletarian" in nature. It liquidated the power of the nobles, the clergy and the bourgeoisie, and on the ruins of which it established the dictatorship of the Proletariat. Although the Bolsheviks claimed to invest power into the hands of the proletariat, the power actually came to be monopolised by a few astute leaders of the Bolshevik's Party in Russia like Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin. They acted for all practical purposes as iron dictators of Russia. No political party, except the Bolshevik's Party, was allowed to function in the country. All opposition was most ruthlessly and savagely repressed and eliminated. Soviet Russia became a one-party totalitarian state.

According to Prof. Louis L. Snyder, "the new political structure of the Soviet Union was rigidly oriented around despotism, mass discipline, fanaticism, terror and propaganda all distinguished by a bitter, implacable hatred of the capitalist world. Leninist-Stalinist ideology erased the slate of the past, and introduced a new idea of man and society, denouncing the cultural humanism of the West as an outmoded expression of a decadent bourgeois world."

Lenin claimed that "Soviet power was a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic." He was dead against the monstrous individual liberty, "that precious ideal which it has been the aim of Western democracies to preserve by never allowing exclusive and unconditional power to accrue for an unlimited period to any one party or section of the population."

Western democracy no doubt is bourgeois-capitalist, according to communist standards, but it at least curbs political power, guarantees the free, unhampered expression of responsible political opinion, which is unthinkable in the communist society, wherein all power is concentrated in the hands of the Communist Party in the name of the proletariat.

4.5.2 Its International Character:

Once the Revolution was solidified in Russia, it threw a powerful bait and drew millions of inhabitants of Eastern Europe into its orbit, overwhelmed China and is attracting millions in South East Asia and the Middle East. It believes in the unity of workers of the world and world-revolutionary communism.

According to Dr. M. G. Gupta, "other revolutions (like the American, or the French) had come to terms with their environment; the Russian Revolution has not, for it is still going on and continues to display the dynamics that has converted a feudal, backward and decadent state into a major centre of world power.....The motor that drives it may have slowed a little, but the mechanism still churns up the living body of society in a manner unheard of in earlier revolutions."

The Russian Revolution of October 1917, observes Dr. M. G. Gupta, "is perhaps the most important single event of world history, incomparable in its scope, dimensions, its fundamentalism, dynamism, and its immediate repercussions with any revolutions preceding or following it. It threw out a powerful challenge to the manifold aspects of the Western values, the principles of trade, the theories of Government, the framework of institution, the rules of international conduct and the technique of diplomacy, believed in the unity of workers of the world and world-revolutionary communism.

4.6 PROBLEMS OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

4.6.1. Coalition Provisional Government:

By March 3, 1917 a Coalition Government under the premiership of Prince George Lvov, came into being. Milyukov was placed in charge of foreign affairs. Guchkov of the War Ministry and Kerensky, a member of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Society, became the new Minister of Justice. Thus, it was the Mensheviks who, at first, profited most by the February Revolution. This Provisional Government, which became the "legal successor" of the Tsarist government, soon came to be recognised by the outside world including the Allied Powers, and continued the First World War in accordance with the agreements and pacts made by the Tsarist Government with the Allied Powers.

4.6.2 Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies:

However, the writ of the self-constituted Soviet of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies came to be recognised by an ever increasing number of workers and soldiers. This fact which gave it a position of authority, no one could ignore; and "this was the-practical and almost accidental basis of the so called dual powers set by the February Revolution"

The example of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was followed by the setting up of the Soviets in Moscow and in other big cities and later on, in country districts. This, later on, led to the summoning of the first All-Russian Congress of Soviets at the end of March, 1917.

4.6.3 Bolsheviks in Minority and in the State of Confusion:

The Bolsheviks were in a minority in the Soviets and were in a state of confusion, for, all their chief leaders were in exile abroad or in Siberia.

On March 11, 1917, they issued a manifesto, demanding "Down with, the Czarist Monarchy" and "Long live the Democratic Republic". Pravda, the Bolsheviks literary mouthpiece, which was repressed at the beginning of the War, resumed publication on March 18, 1917 in Petrograd. Its editors condemned the Provisional Government as "a government of the capitalists and landlords," and repeated the slogan "Turn the imperialist war into civil war for the liberation of the people from the yoke of the ruling classes." Soon thereafter, the senior leaders of the Bolsheviks, viz, Kamenev, Sverdlov, Stalin and Muranov, returned from Siberia to Petrograd and gave the right direction to the party.

Check your progress

Q.1 Discuss the working of the Provisional Government.

4.7 THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION OF 25TH OCTOBER (7TH NOVEMBER) 1917

The February Revolution was local in character. It took place only in Petrograd and the whole country was not affected by it. It was mainly a bourgeois revolution of the Mensheviks. The failure of the provisional government in fulfilling the demands and aspirations of majority people led to the Bolshevik Revolution under the leadership of Lenin.

4.7.1 Causes of the Bolshevik Revolution:

- (1) The Provisional Government was weak and unstable.
- (2) The exploitation of the masses continued.
- (3) The Provisional Government was not in touch with the common people.
- (4) Growing conflict between the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet.
- (5) Continued participation of Russia in the First World War caused great sufferings to soldiers in particular and the people of Russia in general. The war made the Provisional Government unpopular among the people. The Bolsheviks condemned it as an imperialist war.
- (6) Provisional Government lost control on the army.
- (7) Two reforms introduced by the Provisional government proved to be a boon for the Bolsheviks and a curse for the Provisional Government. Firstly, they released all the political prisoners from jail and deportation. As a result, different Bolshevik leaders like Lenin, Stalin,

Kamenev, Bukharin etc., reappeared in Petrograd. Secondly, they granted the freedom of expression to all the citizens of Russia. As a result, "Pravda", the mouthpiece of the Bolshevik party, which was banned during the Tsarist Period, now started reappearing from March 18 1917 from Petrograd. Its editors denounced the Provisional Government, criticized it to be the government of the capitalists and landlords, and appealed the people to turn the World War into a Civil War to liberate the nation from the yoke of the Provisional Government. Naturally, the popularity and strength of the Bolshevik Party went on mounting.

Check your progress:

Q.1 Discuss the causes of the Bolshevik Revolution.

4.7.2 Role of Lenin in the Bolshevik Revolution:

Lenin (1870-1924):

Lenin was born on 22 April 1870 in the Volga Valley at Simbirsk (Now Ulyanovsk). His original name was Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov. He was the third of six children born to Ilya Nikolayevich Ulyanov and Maria Alexandrovna Blank. His father was a schoolmaster, who ultimately rose to the position of Director of Schools for the whole of Simbrisk. When Lenin was 17, his elder brother Alexander, while a university student, joined the Populist group and took part in a plot to assassinate Tsar Alexander II. Therefore, he was executed in 1887 during the time of Tsar Alexander III. This event inculcated revolutionary ideas on Lenin's mind. In the same year, Lenin joined the university of Kazan as a law student, where he accepted Marxism as his guide and in December 1887, he was expelled from the university and a little later from the city of Kazan itself for his active participation in the student gathering. However, he obtained his degree in law in 1891 as external student from the university of St. Petersburg. By 1893, he came to be recognized as an authority on Marxism. In 1895, he went to Switzerland to meet G.V. Plekhanov, the most illustrious Marxist in Geneva, who had founded there an institution to teach Marxism to Russian revolutionaries. On returning to Russia, Lenin organized the league of struggle for the liberation of the Working Class. However, while he was distributing revolutionary leaflets to factory workers on the night of 20 December 1895, he was arrested and imprisoned for about 14 months; and later on in 1897, he was exiled to Siberia for three years. There he was joined by Nadezhda Krupskaya, who became his life partner on 22 July 1898. Having completed his term of exile in 1900, he started a weekly called "Iskra" i.e. (The Spark) and a theoretical journal named "Zarya" i.e. (The Dawn). These periodicals were to be published abroad and smuggled into Russia. In 1902, he wrote a book called "What is to be done" in which he strongly advocated revolutionary doctrine and revolutionary organization, 'The World in Transition' (1914-1919).

He further advocated the need of a party of professional revolutionaries who must be bound together by military discipline to prove a match to the

police. He believed that with such a party, one could turn the whole of Russia upside down. He brought about the combination of the proletariat and the peasantry against the capitalists and landlords. The Russian Revolution of 1905, failed to offer Lenin a chance for translating his revolutionary plans into reality. From 1905 to 1917, he travelled at Finland, Stockholm, London, Switzerland, Paris and Austria. In 1916, he wrote a book titled "Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism".

When the Menshevik Revolution broke out in February 1917, Lenin was in Switzerland. He was unable to return to Russia without crossing the enemy territory. Therefore, he requested the German Government to reach him to Russia. The Germans reached him safely to Petrograd on 16 April 1917 in a sealed train along with other Russian socialists. The motive of Germany behind this was to create chaos in Russia, so that she may withdraw from the First World War. Once Lenin reached Petrograd, he took the charge of the revolutionary movement. He reorganized his Bolshevik Party and denounced the bourgeois Provisional Government. He saw in that government an obstacle to his cherished desire of converting Russia into a Socialist country. Hence he told the people that the country did not require a parliamentary Republic or a Bourgeois Democracy, what the country needed the most was the government of the Soviet of Workers', soldiers' and farmhands deputies. The Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 was engineered under the able and brilliant leadership of Lenin.

The very next day of his returning to Petrograd, Lenin placed his famous April Theses before the conference of the Soviets. It was fully based on Marxism.

Lenin's April Theses was so radical that even staunch Bolshevik leaders like Stalin and Kamenev opposed it. They charged Lenin of being an anarchist and out of touch with the realities in Russia. However, Lenin was fully convinced that his programme was right and only it could save Russia. Through public meetings and speeches, Lenin began to present his programme before the workers and peasants. The programme offering food to the hungry, land to the peasants and peace to the nation, greatly appealed to the hearts of the Russian people and they spontaneously supported Lenin. Naturally, the Bolshevik Party also had to ultimately approve it. Thenceforth, all the programmes of the Bolshevik Party were drawn on the basis of Lenin's April Theses.

Leon Trotsky, who was in exile at New York, returned to Petrograd in May 1917. The strength and popularity of the Bolshevik Party began to increase when Lenin's ability was supplemented by Trotsky's oratory. As Lenin became the main leader of the Bolshevik Party, the position of the Provisional Government became shaky. People openly opposed government's policy of continuing Russian participation in the First World War. Denouncing the government, the workers and soldiers started demonstrations against the government in the streets of Petrograd. So, the Provisional Government became panicky. Owing to the failure in the Galician Campaign, Prince George Lvov's Government resigned on July 8

21st 1917. Alexander Kerensky became the new Prime Minister. His cabinet had 11 members of the Socialist Party and 7 others.

In the mean time, peasants uprisings reached their climax during September and October, and soldiers deserted the war front in great numbers. The German troops defeated Russia and marched towards Petrograd. Therefore, Kerensky decided to shift the Russian capital from Petrograd to Moscow. But the Bolsheviks opposed this decision. They demanded that the government should either withdraw from the War and should immediately start negotiations with Germany or should step down and let the Bolsheviks rule. The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party had been making all the required preparations for an armed insurrection against the Kerensky Government. It formed the Military Revolutionary Committee under the leadership of Leon Trotsky. Kerensky's Government's attempts to suppress the military preparations of the Bolsheviks for an armed insurrection came to naught.

On October 24, the sailors of cruiser "aurora", anchored in the Neva opposite the Winter Palace, refused to obey the orders of the Government and instead put themselves at the disposal of the MRC. In the night of October 24, under the orders of Lenin and Trotsky, the Red Guards occupied railway stations, bridges, the State Bank, the telephone exchange, the central Post and telegraph Office, and other public buildings, without any opposition and bloodshed, because most of the were at the disposal of the insurgents. The city's electric power plant was occupied and power supply to government buildings was cut off. On October 24, Kerensky declared a state of emergency in the state. On October 25, the emergency meeting of the troops of the coalition cabinet was held into the Winter Palace. The Red Guards besieged the Winter Palace at six p.m. and issued an ultimatum to the government to surrender within half an hour, failing which the Winter Palace would be bombarded. The Bolsheviks waited till 9.00 p.m. Finally, when two bombshells hit the palace, all the ministers surrendered and Kerensky fled to USA. On October 26, all ministers were arrested in the Winter Palace and were marched to the fortress of Peter and Paul, where they were put to death. Thus, the October Revolution was successful without much bloodshed.

Check your progress

Q.1 Evaluate the role of Lenin in the Bolshevik Revolution

4.7.3 Establishment of the Soviet Government:

The second session of the all Russian Congress of Soviets was convened on October 25, 1917 at Smolny at 10.45 P.M. It was composed of 650 deputies, of whom 390 were Bolsheviks. All power was transferred to the Soviets. The Congress passed three important decrees. Namely, (1) to start immediate efforts for the termination of the War and to make peace. (2) Introducing radical land-reforms, which would nationalize all agricultural land and authorized the Russian peasantry to forcibly confiscate privately owned lands, and (3) setting up the council of People's Commissars, i.e. "Sovanarkom". Accordingly, the Congress elected a fifteen member

cabinet under the chairmanship of Lenin. In it, Trotsky became the Commissar for foreign affairs and Stalin became the Commissar for the National Minorities. The Congress also elected the Central Executive Committee consisting of 101 members. Moreover, there was the Politburo of the Bolshevik Party. Thus, came into existence the first Soviet Government in Russia under Proletarian Dictatorship.

Although in theory the Proletarian Dictatorship was established, in actual practice all the power was concentrated in the hands of few Bolshevik leaders. Although superficially the Bolsheviks created a show that the October Revolution is engaged as per the orders of the Petrograd Soviet, actually the Bolsheviks were using the soviet only as a shield and the Revolution was launched keeping in view the interests of the Bolshevik Party. Since the October Revolution was staged with the help of the Soviet and since the Soviet comprised of the representatives of various parties, many people were of the opinion that the new government should be coalition government. But the Bolsheviks did not want a coalition government. They wanted only a One Party Government of the Bolshevik Party and they wanted the Soviet to be a mere puppet in their hands.

4.8 EFFECTS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 1917 RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The 1917 Russian Revolution was an epoch making event. It radically transformed the human life not only in Russia but also all over the world. The Revolution had far reaching and long lasting effects both on Russia as well as on the world. It threw a powerful challenge to the existing norms of diplomacy, socio economic institutions and values in the Western world.

The main effects of the Revolution are as follows:

4.8.1 Practical Demonstration of the Marxian Philosophy:

Till 1917, Marxism was regarded only as a philosophy, ideology or theory. Nobody expected that it would be implemented into real life. But, the 1917 revolution showed that Marxism was not merely a philosophy, but it could be the way of living. For the first time in history, the Scientific Socialist ideology of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, as interpreted by Lenin, were applied to the Russian Government and socio-economic policies. A New Soviet man and society were sought to be created bidding good-bye to centuries old and anachronistic feudal social system.

4.8.2 A Powerful Challenge to the Western Culture:

The Bolsheviks repudiated the traditional framework as well as the traditional standards of internal and international policies. The Bolshevik Revolution had thrown out a powerful challenge to the various values and ideals of Western culture, the fundamental principles of trade and industry, the established systems of government, the social, economic, and political

institutions," and the methods of diplomacy. It offered an alternative to capitalism. It set up standards for a new way of living and thinking.

4.8.3 Great Progress:

The Revolution pulled Russia out of her backwardness and put her on the road to modernity and dynamic progress. It not only overthrew the outdated, autocratic and ruthless old Tsarist Regime, but it also liquidated the power of the clergy, nobility and the bourgeoisie. It also brought about great social, political and economic changes, and thereby provided the basic conditions for the emergence of Soviet Russia as a great power.

4.8.4 Workers of the World, 'Unite':

The 1917 revolution created a new awakening and sensation among the Industrial workers all over the world. "The Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains, but they have the world to win." The establishment of the Third Communist International (Comintern) further encouraged the labouring people all over the world to stand united against the capitalist class. The concept that the working classes had no fatherland or motherland and that the problems of depressed people all over the world were the same, resulted in extra-territorial loyalties all over the world. In order to keep away Communism from their countries, many capitalist governments awarded a number of concessions and brought legislations, which benefited the industrial workers. Thus, the Russian Revolution indirectly helped the betterment of workers all over the world. Establishment of the dignity of labour was an important achievement of the Revolution. Work became an essential requirement for every man, as there was no unearned income to live on. The idea spread by the Russian Revolution "He who does not work shall not eat" became widespread adding a new dignity to labour.

4.8.5 Forced the Imperialist Countries to part with Colonies:

The Revolution has virtually shaken and awakened the colonial peoples from ignorance, and injected into their blood a new consciousness of their political rights and the principle of self determination of the people. The rapid spread of Communism created great fear in the minds of the imperialist powers in the Western countries. They suspected that Communism might cover the whole world. So, they granted independence to countries like India, Indonesia and Indochina. According to Marx, a nation, which enslaves another nation, can never be free. Along with political independence, they demanded social and economic justice.

4.8.6. International Significance:

Even the countries, which had capitalist systems of economy, also began to recognize that for democracy to be real, political equality is not enough without social and economic equality. The idea of economic planning by the state to improve the conditions of the people was accepted. The growing popularity of socialism also helped to mitigate discriminations based on race, colour and sex. The spread of socialist ideas also helped in

promoting internationalism. The nations, at least in theory, began to accept the idea that their relations with other nations should go farther than merely promoting their narrow self-interest. Many problems, which were considered national, began to be looked upon as concerns of the world as a whole.

4.8.7 Other Countries inspired by the Communist Revolution:

The Third Communist International (Comintern) was established in 1919 to spread Communism throughout the world. A number of countries from Asia, Europe and Latin America, which were weak, backward, exploited or ruled by autocratic rulers, were greatly impressed by the success of the Communist Revolution. Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland and East Germany in Europe, Mongolia, North Korea, China and Vietnam in Asia, and Cuba, Chile and Peru in Latin America were inspired by the Communist Revolution in Russia. In several other countries, Communist parties were established and were affiliated to the Comintern. The Third Communist International was the forum for promoting revolutions on an international scale. Common questions of interest were discussed and common policies were suggested from this forum 'The World' in Transition' (1914- 1919).

4.8.8 Economic Impact:

The 1917 Russian Revolution was not merely a political revolution, but it was mainly a socio-economic revolution. It brought about fundamental changes in the social and economic life of Russia. The weak, backward, agrarian, feudal Russian economy was transformed into an advanced, self-sufficient industrialized economy. Agricultural and industrial production went up, foreign trade flourished, standard of living improved, labour-productivity increased, the gross national income increased, unemployment was practically eliminated, class distinctions were wiped out and society became more homogeneous. Stalin's Economic Planning provided a model of development not only for the underdeveloped and developing countries but also for the advanced countries.

4.8.9 Russia emerged as a Super Power:

Till 1917, Russia was a weak and backward country. But the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, transformed a poverty-stricken, feudal Tsarist Russia into a super World Power under the brilliant leadership and guidance of Lenin and Stalin. Russia, which had been defeated in the Crimean war, Russo-Japanese war and the First World War, emerged victorious in the Second World War. Russia played the most vital role in defeating Germany and liberating the East European countries from the clutches of Nazi Germany. After the Second World War, the Victorious Russia emerged as a Super Power just next to the USA.

4.8.10 Beginning of the Cold War:

With the rise and success of Communism in Russia and its spread in other countries, a conflict started between Capitalism and Communism. This

ideological conflict between Communism and Capitalism is called the Cold War. Both Communist Russia on one side, and Capitalist England and America on the other side were trying their best to spread their respective ideology and trying to win over maximum countries to their side.

4.8.11 Totalitarian Dictatorship:

Although, the Bolsheviks claimed to invest power into the hands of the proletariat, actually the power was monopolized by few leaders of the Bolshevik Party such as Vladimir Lenin, Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky. They acted as Iron Dictators of Russia. No political party except the Bolshevik party was allowed to function in the country. All opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Soviet Russia became a One Party Totalitarian State.

4.8.12 Suppression of Religious Freedom:

The Russians were religious minded people and were the followers of the Great Eastern Church. But Marxism preached, "Religion is opium". Therefore, the Bolsheviks ruthlessly suppressed all religious freedom.

4.8.13 An Endless Revolution:

The Russian Revolutionaries argued that the Glorious Revolution in England of 1688, the American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 continued to have their effect only for a particular period of time. But, the Bolshevik revolution is a continuous everlasting process, as long as exploitation, backwardness, torture, capitalism and autocracy prevail in any part of the world.

Check your progress

Q.1 Assess the Effects and significance of the 1917 Russian Revolution.

4.9 SUMMARY

Before World War I, Russia was not only one of the largest countries in the world, but also one of the so-called Powers. Nearly 4/5 of the population consisted of peasants and the people were economically and culturally backward. Economic conditions were unsatisfactory, because industrial development was slow and in agriculture farmers still used traditional methods of cultivation. Taxes were very high. The military had become weak due to corruption and inefficient management.

Politically, Russia had a monarchical system of government and was ruled by the Romanov Tsars. They were despotic rulers and the people had no rights. After the defeat of Russia by the Japanese in 1904. The Russians revolted but they were ruthlessly put down. Though the Duma was summoned, in practice it had no power, the conditions prevailing in the

country inspired revolutionary movements of which the Social Democrats and the Social Revolutionaries were important.

The Tsar and his advisors, the bureaucracy, the military officers and the feudal elements were opposed to reforms. So, when the country involved itself in World War I, the weak autocracy collapsed. Two Revolutions broke out-the February Revolution and October Revolution of 1917,

The February revolution saw the Mensheviks the leader of the provisional Government. The October revolution saw the Bolsheviks in power with Lenin as the leader. The Bolsheviks introduced a Socialism system of government. Lenin dealt with the Civil War effectively and also withdrew from the first World War. However, his initial economic reforms were not so successful. He then introduced the New Economic Policy with a partial return to capitalism.

The Revolution had a deep impact on many countries of the world. It challenged the traditional economic, political and social systems.

4.10 QUESTIONS

1. Examine the causes of the February Revolution, 1917 in Russia.
2. Analyse the social, political and economic causes of the Russian Revolution.
3. Discuss the working of the Provisional Government. Why did it fail?
4. Describe the role played by Lenin in the Bolshevik Revolution, 1917.
5. Assess the significance and results of the Russian Revolution.
6. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Economic causes of the Russian Revolution.
 - (b) Political causes of the Russian Revolution
 - (c) Social causes of the Revolution
 - (d) Revolution of 1905
 - (e) Russia and World War I
 - (g) The Provisional Government.

4.11 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Beik, Paul H. & Lavouvre, L., Modern Europe: A History Since 1815, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1959.
- Bennis Lee, Europe 1870-1914, Appleton tan Century Grafts, New York, 1965.
- Breace, Richard M, The Making of the Modern World, New York, Reinehart & Co., Inc. 1956.
- Comwell R. D., World History In the Twentieth Century, Longman Group Ltd., London, 1977.
- Croce Bendetto , History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century, Unwin University Books, England, 1965.
- Freetorn Richard, A short history of Modern Russia.
- Garraty, J., and Gay, Peter(Ed.), A History of the World, New York, Harper & Row, 1972.
- Gressy Eduard, An Outline of Industrial History, Macmillan & Co. London, 1929.
- Gupta M. G. , International Relations Since 1919.
- Ketelbey C.D.M., A Brief History of Modern Times from 1789, Oxford University Press, Calcutta, 1984.
- Lipson E., Europe in the 19 and 20 Centuries, English Language Book Society, London, 1960.
- Masaryk T. G. , The Spirit of Russia, Vol. I.
- Palmer, R.R., and Colton, Joel, A History of the Modern World, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.
- Synder Louis L. , The world in the Twentieth Century.
- Weech W. N.- History of the World, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
- Westwood, J.N, Endurance and Endeavour: Russian History, 1812-1980, London, Oxford University Press, 1982.

EARLY COLONIAL EXPANSIONS – EXPLORATIONS AND MOTIVES

Unit Structure

5.0 Objectives

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Background

5.3 Early Colonial Expansions

5.4 Colonial Explorations

5.5 Summary

5.6 Questions

5.7 Additional Readings

5.0 OBJECTIVES

- To introduce students to Colonialism.
- To understand Imperialism.
- To orient learners about the early Colonial Expansions.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Colonialism is a practice of domination, which involves the suppression by one people to another. One of the difficulties in defining colonialism is that it is hard to distinguish it from imperialism. Frequently the two concepts are treated as synonymous. Like colonialism, imperialism also involves political and economic control over a dependent territory. The etymology of the two terms, however, provides some clues about how they differ. The term colony comes from the Latin word *colonus*, meaning farmer. This root reminds us that the practice of colonialism usually involved the transfer of population to a new territory, where the arrivals lived as permanent settlers while maintaining political allegiance to their country of origin. Imperialism, on the other hand, comes from the Latin term *imperium*, meaning to command. Thus, the term imperialism draws attention to the way that one country exercises power over another, whether through settlement, sovereignty, or indirect mechanisms of control.

Colonialism is not a modern phenomenon. World history is full of examples of one society gradually expanding by incorporating adjacent

territory and settling its people on newly conquered territory. The ancient Greeks set up colonies as did the Romans, the Moors, and the Ottomans, to name just a few of the most famous examples. Colonialism, then, is not restricted to a specific time or place. Nevertheless, in the sixteenth century, colonialism changed decisively because of technological developments in navigation that began to connect more remote parts of the world. Fast sailing ships made it possible to reach distant ports and to sustain close ties between the center and colonies. Thus, the modern European colonial project emerged when it became possible to move large numbers of people across the ocean and to maintain political sovereignty in spite of geographical dispersion. This entry uses the term colonialism to describe the process of European settlement and political control over the rest of the world, including the Americas, Australia, and parts of Africa and Asia.

The difficulty of defining colonialism stems from the fact that the term is often used as a synonym for imperialism. Both colonialism and imperialism were forms of conquest that were expected to benefit Europe economically and strategically. The term colonialism is frequently used to describe the settlement of North America, Australia, New Zealand, Algeria, and Brazil, places that were controlled by a large population of permanent European residents. The term imperialism often describes cases in which a foreign government administers a territory without significant settlement; typical examples include the scramble for Africa in the late nineteenth century and the American domination of the Philippines and Puerto Rico. The distinction between the two, however, is not entirely consistent in the literature. Some scholars distinguish between colonies for settlement and colonies for economic exploitation. Others use the term colonialism to describe dependencies that are directly governed by a foreign nation and contrast this with imperialism, which involves indirect forms of domination.

The confusion about the meaning of the term imperialism reflects the way that the concept has changed over time. Although the English word imperialism was not commonly used before the nineteenth century, Elizabethans already described the United Kingdom as “the British Empire.” As Britain began to acquire overseas dependencies, the concept of empire was employed more frequently. Imperialism was understood as a system of military domination and sovereignty over territories. The day-to-day work of government might be exercised indirectly through local assemblies or indigenous rulers who paid tribute, but sovereignty rested with the British. The shift away from this traditional understanding of empire was influenced by the Leninist analysis of imperialism as a system oriented towards economic exploitation. According to Lenin, imperialism was the necessary and inevitable result of the logic of accumulation in late capitalism. Thus, for Lenin and subsequent Marxists, imperialism described a historical stage of capitalism rather than a trans-historical practice of political and military domination. The lasting impact of the Marxist approach is apparent in contemporary debates about American

imperialism, a term which usually means American economic hegemony, regardless of whether such power is exercised directly or indirectly.

Check your progress:

1. Define Colonialism.
2. Explain Imperialism.

5.2 BACKGROUND

Colonialism is a political-economic phenomenon whereby various European nations explored, conquered, settled, and exploited large areas of the world. The age of modern colonialism began about 1500, following the European discoveries of a sea route around Africa's southern coast (1488) and of America (1492). With these events sea power shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic and to the emerging nation-states of Portugal, Spain, the Dutch Republic, France, and England. By discovery, conquest, and settlement, these nations expanded and colonized throughout the world, spreading European institutions and culture.

The historical phenomenon of colonization is one that stretches around the globe and across time. Ancient and medieval colonialism was practiced by the Phoenicians, the Greeks, the Turks, the Arabs and the crusaders, among other non-white people. Colonialism in the modern sense began with the "Age of Discovery", led by Portuguese, and then by the Spanish exploration of the Americas, the coasts of Africa, Southwest Asia which is also known as the Middle East, India, and East Asia. The Portuguese and Spanish empires were the first global empires because they were the first to stretch across different continents, covering vast territories around the globe. Between 1580 and 1640, the two empires were both ruled by the Spanish monarchs in personal union. During the late 16th and 17th centuries, England, France and the Dutch Republic also established their own overseas empires, in direct competition with one another.

The end of the 18th and mid 19th century saw the first era of decolonization, when most of the European colonies in the Americas, notably those of Spain, New France and the 13 colonies, gained their independence from their metropole. The Kingdom of Great Britain (uniting Scotland and England), France, Portugal, and the Dutch turned their attention to the Old World, particularly South Africa, India and South East Asia, where coastal enclaves had already been established. The second industrial revolution, in the 19th century, led to what has been termed the era of New Imperialism, when the pace of colonization rapidly accelerated, the height of which was the Scramble for Africa, in which Belgium, Germany and Italy were also participants.

There were deadly battles between colonizing states and revolutions from colonized areas shaping areas of control and establishing independent nations. During the 20th century, the colonies of the defeated central powers in World War I were distributed amongst the victors as mandates,

but it was not until the end of World War II that the second phase of decolonization began in earnest.

Some commentators identify three waves of European colonialism. The three main countries in the first wave of European colonialism were Portugal, Spain and the early Ottoman Empire. The Portuguese started the long age of European colonisation with the conquest of Ceuta, Morocco in 1415, and the conquest and discovery of other African territories and islands, this would also start the movement known as the Age of Discoveries. The Ottomans conquered South Eastern Europe, the Middle East and much of Northern and Eastern Africa between 1359 and 1653 - with the latter territories subjected to colonial occupation, rather than traditional territorial conquest. The Spanish and Portuguese launched the colonisation of the Americas, basing their territorial claims on the Treaty of Tordesillas of 1494. This treaty demarcated the respective spheres of influence of Spain and Portugal.

The expansion achieved by Spain and Portugal caught the attention of Britain, France and the Netherlands. The arrival of these three powers into the Caribbean and North America spread European colonialism in these regions.

The second wave of European colonialism commenced with Britain's involvement in Asia in support of the British East India Company; other countries such as France, Portugal and Netherlands also had involvement in European expansion in Asia.

The third wave consisted of the scramble for Africa regulated by the terms of the Berlin Conference of 1884–1885. The conference effectively divided Africa among the European powers. Vast regions of Africa came under the sway of Britain, France, Germany, Portugal, Belgium, Italy and Spain.

Gilmartin argues that these three waves of colonialism were linked to capitalism. The first wave of European expansion involved exploring the world to find new revenue and perpetuating European feudalism. The second wave focused on developing the mercantile capitalism system and the manufacturing industry in Europe. The last wave of European colonialism established all capitalistic activities by providing new markets and raw materials.

Check your progress:

1. Describe the historical phenomenon of colonialism.
2. Describe the three waves of European colonialism.

5.3 EARLY COLONIAL EXPANSIONS

European colonization of both Eastern and Western Hemispheres has its roots in Portuguese exploration. There were financial and religious

motives behind this exploration. By finding the source of the lucrative spice trade, the Portuguese could reap its profits for themselves. They would also be able to probe the existence of the fabled Christian kingdom of Prester John, with an eye to encircling the Islamic Ottoman Empire, itself gaining territories and colonies in Eastern Europe. The first foothold outside of Europe was gained with the conquest of Ceuta in 1415. During the 15th century, Portuguese sailors discovered the Atlantic islands of Madeira, Azores, and Cape Verde, which were duly populated, and pressed progressively further along the west African coast until Bartolomeu Dias demonstrated it was possible to sail around Africa by rounding the Cape of Good Hope in 1488, paving the way for Vasco da Gama to reach India in 1498.

Portuguese successes led to Spanish financing of a mission by Christopher Columbus in 1492 to explore an alternative route to Asia, by sailing west. When Columbus eventually made landfall in the Caribbean Antilles he believed he had reached the coast of India, and that the people he encountered there were Indians with red skin. This is why Native Americans have been called Indians or Red-Indians. In truth, Columbus had arrived on a continent that was new to the Europeans and the Americans. After Columbus' first trips, competing Spanish and Portuguese claims to new territories and sea routes were solved with the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, which divided the world outside of Europe in two areas of trade and exploration, between the Iberian kingdoms of Castile and Portugal along a north-south meridian, 370 leagues west of Cape Verde. According to this international agreement, the larger part of the Americas and the Pacific Ocean were open to Spanish exploration and colonization, while Africa, the Indian Ocean and most of Asia were assigned to Portugal.

The boundaries specified by the Treaty of Tordesillas were put to the test in 1521 when Ferdinand Magellan and his Spanish sailors (among other Europeans), sailing for the Spanish Crown became the first European to cross the Pacific Ocean, reaching Guam and the Philippines, parts of which the Portuguese had already explored, sailing from the Indian Ocean. The two by now global empires, which had set out from opposing directions, had finally met on the other side of the world. The conflicts that arose between both powers were finally solved with the Treaty of Zaragoza in 1529, which defined the areas of Spanish and Portuguese influence in Asia, establishing the anti meridian, or line of demarcation on the other side of the world.

During the 16th century the Portuguese continued to press both eastwards and westwards into the Oceans. Towards Asia they made the first direct contact between Europeans and the peoples inhabiting present day countries such as Mozambique, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Indonesia, East Timor (1512), China, and finally Japan. In the opposite direction, the Portuguese colonized the huge territory that eventually became Brazil, and the Spanish conquistadores established the vast Viceroyalties of New Spain and Peru, and later of Río de la Plata (Argentina) and New Granada (Colombia). In Asia, the Portuguese

encountered ancient and well populated societies, and established a seaborne empire consisting of armed coastal trading posts along their trade routes (such as Goa, Malacca and Macau), so they had relatively little cultural impact on the societies they engaged. In the Western Hemisphere, the European colonization involved the emigration of large numbers of settlers, soldiers and administrators intent on owning land and exploiting the apparently primitive (as perceived by Old World standards) indigenous peoples of the Americas. The result was that the colonization of the New World was catastrophic: native peoples were no match for European technology, ruthlessness, or their diseases which decimated the indigenous population.

Spanish treatment of the indigenous populations caused a fierce debate, the Valladolid Controversy, over whether Indians possessed souls and if so, whether they were entitled to the basic rights of mankind. Bartolomé de Las Casas, author of *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*, championed the cause of the native peoples, and was opposed by Sepúlveda, who claimed Amerindians were "natural slaves".

The Roman Catholic Church played a large role in Spanish and Portuguese overseas activities. The Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans, notably Francis Xavier in Asia and Junípero Serra in North America, were particularly active in this endeavour. Many buildings erected by the Jesuits still stand, such as the Cathedral of Saint Paul in Macau and the Santísima Trinidad de Paraná in Paraguay, the latter an example of the Jesuit Reductions. The Dominican and Franciscan buildings of California's missions and New Mexico's missions stand restored, such as Mission Santa Barbara in Santa Barbara, California and San Francisco de Asis Mission Church in Ranchos de Taos, New Mexico.

As characteristically happens in any colonialism, European or not, previous or subsequent, both Spain and Portugal profited handsomely from their newfound overseas colonies: the Spanish from gold and silver from mines such as Potosí and Zacatecas in New Spain, the Portuguese from the huge markups they enjoyed as trade intermediaries, particularly during the Nanban Japan trade period. The influx of precious metals to the Spanish monarchy's coffers allowed it to finance costly religious wars in Europe which ultimately proved its economic undoing: the supply of metals was not infinite and the large inflow caused inflation and debt, and subsequently affected the rest of Europe.

Check your progress:

1. Describe the early colonial expansions.
2. Examine the countries which benefited from early colonial expansion.

5.4 COLONIAL EXPLORATIONS

In the 100 years from the mid-15th to the mid-16th century, a combination of circumstances stimulated men to seek new routes, and it was new routes

rather than new lands that filled the minds of kings and commoners, scholars and seamen. First, toward the end of the 14th century, the vast empire of the Mongols was breaking up; thus, Western merchants could no longer be assured of safe-conduct along the land routes. Second, the Ottoman Turks and the Venetians controlled commercial access to the Mediterranean and the ancient sea routes from the East. Third, new nations on the Atlantic shores of Europe were now ready to seek overseas trade and adventure.

Henry the Navigator, prince of Portugal, initiated the first great enterprise of the Age of Discovery—the search for a sea route east by south to Cathay. His motives were mixed. He was curious about the world; he was interested in new navigational aids and better ship design and was eager to test them; he was also a Crusader and hoped that, by sailing south and then east along the coast of Africa, Arab power in North Africa could be attacked from the back. The promotion of profitable trade was yet another motive; he aimed to divert the Guinea trade in gold and ivory via the sea route to Portugal.

Expedition after expedition was sent forth throughout the 15th century to explore the coast of Africa. In 1445 the Portuguese navigator Dinís Dias reached the mouth of the Sénégal. Once the desert coast had been passed, the sailors pushed on: in 1455 and 1456 Alvise Ca' da Mosto made voyages to Gambia and the Cape Verde Islands. Prince Henry died in 1460 after a career that had brought the colonization of the Madeira Islands and the Azores and the traversal of the African coast to Sierra Leone. Henry's captain, Diogo Cão, discovered the Congo River in 1482. All seemed promising; trade was good with the riverine peoples, and the coast was trending hopefully eastward. Then the disappointing fact was realized: the head of a great gulf had been reached, and, beyond, the coast seemed to stretch endlessly southward. Yet, when Columbus sought backing for his plan to sail westward across the Atlantic to the Indies, he was refused—"seeing that King John II [of Portugal] ordered the coast of Africa to be explored with the intention of going by that route to India."

King John II sought to establish two routes: the first, a land and sea route through Egypt and Ethiopia to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean and, the second, a sea route around the southern shores of Africa. In 1487, a Portuguese emissary, Pêro da Covilhã, successfully followed the first route. In the same year, another Portuguese navigator, Bartolomeu Dias, found encouraging evidence. In 1487 he rounded the Cape of Storms in such bad weather that he did not see it. Before turning back, he reached the Great Fish River, in what is now South Africa. On the return voyage, he sighted the Cape and set up a pillar upon it to mark its discovery.

The seaway was now open, but eight years were to elapse before it was exploited. In 1492 Columbus had apparently reached the East by a much easier route. By the end of the decade, however, doubts of the validity of Columbus's claim were current. Interest was therefore renewed in establishing the sea route south by east to the known riches of India. In 1497 a Portuguese captain, Vasco da Gama, sailed in command of a fleet

under instructions to reach Calicut (Kozhikode), on India's west coast. This he did after a magnificent voyage around the Cape of Storms (which he renamed the Cape of Good Hope) and along the unknown coast of East Africa. Yet another Portuguese fleet set out in 1500, this one being under the command of Pedro Álvares Cabral; on the advice of da Gama, Cabral steered southwestward to avoid the calms of the Guinea coast; thus, en route for Calicut, Brazil was discovered. Soon trading depots, known as factories, were built along the African coast, at the strategic entrances to the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, and along the shores of the Indian peninsula. In 1511 the Portuguese established a base at Malacca (now Melaka, Malaysia), commanding the straits into the China Sea; in 1511 and 1512, the Moluccas, or Spice Islands, and Java were reached; in 1557 the trading port of Macau was founded at the mouth of the Canton River. Europe had arrived in the East. It was in the end the Portuguese, not the Turks, who destroyed the commercial supremacy of the Italian cities, which had been based on a monopoly of Europe's trade with the East by land. But Portugal was soon overextended; it was therefore the Dutch, the English, and the French who in the long run reaped the harvest of Portuguese enterprise.

Some idea of the knowledge that these trading explorers brought to the common store may be gained by a study of contemporary maps. The map of the German Henricus Martellus, published in 1492, shows the shores of North Africa and of the Gulf of Guinea more or less correctly and was probably taken from numerous seamen's charts. The delineation of the west coast of southern Africa from the Guinea Gulf to the Cape suggests a knowledge of the charts of the expedition of Bartolomeu Dias. The coastlines of the Indian Ocean are largely Ptolemaic with two exceptions: first, the Indian Ocean is no longer landlocked; and second, the Malay Peninsula is shown twice—once according to Ptolemy and once again, presumably, according to Marco Polo. The Contarini map of 1506 shows further advances; the shape of Africa is generally accurate, and there is new knowledge of the Indian Ocean, although it is curiously treated. Peninsular India (on which Cananor and Calicut are named) is shown; although too small, it is, however, recognizable. There is even an indication to the east of it of the Bay of Bengal, with a great river running into it. Eastward of this is Ptolemy's India, with the huge island of Taprobane—a muddled representation of the Indian peninsula and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka). East again, as on the map of Henricus Martellus, the Malay Peninsula appears twice. Ptolemy's bonds were hard to break.

It is not known when the idea originated of sailing westward in order to reach Cathay. Many sailors set forth searching for islands in the west; and it was a common place among scientists that the east could be reached by sailing west, but to believe this a practicable voyage was an entirely different matter. Christopher Columbus, a Genoese who had settled in Lisbon about 1476, argued that Cipango lay a mere 2,500 nautical miles west of the Canary Islands in the eastern Atlantic. He took 45 instead of 60 nautical miles as the value of a degree; he accepted Ptolemy's exaggerated west-east extent of Asia and then added to it the lands

described by Marco Polo, thus reducing the true distance between the Canaries and Cipango by about one-third. He could not convince the Portuguese scientists nor the merchants of Lisbon that his idea was worth backing; but eventually he obtained the support of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain. The sovereigns probably argued that the cost of equipping the expedition would not be very great; the loss, if it failed, could be borne; the gain, should it succeed, was incalculable—indeed, it might divert to Spain all the wealth of Asia.

On August 3, 1492, Columbus sailed from Palos, Spain, with three small ships manned by Spaniards. From the Canaries he sailed westward, for, on the evidence of the globes and maps in which he had faith, Japan was on the same latitude. If Japan should be missed, Columbus thought that the route adopted would land him, only a little further on, on the coast of China itself. Fair winds favoured him, the sea was calm, and, on October 12, landfall was made on the Bahama island of Guanahani, which he renamed San Salvador (also called Watling Island, though Samana Cay and other islands have been identified as Guanahani). With the help of the local Indians, the ships reached Cuba and then Haiti. Although there was no sign of the wealth of the lands of Kublai Khan, Columbus nevertheless seemed convinced that he had reached China, since, according to his reckoning, he was beyond Japan. A second voyage in 1493 and 1494, searching fruitlessly for the court of Kublai Khan, further explored the islands of “the Indies.” Doubts seem to have arisen among the would-be colonists as to the identity of the islands since Columbus demanded that all take an oath that Cuba was the southeast promontory of Asia—the Golden Chersonese. On his third voyage, in 1498, Columbus sighted Trinidad, entered the Gulf of Paria, on the coast of what is now Venezuela, and annexed for Spain “a very great continent...until today unknown.” On a fourth voyage, from 1502 to 1504, he explored the coast of Central America from Honduras to Darien on the Isthmus of Panama, seeking a navigable passage to the west. What passage he had in mind is obscure; if at this point he still believed he had reached Asia, it is conceivable that he sought a way through Ptolemy’s Golden Chersonese into the Indian Ocean.

Columbus’s tenacity, courage, and skill in navigation make him stand out among the few explorers who have changed substantially ideas about the world. At the time, however, his efforts must have seemed ill-rewarded: he found no emperor’s court rich in spices, silks, gold, or precious stones but had to contend with mutinous sailors, dissident colonists, and disappointed sovereigns. He died at Valladolid in 1506. Did he believe to the end that he indeed had reached Cathay, or did he, however dimly, perceive that he had found a New World?

Whatever Columbus thought, it was clear to others that there was much to be investigated, and probably much to be gained, by exploration westward. Not only in Lisbon and Cádiz but also in other Atlantic ports, groups of men congregated in hopes of joining in the search. In England, Bristol, with its western outlook and Icelandic trade, was the port best placed to nurture adventurous seamen. In the latter part of the 15th

century, John Cabot, with his wife and three sons, came to Bristol from Genoa or Venice. His project to sail west gained support, and with one small ship, the *Matthew*, he set out in May 1497, taking a course due west from Dursey Head, Ireland. His landfall on the other side of the ocean was probably on the northern peninsula of what is now known as Newfoundland. From there, Cabot explored southward, perhaps encouraged to do so, even if seeking a westward passage, by ice in the Strait of Belle Isle. Little is known of John Cabot's first voyage, and almost nothing of his second, in 1498, from which he did not return, but his voyages in high latitudes represented almost as great a navigational feat as those of Columbus.

The coasts between the landfalls of Columbus and of John Cabot were charted in the first quarter of the 16th century by Italian, French, Spanish, and Portuguese sailors. Sebastian Cabot, son of John, gained a great reputation as a navigator and promoter of Atlantic exploration, but whether this was based primarily on his own experience or on the achievements of his father is uncertain. In 1499 Amerigo Vespucci, an Italian merchant living in Sevilla (Seville), together with the Spanish explorer Alonso de Ojeda, explored the north coast of South America from Suriname to the Golfo de Venezuela. His lively and embellished description of these lands became popular, and Waldseemüller, on his map of 1507, gave the name America to the southern part of the continent.

The 1506 map of Contarini represented a brave attempt to collate the mass of new information, true and false, that accrued from these western voyages. The land explored by Columbus on his third voyage and by Vespucci and de Ojeda in 1499 is shown at the bottom left of the map as a promontory of a great northern bulge of a continent extending far to the south. The northeast coast of Asia at the top left is pulled out into a great peninsula on which is shown a big river and some mountains representing Contarini's concept of Newfoundland and the lands found by the Cabots and others. In the wide sea that separates these northern lands from South America, the West Indies are shown. Halfway between the Indies and the coast of Asia, Japan is drawn. A legend placed between Japan and China reveals the state of opinion among at least some contemporary geographers; it presumably refers to the fourth voyage of Columbus in 1502 and may be an addition to the map. It runs:

Christopher Columbus, Viceroy of Spain, sailing westwards, reached the Spanish islands after many hardships and dangers. Weighing anchor thence he sailed to the province called Ciambra [a province which then adjoined Cochinchina].

Others did not agree with Contarini's interpretation. To more and more people it was becoming plain that a New World had been found, although for a long time there was little inclination to explore it but instead a great determination to find a way past it to the wealth of Asia. The voyage of the Portuguese navigator Ferdinand Magellan, from 1519 to 1521, dispelled two long-cherished illusions: first, that there was an easy way

through the barrier and, second, that, once the barrier was passed, Cathay was near at hand.

Ferdinand Magellan had served in the East Indies as a young man. Familiar with the long sea route to Asia eastward from Europe via the Cape of Good Hope, he was convinced that there must be an easier sea route westward. His plan was in accord with Spanish hopes; five Spanish ships were fitted out in Sevilla, and in August 1519 they sailed under his command first to the Cape Verde Islands and thence to Brazil. Standing offshore, they then sailed southward along the east coast of South America; the estuary of the Río de la Plata was explored in the vain hope that it might prove to be a strait leading to the Pacific. Magellan's ships then sailed south along the coast of Patagonia. The Gulf of St. George, and doubtless many more small embayments, raised hopes that a strait had been found, only to dash them; at last at Port Julian, at 49°15' S, winter quarters were established. In September 1520 a southward course was set once more, until, finally, on October 21, Magellan found a strait leading westward. It proved to be an extremely difficult one: it was long, deep, tortuous, rock-walled, and bedevilled by icy squalls and dense fogs. It was a miracle that three of the five ships got through its 325-mile (525-km) length. After 38 days, they sailed out into the open ocean. Once away from land, the ocean seemed calm enough; Magellan consequently named it the Pacific. The Pacific, however, proved to be of vast extent, and for 14 weeks the little ships sailed on a northwesterly course without encountering land. Short of food and water, the sailors ate sawdust mixed with ship's biscuits and chewed the leather parts of their gear to keep themselves alive. At last, on March 6, 1521, exhausted and scurvy-ridden, they landed at the island of Guam. Ten days later they reached the Philippines, where Magellan was killed in a local quarrel. The survivors, in two ships, sailed on to the Moluccas; thus, sailing westward, they arrived at last in territory already known to the Portuguese sailing eastward. One ship attempted, but failed, to return across the Pacific. The remaining ship, the *Vittoria*, laden with spices, under the command of the Spanish navigator Juan Sebastián del Cano, sailed alone across the Indian Ocean, rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and arrived at Sevilla on September 9, 1522, with a crew of four Indians and only 17 survivors of the 239 Europeans who had set sail with the expedition three years earlier. Cano, not having allowed for the fact that his circumnavigation had caused him to lose a day, was greatly puzzled to find that his carefully kept log was one day out; he was, however, delighted to discover that the cargo that he had brought back more than paid for the expenses of the voyage.

It is fitting to consider this first circumnavigation as marking the close of the Age of Discovery. Magellan and his men had demonstrated that Columbus had discovered a New World and not the route to China and that Columbus's "Indies"—the West Indies—were separated from the East Indies by a vast ocean. Not all the major problems of world geography were, however, now solved. Two great questions still remained unanswered. Were there "northern passages" between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans more easily navigable than the dangerous Strait of Magellan to the south? Was there a great landmass somewhere in the

vastness of the southern oceans—a Terra Australis (“southern land”) that would balance the northern continents?

The centuries that have elapsed since the Age of Discovery have seen the end of dreams of easy routes to the East by the north, the discovery of Australasia and Antarctica in place of Terra Australis Incognita, and the identification of the major features of the continental interiors.

While, as in earlier centuries, traders and missionaries often proved themselves also to be intrepid explorers, in this period of geographical discovery the seeker after knowledge for its own sake played a greater part than ever before.

The concept of a Northeast Passage was at first favoured by the English: it was thought that, although its entry was in high latitudes, it “turning itself, trendeth towards the southeast...and stretcheth directly to Cathay.” It was also argued that the cold lands bordering this route would provide a much needed market for English cloth. In 1553 a trading company, later known as the Muscovy Company, was formed with Sebastian Cabot as its governor. Under its auspices numerous expeditions were sent out. In 1553 an expedition set sail under the command of Sir Hugh Willoughby; Willoughby’s ship was lost, but the exploration continued under the leadership of its pilot general, Richard Chancellor. Chancellor and his men wintered in the White Sea, and next spring “after much adoe at last came to Mosco.” Between 1557 and 1560, another English voyager, Anthony Jenkinson, following up this opening, traveled from the White Sea to Moscow, then to the Caspian, and so on to Bukhara, thus reaching the old east–west trade routes by a new way. Soon, attempts to find a passage to Cathay were replaced by efforts to divert the trade of the ancient silk routes from their traditional outlets on the Black Sea to new northern outlets on the White Sea.

The Dutch next took up the search for the passage. The Dutch navigator William Barents made three expeditions between 1594 and 1597 (when he died in Novaya Zemlya, modern Russia). The English navigator Henry Hudson, in the employ of the Dutch, discovered between 1605 and 1607 that ice blocked the way both east and west of Svalbard (Spitsbergen). Between 1725 and 1729 and from 1734 to 1743, a series of expeditions inspired by the Danish-Russian explorer Vitus Bering attempted the passage from the eastern end, but it was not until 1878–79 that Baron Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld, the Finnish-Swedish scientist and explorer, sailed through it.

The Northwest Passage, on the other hand, also had its strong supporters. In 1576 Humphrey Gilbert, the English soldier and navigator, argued that “Mangia [South China], Quinzay [Hangzhou] and the Moluccas are nearer to us by the North West than by the North East,” while John Dee in 1577 set out the view that the Strait of Anian, separating America from Asia, led southwest “along the backside of Newfoundland.” In 1534 Jacques Cartier, the French navigator, explored the St. Lawrence estuary. In 1576 the English explorer Sir Martin Frobisher found the bay named after him.

Between 1585 and 1587, the English navigator John Davis explored Cumberland Sound and the western shore of Greenland to 73° N; although he met “a mighty block of ice,” he reported that “the passage is most probable and the execution easy.” In 1610 Henry Hudson sailed through Hudson Strait to Hudson Bay, confident, before he was set adrift by a mutinous crew, that success was at hand. Between 1612 and 1615, three English voyagers—Robert Bylot, Sir Thomas Button, and William Baffin—thoroughly explored the bay, returning convinced that there was no strait out of it leading westward. As in the quest for a Northeast Passage, interest turned from the search for a route leading to the riches of the East to the exploitation of local resources. Englishmen of the Hudson’s Bay Company, founded in 1670 to trade in furs, explored the wide hinterlands of the St. Lawrence estuary and Hudson Bay. Further search for the passage itself did not take place until the 19th century: expeditions led by Sir William Parry (1819–25) and Sir John Franklin (1819–45), as well as more than 40 expeditions sent out to search for Franklin and his party, failed to find the passage. It was left to the Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen to be the first to sail through the passage, which he did in 1903–05.

By the end of the 16th century, Portugal in the East held only the ports of Goa and Diu, in India, and Macau, in China. The English dominated the trade of India, and the Dutch that of the East Indies. It was the Dutch, trading on the fringes of the known world, who were the explorers. Victualing their ships at the Cape, they soon learned that, by sailing east for some 3,000 miles (5,000 km) before turning north, they would encounter favourable winds in setting a course toward the Spice Islands (now the Moluccas). Before long, reports were received of landfalls made on an unknown coast; as early as 1618, a Dutch skipper suggested that “this land is a fit point to be made by ships...in order to get a fixed course for Java.” Thereafter, the west coast of Australia was gradually charted: it was identified by some as the coast of the great southern continent shown on Mercator’s map and, by others, as the continent of Loach or Beach mentioned by Marco Polo, interpreted as lying to the south of Malacca (Melaka); Polo, however, was probably describing the Malay Peninsula.

In 1642 a farsighted governor general of the Dutch East India Company, Anthony van Diemen, sent out the Dutch navigator Abel Tasman for the immediate purpose of making an exploratory voyage, but with the ultimate aim of developing trade. Sailing first south then east from Mauritius, Tasman landed on the coast of Tasmania, after which he coasted round the island to the south and, sailing east, discovered the South Island of New Zealand; “We trust that this is the mainland coast of the unknown South land,” he wrote. He sailed north without finding Cook Strait, and, making a sweeping arc on his voyage back to the Dutch port of Batavia (now Jakarta, Indonesia), he discovered the Tonga and the Fiji Islands. In 1644, on a second voyage, he traced the north coast of Australia from Cape York (which he thought to be a part of New Guinea) to the North West Cape.

The earlier European explorers in the Pacific were primarily in search of trade or booty; the later ones were primarily in search of information. The

traders, for the most part Spaniards, established land portages from harbours on the Caribbean to harbours on the west coast of Central and South America; from the Pacific coast ports of the Americas, they then set a course westward to the Philippines. Many of their ships crossed and recrossed the Pacific without making a landfall; many islands were found, named, and lost, only to be found again without recognition, renamed, and perhaps lost yet again. In the days before longitude could be accurately fixed, such uncertainty was not surprising.

Check your progress:

1. Discuss the early colonial explorations.
2. Examine the countries that were involved in early colonial explorations.
3. Discuss the meaning of Colonialism.
4. State the examples of colonialism.

5.5 SUMMARY

Colonialism is a practice of domination, which involves the suppression of one people to another. One of the difficulties in defining colonialism is that it is hard to distinguish it from imperialism. Frequently the two concepts are treated as synonymous. Like colonialism, imperialism also involves political and economic control over a dependent territory. The etymology of the two terms, however, provides some clues about how they differ. The term colony comes from the Latin word *colonus*, meaning farmer. This root reminds us that the practice of colonialism usually involved the transfer of population to a new territory, where the arrivals lived as permanent settlers while maintaining political allegiance to their country of origin. Imperialism, on the other hand, comes from the Latin term *imperium*, meaning to command. Thus, the term imperialism draws attention to the way that one country exercises power over another, whether through settlement, sovereignty, or indirect mechanisms of control.

Colonialism is not a modern phenomenon. World history is full of examples of one society gradually expanding by incorporating adjacent territory and settling its people on newly conquered territory. The ancient Greeks set up colonies as did the Romans, the Moors, and the Ottomans, to name just a few of the most famous examples. Colonialism, then, is not restricted to a specific time or place. Nevertheless, in the sixteenth century, colonialism changed decisively because of technological developments in navigation that began to connect more remote parts of the world. Fast sailing ships made it possible to reach distant ports and to sustain close ties between the center and colonies. Thus, the modern European colonial project emerged when it became possible to move large numbers of people across the ocean and to maintain political sovereignty in spite of geographical dispersion. This entry uses the term colonialism to

describe the process of European settlement and political control over the rest of the world, including the Americas, Australia, and parts of Africa and Asia.

5.6 QUESTIONS

1. Analyse the phenomenon of Colonialism and Imperialism.
2. Discuss the early colonial expansions.
3. Examine the development of the initial colonial explorations.

5.7 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism/>
- Tignor, Roger (2005). Preface to Colonialism: a theoretical overview. Markus Weiner Publishers
- Philip T. Hoffman (2015). Why Did Europe Conquer the World?. Princeton University Press.
- Walter Rodney (1972). How Europe Underdeveloped Africa. East African Publishers.
- Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 1989.

NATURE OF COLONIAL CONTROL – AFRICA AND ASIA

Unit Structure

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Background
- 6.3 Nature of Colonial Control in Africa
- 6.4 Nature of Colonial Control in Asia
- 6.5 Summary
- 6.6 Questions
- 6.7 Additional Readings

6.0 OBJECTIVES

- To introduce students to Colonialism.
- To understand the development of Colonial Control.
- To orient learners about the Colonial control in Asia and Africa.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Having understood the meaning of Colonialism, now let us shift our focus to the nature of colonial control in Asia and Africa. European expansion during the 1600s and 1700s was often motivated by economic and technological forces. To understand the impact of these forces, we need to compare the different ways that European nations developed political and economic influences, including trade and settlement patterns, on the continents of Asia, and Africa. Mother countries such as Portugal, Spain, Great Britain, France and the Netherlands were driven by money and power and enabled by advanced weapons and technology to expand and develop political and economic influences in Asia, and Africa.

The political quarrel among different nations of Europe of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries crossed its barrier and found expression outside. The impact of such quarrel were heard in Asia and Africa. This quarrel took place due to Colonialism. The ghost of Colonialism haunted most of the countries of Europe. The net result of this was disastrous which gave birth to a giant like First World War.

The meaning of Colonialism is very simple. When a country conquers another country and imposes its supremacy on that conquered country, it is known as colonialism. In Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries several countries of Europe like France, England, and Portugal etc. established their colonies in different countries of Asia and Africa. This thirst of imperial expansion was known as Colonialism.

6.2 BACKGROUND

Many countries of Europe had established their colonies outside. Many reasons were responsible for that. At first, with the Discovery of New Sea-Route, new places and countries were discovered. After Columbus had discovered America, the countries like Spain and Portugal established Colonies in that country. When Vasco da Gama discovered the sea-route to India, Portugal had to establish its colonies in that country. Subsequently, France and England came to establish their colonies in India.

Another major factor was economy. Economic Consideration encouraged colonialism. The countries like England, France, Spain and Portugal established their colonies and wanted to be rich by bringing money from those colonies. We should also remember that the Industrial Revolution prompted the countries of Europe to procure raw-materials from outside for their factories. Since, they had no huge quantity of raw-materials for their factories; they had no alternative to bring the same from their colonies. This gave rise to Colonialism. There was also the issue of overpopulation. Some European countries having imperial tendency wanted to send their Surplus Population outside their countries. That is why they wanted to have their colonies for absorbing surplus population.

Another major factor was that due to the Industrial Revolution, the Capitalists became richer. They decided to invest their surplus money outside. This also gave rise to Colonialism. Sixthly, many European countries wanted to educate the backward countries of Asia and Europe. Rudyard Kipling, a famous poet of England propounded the theory of 'White men's burden'. He said that it is the White man's responsibility to civilize the uncivilized people of Africa and Asia and teach them sophisticated habits. This prompted England to establish overseas empire. In every sense, this view prompted colonialism.

There was also the idea of national glory. Many countries of Europe felt that Colonies are the Pride of a Country. Mainly England, France, Germany and Portugal championed this cause. This gave rise to unhealthy competition among the European countries for having more and more colonies. There was a kind of race for colonies. Finally, the unstable political condition of some of the countries of Asia and Africa gave scope for the rise of Colonialism. Taking chance of such weakness, the European countries tried to establish their colonies in these countries and thus colonialism got chance to grow.

Many factors led to the establishment of Colonies in Asia. The European countries established their colonies in many Asian countries. One of those countries was India. After the discovery of sea-route to India in 1498 by Vasco da Gama, the European Countries tried to establish their colonies in India. The Portuguese first entered into India and established their colonies in Goa, Daman and Diu. After that the Dutch, French and English had their colonies in India. At last in the game of power politics, the English became successful and ruled India about two hundred years.

Several colonies were established in South-East Asia. The Portuguese first established their colonies in South-East Asia. They had first occupied Malacca. In 1640, the Dutch occupied it by defeating the Portuguese. After that, the Dutch established their colonies in Java, Sumatra, Borneo and Bali. The Dutch also occupied Ceylon but during the Napoleonic Wars, the English occupied it from the Dutch. The English also occupied Burma. They got Hongkong from China in 1819. The French received Sigan from China. They also established their authority over Tonking. In a similar vein, Russia occupied Arthur harbour and a large portion of Manchuria. Germany occupied Kiachou. Japan occupied Korea and Formosa.

Colonies were established in Central Asia. In Central Asia, Russia and England established their colonies. Russia occupied Tashkent, Samarkand and Bokhara. As per an agreement, the northern part of Persia was retained by Russia and its southern part came under the sway of England. Germany could not establish a single colony in this area. In this way, colonialism had its impact in many parts of Asia.

There was the establishment of Colonies in Africa as well. Like the Asian Countries, the continent of Africa also experienced colonialism. Several countries of Africa came under the sway of Colonialism. Togoland and Cameroon came under colonial control. David Livingstone had discovered Africa. After that, the European countries got an idea about the wealth of that continent. In due course of time, Leopold II, the ruler of Belgium sent soldiers and created a free Congo state. However, in 1907 Belgium brought it under his control. After unification, Germany concentrated on colonial empire. So, Germany occupied Togoland and Cameroon in 1884. No doubt after the defeat in the World War I, Germany had to surrender these colonies. Till that time Germany had her sway on East and South Africa.

Algeria, Tunis, Madagascar were also colonized. France also tried her level best to establish her colony in Africa. France occupied Algeria and sent 11,000 people from Alsace and Lorraine to live there. After that, Tunis came under France. With the gradual passage of time, Madagascar, Ivory Coast, Dahomi, Morocco, Senegal and Sahara Desert came under the colonial possession of France.

Angola, Mozambique, Tripoli, Abyssinia were colonized as well. Spain, Portugal and Italy also wanted to have their colonies in Africa. Portugal established her colony at Angola, which is situated in the south of Congo.

She also occupied Mozambique. Italy occupied Eritrea and Somali land. It also established colonies in Libya and Tripoli, situated in North Africa. Abyssinia also came under its sway. Spain occupied the Canary Islands situated on the West Coast and also other islands.

East, West, North and South Africa were all colonized. The English established her colonies in East, West, North and South Africa. Cecil Rhodes helped a lot in the establishment of England's colonies in Africa. He helped England to occupy Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Cape Colony. In 1855, England declared that the Bechuanaland was under her control.

In 1886 she occupied Gold Coast and extended its help to Uganda, Kenya and Nigeria. England also occupied Sudan and Somali Land in 1898. After her victory, in the 'Boer War' England occupied Transvaal and Orange Free State. England only occupied five hundred lakhs square miles of land in Africa and exerted her influence over ninety lakhs people of that Continent there by establishing her supremacy.

Check your progress:

1. Describe the colonization of Asia.
2. Describe the colonization of Africa.

6.3 NATURE OF COLONIAL CONTROL IN AFRICA

The main powers involved in the modern colonization of Africa are Britain, France, Germany, Portugal, Spain and Italy. In almost all African countries today, the language used is the one imposed by the colonial power. North Africa experienced colonisation from Europe and Western Asia in the early historical period, particularly Greeks and Phoenicians. Under Egypt's Pharaoh Amasis (570–526 BC) a Greek mercantile colony was established at Naukratis, some 50 miles from the later Alexandria. Alexander the Great (356–323 BC) founded Alexandria during his conquest of Egypt. This became one of the major cities of Hellenistic and Roman times, a trading and cultural centre as well as a military headquarters and communications hub.

Initial European expeditions by the Portuguese focused on colonizing earlier uninhabited islands such as the Cape Verde Islands and Sao Tome Island, or founding coastal forts as a base for trade. The Spanish also established properties of the Canary Islands off the West African Coast, and Equatorial Guinea, Ceuta and Melilla on the African mainland before 1830. Established empires like Britain, France, Spain and Portugal were already controlling coastal areas but they had not entered deeply inland. Europeans controlled one tenth of Africa, primarily along the Mediterranean and in the far South. An important initial advocate of colonising inland Africa was King Leopold of Belgium. He treated Congo as his own private area until 1908. The 1885 Berlin Conference was initiated by Otto von Bismarck. This was to establish international procedures to prevent violent disputes among European Powers. In this

conference, the theme of "New Imperialism" took shape. This allowed the imperialists to move inland, with comparatively few disputes among themselves. Between 1870 and 1914 Europe acquired almost 23,000,000 sq. km—one-fifth of the land area of the globe—to its overseas colonial possessions.

Imperialism produced self-confidence across Europe. The Allies of World War I and World War II made widespread use of African work and soldiers during the wars. In terms of administrative styles, the French, the Portuguese, the Germans and the Belgians exercised a highly centralized type of administration called 'direct rule'. The British were different. They wanted to rule by identifying local power holders and encouraging or forcing them to administer for the British Empire. This was indirect rule. France ruled from Paris, appointing chiefs who used to show loyalty to France. France established two large colonial federations in Africa, French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa. France appointed the state officials, passed laws and had to approve any measures passed by colonial assemblies.

Local groups in German East Africa resisted German enforced labour and taxation. In the Abushiri revolt, the Germans were almost driven out of the area in 1888. In 1905, the Germans were astonished by the widely supported Maji Maji Rebellion. This resistance was at first successful. However, within a year, the insurrection was suppressed by reinforcing troops armed with machine guns. German attempts to seize control in Southwest Africa also produced ardent resistance, which was very forcefully repressed leading to the Herero and Namaqua Genocide. King Leopold II of Belgium called his vast private colony the Congo Free State. His barbaric treatment of the Africans sparked a strong international protest and the European powers forced him to relinquish control of the colony to the Belgian Parliament.

Colonial powers had their techniques of colonization. This included procurement of land, frequently enforced labour, the introduction of cash crops, the neglect of food crops, changing inter-African trading patterns of pre-colonial times, the introduction of labourers from India, etc. and the continuation of Africa as a source of raw materials for European industry.

The European scramble for Africa concluded in the Berlin West African Conference of 1884-85. The conference was called by German Chancellor Bismarck and would set up the limits for the eventual partition of Africa. European nations were summoned to discuss issues of free navigation along the Niger and Congo rivers and the African coasts. In the end, the European powers signed The Berlin Act (Treaty). This treaty set up rules for European occupation of African territories. The treaty stated that any European claim to any part of Africa, would only be recognized if it was successfully occupied. The Berlin Conference led to the ultimate European military attack and conquest of African continent. With the exclusion of Ethiopia and Liberia, the whole mainland came under European colonial rule. The major colonial powers were Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Portugal.

Effective Occupation was a clause in the Berlin Treaty which gave Europe a blank check to use military force to occupy African territories. 1885-1914 were the years of European conquest and mergers of pre-colonial states and societies into new states. European imperialists continued to pursue their earlier treaty making processes whereby African territories became European protectorates. Because protectorate treaties posed serious challenges to African independence most African rulers naturally rejected them. African rulers adopted many approaches to prevent European occupation such as diplomacy, alliance, and finally military confrontation.

European Colonial Policies in Africa:

The British:

The 19th century British colonial policy in Africa was a policy of assimilation and integration. Their grand strategy was to have Africans integrate into European civilization and culture. The policy created a western class of black Englishmen who were supposedly British partners in religion, trade and administration. These African “British men,” especially Creoles, rose in colonies of Freetown, Bathurst, southern Ghana and Lagos to important positions in the church, commercial firms and the colonial government. However, with the growth of European racism, western educated Africans found that they were increasingly discriminated against in administration. The British now imported European administrators to fill positions previously held by Africans. Western educated Africans like the Creoles were even forced out of the civil service.

In 1910, the British colonial office expressed the opinion that Englishmen naturally expected to enjoy fruits of their conquests, therefore they should be preferred over Africans in senior positions. The problem however was that there were not enough Englishmen prepared to serve as colonial administrators in Africa. Therefore, the British soon adopted the policy of Indirect Rule. Indirect Rule was the brain child of Lord Lugard. He presented the principles of the system in his book *The Dual Mandate in Tropical Africa*. In it, he identified the two most important administrative principles to employ in ruling alien people. The first was the principle of decentralization, in which he stressed importance of recognizing and ruling people through their indigenous authorities. He argued that the role of the British officers, except in critical areas such as taxation, military forces and the alienation of land, was to advise, not demand. The second principle, was the principle of continuity. Lugard argued that the British should utilize indigenous institutions and authorities, thereby preserving “continuity” with the past, while laying foundations for what he saw as the progressive improvement of indigenous society.

Indirect Rule which begun as administrative expedient in Northern Nigeria, would eventually be imposed throughout their territories of British Africa.

The French:

The French had a policy of assimilation which sought to “civilize” natives and gradually turn them into petits Français or junior Frenchmen. The highest-ranking of these juniors were the évolués, or evolved ones. They were colonial subjects trained to work in administrative positions. Evolués served two purposes. First, to cut down on costs by replacing French manpower. Second, to create an impression that colonials were profiting from their becoming “civilized.” Both the junior Frenchmen or petits Français and the evolved ones or évolués were to serve the grandeur of France and in the far, far, future, they would become “civilized” enough to be considered fully French. This would never really happen however. When independence came, these well-positioned évolués often ended up running their countries.

In French West Africa, the colonies were integral parts of the urban country, and were also considered foreign provinces. Africans were regarded as subjects of France, and like children were expected to have patriotic duties to their mother country. The French believed that the first duty of civilization to the savage was to give them “a taste for work” on the grounds that as beneficiaries of civilization, they should contribute to expenses of the country which brings them benefits. In keeping with this philosophy, the primary role of the “native” therefore was to fight and produce for mother country. The French believed that the “native” will unavoidably be refined by this process, so that in helping France, the “native,” in fact, helps himself or herself.

Africans that were deemed civilized were rewarded by conferring the privileged status of French citizen on them. To become a French citizen, the African would have to have been born in one of the four communes or municipalities in Senegal: Saint-Louis, Gorée, Rufisque, and Dakar. They must also have a merited a position in the French service for at least ten years; and have evidence of good character and possess a means of existence. They must also have been decorated with the Legion of Honor, a military award.

The advantages of French citizenship were many. Once an African became a Frenchman, they were subject to French law and access to French courts. The black Frenchman was exempted from indigénat, which is a legal system which enabled a French administrative officer to sentence any African for up to two years forced labour without a trial. A West African Frenchman could commute compulsory labor for a monetary payment. The person could be appointed to any post in France and in colony. For example, Blaise Diagne of Senegal was the first black African elected to French National Assembly and Mayor of Dakar, which was the capital of the Federation of French West Africa.

However, the assimilation policy was abandoned as impractical. Thus, in the 1920s, the policy was changed to the policy of association, which was advocated as the most appropriate for French Africa. On paper, association reorganized the society supposedly to achieve maximum benefit for both

the French and the African. In practice however, scholars have argued that this policy was like the association of a horse and its rider, since the French would at all times dictate the direction that the development should take and determine what would be of mutual benefit to themselves and West Africans. The colonial belief in the superiority of French civilization was reflected in the judicial system, their attitude toward indigenous law, indigenous authorities, indigenous rights to land, and the educational program. They condemned everything African as primitive and barbaric.

The Portuguese:

Portugal, one of the poorest of the European colonist nations in Africa operated what amounted to a closed economic system in their African colonies. They created a system which welded their African colonies to mother country, Portugal, both politically and economically. As such, their territories in Africa were considered overseas provinces and integral part of Portugal. One fundamental connection of all African Portuguese colonies was the presence of relatively large numbers of Portuguese in the colonies, especially after 1945 when there was a full-scale emigration program from Portugal, especially to Angola. The Portuguese operated a very authoritarian and centralized system of government. At the top of government was the Prime Minister. Under him were the Council of Ministers and the Overseas Ministry, which was made up of the Overseas Advisory Council, and the General Overseas Agency. Then there was the Governor General, a Secretariat and Legislative Council. All of these offices were in Portugal. There were also Governors of Districts, Administrators and at the very bottom of the governmental hierarchy, the African Chiefs.

As in the British case, the Portuguese corrupted the systems of chieftaincies. They sacked chiefs who resisted colonial rule, and replaced them with more flexible chiefs. Thus, the historical authority of chiefs and their relationships with subjects was corrupted to one of authoritarianism which reproduced the authoritarian system of government. Real authority was held by the Portuguese council of ministers, which was controlled by the prime minister. The direction of colonial policy was determined by the overseas ministry, aided by the advisory overseas council and two subsidiary agencies. The governor-general appointed the chief official resident for the colony. The chief official of the resident for the colony had far reaching executive and legislative power. He headed the colonial bureaucracy, directed the native authority system, and was responsible for the colonies' finances.

The Circumscricoes and Chefes de posto roughly corresponded to the British provincial and district officers. They collected taxes, were judges and finance officers. African chiefs were subordinate to the European officers with little power to act on their own. Moreover, they could be replaced at any time by a higher Portuguese power. The political policy adopted in Guinea Bissau, São Tomé, Príncipe, and Cape Verdes, Portugal's West African territories was a system of *assimilado*. The *assimilado* policy held that all persons, no matter their race, would be

accorded this status if they met the specific qualifications. Similar to the French policy of assimilation, the Portuguese West African had to adopt a European mode of life; speak and read Portuguese fluently; be a Christian; compete military service; and have a trade or profession. However, only a small number Portuguese West Africans became assimilados because of the difficulty in achieving this position.

Moreover, the Portuguese did not support education in their colonies. They built few secondary schools, and almost entirely neglected elementary education. Most of their emphasis was given to rudimentary levels of training where Portuguese African students were taught moral principles and basic Portuguese; making it almost impossible for the Portuguese African, even if she or he wanted to, to achieve the status of assimilado.

The Germans:

German African colonial experience was characterized by bloody African rebellions. However, their harsh treatment resulted in intervention and direct rule by German government. The German colonialists envisioned a “New Germany” in Africa in which colonialists would be projected as members of a superior and enlightened race; while Africans were projected as inferior, indolent, and destined to be permanent subjects of Germans. The Germans had a highly centralized administration. At the top of government was the Emperor. The Emperor was assisted by the Chancellor, who was assisted by Colonial Officers, who supervised the administration. At the bottom were the jumbes or subordinate African staff. These men had been placed in the stead of recognized leadership.

European Economic and Social Policies in Africa:

The basic principles of the European colonial economic relationship in Africa were to:

- (1) inspire the production and export of African cash crops including palm produce, groundnuts, cotton, rubber, cocoa, coffee and timber;
- (2) boost the consumption and increase the import of European manufactured goods;
- (3) ensure that the African colony's trade, both imports and exports, were conducted with the metropolitan European country concerned. The colonialists thus instituted the Colonial Pact which ensured that African colonies must provide agricultural export products for their imperial country and buy its manufactured goods in return, even when they could get better deals elsewhere. This was similar to the Navigation Acts where the British forced the 13 American colonies to use only British ships and first trade with the mother country.

To facilitate this process, the colonialists therefore forced Africans to participate in a monetized market economy. They introduced new currencies, which were tied to currencies of the metropolitan countries to

replace the local currencies and barter trade. Railroads were a dominant component in the imposition of the colonial economic and political structures. Colonial railways did not link African economies and production together. They did not link African communities together either, rather they served the purpose of linking West African producers to international trade and market place; and also connecting production areas to the African coast. Moreover, railroads meant that larger amounts of African produced crops could be sent to coast. All equipment used to build and operate the railroads were manufactured in Europe, and brought little to no economic growth to Africa. It was only used for the production of African cash crops for the external market. What was more, thousands of African men were forced to construct these railroads; and many died doing so.

The key to the development of colonial economies in Africa, was the need to control labor. In the colonies, this labor was forced. There were basically two types of forced labor in Africa. The first, was peasant labor. This occurred in most parts of Africa where agriculture was already mainstay. In East, Central, and South Africa, Africans performed migrant wage labor on European owned and managed mines and plantations. The colonial masters also imposed taxation in Africa. By taxing rural produce, the colonial state could force Africans to farm cash crops. Africans had to sell sustenance crops on the market for cash. Then use cash to pay taxes. Taxes could be imposed on land, produce, and homes (hut tax). The requirement to pay tax forced Africans into the colonial labour market.

Check your progress:

1. Describe the nature of colonial control in Africa.
2. Examine the major countries who colonized Africa.

6.4 NATURE OF COLONIAL CONTROL IN ASIA

Several different Western European powers established colonies in Asia during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Each of the imperial powers had its own style of administration, and colonial officers from the different nations also displayed various attitudes towards their imperial subjects.

Great Britain:

The British Empire was the largest in the world prior to World War II and included a number of places in Asia. Those territories include what is now Oman, Yemen, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan, Palestine, Myanmar (Burma), Sri Lanka (Ceylon), the Maldives, Singapore, Malaysia (Malaya), Brunei, Sarawak and North Borneo (now part of Indonesia), Papua New Guinea, and Hong Kong. The crown jewel of all of Britain's overseas possessions around the world, of course, was India. It was said that the sun never set on the British empire.

British colonial officers and British colonists, in general, saw themselves as exemplars of "fair play," and in theory, at least, all of the crown's subjects were supposed to be equal before the law, regardless of their race, religion, or ethnicity. Nonetheless, British colonials held themselves apart from local people more than other Europeans did, hiring locals as domestic help, but rarely intermarrying with them. In part, this may have been due to a transfer of British ideas about the separation of classes to their overseas colonies.

The British took a paternalistic view of their colonial subjects, feeling a duty — the "white man's burden," as Rudyard Kipling put it — to Christianize and civilize the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the New World. They felt that they had to teach sophisticated and cultured habits to the uncivilized people of Asia. In Asia, the story goes, Britain built roads, railways, and governments, and acquired a national obsession with tea. This coating of gentility and humanitarianism quickly crumbled, however, if a conquered people rose up. Britain ruthlessly put down the Indian Revolt of 1857 and brutally tortured accused participants in Kenya's Mau Mau Rebellion (1952 - 1960). Kallie Szczepanski mentions that when famine struck Bengal in 1943, Winston Churchill's government not only did nothing to feed Bengalis, it actually turned down food aid from the US and Canada meant for India.

France:

Although France sought an extensive colonial empire in Asia, its defeat in the Napoleonic Wars left it with just a handful of Asian territories. Those included the 20th-century mandates of Lebanon and Syria, and more especially the key colony of French Indochina — what is now Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

French attitudes about colonial subjects were, in some ways, quite different from those of their British rivals. Some idealistic French sought not just to dominate their colonial holdings, but to create a "Greater France" in which all French subjects around the world truly would be equal. For example, the North African colony of Algeria became a department, or a province, of France, complete with parliamentary representation. This difference in attitude may be due to France's embrace of Enlightenment thinking, and to the French Revolution, which had broken down some of the class barriers that still ordered society in Britain. Nonetheless, French colonizers also felt the "White man's burden" of bringing so-called civilization and Christianity to barbaric subject peoples.

On a personal level, French colonials were more apt than the British to marry local women and create a cultural fusion in their colonial societies. Some French racial theorists such as Gustave Le Bon and Arthur Gobineau, however, decried this tendency as a corruption of Frenchmen's innate genetic superiority. As time went on, social pressure increased for French colonials to preserve the "purity" of the "French race."

In French Indochina, unlike Algeria, the colonial rulers did not establish large settlements. French Indochina was an economic colony, meant to produce a profit for the home country. Despite the lack of settlers to protect, however, France was quick to jump into a bloody war with the Vietnamese when they resisted a French return after World War II. Today, small Catholic communities, and some pretty colonial architecture are all that remains of visible French influence in Southeast Asia according to Kallie Szczepanski.

The Netherlands:

The Dutch competed and fought for control of the Indian Ocean trade routes and spice production with the British, through their respective East India Companies. In the end, the Netherlands lost Sri Lanka to the British, and in 1662, lost Taiwan (Formosa) to the Chinese, but retained control over most of the rich spice islands that now make up Indonesia.

For the Dutch, this colonial enterprise was all about money. There was a very little pretense of cultural improvement or Christianization of the heathens — the Dutch wanted profits, plain and simple. As a result, they showed no qualms about ruthlessly capturing locals and using them as enslaved laborer on the plantations, or even carrying out a massacre of all the inhabitants of the Banda Islands to protect their monopoly on the nutmeg and mace trade.

Portugal:

After Vasco da Gama rounded the southern end of Africa in 1497, Portugal became the first European power to gain sea access to Asia. Although the Portuguese were quick to explore and lay claim to various coastal parts of India, Indonesia, Southeast Asia, and China, its power faded in the 17th and 18th centuries, and the British, Dutch, and French were able to push Portugal out of most of its Asian claims. By the 20th century, what remained was Goa, on the southwest coast of India; East Timor; and the southern Chinese port at Macau.

Although Portugal was not the most intimidating European imperial power, it had the most staying power. Goa remained Portuguese until India annexed it by force in 1961; Macau was Portuguese until 1999 when the Europeans finally handed it back to China, and East Timor or Timor-Leste formally became independent only in 2002.

Portuguese rule in Asia was by turns ruthless. One example is when they began capturing Chinese children to sell into enslavement in Portugal. They were also careless, and did not spend much for the welfare of the colonies. Like the French, Portuguese colonists were not opposed to mixing with local peoples and creating creole populations. Perhaps the most important characteristic of the Portuguese imperial attitude, however, was Portugal's stubbornness and refusal to withdraw, even after the other imperial powers had closed up shop.

Portuguese imperialism was driven by a sincere desire to spread Catholicism and make lots of money. It was also inspired by nationalism; originally, a desire to prove the country's might as it came out from under Moorish rule, and in later centuries, the proud persistence on holding onto the colonies as a symbol of past majestic glory.

Check your progress:

1. Discuss the nature of colonial control in Asia.
2. Examine the various colonial powers in Asia.

6.5 SUMMARY

Colonialism is the direct and overall domination of one country by another on the basis of state power being in the hands of a foreign power. The first objective of colonialism is political domination. Its second objective is to make possible the exploitation of the colonized country. Many countries of Europe had established their colonies outside. Many reasons were responsible for that. At first, with the Discovery of New Sea-Route, new places and countries were discovered. After Columbus had discovered America, the countries like Spain and Portugal established Colonies in that country. When Vasco da Gama discovered the sea-route to India, Portugal had to establish its colonies in that country. Subsequently, France and England came to establish their colonies in India.

Another major factor was economy. Economic Consideration encouraged colonialism. The countries like England, France, Spain and Portugal established their colonies and wanted to be rich by bringing money from those colonies. We should also remember that the Industrial Revolution prompted the countries of Europe to procure raw-materials from outside for their factories. Since, they had no huge quantity of raw-materials for their factories; they had no alternative to bring the same from their colonies. This gave rise to Colonialism. There was also the issue of overpopulation. Some European countries having imperial tendency wanted to send their Surplus Population outside their countries. That is why they wanted to have their colonies for absorbing surplus population.

6.6 QUESTIONS

1. Analyse the reasons for the growth of Colonialism.
2. Discuss the nature of colonial control in Africa.
3. Examine the features of Colonial control in Asia.

6.7 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- John King Fairbank (1978). The Cambridge History of China: Late Ch»ing, 1800-1911 Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-22029-3.
- M. Weisner-Hanks, Early Modern Europe 1450–1789 (Cambridge, 2006)
- Barbara Watson Andaya; Leonard Y. Andaya (19 February 2015). A History of Early Modern Southeast Asia, 1400-1830. Cambridge University Press
- Comparative Colonization in Asia By Kallie Szczepanski, in <https://www.thoughtco.com/comparative-colonization-in-asia-195268>
- http://www.wpmss.weebly.com/uploads/4/0/1/9/40195199/715_1.pdf
- <https://www.historydiscussion.net/world-history/colonialism-in-different-countries-causes-establishment-and-end-of-colonialism/1866>
- <https://wasscehistorytextbook.com/8-colonial-rule-in-west-africa/>

THEORIES AND MECHANISMS OF IMPERIALISM

Unit Structure

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Background
- 7.3 Theories of Imperialism
- 7.4 Phases of Imperialism
- 7.5 Mechanisms of Imperialism
- 7.6 Summary
- 7.7 Questions
- 7.8 Additional Readings

7.0 OBJECTIVES

- To introduce students to Colonialism and Imperialism.
- To understand the theories of Imperialism.
- To orient learners about the Mechanisms of Imperialism.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

When a big country dominates a smaller country, it is known as Imperialism. When one country controls another country, it is identified as Imperialism. There is no one standard definition of Imperialism. Some of the definitions of Imperialism are as follows:

- 1) Imperialism refers to the process of capitalist development which leads the capitalist countries to conquer and dominate pre-capitalist countries of the world.
- 2) Imperialism is the system of political control exercised by the metropolis over the domestic and foreign policy and over the domestic politics of another polity, which we shall call the periphery (countries at the margins of the economic hierarchy).
- 3) The term Imperialism is used to designate the international practices and relations of the capitalist world during the distinct stage of mature capitalism that begins in the last quarter of the 19th century.

Imperialism is a modern phenomenon and distinctly different from pre-modern forms of conquests and political domination. In this context four important characteristic features of Imperialism are:

- a) sharp increase in international flow of commodities, men and capital,
- b) interdependent set of relations between countries at different levels of industrial development,
- c) advanced and superior technology in imperialist countries, and competition between advanced capitalist countries

Check your progress

1. Define Imperialism.
2. Examine some of the features of Imperialism.

7.2 BACKGROUND

It is important to distinguish between empires and imperialism. There were many empires in history but empire in the era of capitalism is imperialism. What was new about imperialism in the modern era? What made it different from earlier expansions of empire? In earlier eras the motive was exaction of tribute. Under capitalism the economies and societies of the conquered or dominated areas were transformed, adapted and manipulated to serve the imperatives of capital accumulation in the imperialist countries placed at the center of the economic hierarchy.

Imperialism can be both formal and informal. Formal imperialism involves annexation and direct rule while informal empire means indirect rule by local elites who are independent legally but politically dependent on the metropolis. Similarly, there are three broad types of empires which have either existed in a linear chronology, one succeeding the other, or also co-existed with each other at a particular historical juncture.

These types are:

- 1) Trading empires which took the initiative in early conquests but eventually lost out in the era of industrial capitalism, such as Portugal and Spain
- 2) Industrial empires with full-fledged colonies, such as Britain and France
- 3) Industrial empires without, or with few, formal colonies, such as Germany

At the same time, it is important to remember different historical stages through which capitalist expansion took place leading to the formation of empires. The changing nature of imperialism was dependent upon the stages of capitalist development. Broadly speaking capitalism may be said to have gone through five stages, mentioned below:

- 1) end of 15th to mid 17th Century — rise of commercial capital and rapid growth of world commerce
- 2) mid 17th to latter 18th Century — commercial capital ripens into a dominant economic force
- 3) late 18th Century to 1870s — the era of industrial capital
- 4) 1880 to World War I — rise of monopoly capital, division of globe, etc.
- 5) Post World War I — socialism, decolonization, rise of multinational corporations

In this sense stages of imperialism coincide with stages of capitalism

Stage of capitalism	Imperial Powers
1) Merchant capitalism	Portugal and Spain
2) Industrial capitalism	Britain, France and Netherlands
3) Finance capitalism	Britain, USA and Germany

The history of the European colonial empires falls into two overlapping cycles. The first began in the 15th Century and ended soon after 1800, the second in the late 18th Century lasting into the twentieth. During the first cycle America was important as a colony—in the second Africa and Asia

Check your progress

1. Describe the period of Imperialism.
2. Describe the types of Imperialism.

7.3 THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM

The theories of imperialism can be grouped into two broad types, economic and political. J.A.Hobson, Hilferding, Rosa Luxembourg and Lenin were the economic proponents and Schumpeter, Fieldhouse, Gallagher and Robinson were the political proponents.

The Economic Theories:

The economic explanations offered by Hobson, Hilferding, Rosa Luxembourg and Lenin had a common feature — a political agenda. Hobson's purpose was to alert the British public to "the new plutocratic phenomenon that was hijacking British foreign policy" — to the expansionist agenda that was extracting a heavy price from the ordinary people merely to satisfy the financial capitalists who cared for nothing except maximizing returns on their investments. Hilferding was a German Social Democrat who was Finance Minister and paid with his life for being anti Nazi. Rosa Luxembourg, born in Poland, was a fiery

revolutionary Social Democrat leader in Germany. Vladimir Lenin, the prominent Bolshevik leader and maker of the Revolution in Russia in 1917, wished to convince the Russian people that World War I was an imperialist war which they would do best to stay out of.

In *Imperialism* (1902) Hobson explains imperialism as an outcome of the capitalist system. The key concept used is underconsumption. Industry looked for foreign markets as it cannot find domestic markets for its goods, wages being low. With major industrial powers competing for foreign markets there was a race for colonies which would serve as captive markets. Underconsumption also leads to oversaving as domestic investment does not make sound economic sense when there is little purchasing power. Here again colonies serve as channels for investment. Thus Hobson concluded that “..the dominant directive motive” behind imperialism “was the demand for markets and for profitable investment by the exporting and financial classes within each imperialist regime.” He dismissed other motives as secondary, be it power, pride and prestige or “trade follows the flag” or the mission of civilizing the natives.

Rudolf Hilferding, in his work, *Das Finanzkapital*, (Finance Capital) published in 1910, demonstrated how big banks and financial institutions in fact control industrial houses in this last stage of capitalism, better known as finance capitalism. Monopoly capitalists looked to imperialist expansion as a way of ensuring secure supplies of raw materials, markets for industrial goods and avenues for investment. As each big European power was a monopoly capitalist, economic competition soon became political rivalry, which in turn escalated into war.

Rosa Luxembour’s study titled *Accumulation of Capital* (1913) highlighted the unequal relationship between the imperial powers and the colonies. The European powers gained captive markets and secured profitable avenues for investment. In contrast, the colonies were merely suppliers of raw materials and foodstuffs.

In *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916) Lenin argued that advanced capitalist countries invest in backward countries because the limits of profitable domestic investment have been reached. To invest at home would require development of the economy and better standard of living for workers, neither of which was in the interest of the capitalists. Lenin’s argument was that imperialist interests lay behind the rivalries between European powers that culminated in World War I. His intention was overtly political – to expose the capitalist designs and convince the people of Russia that they should not participate in the War.

Non-economic theories:

Schumpeter’s *Imperialism and the Social Classes* (1931) broke away from the leftist paradigm which located imperialism and capitalism on the same grid. In his scheme, imperialism and capitalism were seen as clearly separate phenomena. Imperialism was ancient, generated by pre-capitalist forces which were pre-modern in spirit. In contrast, capitalism was modern, innovative and productive and did not need control on a territory

in order to prosper. Whereas the writers on the left saw imperialism as an economic system, for Schumpeter, “Imperialism is the objectless disposition on the part of a state to unlimited forcible expansion.” However, the problem with the usage of a conceptual attribute like ‘disposition’ is that it can not be empirically tested and can, therefore, never be proved or disproved.

Gallagher and Robinson (Africa and the Victorians) questioned the common interpretations of modern imperialism on two counts. They understood the distinction between pre 1870 and post 1870 imperialism to be invalid. Also, imperialism of free trade or informal imperialism was seen to be as important as formal imperialism. Political expansion was a function of commercial expansion - “trade with informal control if possible; trade with rule when necessary.” Gallagher and Robinson’s explanation of imperialism was different. In their view imperialism was a process driven by pressures from the peripheries - Asia, Africa and Latin America. The scramble for colonies was a preemptive move by European powers to occupy whatever territory they could in Asia and Africa so as to keep out rival nations. This view questioned the traditional Eurocentric explanation of the scramble for colonies in terms of the great conflicts of European diplomacy or the great thrusts of expansionary financial capitalism.

Fieldhouse advanced a political explanation for imperialism. The new imperialism was the extension into the periphery of the political struggle in Europe. At the centre the balance was so nicely adjusted that no major change in the status or territory of any side was possible. Colonies became a means out of this impasse. For the British this “impulse” meant protecting the route to India through Egypt and the Suez Canal which necessitated control over the headwaters of the Nile and a predominant position in North Africa. For the French and Germans the impulse meant acquiring “places in the sun” to demonstrate national prestige. Fieldhouse concluded: “In short, the modern empires lacked rationality and purpose: they were the chance products of complex historical forces operating over several centuries and more particularly during the period after 1815.”

Colonialism, according to AJP Taylor, became a “move” in the European game of balance of power. Doyle uses the term ‘colonialization of the diplomatic system’ to describe the developments between 1879 and 1890. Bismarck acquired colonies in the early 1880s in the hope that a colonial quarrel with England would establish German credibility in France. France had to be compensated with colonies and overseas adventures in lieu of her loss of Alsace & Lorraine. Competition for colonies led to a rift between England and Italy and Italy went over to the side of Germany.

To sum up, a whole variety of theories and descriptions have been offered for imperialism and are now accessible with us. These can broadly be classified into economic and non-economic explanations. The economic explanation includes the factors pertaining to overproduction and underconsumption as stated by Hobson, requirements of finance capitalism as stated by Hilferding, unequal exchange between the imperial

powers and the colonies as stated by Rosa Luxembourg, and the highest stage of capitalism which has been described by Lenin. The non-economic explanations have looked at imperialism as a pre-modern ancient force according to Schumpeter; or have offered a pericentric view concentrating on the developments in the colonies rather than the metropolis according to Gallagher and Robinson; or have seen it merely as an expression of political struggles within Europe as stated by Fieldhouse.

Check your progress

1. Describe the Economic theories of Imperialism.
2. Examine the Non-Economic theories of Imperialism.

7.4 PHASES OF IMPERIALISM

Let us examine the development of imperialism through various stages.

Mercantilism:

In 1500, the Ottoman Empire, China under the Mings and India under the Mughals were at the same stage of development. They suffered from one major drawback, however, and that was their domination by a centralized authority which did not provide conditions conducive to intellectual growth. In contrast, the competition between different European powers encouraged the introduction of new military techniques. For example, the long range armed sailing ship helped the naval powers of the West to control the sea routes. This increased military power combined with economic progress to push Europe forward and ahead of other continents.

The growth of trans - Atlantic trade was spectacular. It increased eightfold between 1510 and 1550 and threefold between 1550 and 1610. Trade was followed by the establishment of the empires and churches and administrative systems. The Spanish and Portuguese clearly intended their empires in America to be permanent.

The goods obtained from America were gold, silver, precious metals and spices as well as ordinary goods like oil, sugar, indigo, tobacco, rice, furs, timber and new plants like potato and maize. Shipbuilding industry developed around the major ports of London and Bristol in Britain, Antwerp in Belgium and Amsterdam in the Netherlands. The Dutch, French and English soon became keen rivals of the Spanish and Portuguese. This competition encouraged the progress of the science of navigation. Improved cartography, navigational tables, the telescope and the barometer made travel by sea safer. This strengthened Europe's technological advantage further.

The discovery of America and of the route to the Indies via the Cape of Good Hope had great consequences for Europe. It liberated Europe from a confined geographic and mental cell. The medieval horizon was widened to include influences from Eastern civilizations and Western peoples.

Discoveries, trade and conquests, which followed them, had practical consequences. Every colony or trading centre was a new economic stimulus. America was a market and American bullion increased the supply of money circulating in Europe and intensified existing economic and social developments. The volume of trade with America increased. For four centuries America satisfied the hunger for land among Europeans. Gold and silver stimulated exploration and conquest and attracted immigrants, who were followed close on their heels by missionaries. American colonies were set up by individuals; the state, patriotism and missionary impulse played little part.

Before 1815 Spain and Portugal were the pre-eminent imperial powers. Their primacy lay not only in the fact that they were the first discoverers but that they worked out four of the five models for effective colonization which were typical of the first colonial empires. Both made huge profits from their colonies. Portugal had a huge empire in Asia and then in America and Brazil. Colonial revenues brought in the equivalent of 72,000 pound sterling in 1711. This was almost equal to metropolitan taxes. One special feature of the Portuguese empire was that she made no distinction between her colonies and the metropolis. No separate colonial department was set up till 1604.

France, like Spain and Portugal, carried out expansion in the Americas – in the regions of Canada and Latin America. This was undertaken by individual Frenchmen supported by the Crown with the aim of ensuring supplies of groceries and increasing naval power. The task of setting up the empire was carried out by the chartered companies. This worked to the advantage of the state as it was at a minimum cost. After 1660s the colonies became royal possessions and royal agents headed the government. French colonial government was as authoritarian as that of Spain. France was then an absolute monarchy and ruled colonies without giving them any constitutional rights. Local administration and law in the colonies were modeled on those prevailing in France. Her colonial empire suffered from too much state interference. France made no fiscal profits on her colonies, in sharp contrast to Portugal. This was despite the fact that more than two fifths French exports in 1788 were to colonial governments. By 1789 France lost most of her colonial possessions in America and India to Britain. The crucial weakness was her inferior naval power.

Some of the Western states developed their colonies in the tropics, in India, Africa, Latin America and Australia. The Europeans did not settle in Africa, they were content with slaves, gold dust and ivory. The colonies were crucial to the British economy, they supplied raw materials and were markets for metropolitan products. The French minister, Choiseul, regretted that ‘in the present state of Europe it is colonies, trade and in consequence sea power, which must determine the balance of power upon the continent.’ Of the five big European powers, France, Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia, Britain soon emerged as the leader. She had many advantages — the first was a developed banking and financial system. Her geographical location at the westward flank of Europe helped her to maintain a distance from the continent when she wished. The most

important factor, which gave Britain an edge, was that it was the first country to undergo the Industrial Revolution. This enabled it to dominate Europe and to acquire colonies.

In Bernard Porter's words, she (Britain) was the first frog to hop out of the pond. The first empires represented European ambition, determination and ingenuity in using limited resources rather than European predominance throughout the world. Gradually there was a decline. The old colonialism had its natural limits. Flow of precious metals declined. By the late 18th Century Spanish and Portuguese power declined and they lost their colonies. Dutch monopoly on shipping ended. Colonial rivalry between France and Britain ended in Britain's preeminence. Britain was now the world leader in empire, finance and trade. Europe's conquest of America, Africa and Asia from the sixteenth century was possible only because of her mastery of the seas. In this the countries on the Atlantic seaboard, Portugal, Spain, France, Britain and Holland, had an obvious advantage because of their geographical location. Europe's domination was disastrous for other peoples: the indigenous populations in the Americas were wiped out and twelve million Africans were made slaves between 1500 and 1860. Europe benefited vastly in this era when merchant capital controlled the world economy. Institutions such as the modern state and bureaucracy and the scientific revolution in knowledge laid the foundations of the modern world.

2. Industrial capitalism:

Hobsbawm describes the Industrial Revolution in Britain as that unusual moment in world history when the world's economy was built around Britain; when she was the only world power, the only imperialist, the only importer, exporter and foreign investor. The description of Britain as the workshop of the world was literally true in the middle of the nineteenth century when she produced most of its coal, iron and steel. The Industrial Revolution was followed by the single liberal world economy and the final penetration of the undeveloped world by capitalism. The early British industrial economy relied for its expansion on foreign trade. Overseas markets for products and overseas outlets for capital were crucial. The cotton industry exported eighty per cent of its output at the end of the nineteenth century. The iron and steel industry exported forty per cent of its output in the mid nineteenth century.

In return Britain bought specialized local products such as cotton from the US, wool from Australia, wheat from Argentina, etc. Britain's trade also increasingly became greater with the empire. In cotton Latin America accounted for thirty five percent of British exports in 1840. After 1873 the East absorbed over sixty per cent of British cotton exports. Thus there were sound economic reasons for Britain opposing these areas being opened up to others. By 1815 Britain had already become the preeminent world power, combining naval mastery, financial credit, commercial enterprise and alliance diplomacy. The following decades of British economic hegemony were accompanied by large-scale improvements in transport and communications, by the increasingly rapid transfer of

industrial technology from one region to another, and by an immense increase in manufacturing output, which in turn stimulated the opening of new areas of agricultural land and raw material sources. The age of mercantilism was over and with it tariff barriers stood dismantled.

Europe's military superiority continued. The improvements in the muzzle loading gun, the introduction of the breechloader, the Gatling guns, Maxims and light field artillery constituted a veritable firepower revolution, which the traditional societies could not withstand. The decisive new technology was the gun, the symbol of European superiority in the armament factory. As Hilaire Belloc said, "Whatever happens, we have got the Maxim gun, and they have not." In the field of colonial empires, Britain tolerated no rivals. The empire grew at an average annual rate of 100,000 square miles between 1815 and 1865. One group of colonies comprised those acquired for strategic and commercial reasons like Singapore, Aden, Falkland Islands, Hong Kong and Lagos.

A second group was that of settler colonies, such as South Africa, Canada and Australia. With the spread of industrial capitalism the need grew for colonies as markets for manufactured goods especially textiles and suppliers of raw materials such as cotton and foodgrains. The colony emerged as a subordinate trading partner whose economic surplus was appropriated through trade based on unequal exchange. This international division of labour condemned the colony to producing goods of low value using backward techniques. By the 1860s the other countries like Germany and United States, were catching up with Britain in industrialization. In 1870 the figures for share of world industrial production were 13 percent for Germany and 23 per cent for the United States.

3. Finance Capitalism:

Stages of capitalism and imperialism could overlap, as in the case of industrial capitalism and financial capitalism, where one did not replace the other, it was superimposed on it. The informal empire of trade and finance was added to the empire of industrial capital. Many major changes took place in the world economy after 1860. Industrialization spread to several countries of Europe, the US and Japan with the result that Britain's industrial supremacy in the world came to an end. For Britain this was a setback. The application of scientific knowledge to industries led to an intensification of industrialization. Modern chemical industries, the use of petroleum as fuel for the internal combustion engine and the use of electricity for industrial purposes developed during this period. Moreover, there was further unification of the world market because of revolution in the means of international transport. Capital accumulation on a large scale took place because of the development of trade and industry at home and extended exploitation of colonies and semicolonies. This capital was concentrated in a few hands.

Trusts and cartels emerged and banking capital merged with industrial capital. Outlets had to be found for this capital abroad. Significant export

of capital had been there even before the stage of predominance of finance capital. By 1850 Britain's capital exports were 30 million pounds a year. In 1870-75 this was 75 million pounds. The income from this came to 50 million pounds, which was reinvested overseas. This financed the trade with the colonies, wherein huge quantities of raw materials were procured and equally vast quantities of industrial goods sent out.

By 1914 European nations controlled over 84.4 per cent of the world. Capital which was concentrated in and channeled through first, the City of London and then New York, the centres of the international network of trade and finance.

The metropolitan country also used empire for political and ideological ends. Jingoistic nationalism and glorification of empire acted to reduce social divisions in the metropolis. Bipan Chandra notes that the slogan — 'the sun never sets on the British empire' — generated pride among British workers. Each country justified its empire in different ways — for example, the "civilizing mission" of the French and the pan-Asianism of Japan. Between 1870 and 1913 London was the financial and trading hub of the world. By 1913 Britain had 4000 million pounds worth abroad. Most international trade was routed through British ships at the turn of the twentieth century. After World War I, Britain lost this position to the US. The US became the major dominant capitalist economy. She was now the world's largest manufacturer, foreign investor, trader and banker and the US \$ became the standard international currency. From the mid-twentieth century onwards, decolonization gathered pace, as did the rise of multinational companies, international donor agencies and the entire gamut of mechanisms of international economic influence. This process is generally known as neo-colonialism

Check your progress

1. Discuss the phase of Mercantilism.
2. Discuss the phase of Finance Capitalism.

7.5 MECHANISMS OF IMPERIALISM

The mechanisms and forms of imperialism are as follows:

1. Conquest and Annexation:

In the early modern times, the Spaniards, the Frenchmen and the British used to send soldiers to distant lands. They overpowered the native chiefs, annexed the conquered lands and made them a colony. Outright conquest and annexation proved to be expensive and burdensome.

2. Spheres of Influence:

With a sphere of influence, a more powerful country will use its power to develop exclusive rights to resources or other benefits. Spheres of influence were most often established by a treaty. This was usually

between two controlling nations who agreed not to interfere with the other's territory or between a controlling nation and a representative of the territory. This was usually the precursor to the establishment of a colony or protectorate.

3. Colonization:

Both Colonialism and Imperialism mean economic and political domination of the other. As a result, both are hard to differentiate at times. Yet they are two words with totally different meanings. Colonialism is where one country physically exerts complete control over another country and Imperialism is formal or informal economic and political domination of one country over the other. In a nutshell, colonialism can be thought of as the practice of domination and imperialism as an idea behind the practice.

4. Protectorate:

The next type of imperialism is protectorate imperialism. With this type, the country or a territory will have its own government, but the government of the country is not making all the decisions. There is another outside government (a stronger, more powerful one) which is making decisions for them. Essentially, with protectorate imperialism, you lose control over your own country, but you are still responsible for running it. This is different than colony imperialism because, with colony imperialism, you have no need for your own government. Everything is managed and handled by the ruling country. Protectorate Imperialism has happened many times in history. One example would be when Britain established a protectorate over the Niger River delta. The people in this area had their own government, but it was controlled by Britain.

5. Concession or Franchise:

When a powerful, ambitious and aggressive agency, acquired an exclusive right to exploit some economic resources, in a "background" region, it was called a concession or franchise. A group of German bankers and engineers got a concession to build a long railroad, which later came to be known as the Bagdad Railway in Turkey.

6. Leasehold:

When the exclusive right to exploit some economic resources was accompanied with the grant of lease of a stretch of territory and the actual exercise of political control over it, it was called a leasehold. The German Empire acquired such leasehold of ninety-nine years over a part of the Shantung Peninsula in China.

7. Financial or Tariff Control:

Economic imperialism could assume the form of financial or tariff control. Thus, the powerful nation could take over the complete charge of the finances of a weak and backward region, or its tariff system. Before World War I, the Turkish finances was actually run by the Ottoman Public Debt Administration, an organization composed of mainly European officials.

8. Extra-territoriality:

The right of extra-territoriality was a privilege whereby the Europeans were subjected the Western law and Western courts of law, even if they committed crimes in non-European jurisdictions. Thus if a Frenchman committed an offence in Constantinople, he was tried by a French or a European official under French law.

9. The Mandate System:

This was the last form of the new imperialism. It emerged at the Paris Peace Conference, at the suggestion of General Jan Smuts of South Africa. Most of the former colonies and other weak and backward regions were assigned to the League of Nations. The League delegated its authority, subject to some restrictions, to various states as its agents or "mandatories." The mandatories had to submit to a League body called the 'Permanent Mandates Commission' which were annual reports about the moral and material progress in regions under their control.

Check your progress

1. Define the system of Leasehold.
2. Examine the system of Protectorate.

7.6 SUMMARY

Political imperialism refers to building of an empire under a powerful empire through conquest of other countries by military force. Thus a country, which is militarily, politically and economically powerful, conquers a less powerful, weaker country. This annexes the weaker one and makes it a colony. Political control is then established upon her colony by the mother country, which attempts to impose her political ideologies and institution upon it. An outstanding example of this kind of imperialism is of British imperialism in India.

The Industrial Revolution led to economic imperialism or 'neo-imperialism.' In this case, the industrially advanced countries economically exploit the regions that were rich in raw materials. These regions are also used as markets for their finished products and for investment of surplus capital. This kind of economic imperialism was imposed by England, France, Italy, Germany, and the U.S.A. upon China. Though China was politically independent and sovereign under the Manchu rule, it was economically dominated by these European and American countries.

7.7 QUESTIONS

1. Analyse the theories of Imperialism.
2. Discuss the phases of Imperialism.
3. Examine the mechanisms of Imperialism.

7.8 ADDITIONAL READINGS

Theories And Mechanisms
of Imperialism

- M. Weisner-Hanks, Early Modern Europe 1450–1789 (Cambridge, 2006)
- Imperialism - eGyanKosh<http://egyankosh.ac.in> › bitstream › Unit-17PDF
- Barbara Watson Andaya; Leonard Y. Andaya A History of Early Modern Southeast Asia, 1400-1830. Cambridge University Press
- Edward W. Said. Culture and Imperialism. Vintage Publishers, 1994.
- British Empire" British Empire | historical state, United Kingdom | Encyclopædia Britannica Online

munotes.in

UNIFICATION OF GERMANY AND ITALY

Unit Structure

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Unification of Germany
- 8.3 Unification of Italy
- 8.4 Summary
- 8.5 Questions
- 8.6 Additional Readings

8.0 OBJECTIVES

- To understand the background of unification of Germany and Italy
- To trace the events leading to the unification of Germany and Italy
- To grasp the role of Bismarck in unification of Germany
- To grasp the role of Cavour in unification of Italy

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Germany and Italy were in a bad shape in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. These nationalities were divided into many petty states, each under a despot. Most of the kings were controlled by Austria. Austrian Prime Minister, Metternich mercilessly crushed all attempts at liberalism and reform. Besides Austria, England and Denmark had some impact on German states. The Diet was a body which consisted representatives from all states. The Diet never worked for the interests of the masses. The rulers preferred to maintain status-quo. They did not bother about the unification. The German patriots tried for the unity, but could not succeed. Prussia was the strongest of the states and patriots hoped that she would take the reins of unification movement.

8.2.1 Effects of Napoleon's Conquest on German States:

Napoleon's administrative unity, encouraged the forces of nationalism and unity. He eliminated feudalism and serfdom. However, Napoleon's defeat crushed all hopes of patriots. The Peace Settlement at Vienna, turned Germany into a loose confederation of 39 states, with the Diet. It was presided over by Austria. All the 39 rulers reintroduced despotism. For a generation, the states remained stagnant. Sacrifices made by patriots were forgotten. The reasons were Lack of Unity among nationalists and superiority of Austrian military might. The University of Jena served as the center of radical thought. Austria protested that the university encouraged revolutionary tendencies. In spite of it, the students formed secret societies. To put down the youth, Austria passed the Carlsbad Decrees in 1819. Committees were appointed to control student and teacher activities. The press was censored. Suspicious persons were taken into custody.

8.2.2 The Revolution of 1848 in France:

Growing displeasure with the political and social order imposed by the Congress of Vienna led to the outbreak in 1848 of the March Revolution in the German states. The revolutions of 1848 in the German states, the opening phase of which was also called the March Revolution, were primarily part of the Revolutions of 1848 that broke out in many European countries. They were a series of loosely coordinated political disputes and rebellions in the states of the German Confederation, including the Austrian Empire. The revolutions, which aimed German unity, demonstrated popular discontent with the traditional, largely autocratic political structure of the 39 independent states of the Confederation that inherited the German territory of the former Holy Roman Empire. They demonstrated the common desire for the Zollverein movement.

Frankfurt Parliament 1848-49:

A national assembly summoned at Frankfurt on May 18, 1848, as a result of the liberal revolution that swept the German states early in 1848. The parliament was called by a introductory assembly of German liberals in 1848, and its members were elected by direct manhood suffrage. They represented the entire political spectrum and included the notable German figures of the time. The president of this parliament was Heinrich von Gaggers. Its purpose was to plan political unification of Germany. Frederick William attempted to substitute a union scheme of his own, but his efforts were smothered by Austria through the Treaty of Olmutz (1850), which restored the German Confederation. The constitution drafted by the Frankfurt Parliament influenced the [North German Confederation](#) in 1866.

8.2.3 The Zollverein or Customs Union:

Different German states had different regulations for trade. Tax collection posts were set up at borders and interstate trade was taxable. This arrangement was detrimental to trade. Prussia provided leadership in bringing economic unification of German states. Prussia was linked to foreign countries for trade and commercial activities. These developments brought in prosperity. It gave rise to a new traders and capitalist class, which wanted to widen markets. This could become possible only by a strong and stable government. This new economic class was ready to strengthen the governing class. There was also a great intellectual awakening, which aroused a wave of nationalism and patriotism. People realized that a strong army was needed to defeat Austria. In this task the king got help from Otto Von Bismarck, the foremost leader of the German unification.

8.2.4 The Rise of Bismarck:

He was born in 1815 in a noble family of Prussia. After completing education he joined the civil service, but was dismissed due to lack of discipline. He was not sympathetic to liberals and supported monarchy. Due to his timely support the king took him into diplomatic service. First he served in the Diet. There he studied the administration of Austria. Later he was Prussian ambassador to Russia and France. He was able to calculate the weaknesses and strengths of both countries. He made use of this knowledge and experience in his later career. A majority of the members of the Parliament were Liberals who favored democratic republic. They opposed the king and despotism, when he tried to increase his military strength. Bismarck supported the king wholeheartedly and assured him that he would put the king's plan into action. The king supported all moves of Bismarck in the process of unification.

Bismarck's Policy of Blood and Iron:

Bismarck had two aims. 1) Prussia should assume the leadership of German unification. 2) Prussia should not merge her identity into Germany. Instead Prussia should conquer Germany and propagate Prussian culture and civilization. He knew that his aims could not be achieved by peaceful means. Consequently, he initiated the policy of blood and iron. The policy required that first Prussia should build a strong army. Secondly all danger of foreign interference in the German question should be eliminated. Bismarck did not want France, England or Russia to help Austria. His aim was to isolate Austria. For this purpose he played his cards tactfully. He offered Prussian help to Russia in 1863 at the Polish revolt and earned the Czar's appreciation and assurance of neutrality in case of a conflict between Austria and Prussia, in future. He then built up the army, ignoring the opposition. He set about to achieve the aim of achieving German unification. It could not be achieved without the elimination of Austria. But before challenging mighty Austria's he fought a war with Denmark.

8.2.5 War with Denmark 1864:

Bismarck fought a war with Denmark for two motives. He wanted to test might of Prussian military. Secondly, he wanted to find an opportunity to wage war against Austria, in the provinces of Schleswig and Holstein. Both provinces were German, but were governed by the ruler of Denmark. People of Holstein were German descendants, but in Schleswig there were many Danes. According to the treaty signed in 1852, the provinces could not be annexed by Denmark. In spite of it, the Danish king declared the annexation of Schleswig province. At the same time Austria took Holstein. Bismarck declared war on Denmark. The Danes were defeated. Prussia captured Schleswig. Next Bismarck made preparation for the war with Austria.

8.2.6 Austro - Prussian War 1866 (Seven Week War):

The war that followed in 1866 was a resounding Prussian triumph which radically changed a European political landscape which had remained virtually the same since the defeat of Napoleon. Many of Prussia's rival states had joined Austria and been defeated, and the Empire then turned its attentions away from Germany in order to restore some of its severely battered prestige. The ethnic tensions that this move created also became one of the responsible cause of the World War I. Following are the causes of this war.

- 1) The Zollverein proved beneficial. Austria desired to join it, but Bismarck refused to let Austria in it.
- 2) The ruler of a German state Hessel gave a new Constitution, but people opposed because it was not liberal. Austria supported the people, while Bismarck sided with the ruler of Hessel.
- 3) Diplomacy of Bismarck brought the war. He wanted to isolate Austria diplomatically and, built an opposition against it. England favoured Prussia's free trade and despised Austria's reactionary policies. Bismarck sought the Czar's admiration by helping him in Polish revolt. The Czar was already angry on Austria, because she did not help the Czar during the Crimean war. Napoleon III the king of France wanted a war between Austria and Prussia, so that both countries would become weak and he would get a chance to extend his empire. Bismarck secured his neutrality. Then he made an agreement with Italy and promised to support Italians capture Venetia in return of military aid to Prussia. Thus Bismarck diplomatically isolated Austria.
- 4) The immediate cause of the war was provided by the duchy of Holstein which was under Austria. Bismarck alleged that Austria did not govern the area properly. The Germans in duchy had to be protected and so Bismarck declared war on Austria.

The war lasted for seven weeks. Some provinces helped Austria, but no European state came to her help. Italian participation divided Austria's

forces into two. Within first three days Prussia defeated the provinces and annexed North Germany. Moltke then moved further. The main battle was fought at Sadowa on July 3, 1866. Austria fought valiantly, but finally lost the battle. She lost nearly 40,000 soldiers in the campaign. In France, Napoleon III was criticized for not helping Austria. A strong and powerful Prussia was created after the war.

The Treaty of Prague:

It was the master diplomacy of Bismarck. He kept the terms lenient, or else France was likely to intervene. The terms of the treaty were –

1. Confederation of German states was abolished; thus ending Austria's influence in Germany.
2. Austria had to pay war indemnity.
3. Austria had to cede Venetia to Italy and Holstein to Prussia.
4. Prussia annexed German provinces which helped Austria and combined them into a union.
5. Other states were kept independent.

Out of the treaty the North German Confederation was created. Prussian king became its President. Accordingly, half of the unification process was done. The war was highly beneficial to Prussia. Her international prestige increased. Her military supremacy was acknowledged in Europe.

8.2.7 The Franco Prussian War, 1870-71:

France was ruled at this point by Napoleon III nephew of Napoleon, who did not have his uncle's brilliance or military skill. Through a series of shrewd diplomatic tactics Bismarck was able to provoke Napoleon into declaring war on Prussia and this seemingly aggressive move on France's part kept the other European powers including Britain from joining her side. It also created a furious anti-French feeling across Germany and when Bismarck moved Prussia's armies into position, they were joined for the first time in history by men from every other German state. The war was devastating for the French. The large and well trained German armies won many victories most notably at [Sedan in September 1870](#), a defeat which persuaded Napoleon to quit and live out the last dejected year of his life in exile in England. The war did not end there nevertheless, and the French fought on without their Emperor. A war with France was essential for the unification.

Causes of the war:

- 1) German states were out of the unification. They had to be persuaded or conquered. In either effort, there was danger of French intervention. Bismarck's diplomacy worked once again. He got English neutrality by creating bitterness between England and France. Bismarck persuaded Russia and Italy to remain neutral. Austria had

become weak and would not help France. These developments angered Napoleon III.

- 2) Napoleon III had failed in his Mexico campaign of 1864. He had lost his prestige and wanted to revive it by a war against Prussia. He was frustrated after the Austria Prussia battle, because Prussia had become strong, against his expectations. This created hostility between the two countries.
- 3) Napoleon III was ambitious. Bismarck had promised him some 88 territory during Austro Prussian war. But he did not keep his word. The French wanted war to settle the dispute.
- 4) The immediate cause was given by Spain. Both countries interfered in the Spanish succession issue. In both countries there was public hatred against each other. Finally war was declared in July 1870. During the war the 16 states helped Prussia.

The army invaded France. Prussia won many battles and gained large areas in France. The main battle at Sedan was commanded by Napoleon III. He was defeated and forced to surrender. The people in Paris continued to fight for four months. Then they surrendered to Prussia.

Reasons for the defeat of France:

- 1) The French were over-confident and felt that they would have little difficulty defeating Prussia. Usually, she was regarded as Europe's strongest military power.
- 2) The French counted on the technical superiority of their chassepot rifles but this advantage was cancelled by Prussian superiority in artillery.
- 3) The speed of the Prussian mobilization organized brilliantly by von Moltke caught the French by surprise.
- 4) The catastrophic defeat at Sedan was as much a psychological defeat as a military one. Napoleon III was captured and a French army was completely defeated. French morale never recovered.
- 5) France was diplomatically isolated. Bismarck had cleverly made France appear the aggressor and she received no help from any of the other major powers.

The treaty of Frankfurt was signed according to which France had to surrender the rich provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. France agreed to pay a huge war indemnity. A part of German army had to occupy France till the money was paid. France was declared a republic. The Southern German States joined Prussia during the war. A compromise was made and the states agreed to join the German union. Before the end of the Franco - Prussian war the task of German unification was completed on January 18, 1871. A German empire came into being. The King of Prussia was declared the king of Germany. The federal government was

announced. Berlin was made the capital. It was the shrewd diplomacy of Bismarck which brought about the unification of Germany.

8.3 UNIFICATION OF ITALY

A new epoch began, when Napoleon Bonaparte conquered the kingdoms of Austrian and French princes. He even annexed the Papal State. He brought together the city states. Napoleon gave Italy a uniform system of administration. The Italians were influenced by the French ideas of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. They were introduced to concepts like self government and freedom of press. This intensified their sense of patriotism. After Napoleon's defeat, the Congress of Vienna was called in 1815 to reorganize the map of Europe. The national sentiments of Italians were ignored and 'status quo' was maintained. Italy was once again divided as she was before the annexation of Napoleon. Austrian and French kings captured Italian states again.

The division of Italy was done accordingly

- 1) Kingdom of Naples and Sicily under French prince.
- 2) Lombardy and Venetia which were parts of Austria.
- 3) Parma, Tuscany, Madena remained under relatives of Austrian King.
- 4) Papal State under Pope.
- 5) Piedmont, Sardinia and Savoy, under only Italian dynasty called House of Savoy.

8.3.1 Events on Piedmont:

The patriots of Italy founded and joined secret societies, to revolt against despotic kings. Their aim was unity. The most well-known of these was the Carbonari or charcoal burners. Its origin was in Naples. All discontented elements joined, it. They wanted to expel foreigners from Italy. The revolutionary society Carbonari led a revolt in Naples in 1820 against the king Ferdinand I. People asked for a liberal constitution. The king agreed, but then secretly asked help from Austria. The Austrian army arrived and suppressed the revolt. While one revolt was put down, another arose in Piedmont. The king of Piedmont abdicated the throne in favour of his brother Charles Albert. Again Austria intervened and suppressed the revolt. The French revolution of 1830 influenced Italian states. There were revolts in Modena, Papal State and Parma, but Austria crushed all the uprisings. This convinced the patriots a lesson - that the common enemy in all states was Austria. It was therefore necessary to get rid off Austrian influence and suppression.

8.3.2 The Revolutions of 1848 in France:

The revolution of 1848 paved way for rise of nationalist sentiment throughout the Italian peninsula. There were widespread rebellions in several Italian cities that year, mostly by the professional classes (such as doctors, lawyers, shopkeepers) as well as students. Lombardy-Venetia and Milan tried to rise up against Austrian rule. Although the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia sent troops to support the revolt, it was crushed by the Austrians at Custoza in July 1848. The Italian rebellions were unsuccessful and by 1849 the old regimes were once again in place.

8.3.3 Risorgimento:

There were many revolts in Italy against the prevailing conditions and thousands of persons were sent to prisons or in exile. They inspired the deep and wide movement of thought and feeling which became so important in Italian history that they were given the title of II Risorgimento, the revival or resurrection. The Risorgimento movement was based on the ideal of a free and united Italy. It got strength from the Romantic Movement. It reminded the Italians of their greatness in the past. Politically, the revival was patriotic and national. It was a protest against Austrian dominance and a demand for unity. It was liberal and democratic. There was a demand for parliamentary form of government, freedom of press and expression, reduction of powers of the church, and the establishment of a republic. It presented the desires of the middle classes of Italy to develop themselves economically. It was linked up with the growth of scientific knowledge. Such a broad movement could not be assimilated in one single programme. The vision and efforts of persons like Mazzini came within its scope.

8.3.4 Joseph Mazzini:

He was born in 1805 in Genoa. His father was a professor at the University of Genoa. In his young days Mazzini became member of the Carbonari. He vigorously participated in the revolt of 1830, for which he was exiled. After his release in 1831, he founded a Society called "Young Italy". His aim was to organize the youth to the national movement. He had immense faith in youth power. He told the young men to speak to artisans, labour, workers and farmers, and make them aware of their rights. He wanted to make Italy a nation. He lost faith in Carbonari way of action, which led to weak revolts. He aimed at a strong national action. His nationalistic propaganda broadened the political horizon of the Italians. The other schools of thought were - Federalists who believed that Pope should take the leadership.

8.3.5 Count Cavour's Diplomacy:

An innovative agriculturalist and civil servant in Piedmont (Kingdom of Sardinia), Cavour (1810-1861) played a central role in the unification of Italy. Cavour was liberal and believed in free trade, freedom of opinion, and secular rule, but he was an enemy of republicans and revolutionaries, whom he feared as disorganized radicals who would upset the social order.

Cavour participated in in Parliament debate but is criticized for the controversial methods he used while Prime Minister, including excessive use of emergency powers, employing friends, bribing some newspapers while suppressing others, and rigging elections, though these were fairly common practices for the time. The national debt soared by a factor of six because of his heavy spending on modernizing projects, especially railways, and building up the army and navy. When Cavour became Prime Minister Piedmont had just suffered a major defeat by Austria, but when he died, Victor Immanuel II ruled a state ranked among Europe's great powers.

8.3.6 Crimean War (1853-56):

The allied powers of Britain and France asked Piedmont Kingdom to enter the Crimean war, partially to encourage Austria to enter, which it would not do unless it was certain that Piedmont's troops were not available to attack Austrian positions in Italy. Cavour, who hoped that the allies would support Piedmont's initiative of unification Italy, agreed as soon as his colleagues' support would allow and entered the war on 10 January 1855. This was quite late to truly distinguish themselves militarily, but the 18,000 man contingent earned Piedmont a position at the congress of Paris that ended the war. Cavour understood the most powerful nation in northern Italy in the mid-19th century was Austria, who possessed the large and rich territory of Lombardy. Knowing Piedmont-Sardinia could not defeat the Austrians by themselves, Cavour tried to position Sardinia in a politically advantageous position by entering the Crimean War on the side of France, England, and the Ottoman Empire in the mid-1850s. Meanwhile, Cavour continued to strengthen Piedmont-Sardinia and its territories from within, building railroads and improving the military.

Cavour grasped the condition of his success cleverly. Piedmont needed strong allies, to match Austria. He decided to seek alliance with France. The French King Napoleon III was a member of Carbonari earlier and was supposed to be sympathetic toward Italian states. He took a diplomatic step in 1855 by aiding England and France in the Crimean war. He had no enmity with Russia, but he wanted to take some interest in international politics. When Italian troops raised complaints about the war, he said "out of this mud of Crimea, a new Italy will be made". After the war, Cavour was called to the Paris Peace Conference. He went there and put forward the problems of Italian states. Napoleon III agreed to help Italy. He met Cavour and discussed the details. He assured to help Piedmont to drive Austria from Lombardy and Venetia. In return France would get provinces Savoy and Nice. France would continue to hold Naples.

8.3.7 War Against Austria, 1859:

After striking coalition with Napoleon III's France, Piedmont-Sardinia provoked Austria to declare war in 1859. To antagonize Austria, Cavour deployed troops along the border of Lombardy. Austria asked Piedmont to withdraw army but Cavour refused. Austria therefore declared war. According to the agreement Napoleon III personally, commanded French

army to the war to help Cavour. Lombardy was occupied by Sardinia. When it became clear that Austria would lose Venetia, Napoleon III halted suddenly and retreated. He signed treaty of Villafranca with Austria. Cavour was disappointed and resigned. Italians rejected the rulers of Parma, Modena and Tuscany. In this task they got moral support from England. The British Prime Minister declared that the people had the right to change their kings. People from the three kingdoms desired to join Piedmont. This was an important step. Sardinia - Piedmont became a large and predominant state.

8.3.8 Garibaldi:

Giuseppe Garibaldi was born in Nice in 1807. He was a supporter of Mazzini and became a member of Young Italy. He participated in an unsuccessful revolt against Piedmont. He organized a movement of his followers called Red Shirts. He returned back and helped Mazzini, to abolish the authority of the Pope. French forces came to Pope's rescue. Garibaldi lost the battle and fled again to America. He returned to Italy and spent a farmer's life in a small island. In 1854 Cavour called him seeking his help to complete the unification under the leadership of Victor Emmanuel, the king of Piedmont. Garibaldi supported republicanism. Nonetheless, he accepted Emmanuel's leadership, for the sake of his country's unification. The Northern Italian states conducted elections in 1859 and 1860 and voted to join the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, a major step towards unification, while Piedmont-Sardinia ceded Savoy and Nice to France. Giuseppe Garibaldi was instrumental in bringing the southern Italian states into the unification process. In early 1861 a national parliament summoned and proclaimed the Kingdom of Italy, with Victor Emmanuel II as its king.

He led his followers to fight the war against Austria in 1859. In 1860 the patriots of Sicily rebelled against the French king Francis I. They requested for Garibaldi's help. He sailed to the shores of Marsala with thousand of followers. He occupied the whole of Sicily, in the name of Victor Emmanuel. After the victory, he entered the main land of Italy, and reached Naples. Garibaldi, captured Naples in 1860. He began preparation for a march on Rome. To Cavour, the situation seemed full of danger. Rome was under the Pope. It was occupied by a French garrison. Napoleon III was a Catholic and did not want the Pope to be disturbed. Cavour understood that an attack on Rome would mean a war with France. Cavour decided to check Garibaldi's advance. He wanted to keep Garibaldi away. He assured to Napoleon III that Rome would not be attacked, but other areas of Papal state would be captured by Victor. He marched on the Papal areas and captured those. People accepted him as their king. Garibaldi saluted the king, gave him all the areas under him and retired to his home town. He refused the gifts, Victor offered him. He took only a bag of potato seeds with him.

8.3.9 Victor Emmanuel Completes the Unification:

Victor Emmanuel was the son of Charles Albert the king of Sardinia - Piedmont. He was fortunate to get the services of Count Cavour in the task of unification. He gave full authority to Cavour to direct the course of the unification. By 1861, all areas except Venetia and Rome were out of the unification. Venetia was held by Austria and Rome by the Pope, with the help of French army, Cavour thought that without Rome, there was no Italy. Over work and extra stress brought his death in 1861. Victor decided to wait for an appropriate opportunity to conquer the two areas. In 1866, a war took place between Austria and Prussia. Victor made an alliance with Prussia that Italy would fight against Austria and in return Prussia would help Victor to capture Venetia. Prussia won the war and forced Austria to surrender Venetia to Italy. Rome alone was out of Italy. In 1870 a war broke between France and Prussia. Napoleon III was compelled to withdraw French troops, from Rome, to be sent for the war. Victor seized the opportunity. Italian troops marched towards Rome in September 1870. Pope retreated into the Vatican. The citizens of Rome voted for joining the unification.

8.4 SUMMARY

Bismarck dominated German and European affairs from the 1860s until 1890. In the 1860s he engineered a series of wars that unified the German states, significantly and deliberately excluding Austria, into a powerful German Empire under Prussian leadership. On December 10, 1870, the North German Confederation Reichstag renamed the Confederation as the German Empire and offered the title of German Emperor to William I, the King of Prussia. Following the unification of Germany, Bismarck's foreign policy as Chancellor of Germany under Emperor William I secured Germany's position as a great nation by making alliances, isolating France by diplomatic means, and avoiding war. The unification of Italy was complete with the acceptance of Victor Emmanuel as the king. It was due to extensive efforts of Italian patriots. Rome was declared the capital of United Italy. The long cherished dream realized due to nationalism of Mazzini, diplomacy of Cavour, sacrifice of Garibaldi and wisdom of Victor Emmanuel.

8.5 QUESTIONS

- 1) Describe the Austro Prussian war of 1866 and The Franco Prussian war of 1870 -71.
- 2) Discuss the process of unification of Germany.
- 3) Assess the role of Bismarck in the unification of Germany.
- 4) Discuss the events leading to the unification of Italy.

- 5) Describe the background and outcomes of war against Austria 1859 in Italian unification.
- 6) Explain the role of Cavour in the unification of Germany.

8.6 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Carrie Albrecht. R.A. Diplomatic History of European Since the congress of Vienna- New York, Harper 1958.
- Hazen Charles, Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand, 1992.
- Cornell R.D. World History in the Twentieth Century - Longman, Essex 1999.
- Fay S.B. Origins of the World War 1930 New York- Second Ed. New York Free Press 1999.
- Grant and Temperley: Europe in 19th & 20th Centuries 14th Ed. New York Longman 2005.
- Hayes C.J. H. Contemporary Europe Since 1870-1955 New York Macmillan
- Lipson E. Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries – 1916 London. A.H. Black.
- Lipton Joseph M. The History of Modern Iran: An Interpretation Harvard University Press 1975.
- Lowe Norman, Mastering Modern World History -4th Ed. 2005, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taylor's A.J.P. The struggle for Mastery in Europe (1848-1918) – 1954. Oxford.
- Thomson David: Europe Since Napoleon - 1962, Longman. (Indian Ed. Jain Pushpak Mandir Jaipur 1977)

FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDENTITIES : IRELAND AND BALKANS

Unit Structure

- 9.0 Objectives
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Causes of the rise of Irish Nationalism
- 9.3 Rise of Balkan Nation States
- 9.4 Summary
- 9.5 Questions
- 9.6 Additional Readings

9.0 OBJECTIVES

- To understand the rise of Irish Nationalism.
- To trace the Formation of National Identities in Ireland.
- To trace the Formation of National Identities in Balkans region.
- To study the role of England, Russia, Austria in the Formation of National Identities in Ireland and Balkans.

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The essential cause of the Irish question lay in the fact that Ireland was a subjugated country, that the Irish were a subject race. Irish uprisings have been ruthlessly punished, and race hatred has been the consuming emotion in Ireland for centuries. The contest has been unequal, owing to the far greater resources of England during all this time. The result of this stormy history was that the Irish were a subject people in their own land. It was a hate-laden atmosphere which they breathed.

9.2 CAUSES OF THE RISE OF IRISH NATIONALISM

The Agricultural issues:

The marks of Irish subjugation were several. As Charles Hazes records, the Irish did not own the land of Ireland, which had once belonged to their

ancestors. The various subjugations by English rulers had been followed by widespread seizures of the land. These lands were given to the Englishmen. The Irish became mere tenants that now belonged to others. The Irish have always regarded themselves as the rightful owners of the land in Ireland, have regarded the English landlords as usurpers, and have wished to recover possession for themselves. Henceforth there has arisen the agricultural question, a part of the general Irish problem.

The Religious Problems:

The Irish had long been the sufferers of religious prejudices. At the time of the Reformation they remained Catholic, while the English separated from Rome. Attempts to force the Anglican Church upon them only hardened their hostility. Nonetheless, at the opening of the nineteenth century they were paying tithes to the Anglican Church Ireland, though they were themselves ardent Catholics, never entered a Protestant church, and were supporting their own churches by intentional favors.

The Political status:

The Irish did not make the laws which governed them. In 1800 their separate Parliament in Dublin was abolished, and from 1801 there was only one Parliament in Great Britain, that in London. While Ireland henceforth had its quota of representatives in the House of Commons, it was never consulted in important decisions. The Irish famine of 1845-1847 was a tragic disaster, far-reaching in its effects. The anguish continued for several years.

The Home Rule Movement:

Irish were demanding Home Rule, an Irish Parliament for the managing of the internal affairs of Ireland. They detested the rule of an English Parliament and an alien people. They did not wish the separation of Ireland from England, but they did wish a separate parliament for Irish affairs. The Bill, thus introduced, provided for an Irish Parliament to sit in Dublin, controlling a ministry of its own, and legislating on Irish, as distinguished from imperial affairs. The bill was beaten by 343 votes to Gladstone dissolved Parliament and appealed to the people.

The Third Salisbury Ministry:

In the elections of 1895 the Unionists secured a majority of a hundred and fifty. They were to remain uninterruptedly in power until December, 1905. Lord Salisbury became prime minister for the third time. For many years the Home Rule question dropped into the back ground, the party now in power being resolutely opposed to the idea of an independent parliament in Ireland. Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, the sixtieth anniversary of Queen Victoria's accession occurring in 1897 was the occasion of a remarkable demonstration of the loyalty of the colonies to the Empire, as well as of the universal respect and affection in which the sovereign was held. This diamond jubilee was an imposing demonstration of the strength of the sentiment of union that bound the various sections of the Empire

together, the advantages accruing to each from the connection with the others, of the pride of power. Advantage was taken, too, of the presence of the prime ministers of the various colonies in London to discuss methods of drawing the various parts of the Empire more closely together. All these circumstances gave expression to that "imperialism" which was becoming an increasing factor in British politics.

The last years of the nineteenth century saw a great flowering of the Irish literature.

Dublin saw the emergence of a brilliant group of poets, playwrights and novelists like George Moore, J.M. Synge, W.B. Yeats, George Russell and James Joyce. Meanwhile the Gaelic League (1893) tried to restore Gaelic as the first language of the Irish nation and the Gaelic Athletic Association tried to popularize traditional Irish sports in place of the British. Sinn Fein played importance after the Easter Rising in Dublin (1916), thereafter it became the rallying point for extreme nationalist sentiments, referred to as Republicanism. The unambiguous demand by Sinn Fein's leader, Eamon de Valera, for a united and independent Ireland won the party 73 of the 105 Irish seats in the British Parliament in 1918. Sinn Fein members of Parliament met in Dublin in January 1919 and declared themselves the parliament of an Irish republic, setting up a provisional government to rival.

Thus, the creation of the Nationalist party Sinn Fein (1905), the spread of the Home Rule Movement, and the popular nationalist risings (1891-1921) under the Irish Republican Army led to the partition of Ireland. Northern Ireland retained its loyalty to the British crown while the rest of Ireland declared itself a Republic with a separate constitution.

9.3 RISE OF BALKAN NATION STATES

There was a lot of restlessness and discontentment among the Christian nationalities of the Balkan Peninsula. There was a strong nationalist movement among the Balkan people encouraged by Russia. Being defeated in the Crimean War, Tsar Alexander II could only make Russia's influence felt by propagandist policies and by a general support of the Slav peoples outside Russia. In this way Tsar Alexander II desired to turn the Slav peoples of the Balkans into satellites of the Russian Empire. The Austro-Hungarian Empire also began to aspire to expand to the Aegean Sea through the Balkan Peninsula. Thus, a conflict between Russia and Austria became inevitable. The Sultan of Turkey did not carry out his promises of political and religious reforms in the interests of his Christian subjects and the oppression by the Turks on their Christian subjects increased. These factors led to the rising of the Balkan Christian nationalities against the oppressive rule of the Ottoman Empire.

The rising of Balkan nationalities against Turkey were encouraged by rival powers, Austria and Russia. Austrian interest in the Balkan Peninsula was

chiefly due to her desire to recover territories and prestige which she had lost to Italy and Germany in the course of their unification. Russia had a venerable interest in the Balkan Peninsula, which was intensified due to Austrian interests. The revolts in different regions of the Balkan Peninsula and the Bulgarian areas south of the Danube attracted the attention of Austria and Russia.

In 1858, **Montenegro**, which had already shown strong sympathy for Russia, had beaten the Turks at Grahovo. However, during the next few years, her very existence was threatened by Turkey, and Russia came to the rescue of Montenegro. Romania, though not a Slav state, was assisted by Russia to complete her unity in 1861. In 1867 Russia intervened to remove the Turkish garrison from Belgrade and other Serbian fortresses, and thus renewed her intimate connection with Serbia. In 1870 Russia abrogated the Black Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris (1856), and announced the restoration of the fortress of Sebastopol and rebuilding of her navy on the shores of the Black Sea. These factors demonstrated the revival of the Russian power and encouraged the Slav population of the Balkans to rise against the Turks.

Bosnia and Herzegovina:

The first signs of revolt against the Turks began among the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. A bad harvest in 1874 led to the risings in both Bosnia and Herzegovina, which became formidable in 1875. They were helped by the people of Serbia and Montenegro. The movement began to spread and there was the danger of a general conflagration. The Great Powers were anxious to localize the rising and to remove the causes of the rising. A proposal of Count Andrassy, the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary was circulated on 30 December 1875, in which the Turkish rule in the Balkans was condemned and its shortcomings were pointed out. The Sultan once again expressed his willingness to introduce reforms. Nevertheless, the Christian rebel nationalities had no faith in the promises of the Sultan.

Greece:

The Greeks were the first to rebel against the Ottoman multi-national empire. The Greek nationalist idea had been disseminated by the end of the eighteenth century by scholarly and literary groups. Rhigas Pheraios was earlier nationalist poet who propagated the nationalistic ideas. 'Society of Friends' established by Greek in the Crimea in 1814 for independence movement. International publicity came in the form of the great European enthusiasm nonetheless the actual support for their nationalism was provided by Russia. As early as 1770 Russia helped a rising in the Peloponnese, and by the treaty of Kucuk Kainarca in 1774, Russia acquired a comprehensive right to represent Orthodox Christians of the Empire to the Sultan. Further rebellions occurred, but the decisive one was in 1821, which rapidly spread through the Morea, the Aegean Islands, Athens, Corinth, Thessaly, and Macedonia. Independently, an Ottoman governor, Ali Pasha of Janina was in rebellion against the Sultan and

extending his control southward into Greece. The Greek nationalists and Ali Pasha now momentarily collaborated against Turks. The Ottoman government first confronted the dangerously independent Ali Pasha and executed him in 1822; but they had unwittingly removed the single political force that could have held the Greek nationalists in check. Its further attempts at repression of the Greeks provoked a violent anti-Islamic hysteria throughout Europe, and Greek independence was declared in 1822. The Sultan now summoned the help of his powerful governor of Egypt, Muhammad (Mehmet) Ali, another of Albanian origin, who was keen to extend his domain into Greece. Now a typical Balkan situation developed. Russia put pressure on the Sultan to concede. Britain and France feared the growth of Russian influence, independently made war on Muhammad Ali, and destroyed his great fleet at the Battle of Navarino Bay in 1827. The Russian Mediterranean Fleet supplied the Greeks, and Russia invaded the Ottoman Empire through the Danubian Principalities (modern Romania) and the Caucasus. Following the Ottoman defeat and the treaty of Edirne (Adrianople) in 1829, Greek independence was finally accepted. A Greek kingdom was set up in 1832, but, in order to restrain Russia, under a German prince who was not Greek Orthodox but Roman Catholic by religion. In effect, Russia, Austria, Britain, France, the Sultan, Ali Pasha, and Muhammad Ali, all acted simultaneously on Greece. Austria passively approved of British and French action. They finally created a Greece which was much smaller than the nationalist dream or modern Greece, chiefly for fear of Russian influence. For the same reason, a complete foreigner by religion and nationality was placed on the throne. Thereafter, in a series of Balkan crises during the next century and a half, Greece was permitted to expand to her present dimensions. As it happened, each national state was started off with a minimum territory; it then expanded or contracted as reward or punishment for the positions taken in great power conflicts.

Serbia:

The Serbian situation can be compared with other rising states in Balkan region such as deterioration of Ottoman state, regional conflicts between local rulers and nationalists, Russian patronage. The years 1804 to 1813 witnessed a rising under the leadership of a Karageorge against local Janissary rule. Typically, the Sultan was not displeased as he himself had lost control of the Janisseries. The movement itself was minimally nationalist; and while Karageorge sought help from the great powers, only Russia came forward with some funding and troops and urged restraint on the Sultan. Much of the success of the rebellion was due to the Janissary revolts and succession crises at Istanbul. In 1813 however, the Ottomans revived and defeated Karageorge who fled to Hungary, where he was murdered by his fellow Serbian Milos Obrenovic. In 1815, Milos launched another revolt, declared himself a Christian Pasha of the Sultan, and in 1817 had himself elected hereditary prince by an assembly of notables. The Sultan accepted him as a subordinate prince within the Empire. The beginnings of the Serbian state, later to expand into Yugoslavia, was due largely to the collapse of Ottoman rule; the nationalist mobilization and great power intervention followed. Thus, the inevitable "national

awakening" occurred between 1820 and 1870 with the usual historical researches into past greatness, the folklore cult, and Vuk Karadzic's reform of the literary language and his composition of a Serbian grammar and dictionary. In the subsequent great power moves, Russia expressed the keenest interest in a powerful Serbia as a Russian client in the Balkans. In the precise context of Serbia, it was Habsburg policy to shore up the Ottoman Empire even while hoping to detach Croatia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. Serbia's own interest was to expand eastward into Macedonia and southward into Albania, for which rulers periodically attempted a Serb-Greek-Bulgarian alliance against the Ottomans. Serbia, like Greece, was territorially unsatisfied; but unlike Greece, she at least had a native dynasty, the Obrenovic. The Ottoman power inevitably receded from Serbia, such that by 1867 nothing Ottoman remained there except the flag in Belgrade. After the Ottoman defeat in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, and by decisions of the Congress of Berlin in 1878, Serbia finally became independent.

Romania:

Romania was a very important province of the Ottoman Empire. It consisted of two main segments, Moldavia and Wallachia, also known as the Danubian Principalities, which were united as Romania only in 1859. The local religious belief, and taxes continued to rule subject to Ottoman control. Between 1634 and 1711, a series of Greek princely dynasties ruled the provinces. During the eighteenth century, the Phanariot Greeks (wealthy Greeks from the Phanar region of Istanbul) administered the country after purchasing their office at auctions in Istanbul. But, with the steady decline of the ottoman center and the advance of Russian power throughout the eighteenth century, the Principalities effectively passed under Russian protection, especially from the Russian occupation of 1769. Now, the usual combination of local nationalism, Russian penetration, Austrian attempts to check it, and Ottoman balancing of both, provided the background to the emergence of the Romanian nation. The "national renaissance" followed in the first half of the nineteenth century. Romanian national history was composed by Mihail Kogalniceanu (1840), the editor of the literary journal *Dacia Literara*; the romantic literary personality was Grigore Alexandrescu; the first Romanian newspaper appeared in Wallachia in 1833, just as the National Theatre in Bucharest. The process of translating the Holy Scriptures and liturgical texts into Romanian began in the seventeenth century and was completed in the nineteenth. The independent Romanina Orthodox Church with its own Patriarch was created in 1865 with authority over Romanian Orthodox Christian even in the Austro-Hungaria Empire. As in Bulgaria, this was anti-Greek measure. The cultural foundations for a political national movement had been laid; these would now be used by the great powers. Russian influence grew sharply after the treaty of Kainarca in 1774. The Principalities were under Russian occupation between 1828 and 1834 when the foundations for a modern state were laid by the Russian governor, Pavel Kiselev. Thereafter, it remained nominally Ottoman territory, but effectively controlled by Russia. Russia now faced the typical problem with

promoting a nationalism which was useful against Istanbul but dangerous to itself. France under Napoleon III supported national movements everywhere hoping to weaken multi-national empires and gain some influence in the bargain. After the Crimean setback Russia urged on by France, and accepted the unification of the Principalities into the new state of Romania under Alexander Cuza. The aristocracy, deposed him in 1866 and elected a German prince Carol of the Hohenzollern dynasty, as king. In 1878, after the Congress of Berlin, Romania was declared independent.

Bulgaria:

During the first half of the eighteenth century, there was no movement for independence. After the Crimean War (1854-1856), the demands for independence gathered momentum. G. S. Rakovskii and Lyuben Karavelov took a lead in this. Russia supported Slavic nationalism; and Turks also encouraged such nationalism opportunistically against the Greek. Russia had looked to Serbia as the base for her influence in the Balkans; but when Serbia under Prince Milan was roundly defeated by the Ottomans in a war in 1876, Russia turned in disappointment to Bulgaria. Russian Pan Slavism whipped up feeling in Russia for the liberation of the Balkans under Russian leadership; and British public opinion was likewise instigated by William Gladstone, the liberal politician and prime minister at various times, against Turkish atrocities during a repression of a Bulgarian rising in 1875. The result was the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 and the creation of an independent Bulgaria. But as in the case of Greece, suspicion of Russia led to the Congress of Berlin in 1878 creating a divided Bulgaria, a Bulgaria proper, and a new state with the name of Eastern Rumelia. And again, they foisted a German prince, Alexander of Battenberg, on Bulgaria. As always, nationalism had been used but not fulfilled by the great powers. Indeed it had been deliberately perverted by the creation of an obviously unstable state like Eastern Rumelia. Russia now demanded concessions in the running of Bulgaria; and, despite her initial sponsorship of Bulgarian nationalism, objected to the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. Almost inevitably, Britain supported such a union, realizing what Russians had always feared, that national states tend to assert their newly won independence rather than become clients. Bulgaria expanded and contracted through the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913; but during World War I she became ally of Germany and as a consequence by the treaty of Neuilly, she was reduced in size.

9.4 SUMMARY

Ireland was a conquered country by the British. The various subjugations by English rulers had been followed by widespread seizures of the land. They had long been the sufferers of religious prejudices. They detested the rule of an English Parliament and an alien people. They did not wish the separation of Ireland from England in earlier phase, but they did wish a separate parliament for Irish affairs. The creation of the Nationalist party Sinn Fein (1905), the spread of the Home Rule Movement, and the

popular nationalist risings (1891-1921) under the Irish Republican Army led to independence of Ireland at the cost of partition of the country. There was a strong nationalist movement among the Balkan people encouraged by Russia. Tsar Alexander II desired to turn the Slav peoples of the Balkans into satellites of the Russian Empire. Nonetheless, Balkan countries achieved independence with the pace of time.

9.5 QUESTIONS

- 1) Examine the Course of formation of national identity of Ireland
- 2) Trace the course of events that led to the Irelands independence.
- 3) Review the background of the rising nationalism among the Balkan region.
- 4) Describe the formation of the Balkan nations.

9.6 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Hazen Charles, Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand, 1992.
- Cornell R.D. World History in the Twentieth Century - Longman, Essex 1999.
- Fay S.B. Origins of the World War 1930 New York- Second Ed. New York Free Press 1999.
- Grant and Temperley: Europe in 19th & 20th Centuries 19405th Ed. New York Longman 2005.
- Taylor's A.J.P. The struggle for Mastery in Europe (1848-1918) – 1954. Oxford.
- Thomson David: Europe Since Napoleon - 1962, Longman. (Indian Ed. Jain Pushpak Mandir Jaipur 1977).

ARAB NATIONALISM: ZIONIST MOVEMENT

Unit Structure

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Emergence of Arabs Nations
- 10.3 The Suez War (1956): Manifestation of Arab Nationalism
- 10.4 Zionist Movements
- 10.5 Balfour Declaration
- 10.6 The Arab-Israeli War (1948)
- 10.7 Summary
- 10.8 Questions
- 10.9 Additional Readings

10.0 OBJECTIVES

- To understand the rise of Arab Nationalism.
- To trace the Zionist Movement.
- To study the background of the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- Complexities of the West Asian politics in relation to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The establishment of a religious community sharing common history in place of the tribal or blood group had given the great clans of Arabia effective political and military cohesion. Egypt is the only Arabic-speaking country in the Middle East which has been effective in inspiring a local patriotism. A large part of the explanation for this lies in the fact of having unique national tradition and because of the expedition of Napoleon; and after the withdrawal of the French she remained a distinguishable political entity, first under the Turks and then under the British.

10.2 EMERGENCE OF ARABS NATIONS

After the Treaty of Versailles and the confirmation of mandate over the territories of the erstwhile Ottomans, the Arabs in various areas resisted against the British and French which resulted in the formation of Arab nations in Iraq, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. The British put down the discontent of Arabs in Iraq in 1920 and announced that the British would complete the process in 1932 and declare Iraq as an independent nation under the kingship of Faisal. In the same way Abdullah, the son of Hussein ruled Transjordan first as a prince in 1922 and declared independence of Jordan in 1946. Syria and Lebanon were under the mandate of France, they began to resist the French rule but France suppressed them ruthlessly. Syria and Lebanon became independent after the Second World War. In 1932, the British acknowledged the independence of Saudi Arabia under the kingship of Ibn Saudi. Thus, all west Asian Arabs including Egypt became independent as Arab nations.

There were several stages of Arab nationalism but some the important stages were as under –

1. During the first phase of the Arab nationalism it was an idealist movement because there were only intellectuals involved in it and they favoured the establishment of constitutional Government for Arabs. They had liberty and equality as its ideals of the movement.
2. The second phase of the Arab movement was realistic. They put forth the demands like decentralization and autonomy as the nationalist approaches of the Arab movement.
3. During the third phase the Arab nationalist movement became revolutionary. The Arabs prepared themselves to fight for their rights against the Ottoman rulers. This was the direct result of the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Because these Young Turks only encouraged the Arabs to fight for their rights.

10.3 THE SUEZ WAR (1956): MANIFESTATION OF ARAB NATIONALISM

As the Cold War was in progress both the West and the Communist bloc tried to woo Nasser, the President of Egypt into their respective side. However, Nasser, who wanted to have best of both worlds decided to keep equidistance from both and tried to extract maximum benefit for his country. However, in September 1955, when Egypt announced an arms deal with Czechoslovakia, the West became apprehensive of the possibility of Egypt aligning with the Communist bloc. Meanwhile in December 1955, it was announced that the World Bank would provide a loan of \$20 million towards the building of the Aswan High Dam, to add to an American loan of \$56 million and a British contribution of \$14 million. The Western loan was conditional, as the West demanded that

Nasser should break his ties with the communists, a condition that he was not prepared to meet. This led to the withdrawal of the promised aid by the United States. The American example was followed by Britain. Crisis point was reached at climax when Nasser immediately retaliated by nationalizing the Suez Canal, intending to use the income from it to finance the dam. Shareholders in the canal, the majority of whom were British and French, were promised compensation by Nasser. Thus, in one stroke, Nasser was furthering Egyptian socialism, Arab nationalism and the independence of his foreign policy. At the same time, his action was seen by Britain as an illegal and irresponsible threat to a vital international waterway and a move of great strategic danger. Nasser, emboldened by his success and by tacit Russian support, increased his attacks on Israel and in October formed a joint military command with Syria and Jordan. He also blocked the Straits of Tiran, thus completing an Egyptian stranglehold on the northern end of the Red Sea. At this point the French, further angered by Egyptian support for rebels in Algeria, proposed a plan, whereby Israel should counter attack in the Sinai peninsula, thus giving the British and French a reason to reoccupy the Canal zone on the pretext of protecting international waters. The British and the French believed that such an action would restore the Anglo-French control over the Suez Canal, and the defeat of Egypt would result in the overthrow of Nasser from power. The war began with the planned Israeli invasion of Egypt on 29 October 1956. This was a dazzling success, and within a week the Israelis had captured the entire Sinai Peninsula. Meanwhile the British and French dropped bombs on Egyptian airfields and landed troops at Port Said at the northern end of the canal. The attacks caused criticism from the rest of the world, and the Americans, who were afraid of upsetting all the Arabs and forcing them into closer ties with the Soviet Union, refused to support Britain, although they had earlier hinted that support would be forthcoming. At the United Nations, Americans and Russians for once agreed: they demanded an immediate end of hostilities, and prepared to send a UN force. With the pressure of world opinion against them, Britain, France and Israel agreed to withdraw and end war, while UN troops moved in to police the frontier between Egypt and Israel. The Suez War was a complete humiliation for Britain and France, who achieved none of their aims, and it was a triumph for Nasser. However, the war was not without success for Israel. Although she had been obliged to hand back all territory captured from Egypt, she had inflicted heavy losses on the Egyptians in men and equipment, which would take years to make good. For the time being the fedayeen raids ceased and Israel had a breathing space to consolidate her victories

Role of PLO:

The bitterness between Israel and her neighbours continued. In 1964 the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was established. Another secret organization Al Fatah (the Conquest) was also setup and guerilla groups made increasing numbers of attacks on Jewish settlements. In Syria political disturbances brought the Ba'ath party to power in 1966. It supported al Fatah, the Palestinian Liberation Movement, a more effective guerrilla force than the fedayeen. In late 1966 the Syrian border became

the scene of bombardments and reprisal raids, and Nasser pledged his support to Syria in the event of an Israeli invasion. In May 1967, Cairo Radio announced, "All Egypt is now prepared to plunge into total war which will put an end to Israel." This stirred the Arab nationalism into a state of high excitement. Nasser called for the withdrawal of the UN Emergency Force, received promises of support from Saudi Arabia, Algeria and Iraq, and made a treaty with King Hussein of Jordan. He also closed the Straits of Tiran. The Arab world followed Nasser's lead, expecting to arrive at the end of Arab-Israeli conflict by means of the eradication of the Jewish homeland. Following these developments, Arab troops massed on the frontiers of Israel.

The Six-Day War of 1967: Test of Arab Unity:

The Arab states had not signed a peace treaty at the end of the 1948-49 war and were still refusing to give Israel official recognition. In 1967 they joined together again in a determined attempt to destroy Israel as independent state. The lead was taken by Iraq, Syria and Egypt in this venture. Levi Eshkol, the Prime Minister of Israel appointed General Moshe Dayan, hero of the 1956 Sinai campaign, as Minister of Defense. Preferring attack to defense, Moshe Dayan ordered a surprise attack on the Egyptian Air Force while it was on the ground, followed by an immediate assault on all fronts. Deprived of air cover, the Arab forces were rolled back on all fronts. In six days, the Israelis occupied the Gaza Strip and the whole of Sinai Peninsula up to the east bank of the Suez Canal, the rest of Jerusalem and the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. By the time that the UN Security Council could arrange a cease-fire, the Arabs had suffered a major psychological and military defeat, and the Israelis were in a position from which they would not retreat without a guarantee of permanent recognition and security. For the Israelis the Six Day War was a great success. This time they had ignored a UN order to return the captured territory from the neighbouring Arab states. This represented as a series of buffer zones between Israel and the Arab states, and meant that it would be much easier to defend Israel. However, it did bring a new problem of dealing about a million extra Arabs who now found themselves under Israeli rule. Many of them were living in the refugee camps set up in 1948 on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

10.4 ZIONIST MOVEMENTS

West Asia consists of Egypt, the Sudan, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iran, Turkey, the Yemen republics, the United Arab Emirates and Oman. The population of most of these states, except Turkey and Iran is made up of Arabs; Iran, though not an Arab state, contains many Arabs living in the area around the northern end of the Persian Gulf. The West Asia also contains the small Jewish state of Israel, which was set up by the United Nations in 1948 in Palestine. The formation of Israel in Palestine, an area belonging to the Palestinian Arabs, outraged Arab opinion throughout the world. The Arabs exclusively blamed Britain who,

they felt, had been more sympathetic to the Jews than to the Arabs. Besides, they blamed the United States, which had supported the idea of a Jewish state very strongly. The Arab states refused to recognize Israel as a independent state and they vowed to destroy it. Although there were four short wars between Israel and the various Arab states (1948-9, 1956, 1967 and 1973), Arab attacks failed, and Israel survived. The Arab wish to destroy Israel tended for much of the time to overshadow all other concerns. However, two other themes, which ran through the West Asian affairs, got mixed up with the anti-Israel struggle: (1) The desire of some Arabs to achieve political and economic unity among the Arab states and (2) The desire of many Arabs to put an end to foreign intervention in their countries.

West Asia had been the dangerous hotbed of crises and conflicts ever since the end of the Second World War. The four wars between Israel and Arab countries, the direct armed intervention and the continuous interference of the United States and its NATO allies, the drawn-out Iran-Iraq war, the aggravation of relations between individual Arab countries, civil wars and sectarian violence all contributed in making the region one of the world's bloodiest and most tense areas.

Creation of the State of Israel:

The sources of the Arab-Israeli conflict can be traced to a complex of interrelated causes. The most important of these causes was the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. The origin of the Arab-Israeli problem goes back to almost 2000 years. In 71 AD, the Romans had driven out the Jews from Palestine, which was then their homeland. In fact, small groups of Jews stayed behind in Palestine, and over the following 1700 years there was a gradual trickle of Jews returning from exile. Until the end of the nineteenth century the number of Jews inhabiting Palestine did not make the Arabs threatened, who considered Palestine as their homeland, feel threatened.

Jewish Immigration to Palestine:

1897 some Jews living in Europe established the World Zionist Organization at Basel in Switzerland. Zionists were people who believed that Jews ought to be able to go back to Palestine and have what they called 'a national homeland'; in other words, a Jewish state. Jews had been facing persecution in Russia, France and Germany, and a Jewish state would provide a safe refuge for Jews from all over the world. The problem was that Palestine was occupied by Arabs, who were alarmed at the prospect of losing their land to the Jews.

10.5 BALFOUR DECLARATION

It was the British who facilitated the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. The British Foreign Minister, Arthur Balfour announced in 1917 that Britain supported the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine. After

1919, when Palestine became a British mandate, large numbers of Jews started to settle in Palestine. The Arabs protested bitterly to the British plan of creating a national home for the Jews in Palestine. They demanded an independent Palestine for the Arabs, and an end to the immigration of Jews into Palestine. Thus, the clash between Zionism's aims and the national interests of the Arab people of Palestine was the original cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which remains to this day at its core. The British did not visualize that their generous offer to create conditions for the Jewish State in Palestine would embroil West Asia in one of the longest conflicts of modern times. The British government stated in 1922 that there was no intention that the Jews should occupy the whole of Palestine and that there would be no interference with the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. The British hoped to encourage Jews and Arabs to live together peacefully in the same state. However, the British failed to understand the deep religious gulf between the two.

Proposal for the Division of Palestine:

The immigration of Jews into Palestine greatly increased following the Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany after 1933. Around, 1940 about half the population of Palestine was Jewish. As the protest from the Arabs to the Jewish immigration into Palestine increased, the Peel Commission appointed by the British government proposed the division of Palestine into two separate states, one Arab and one Jewish. However, the Arabs, who did not want the presence of Jews in Palestine, rejected the idea. The British tried again in 1939, offering an independent Arab state within ten years, and Jewish immigration limited to 10,000 a year. The Jews rejected this proposal. The Second World War made the condition much worse. There were thousands of Jewish refugees from Hitler's Europe desperately looking for somewhere to go. In 1945 the United States pressurized Britain to allow 100,000 Jews into Palestine. David Ben Gurion, one of the Jewish leaders, supported this demand. However, the British refused to yield to the US pressure, as they did not want to offend the Arabs.

Jewish Attacks against Arabs and the British:

The Jews, who had suffered at the hands of the Nazis, were determined to fight for their 'national home'. They began a terrorist activities against both Arabs and British. One of the most remarkable incidents was the blowing up of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, which the British were using as their headquarters. In this terrorist act ninety-one people were killed and many more injured. The British responded quickly by arresting Jewish leaders and by turning back ships such as the Exodus, crammed with Jews intending to enter Palestine.

Declaration of Independent Jewish State:

The British, weakened by the strain of the Second World War, felt unable to bring about a settlement to the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. Ernest Bevin, the Labour Foreign Secretary, questioned the United Nations to deal with the problem, and in November 1947 the UN voted to divide

Palestine, setting aside roughly half of it to form an independent Jewish state. Early in 1948 the British decided to withdraw from Palestine and let the UN carry out its own plan. Although fighting was already going on between Jews and Arabs, the British withdrew all their troops from Palestine. In May 1948 Ben Gurion declared the independence of the new state of Israel.

10.6 THE ARAB-ISRAELI WAR (1948)

When the formidable coalition of the Arab states declared war on the newly born state of Israel, most people expected the Arabs to win easily. However, in spite of overwhelming odds, the Israelis defeated them and even captured more of Palestinian land than the UN partition had given them. They gained about three-quarters of Palestine plus the Egyptian port of Eilat on the Red Sea. The Israelis won partly because they fought desperately, and partly because of lack of unity of Arab states. They were also divided among themselves and poorly equipped. King Abdullah of Jordan was more interested in seizing the area of Palestine west of the River Jordan known as the West Bank, so that he could make it part of his own state, than in giving it to the Palestinian Arabs. The most tragic consequence of the war was that the Palestinian Arabs became the innocent victims who found themselves without a state or a homeland. Some were in the new Jewish state of Israel, others who lived in the area grabbed by King Abdullah, found themselves living in Jordan. Nearly a million Arabs fled into Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria where they had to live in refugee camps in miserable conditions. Jerusalem was divided between Israel and Jordan. The United States, Britain and France guaranteed Israel's frontiers, but the Arab states did not regard the ceasefire as permanent. They refused to recognize the legality and independence of Israel, and they regarded this war as only the first round in the struggle to destroy Israel and liberate Palestine.

10.4 SUMMARY

There was the manifestation of the rise of Arab nationalism. After the Treaty of Versailles and the confirmation of mandate over the territories of the erstwhile Ottomans. West Asia had been the dangerous hotbed of crises and conflicts ever since the end of the Second World War. The sources of the Arab-Israeli conflict can be traced to a complex of interrelated causes. The most important of these causes was the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. The United States, Britain and France guaranteed Israel's frontiers, but the Arab states did not regard the ceasefire as permanent. They refused to recognize the legality and independence of Israel.

10.5 QUESTIONS

1. Trace the growth of Arab nationalism .
2. Give an account of the Arab-Israeli wars from 1948 to 1973.
3. Examine the peace process between Egypt and Israel.
4. Discuss the various attempts made towards peace between the Israelis and Palestinians.

10.6 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Story Richard Japan and The Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943, 1979 New York City, St. Martin Press. Kirk S.E. A Short History of the Middle East. New York 1959
- Hayes C.J. H. Contemporary Europe Since 1870-1955 New York Macmillan
- Hazen Charles, Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand, 1992.
- Hayes C.J. H. Contemporary Europe Since 1870-1955 New York Macmillan
- Lipson E. Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries – 1916 London. A.H. Black.

NAZISM, FASCISM AND MILITARISM

Unit Structure

- 11.0 Objectives
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 Causes for the rise of Nazism
- 11.3 Foreign Policy under Nazi rule of Hitler
- 11.4 Rise of Fascism in Italy
- 11.5 Foreign Policy under Fascist Rule
- 11.6 Factors Responsible for the rise of Militarism in Japan
- 11.7 Summary
- 11.8 Questions
- 11.9 Additional Readings

11.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying the module the student will be able to

- Understand the factors responsible for the rise of Fascism in Italy.
- Describe the domestic policy of Mussolini.
- The causes for the rise of Nazism in Germany.
- Hitler's domestic policy.
- Hitler's foreign policy.
- Rise of Militarism in Japan.

11.1 INTRODUCTION

After the First World War the democratic government in Europe could not work properly except Britain and France. The war had devastated these countries. The European democracies, were based on coalitions with narrow majorities. This weakened the democratic governments. They were unable to solve the post war economic problems and provide strong and stable government. Thus, the post-war Europe witnessed the rise of dictatorships in various countries. Nazism was a political movement - and later on a form of government - that developed in Germany in the 1920's. The Nazis led by the dictator Adolf Hitler, controlled Germany from 1933 to 1945.

11.2 CAUSES FOR THE RISE OF NAZISM

The Treaty of Versailles:

The defeat of Germany in World War I and the humiliation that she later faced, made her want her revenge. The Treaty of Versailles caused a deep wound on the minds of the Germans. It was not a matter of choice for them. Their delegates were not even allowed to participate in the drafting of the treaty, but were forced to sign it. The entire burden of the war guilt was placed on her, branding her an aggressor.

War Indemnity:

By the treaty she was practically stripped of everything she had, and had to agree to pay a ridiculously high war indemnity. The coal mines of Saar were given to France for fifteen years. Germany lost 1/6 of her arable land, 2/5 of her coal, 2/3 of iron, and 7/10 of her zinc. The war indemnity was fixed at \$33 billion. The Allies knew that she would not be able to pay this amount even if she borrowed from friendly nations. The Germans not being in a position to meet all the demands were only waiting for an opportunity to revoke the treaty.

Territorial Losses:

The Germany was forced to give up territory. They surrendered Alsace and Lorraine to France, Malmedy to Belgium northern Schleswig to Denmark, Posen to Poland, Upper Silesia to Czechoslovakia, and Danzig was made a free city. All her colonies were taken away and her position in China she surrendered to Japan.

Incapable Weimar Republic government:

The Germans were not willing to accept the Weimar Republic, which the Allies had set up for her. The new government was not able to cope with the problems of inflation, rising prices and unemployment. There were severe food shortages also. After the Depression of 1929, the Germans lost their faith in the democratic government and were looking for someone to pull them out of their problems.

Economic Conditions:

The economic problems seemed uncontrollable. Inflation was very high and the German Mark lost all its value. In 1923, France occupied the Rhur valley because Germany had failed to pay its indemnity. The value of the Mark dropped to 40,000 for a dollar. By November 1923, it was quoted as 4,200,000,000,000 marks per dollar.

Limitation on Armed Forces and Armaments:

In their determination to keep Germany down, the Allies had limited Germany's armed forces. She was not permitted an Air Force at all. Her

army was cut down to 100,000 men and the navy to 15,000 men. Factories producing war materials had to be destroyed. The Rhineland was demilitarised. Germany complied with all these requirements, but around her the other countries continued with the production of war materials. It was but natural that Germany would be upset. The League of Nations failed to check the race for armaments. The disarmament Conference held at Washington was not successful. So, Germany secretly started manufacturing weapons and small battleships. In 1935, Britain permitted Germany to increase the strength of her navy. It was a typical case of guilty conscience, since the Allies had not kept to their word of disarming themselves after the war. This gave Hitler an excuse to defy the Treaty of Versailles.

Policy of Appeasement:

One of the key factors, which gave rise to Hitler's aggressive nationalism, was the policy of appeasement, followed by Britain and France. While Hitler was breaking the Treaty of Versailles clause by clause these countries did not have the courage to stop him. A joint armed intervention on their part would have been sufficient but they preferred to remain quiet. Hitler's acts of aggression, namely the invasion and annexation of Austria, Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia remained unchecked.

Growth of Communism:

The German businessmen were worried about the steady growth of Communism in the country. The number of Communists in the Reichstag (Parliament) increased. Hitler had strong anti-Communist views and he spoke of Germany as a 'bulwark against a world socialist revolution'. The German industrialists and businessmen supported him with money, so that the Nazi troops might help to destroy the trade unions etc.

Role of Hitler's Personality in growth of Nazism:

Hitler was a great orator and he exploited the psychological state of the Germans to win them over. Through his speeches he played upon the deep discontent of the people. He promised food, employment to thousands who were unemployed, to fight inflation and so on. His speeches against the Jews, Germany's foreign oppressors and the harsh Treaty of Versailles, secured millions of votes for the Nazi party.

Adolf Hitler was born on 20th April 1889, in Austria. He developed hatred towards the Jews as they controlled the financial institutions. He went to Munich (Germany) in 1912, and when the war broke out in 1914, he joined the army. He was wounded in the war, and for his bravery he was given the Iron Cross. The defeat of Germany and the hardships she faced caused him great distress. He remained unemployed. It was at this time his political career began. In 1919, he formed the German workers party. He was able to gather around him men like Herman Goering and Joseph Goebbels, who became his strong supporters.

Mein Kampf: The Propagation of Nazism:

During his prison days he wrote his memoirs called *Mein Kampf*. This book contained his deep-rooted prejudices on many issues and it outlined the programme of the National Socialist Party. It included: (1) Plans for expanding the German Empire (2) Plans for terminating the Treaty of Versailles, (3) Equality on armaments. (4) Regaining of colonies. (5) Anti-Semetism or anti-Jewish Policy. (6) Superiority of the Aryan race, (7) Removal of German war guilt, (8) Land reforms, (9) Better conditions for workers, (10) Nationalization of trusts and the like.

Hitler was freed within a year and he turned to reviving his party. The party was converted into the National Socialist Party (Nazi Party). The party adopted the brown shirt as its uniform and the 'Swastika' as its emblem. Hitler was called the 'Führer'. The strength of the party kept increasing from 7 members in 1919, to 27, 117 in 1925, and to 176, 426 in 1929. In the 1924 general elections, the Nazi Party secured 32 seats and in 1932 230 seats. In January 1933, President Hindenburg invited Hitler to act as the Chancellor even though the Nazi Party did not have a clear majority in Parliament. Hitler used his powers to crush all opposition. On April 1, the Reichstag voted to give its powers to the Hitler government for a period of four years. Thus the democratic German Republic formally came to an end, and was succeeded by the THIRD REICH (Third German Empire.) This new government was inaugurated with great pomp and popular support. The press, radio and cinema were used to stir up patriotic emotions. Hitler used the supreme power given to him in organizing campaigns against the Jews and Communists.

Taking advantage of the popular enthusiasm for the 'New Germany,' Hitler and his Nazi lieutenants decided to get rid of all possible opposition. All parties were suppressed and Hitler declared that Germany would have only a single political party, the Nazi Party. In 1934, President Hindenburg died and Hitler took charge of two offices: the President and the Chancellor. At last by popular will, Adolf Hitler became the sole and supreme ruler of Germany.

Manifestation of Nazism through Foreign Policy:

Briefly the three goals of Hitler's foreign policy were: (1) The union of all people of German race by the right of self-determination in one great Germany. (2) The cancellation of the Treaty of Versailles (3) The acquisition of more territory for the support and settlement of the surplus population.

Hitler left the League of Nations and openly sent troops to remilitarize the Rhineland. Britain was not willing to take action against Germany for her violation of the treaty of Versailles. France dared not take action against Germany without the co-operation and collaboration of Britain. This policy of appeasement only encouraged Hitler to take larger risks.

Annexation of Austria:

During the Spanish Civil War, Hitler had learnt all he needed about the weakness of the Allies. He had found that his intervention in the Spanish problem, had not met with any resistance from the Great Powers. So he found the courage to embark upon a policy of naked aggression. He turned his attention to Austria whose union with Germany was prohibited by the treaty of Versailles. He encouraged Nazi agitation, bullied the Austrian Chancellor to appoint a Nazi minister in his cabinet. In 1934, when Nazi agents started a revolt and the Chancellor Dr. Dolfuss was murdered. The Austrian government was unable to contain the trouble, so Hitler sent the German army into that country and brought about the ANSCHLUSS (Union with Germany.)

Annexation of Sudetenland:

After Austria, Hitler turned his attention to Sudetenland where a large number of Germans were living. He accused the Czech government of oppressing the German minority. The Czech government denied this and said they had given the Germans all privileges. Hitler refused to accept the explanation and demanded that Sudetenland be ceded (given) to Germany, or he would take it by force if peaceful means failed. At this point Britain and France were very concerned. To check the growing ambition of Hitler, the leaders of France, Britain and Italy signed the MUNICH PACT with Germany on 8th September 1938. Hitler was allowed to annex Sudetenland to Germany. This policy of appeasement exposed the weakness of France and Britain. They were not prepared for another war.

Non-Aggression Pact with U.S.S.R.:

Hitler concluded a non-aggression pact with U.S.S.R. 23rd August 1939 and secured Russia's neutrality. Stalin was angry with Britain and France because he was ignored at the Munich Pact. He accused western democracies for encouraging Germany to attack Russia.

Attack on Poland:

Knowing that Hitler would turn his attention to Poland, Britain and France gave her a guarantee of protection. Hitler put pressure on Poland to return the city of Danzig. The whole world was shocked at the bullying tactics of Hitler and his war-mania. Having the backing of Britain and France, Poland refused Hitler's demands. Hitler then attacked Poland on 1st September 1939. Britain and France honoured their promise to protect and thus the world was drawn into another war.

Fascism:

Rise of Fascism in Italy:

The spirit of national pride and prestige was another factor driving European nations. People happily bore the burden of maintaining overseas empires by paying more taxes. Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany followed a expansionist policy to promote national glory. Democracy could not

survive for long and it received its first blow in Italy, where Fascism under Benito Mussolini emerged.

Political causes:

In spite of being a member of the Triple Alliance, Italy had remained neutral in the first year of the war. Italy changed sides and fought against Germany and Austria-Hungary. But she regretted her actions. She suffered defeats and hardships during the war. But she did not withdraw from the war, because she hoped that she would gain territory after it ended. At the Paris Peace Conference, she was handed over Trentino and Trieste as promised. But Italy felt that she deserved more and also asked for German colonies in Africa and the port of Flume on the Adriatic Sea. Her extra demands were rejected. There was a general sense of disappointment at the treatment given to Italy at the Paris Peace Conference. Most felt the Italy had not been sufficiently compensated for her efforts and sacrifices during the war. The people wanted the government to make a stronger demand, and when the delegation returned to Italy, it was jeered at by the crowds.

Economic Problems:

The post-war conditions in Italy had turned from bad to worse. Poor before, she was poorer now because of war expenditure. Industry and trade were disorganized, agriculture was stagnant and in the cities unemployment was increasing. The value of her currency had depreciated so much that the people were unable to buy the necessities of life. Public debt had increased due to the war and post-war budgets showed even bigger deficits. In some of the industrial regions of the north, there were serious labour strikes.

Failure of the Democratic Government:

Due to so much misery people lost their faith in the democratic government. Political instability was a common feature. Between 1919 and 1922, there were as many as six coalition governments. Politicians were corrupt and the administration was inefficient.

Benito Mussolini: Propagator of Fascism:

Mussolini started as a teacher, then turned into a socialist, and finally became an Editor of a Socialist newspaper. Because of his revolutionary activities, he was asked to leave the country. He returned to Italy for required military training but was soon arrested for revolutionary activities. Later he became Editor of AVANTI, a newspaper of the Italian Socialist Party. Mussolini's break with the Socialist Party began over the question of participation in the war. The majority opposed while Mussolini was in favour of joining. He joined the Italian army and fought on the battlefield. His army career was cut short because he was wounded. He used it to attack the Socialist party, as well as the existing government for being unable to control the economic unrest and violence. He got the

support of a large number of ex-soldiers, property owners and young intellectuals for the new movement, which he called FASCISM

Fascist party:

Between 1921-1922, there was a rapid rise of the Fascist Party and the opposition groups weakened. Mussolini strongly fought the Communists. It was this fight together with militant nationalism, which won the hearts of the bourgeoisie class, the ex-soldiers, peasants and workers. All these people were disgusted with the Government and the Communist take-over of the factories. The Fascist Party had two aims. The first was to restore the full authority of the government. The second was to encourage Italian Nationalism.

On October 27 the Prime Minister resigned, and the Fascist army moved from Naples to Rome. The regular army did not stop them, and King Victor Emmanuel III, without a government had no option but to send for Mussolini and ask him to form the government. Mussolini had hardly expected that his bluff would bring down a government, but that explains his popularity with the people.

Fascism: Totalitarian State:

Mussolini realized that his opponents were waiting to overthrow his government. So he demanded dictatorial powers for a year to end the disorder and violence in the country. He then proceeded to extend and consolidate the Fascist organization throughout the country. (1) Since he had the power Mussolini began to appoint his loyal supporters to important positions in the administration. (2) He then concentrated on establishing his supreme control over the legislature. He passed a new election law, according to which the party that secured the largest number of votes, automatically got 2/3 of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies (lower house.) In the 1924 elections the Fascists got a majority of votes and so they got 2/3 of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies. The opposition parties were threatened, some of their leaders were kidnapped or murdered. By 1928, there was hardly any opposition worth mentioning. He took other steps to maintain his control over the country. (3) The municipalities of towns and cities lost their local autonomy. (4) The press was censored. (5) Mussolini became the Supreme Commander of all the armed forces and he was responsible only to the King. (6) He ruled over the country with the help of a GRAND COUNCIL. The members of this Council were all Fascist Party members. They occupied ministerial positions, drafted laws and discussed national and international issues. (7) All educational institutions were controlled by the state. The textbooks glorified the state and preached loyalty to Il Duce. Fascist teachers and professors dominated the educational institutions. (8) A secret police force was formed and the death penalty was revived. Thus in all respects Italy became a totalitarian state.

The machinery of the Fascist Party and that of the Italian State were closely inter-linked and the supreme manipulator of both was Mussolini. He was Chairman of the Grand Council and through its military he was

master of the entire country. He was also Prime Minister of the State appointing officers, advising the King, drafting laws and much more. Very few statesmen had exercised such wide and dictatorial powers.

11.5 FOREIGN POLICY UNDER FASCIST RULE

The Fascists encouraged population growth, through early marriages and large families. The purpose of increasing the population was to make Italy a strong country. All children above the age of six were given military training. The army and navy were expanded. Mussolini declared the soon Italy would become a world power and the Mediterranean Sea would become an Italian lake (Mare Nostrum.) An ever-increasing population brought its own problems. Food production was less. Italy was left with no other option but to establish colonies. Mussolini adopted a vigorous policy of expansion.

Conquest of Abyssinia (Ethiopia):

But the most spectacular of Mussolini's achievements was the conquest of Ethiopia. He wanted to wipe off the humiliation of Italy's defeat in 1896. But the real cause was that Italy needed colonies to improve her prestige and to find more room and food for her growing population. Mussolini attacked Abyssinia (Ethiopia) in 1935. The King Haile Selassie appealed to the League of Nations. The League immediately declared Italy to be the aggressor. Mussolini however, defied the League, conquered Abyssinia and proclaimed King Victor Emmanuel III as the Emperor of Ethiopia in 1936.

Support to General Military Regime of Franco:

When the Spanish Civil War broke out in 1936, Mussolini looked upon it as a struggle between Communism and Fascism. He decided to support General Franco and sent Italian troops to Spain. He also had selfish reasons to support General Franco. He realised that a friendly Spain would be of great help in checking French and British influence over the Mediterranean region. Then it would be so much easier for Italy to control that region.

Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis:

After this war Italy drew closer to Germany and further away from France and Britain. Mussolini came to an understanding with Hitler and they formed the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis in October 1936. A month later Germany and Japan entered into the Anti-Comintern Pact against Russia. Italy also joined this Pact and this gave rise to the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis.

11.6 MILITARISM IN JAPAN

Factors Responsible for the Rise of Militarism in Japan:

There were several factors responsible for the rise of militarism in Japan. Some of the important factors were as below.

Military Tradition in Japan:

Japan had strong tradition of militarism with the Emperor as its head of honour and authority. During the regions of the Heian and the Kamakura dynasties, the Japanese army occupied the position of importance in the socio-Political set up of the country. The Emperor conferred the title of Shogun on Yoritomo, the head of a influential clan. Naturally, the Shoguns became the supreme commanders in the army of Japanese Emperor, who dominated politics and administration from sixteenth century to the twentieth century Japan. Consequently, it helped rise militarism in Japan to some extent.

Rise and Fall of Party System in Japan:

During the First World War, Germany and Russia were defeated and apparently weaker democratic nations became victorious. This situation captivated Japanese and led them towards the foundation of Liberal and party government. The expansionist policies were manifested by the Twenty one demands and Siberian campaign of Japan were criticized strongly everywhere. The lowering of military leadership in the war contributed much to the rise of party system in Japanese politics. In 1918, Hara Takashi, the leader of political party secured a seat in the lower House and made him to be Prime Minister of Japan. He selected all members of his cabinet from his own party and announced several reforms in the country. But his rule could not last long, because he was assassinated in 1921 and brought two more governments to power which were non-party Cabinets and headed by naval officers namely Admiral Kato and Viscount Kiyoura. These cabinet generated social and economic unrest which led Japanese to introduce universal manhood suffrage and bring to power one more party government. The Japanese working class began to engage itself in forming political parties and trade unions, consequently, the communist party of Japan came into existence in 1922. This resulted in the establishment of several proletarian and peasants parties in Japan.

Political Influence of the Zaibatsu:

In 1920, the political influence of the Zaibatsu class gave birth to large firms Like Mitsui, Mitsubishi and Yasuda Sumitomo. These firms controlled one fourth capital of Japan such as finance, bank, insurance business and enabled them to corrupt members of the 'Diet' and political parties. Due to their influence Japanese politics they always influenced cabinet decisions in their favours and scrapped the anti-trust Laws and the Laws regarding the growth of trade unions. Both politicians and bureaucrats began to receive donations and bribes from the Zaibatus

which obstructed the creation of sound economic foundation for political and social democratic set up. Due to favourable policies of the successive governments towards the business interest of the Zaibatsu, the welfare of common Japanese was totally neglected. This situation created the following as 1. Hatred of conservative nationalists against the Zaibatsu support to political parties. 2. Intense struggle between the young military officers and Zaibatus. 3. Feeling in the military class that Zaibatsu prevented the expansion of army and navy. 4. Dislike in radical army officers about Zaibatus economic independence and aristocratic status. 5. Public opinion extremely hostile towards the politicians, bureaucrats and the Zaibatus. Therefore, the Japanese favoured the military to control the government in Japan and it speeded the rise of militarism in Japan.

Rise of Ultra- Nationalist Groups:

After the Washington Conference of 1921-22, there emerged several ultra-nationalist groups, radical societies and terrorist organizations in Japan, which paved the way for the rise of militarism in Japan. Some of the important groups were as 1. Gen Yosha 2. The Black Dragon Society. 3. The Japan National Socialist Party. 4. The State Shintoists 5. The Sakurakai. Among these groups the first group Gen Yosha was popularly known as the Sea of Genkai that was founded in 1881 and had three aims as crossing the sea of Genkai means adopting the policy of expansion, nationalistic dedication to the emperor and the support for the movement popular rights. Thus, this group favoured the rise of militarism in Japan. The other groups like the Black Dragon Society and the Japanese Production Party emphasized on the attainment of national economic self-sufficiency and equitable distribution of sources of income. They advocated the expansion in the Japanese empire in the Amur River region and realization of its empire in the Greater East Asia.

The Manchurian Crisis:

This crisis also contributed to the rise of militarism in Japan. In 1931, there was a clear split between the Liberal Government in Tokyo and the military classes. This was further divided into armed clashes by an explosion of bomb on the Southern Railroad near Mukden, on the night 18-19 September, 1931. This incident provoked the Japanese armed forces to control Mukden, the Capital of Manchuria and Later whole Manchuria on the basis of protecting Japanese people and their property. So, Manchurian incidence brought military leadership to the forefront in Japan and led her to enter the age of militarism, giving whole Japanese administration in the hands armed personnel

Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis:

After this war Italy drew closer to Germany and further away from France and Britain. Mussolini came to an understanding with Hitler and they formed the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo in October 1936. Within a month Germany and Japan entered into the Anti-Comintern Pact against Russia. Italy also joined this Pact and this gave rise to the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis.

In the Second World War Japan was defeated eventually and Until 1952 she was occupied by allied troops, mostly Americans, under the command of General MacArthur. For the first three years the Americans aimed to make sure that Japan could never again start a war. She was forbidden to have armed forces and was given a democratic constitution under which ministers had to be members of the Diet (parliament).

11.7 SUMMARY

The defeat of Germany in World I and the humiliation that she later faced, made her want her revenge. The Treaty of Versailles caused a deep wound on the minds of the Germans. People saw emancipation in Hitler. He promised food, employment to thousands who were unemployed, to fight inflation. Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany followed a expansionist policy to promote national glory. They were soon joined by Japan. They formed the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo in October 1936. It was only after the defeat of Nazism, Fascism and Militarism that democracy emerged in Germany, Italy and Japan respectively.

11.8 QUESTIONS

1. Analyze the domestic and foreign policy of Mussolini.
2. How and why did Fascism emerge in Italy?
3. Bring out the salient features of Mussolini's dictatorship.
4. Discuss the reasons for the rise of Nazism in Germany. What was the policy of the Nazi Party?
5. Describe the rise of Hitler to power in Germany.
6. Examine the domestic and foreign policy that Hitler followed. Account for the rise of militarism in Japan.
7. Explain the role of the Zaibatsu in the rise of militarism in Japan.

11.9 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Carrie Albrecht. R.A. Diplomatic History of European Since the congress of Vienna- New York, Harper 1958.
- Hazen Charles, Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand, 1992.
- Cornell R.D. World History in the Twentieth Century - Longman, Essex 1999.
- Lowe Norman, Mastering Modern World History -4th Ed. 2005, Palgrane Macmillan.

- Taylor's A.J.P. The struggle for Mastery in Europe (1848-1918) – 1954. Oxford.
- Kennedy MA, A Short History of Japan, North American Library Press 1965
- David M.D. Rise and Growth of Modern Japan- Himalaya Publication House, Mumbai 1999.

munotes.in

HUMAN TRAGEDY AND EXISTENTIALISM

Unit Structure

- 12.0 Objectives
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Loss of Human Lives and Destruction
- 12.3 Changes in the European Society
- 12.4 Existentialism
- 12.5 Tracing Existentialism
- 12.6 Summary
- 12.7 Questions
- 12.8 Additional Readings

12.0 OBJECTIVES

After studying the module the student will be able to

- Understand the Loss of Human Lives and Destruction in world war.
- Changes in the European Society.
- The philosophy of Existentialism.
- The contribution of philosophers in Existentialism.

12.1 INTRODUCTION

The World War I had far reaching consequences on the subsequent history of Europe in particular and world in general. The World War I produced disastrous consequences in the field of politics, economy and society. There was greater political instability in the war ravaged countries as their governments were unable to solve the post-war economic and social problems. This consequently led to the rise of dictatorships in different countries of Europe. The dictators were to shape the future course of the European history leading the world to another major catastrophe. The chief results of the World War I are the following:

12.2 LOSS OF HUMAN LIVES AND DESTRUCTION

The World War I caused immeasurable destruction. Approximately ten million soldiers died as a result of the war - far more than had died in all the wars during the previous 100 years. About twenty one million men were wounded. No one knows how many civilians perished of disease, starvation and other war related causes. Some historians acknowledge that as many civilians died as soldiers. Belligerent governments had spent more than £ 40,000,000,000 in pursuit of victory. The cost of devastation was incalculable. Property destruction in the World War I was greatest in France and Belgium. Armies devastated farms and villages as they passed through them. The war resulted in the destruction of factories, bridges and railroad tracks. Artillery shells, trenches and chemicals made the land unproductive along the Western Front.

Damage to European Industry and Trade:

The real issue for the European nations in the post-war years was to restore Europe to its pre-war position in world trade and industrial production. For four years Europe had been shut out of world markets and new competitors, the United States, Japan and South America had taken over her markets. The war was followed by a boom in production caused by the need to rebuild industry and towns, to replace basic consumer goods which were in short supply. The boom broke in 1921, and though there was a slow improvement up to 1929, the World Trade depression of 1929-31 hit trade and industry not only in Europe, but all over the world. In this way, Europe was unable to regain her earlier position in the international trade and industrial production which she had enjoyed in the years before the war. The burden of war debts, the growth of tariffs, the fall in the prices of raw materials and foodstuffs which hindered the less developed countries from buying industrial goods, the weakness of national currencies, the lack of a steady system of international finance, the decline in demand for the basic industrial products of Europe such as coal, iron and steel, textile and ships, all these factors kept European exports of the commodities low and unemployment high. The European countries had changed from creditor nations to debtor nations. Nations involved in the war raised amount of the money to pay for the war through income taxes and other taxes. But large portion of money came from borrowing, which created huge debts. Governments borrowed from citizens by marketing and selling war bonds. The Allies also borrowed heavily from the United States of America. Additionally, most governments printed extra money to meet their needs. Nonetheless, the increased money supply caused severe inflation after the war. The Allies tried to reduce their debts by demanding compensations from the Central Powers, especially Germany. Compensations worsened the economic problems of the defeated countries and did not solve the problems of the victors.

12.3 CHANGES IN THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY

The World War I brought huge changes in society. Europe's rising population was checked only briefly by the War, by the influenza epidemic which followed it and by the further upheavals such as those in Russia. The rate of increase in population nevertheless slowed down in the twentieth century. Developing technology, improved nutrition and advance in medicine facilitated in increasing the standards of living and better quality of life. Many people chose not to continue their old ways of life after the War. Urban areas developed as peasants settled in cities instead of returning to farms. Women employed in offices and factories after men went to war, and they were reluctant to give up their new independence. Many countries acknowledged the right of vote to women. In England women over thirty were given the right to give vote in 1918. The difference between social classes began to blur as a result of the World War I and society became more democratic. The upper classes, which had customarily governed, lost some of their power and privileges after the war. Men of all classes had experienced the same danger and horror in the trenches. Those who had bled and suffered for their country came to demand a say to administration of it.

The Second World War like the First, conveyed economic, social and political changes. In 1945 the most severe economic and social changes came in central and Eastern Europe, and where many countries underwent a complete economic reorganization under Communist control. The greatest political changes came in the Asiatic countries of China, India, Burma, Malaya and Indonesia. World War II produces disastrous results, unparalleled in the history of mankind.

- 1) During the five years and ten months of war, it was estimated that twelve million soldiers were killed in action. Another twenty five million died due to starvation and disease. About 1,60,000 people died in Japan because of the atom bombs. Even today the children of those who survived the holocaust, suffer from skin diseases and cancer. The numbers will never be accurate, but this time women and children figured very high on the death roll.
- 2) The USA spent nearly 350 billion dollars. The other countries also spent something like a trillion dollars (i.e. 1,000 billion.) At the end of the war Europe found itself completely ruined and devastated. Almost every European State had witnessed heavy bombing. Industries were destroyed, ports, railways, bridges were destroyed and civilian homes as well. Every country found itself bankrupt and this affected political life. European nations came to be influenced by socialist and leftist ideas due to the capitalistic role world wars. E.g. the Labour Government came to power in Britain soon after the war.
- 3) The war caused sufferings to millions of people all over the world. Everything was in short supply. There was shortage of foodstuff, kerosene, building materials etc. Prices shot up and the standard of living went right down.

- 4) The people of the world were horrified at the moral degeneration of all humanity. The worst possible cruelties and atrocities on other innocent human beings were committed in the wars. The Nazi regime had massacred millions of Jews in the most terrible way. The dropping of the atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki proved that man was prepared to wipe out his own species. Acts like these showed the depth of moral degradation.
- 5) The three great Axis Powers i.e. Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and militarist Japan were completely crumpled. Germany was divided into four zones, and each zone was put under the control of USA, Britain, France and Soviet Russia respectively. The capital city of Berlin was also divided into four zones. These zones were placed under foreign military control between 1945-1948. Italy lost all her colonial possessions. Germany had to pay a war indemnity and Russia got a hundred million dollars as reparation from Italy. She collapsed economically and the Marshall Plan helped her to recover. Japan also lost her entire colonial empire including Korea, Manchuria and Taiwan. The Allied Forces (SCAP) under General Eisenhower of the USA occupied her to bring back normalcy. Due to aid of America, all these three countries under democratic governments have staged an economic recovery.

12.4 EXISTENTIALISM

The Second World War had deep impact on the existing philosophical discourse. The thought that the universe is not a rational and coherent place, and that human reason is subordinate to emotion became more dominant. This belief or assumption came to be known as Existentialism. It refers to the philosophical and literary movement. Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980) and Albert Camus (1913–1960) first promoted the term emerged with these and other twentieth century philosophers such as Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) and Simone de Beauvoir (1908–1986), we can trace its roots to the religious thinkers, Blaise Pascal (1623–1662) and Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855). While these "proto-existentialists" did not use the term, their philosophical concerns were direct precursors to the existentialist movement that took shape after World War II. Unlike many of the other complex viewpoints, existentialism derives from ordinary and everyday human experiences. Existentialism basically seeks to explore the fundamental problems that human beings face during the course of their lives. Existentialism forces us to ask ourselves life's fundamental questions: What is base of existence? Why am I here? What does my life mean? Some thinkers described existentialism as almost difficult to define as a philosophical process.

12.5 TRACING EXISTENTIALISM

Existentialism is a movement or trend involving philosophical themes rather than a comprehensible system of philosophy. Oxford Dictionary describes it as the theory that humans are free and responsible for their own actions in a world without meaning. Merriam-Webster describes it as a chiefly twentieth century philosophical movement embracing diverse doctrines but centering on analysis of individual existence in an unfathomable universe and the plight of the individual who must assume ultimate responsibility for acts of free will without any certain knowledge of what is right or wrong or good or bad.

It is possible to trace through the past a number of predecessors who were not existentialists, but did explore existentialist themes and thereby paved the way for the creation of existentialism in the twentieth century. Fyodor Dostoyevsky (1821-1881), Russian novelist, is also important precursor of twentieth-century existentialism. The idea that there is no coherent pattern in life that we can rely upon is prominent theme in it. The third predecessor was Franz Kafka (1883-1924), author of *Metamorphosis*. In this work, Kafka carries the notion of being born or thrown into a precise time and place. This is the story of protagonist Gregor Samsa, in his novel published in 1915. Gregor is isolated from everyone carrying the guilt that he can no longer work to support his family. He is abused and starved. She wrote two novels- 'The Trial' and 'The Castle'. Most of his works are highly ambiguous and all his major novels were left uncompleted. Existentialism found a particular applicability in World War II, when Europe was threatened consecutively by material and spiritual devastation.

Kierkegaard (1813-1855) is Denmark's greatest philosopher and a key figure in the creation of existentialism. He was a philosopher, religious writer, satirist, psychologist and a literary critic. He was born in wealthy family in Copenhagen. That permitted him to dedicate his life to the pursuits of his scholarly interests, distancing himself from everyday man of his times. Kierkegaard, like many other philosophers, questioned the idea of progress in general, not because it makes people depressed but because it could make life too stress-free. According to him the technical progress threatens our life as it distracts us from the real existential issues. Kierkegaard surveyed the theme of nervousness in several short books written under various fictitious name. *The Concept of Anxiety*, *Stages on Life's Way* and *Sickness unto Death*. He drew how the Christian must move from the attitude of atheist to the religious person, ready to make any sacrifice for God.

A German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) challenged the foundations of Christianity and traditional morality. His writings on truth, morality, language, aesthetics, cultural theory, nihilism, power, consciousness and the meaning of existence have exercised a massive influence on western philosophy and intellectual history. Key existentialist philosophers after Nietzsche were Martin Heidegger, Jean Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camus. Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) is commonly recognized as one of the significant philosophers of twentieth

century. His thinking contributed to different fields as phenomenology, existentialism, hermeneutics, political theory, psychology and theology. Heidegger's existential concerns were questions about how to live realistically, that is with reliability in a dangerous world.

Heidegger understood that the best opening point for a broad understanding of being was to consider it from the point of view the human being; not in an intellectual sense, but a person engaged with his or her living world. He also explored the implication of our morality, our place in the world and among other people an individual. He begins his philosophy with a profound anti-Cartesians that rejects any dualism regarding mind and body, the distinction between subject and object and the very language of consciousness, experience and mind.

'Existentialism and Humanism' is a 1946 philosophical contribution by Sartre. He states that the key defining concept of existentialism is that the existence precedes essence. Then he claims that individual must take responsibility for behavior. He defines agony which is related with his concept of depression. Sartre inscribed his thoughts successfully in number of literary modes. His plays are richly figurative and serve as a means of conveying his philosophy. The best known is *No Exit* (1944). His first great novel *Nausea* (1938) describes about the absurdity of human life. The major fiction written by him is- *The Roads to Freedom* trilogy. He composed numerous short stories from an early age one of it was renowned as a masterwork. Set during the Spanish Civil War, his story *the Wall* focuses on the psychology of three prisoners convicted to death without trial and awaiting execution at dawn.

Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1986) was a French writer, feminist, existential philosopher, political activist and social theorist. She significantly influenced both feminist existentialism and feminist theory. She is well known for her well-known book, *The Second Sex* (1949). The book deals with the treatment of women throughout history and is often regarded as a major work of feminist philosophy and the starting point of second wave of feminism. She traced the way women have been seen. *The Ethics of Ambiguity* is her philosophical essay in which she developed existential ethics that condemned the spirit of seriousness in which people too readily identify with certain abstractions at the cost of individual freedom and responsibility.

Albert Camus (1913-1960) was a French Nobel prize winning author and philosopher. Although he separated himself from existentialism, Camus posed one of the twentieth century's best known existential questions in his 'The Myth of Sisyphus:' —There is only one really serious philosophical question and that is suicide. In it Sisyphus had to push a rock up a mountain; upon reaching the top, the rock would roll down again, leaving Sisyphus to start again. Camus sees Sisyphus as the absurd hero who lives life to the full, hates death and is condemned to a meaningless task. Thus, Camus introduces his philosophy of absurdity in life.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) is another significant and often unnoticed French existentialist of the period. He bears strong influence of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. The constitution of meaning in human experience was his foremost interest, and he wrote on perception, art and politics. He articulated his philosophical understandings in writings on art, literature, linguistics and politics. He was a major phenomenologist of the first half of the twentieth century to get involved extensively with the sciences and especially with descriptive psychology.

Existentialism in contemporary world:

The message of existentialism, unlike that of obscure and theoretic philosophical movements, is as simple as can be. It is that every one of us, as an individual, is responsible- responsible for what we do, responsible for who we are, and responsible for the way we face and deal accordingly with the world, accountable eventually, for the way the world is. It is the philosophy of no justification. We cannot shift that burden onto God, or nature, or the ways of the world. Existentialism has continued to play an important role in contemporary thought in both the continental and analytical traditions. It introduced a new norm and authenticity for understanding what it means to be human. The society for phenomenology and existential philosophy, as well as societies dedicated to Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Beauvoir and other existential philosophers, provides a forum for ongoing work that derives from classical existentialism, often bringing it into fight with more modern movements such as structuralism, deconstruction, hermeneutics and feminism.

Existential ideas have once again become important in the works of prominent thinkers. The books by Cooper and Alan Schrift advocate that re-appraisal of existentialism is important in contemporary philosophy. Dr. Reynolds points out in introduction to existentialism with a consideration of how post-structuralists such as Foucault and Derrida extend certain reflections found in Sartre, Camus and Heidegger.

12.6 SUMMARY

The World War I caused immeasurable destruction. Europe was unable to regain her earlier position in the international trade and industrial production which she had enjoyed in the years before the war. Many people chose not to continue their old ways of life after the War. Urban areas developed as peasants settled in cities instead of returning to farms. Women employed in offices and factories after men went to war, and they were reluctant to give up their new independence. The dropping of the atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki proved that man was prepared to wipe out his own species. Acts like these showed the depth of moral degradation. Existentialism is a movement or trend involving philosophical themes rather than a comprehensible system of philosophy. The message of existentialism, unlike that of obscure and theoretic philosophical movements, is as simple as can be. It is that every one of us,

as an individual, is responsible- responsible for what we do. It is the philosophy of no justification.

12.7 QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the Important effects of World War I and II.
2. Elaborate: World wars responsible for great Human Tragedy
3. Describe existentialism and its phase
4. Trace the contribution philosophers in existentialism

12.8 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Hazen Charles, Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand, 1992.
- Fay S.B. Origins of the World War 1930 New York- Second Ed. New York Free Press 1999.
- Hayes C.J. H. Contemporary Europe Since 1870-1955 New York Macmillan
- Lipson E. Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries – 1916 London.A.H. Black.
- Lowe Norman, Mastering Modern World History -4th Ed. 2005, Palgrane Macmillan.
- Taylor's A.J.P. The struggle for Mastery in Europe (1848-1918) – 1954. Oxford.
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/existentialism/><https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/existentialism>

PROCESS OF DECOLONIZATION AND COLD WAR

Unit Structure

- 13.0 Objectives
- 13.1 Introduction
- 13.2 Factors responsible for decolonization
- 13.3 British Decolonization
- 13.4 French Decolonization
- 13.5 Dutch Decolonization
- 13.6 Spanish Decolonization
- 13.7 Cold War: Vietnam, East Timor and Angola
- 13.8 Summary
- 13.9 Questions
- 13.10 Additional Readings

13.0 OBJECTIVES

1. To study the process of decolonization.
2. To understand the various factors that led to the development of free nations.
3. To study the beginning of the cold war in decolonized countries.

13.1 INTRODUCTION

Decolonization was a process by which the non-self-governing territories including colonies and protectorates of Western imperial powers gained independence. The term decolonization came to be used for the emergence of independence states after the end of the Second World War. At the end of the Second World War in 1945, the nations of Europe claimed ownership of vast areas of the rest of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa. Britain's empire was the largest in area, consisting of India, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya, enormous tracts of Africa, and many assorted islands and other territories such as Cyprus, Hong Kong, the West Indies, the Falklands and Gibraltar.

13.2 FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR DECOLONIZATION

Process Of Decolonization
And Cold War

Nationalism:

Organized opposition to colonial rule, often referred to as nationalist movements, emerged at different times and took different forms in different colonies. Nationalists were people who had a natural desire to get rid of their foreign rulers so that they could have a government run by people of their own nationality. Although the European powers claimed to have brought the benefits of western civilization to their colonies, there was a general feeling among colonial peoples that the Europeans, who took most of the profits from their partnership, were exploiting them. The development and prosperity of the colonies were being held back in the interests of Europe and most of the colonial peoples continued to live in poverty.

Impact of the Second World War:

The Second World War gave a great stimulus to nationalist movements in a number of ways. Before the Second World War, colonial peoples believed it would be impossible to defeat the militarily superior Europeans by force of arms. However, Japanese successes in the early part of the war showed that it was possible for non-Europeans to defeat European armies. Japanese forces captured the British territories of Malaya, Singapore, Hong Kong and Burma, the Dutch East Indies and French Indo-China. The Second World War weakened the European states, so that in the end, they were not militarily strong enough to hold on to their empires in the face of determined struggle for independence. The British were the first to recognize this, and they responded by giving independence to India (1947). After that, British policy was to delay independence as long as possible, but to give way when the pressure became irresistible. It was a further ten years before the Gold Coast became the first British territory in Africa to win independence. As Iain Macleod, the British Colonial Secretary later put it: "We could not possibly have held by force our territories in Africa; the march of men towards freedom cannot be halted; it can only be guided." The French, Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese reacted differently and seemed determined to hold on to their empires. But this involved them in costly military campaigns, and eventually they all had to admit defeat.

International Pressure:

There were international pressures on the colonial powers to initiate the process of decolonization. The United States being the earliest part of the British Empire to declare independence as early as in 1776 was hostile to imperialism. During the Second World War, President Roosevelt made it clear that he took the Atlantic Charter to apply to all peoples, not just those taken over by the Germans. He and his successor, Truman, pressurized the British government to speed up independence for India. One reason given by the United States for wanting to bring about the

decolonization and of the European colonial empires was that any delay in granting independence to European colonies in Asia and Africa would encourage the development of communism in those areas. Another important factor was that the Americans looked on the newly independent nations as potential markets into which they could step and establish both economic and political influence. The United Nations Organization, under influence of the United States, came out firmly against imperialism and demanded a step-by-step programme for decolonization. The Soviet Union also prompted the process of decolonization by constantly denouncing imperialism. While putting the European states under pressure, this encouraged nationalists all over the world to intensify their struggle for independence.

13.3 BRITISH DECOLONIZATION

India:

Indian national movement had begun in an organized manner with the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885. The national movement proceeded on moderate lines up to 1905 and militant lines up to 1920. From 1920, Mahatma Gandhi became the supreme leader of the Indian freedom struggle. He used the methods of Satyagraha, non-cooperation and civil disobedience as weapons of the national movement. The civil disobedience movement in the form of Quit India movement was resumed in August 1942. Gandhi, Nehru, and thousands of their supporters were rounded up and imprisoned, and the Indian National Congress was outlawed. With the help of Subhas Chandra Bose, who had organized a 'provisional Indian government' in Burma, the Japanese promptly intensified military operations along the Burmese-Indian frontier. Under the provisions of the Indian Independence Act, which became effective on 15 August 1947, India and Pakistan were established as independent states within the Commonwealth of Nations, with the right to withdraw from or remain within the Commonwealth.

Burma:

After establishing full control over Burma by 1885, the British moved the capital from royal Mandalay to the port city of Rangoon in 1886, and developed it as a sub-station of the British Empire in India. After the end of the war, the returning British found the AFPFL, led by Aung San, had nearly monopolized indigenous political power. The AFPFL (Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League) negotiated with Britain to gain Burma's independence by 1948.

Ceylon (Sri Lanka):

Ceylon (Sri Lanka) had been a British colony since the last decade of the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century Ceylonese nationalist consciousness began to manifest in the social, religious, and educational fronts. During the World War I, the forces of Nationalism in Ceylon

gathered momentum. Civil disturbances in 1915 and subsequent political repercussions helped the growth of national political consciousness. In 1919 the Ceylon National Congress was formed, uniting Sinhalese and Tamil organizations. In response to Ceylonese nationalist leaders, who exerted pressure behind the scenes while cooperating with the war effort--the British in 1945 appointed the Soulbury Constitutional Commission, which drafted a constitution that gave Ceylon internal self-government, retaining some imperial safeguards in defense and external affairs. In 1947 the Ceylon Independence Act conferred dominion status on the colony. The British granted complete independence to Ceylon on 4 February 1948.

West Indies, Malaya and Cyprus:

Britain's West Indian possessions consisted of a large assortment of islands in the Caribbean Sea. The largest among them were Jamaica and Trinidad, and others included Grenada, St Vincent, Barbados, St Lucia, Antigua, the Seychelles and the Bahamas. In 1962 Britain decided to grant independence separately to all those islands, which desired to be independent. Thus, by 1983 all parts of the British West Indies, except a few tiny islands, had become independent. Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago were first to gain independence in 1962, and the islands of St Kitts and Nevis were the last in 1983. British Guiana became known as Guyana (1966) and British Honduras took the name Belize (1981). All of them became members of the British Commonwealth.

Malaya:

Malaya was liberated from Japanese occupation in 1945, but there were two problems to be faced before the British were prepared to withdraw. Malaya was a complex area, which was difficult to organize. It consisted of nine states each ruled by a sultan, two British settlements, Malacca and Penang, and Singapore, a small island less than a mile from the mainland. The population of Malaya was multi-racial. The move towards independence was accelerated when the Malay party, under their able leader Tunku Abdul Rahman, joined forces with the main Chinese and Indian groups to form the Alliance Party, which won 51 out of the 52 seats in the 1955 elections. This seemed to suggest stability and the British were persuaded to grant full independence in 1957 when Malaya was admitted to the Commonwealth. Malaya was running well under the leadership of Tunku Abdul Rahman, and its economy, based on exports of rubber and tin, was the most prosperous in Southeast Asia. In 1961 when Tunku Abdul Rahman proposed that Singapore and three other British colonies, North Borneo (Sabah), Brunei and Sarawak, should join Malaya to form the Federation of Malaysia, Britain agreed. After a United Nations investigation team reported that a large majority of the populations concerned was in favour of the union, the Federation of Malaysia was officially proclaimed in September 1963. Brunei decided not to join the proposed federation, and eventually became an independent state within the Commonwealth (1984). Although Singapore decided to leave the federation to become an independent republic in 1965, the rest of the federation continued successfully.

The Gold Coast:

The Gold Coast was the first black African state south of the Sahara to win independence after the Second World War with the new name Ghana (1957). The nationalist leader, Kwame Nkrumah, who was educated in London and the USA became the leader of the Convention of People's Party (CPP) in 1949 and organized the campaign for independence. There were boycotts of European goods, violent demonstrations and a general strike (1950), and Nkrumah and other leaders were imprisoned for a time. But the British, realizing that he had mass support, soon released him and agreed to allow a new constitution, which included adult franchise, and an elected assembly. In the 1951 elections, the first under the new constitution, the CPP won 34 seats out of 38. Nkrumah was released from prison, invited to form a government and became Prime Minister in 1952. This was self-government but not yet full independence. In 1957 Ghana, as it became known, received full independence.

Nigeria:

Nigeria was the largest of Britain's African colonies, with a population of over 60 million. The leading Nigerian nationalist was Nnamdi Azikiwe, popularly known to his supporters as 'Zik'. After his return to Nigeria in 1937 he soon gained enormous popular support and prestige. To press for the independence of Nigeria in 1945 Nnamdi Azikiwe organized a general strike. In 1954 a new constitution introduced local assemblies for the three regions with a federal government in Lagos, the capital. The regions assumed self-government first and the country as a whole became independent in 1960.

Tanganyika:

In Tanganyika the nationalist movement was led by the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) led by Dr. Julius Nyerere. Harold Macmillan's government, impressed by Nyerere's ability and sincerity, granted independence to Tanganyika with black majority rule (1961). The island of Zanzibar was later united with Tanganyika, and the country came to be known as Tanzania (1964). Nyerere was the President of Tanzania until his retirement in 1985.

Uganda:

In Uganda independence was delayed for a time by tribal conflicts. The ruler, known as the Kabaka of the Buganda area objected to the introduction of democracy. Eventually a solution was found in a federal constitution, which allowed the Kabaka to retain some powers in Buganda. Uganda itself became independent in 1962 with Dr Milton Obote as Prime Minister.

Kenya:

Kenya was the most difficult area to deal with because the 66,000 white settlers were violently opposed to black majority rule. They refused to

negotiate with the African nationalist leaders. African impatience burst out in a campaign of terrorist attacks on European owned farms and on black workers. It was organized by the Mau Mau secret society, whose members were mainly from the Kikuyu tribe, who had been deprived of much of their best land by the white settlers. n Kenya became independent in 1963.

Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia:

The British introduced new constitutions in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, which in effect allowed the Africans their own parliaments (1961- 62). Both wanted to leave the Federation, which was therefore terminated in December 1963. This was considered to be a defeat for the white settlers. The following year Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia became fully independent, taking the names Malawi and Zambia.

13.4 FRENCH DECOLONIZATION

After England, France had the second largest empire, with territories in Africa, Indo-China and the West Indies. In addition, Britain and France still held land in the Middle East taken from Turkey at the end of the First World War. Britain held Transjordan and Palestine, and France held Syria

Indo-China:

Indo-China was one of the most cherished possessions of the French empire from 1884 until 1940. Indo-China was into the five territories - Cochinchina, Tonkin, Annam (these three making up modern Vietnam), Cambodia and Laos, under a French Governor-General, the colony was ruled almost entirely for the benefit of the French economy, and to the advantage of French settlers and a small class of native collaborators. Resistance to the French started in the 1880's, but ruthless suppression crippled all attempts to set up a successful opposition movement until 1930, when Ho Chi Minh formed the Indo-China Communist Party and provoked widespread uprisings. During the war, the Japanese occupied the whole area, and resistance to the Japanese was organized by Ho Chi Minh through the League for Vietnamese Independence (Vietminh). When the Japanese withdrew in 1945, Ho Chi Minh declared Vietnam independent. This was unacceptable to the French, and an eight-year armed struggle began which culminated in the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu in May 1954. The defeat was a humiliating blow for the French and it caused a political crisis. The government resigned and the new and more liberal premier Pierre Mendes-France, realizing that public opinion was turning against the war, decided to withdraw from Indo China.

Tunisia:

In Tunisia the main nationalist group was the New Destour led by Habib Bourghiba. They had widespread support among both rural and townspeople who believed independence would improve their living standards. Bourghiba and other moderate leaders being in prison, the

guerrilla movement was becoming more left wing and less willing to negotiate. Being under pressure at the same time in Indo-China and Morocco, the French realized that they would have to compromise. Under these circumstances Bourghiba was released from prison and Mendes-France allowed him to form a government. In March 1956 Tunisia became fully independent under Bourghiba's leadership.

Morocco:

The Moroccan case was not very different than that of Tunisia. The pattern of events in Morocco was remarkably similar. The principal difference between the Moroccan and Tunisian cases lay in the temper of the ruler. Muhammad V had shown signs of allying himself with the Istiqlal (Independence) Party at the end of the war. The new trade unions also played an important role in the Moroccan freedom struggle. The French deposed Sultan Muhammad V in 1953, and placed the exiled sultan's uncle, Muhammad ben Arafa on the throne. This action of the French provoked violent demonstrations and a guerrilla campaign. Faced with the prospect of yet another long and expensive anti guerrilla war, the French decided to relent. In 1955, following the settlement with Tunisia, Sultan Muhammad V was brought back and before the end of the year France had agreed to concede full independence. It took effect on 2 March 1956. Both Tunisia and Morocco became full members of the Arab league in 1958.

Algeria:

There were over a million French settlers, known as colons that controlled nearly one-third of all the most fertile land in Algeria, taken from the original Algerian owners during the century before 1940. Encouraged by the French defeat in Indo-China, a more militant nationalist group was formed in Algeria. The National Liberation Front (NLF), led by Ben Bella, launched a guerrilla war towards the end of 1954. The war gradually escalated as the French sent more troops to Algeria in order to suppress the guerilla activities of the National Liberation Front. By 1960 the French had around 700,000 troops engaged in a massive anti-terrorist operation in Algeria. The war was having profound effects in France itself. In 1958 the war in Algeria caused the downfall of the French government and brought an end to the Fourth Republic in France. Unsuccessful talks took place in Paris, followed by renewed attacks in Algiers, forcing de Gaulle to state more clearly in November 1960 his eventual intention to emancipate Algeria. The Evian Accords also provided for a referendum, which was held on 1 July 1962. In this referendum the majority of Algerians voted for independence. Over the next few months, French settlers emigrated in large numbers, leaving Algeria under its first independent president, Ahmed Ben Bella.

13.5 DUTCH DECOLONIZATION

Before the second world war, Holland had a huge empire in the East Indies including the large islands of Sumatra, Java and Celebes, West Irian (part of the island of New Guinea) and about two-thirds of the island of Borneo. They also owned some islands in the West Indies, and Surinam on the mainland of South America, between British and French Guiana.

When the Japanese attacked in 1942, they released Sukarno and others and allowed them to play a part in the administration of the country, promising independence when the war was over. After the defeat of Japan in 1945, Sukarno declared an independent republic of Indonesia. Dutch were under strong pressure from the UN to reach an agreement with the Indonesian nationalists.

Belgian Decolonization:

Belgian controlled Congo and Ruanda-Burundi, ended in chaos, violence and civil war. Increasingly oppressive exploitation of the people of the Congo Free State caused continued unrest and finally led, early in the twentieth century, to international protest. On December 8, 1957, the Africans participated for the first time in voting for elective places on the township councils, winning 130 of 170 seats. The Belgians seemed taken by surprise when widespread rioting broke out in January 1959 in the capital of the Congo. Belgium then agreed to relinquish the colony. Congo became independent on 30 June 1960 with Lumumba as Prime Minister and Joseph Kasavubu, the leader of a rival nationalist group, as President. Unfortunately after independence the country was plunged into a disastrous civil war.

Ruanda-Burundi:

The other Belgian territory of Ruanda-Burundi was given independence in 1962 and divided into two states - Rwanda and Burundi, both governed by members of the Tutsi tribe, as they had been throughout the colonial period. After independence, both had a very unsettled history of bitter rivalry and violence between the Tutsis and the Hutus.

Spanish decolonization:

The largest colony of Spain was Spanish Sahara, and there were also the small colonies of Spanish Morocco, and Spanish Guinea. A dictator, General Franco who ruled Spain from 1939 until 1975, showed little interest in the colonies. When nationalist movements developed in the Spanish colonies, General Franco did not resist long in the case of Spanish Morocco. Guinea became independent as Equatorial Guinea in 1968. In the case of Spanish Sahara Franco was reluctant to consider granting independence because it was an important source of phosphates. Only after Franco's death in 1975 did the new Spanish government agree to grant independence to Sahara.

Portuguese Decolonization:

Angola and Mozambique: The main Portuguese possessions were in Africa: the two large areas of Angola and Mozambique, and the small West African colony of Portuguese Guinea. However, by 1960 the situation in the Portuguese colonies had considerably changed. The nationalists were greatly encouraged by the large number of other African states winning independence. Fighting broke out first in Angola (1961) where Agostinho Neto's, People's Movement for Angolan Liberation (MPLA) was the main nationalist movement. Still the Portuguese government refused to abandon its policy of suppressing nationalist movements in its colonies. However, the public opinion and many army officers were sick of the wars, and in 1974 the Salazar dictatorship was overthrown by a military coup. Soon all three colonies were granted independence. Guinea, which became independent in September 1974 took the name Guinea-Bissau. Mozambique and Angola became independent the following year.

Cold War: Vietnam, East Timor and Angola:

At the Geneva Conference held in July 1954, it was agreed that Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia should become independent. Unfortunately this was not the end of the troubles. Although the French had withdrawn, the Americans were unwilling to allow the whole of Vietnam to come under the rule of the communist Ho Chi Minh, and an even bloodier struggle developed. Vietnam became the victim of a bitter Cold War and the struggle between the communist dominated North Vietnam supported by the Soviet Union and China and South Vietnam supported by the United States lasted up to 1976.

Vietnam:

Indo-China, which consisted of three areas, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, was part of the French colonial empire in Southeast Asia. It was the scene of almost non-stop conflict from the end of the Second World War. In the first phase of the conflict the peoples of these areas fought for and won independence from the French. The second phase (1961-75) began with civil war in South Vietnam. The United States intervened in this conflict to prevent the further spread of communism, but eventually had to admit failure and withdraw from Vietnam. Thus, Vietnam became the victim of Cold War. In pursuing the policy of containment, the United States not only assisted the non-communist government in South Vietnam against the communist North Vietnam through financial and military assistance, but also eventually was dragged into conflict that caused death and destruction in Vietnam and humiliation to the United States.

Ho Chi Minh's Leadership:

From 1946 until 1954, the Vietnamese were fighting for independence from France. The Japanese occupied Indo-China during the Second World War. Resistance to both Japanese and French was organized by the League for Vietnamese Independence (Vietminh), led by the communist Ho Chi

Minh, who had spent many years in Russia learning how to organize revolutions. Despite its broad nationalist leanings the Vietminh was communist controlled and its ultimate aim was the establishment of a communist regime in Vietnam. By 1945 the Viet Minh had consolidated their position in the North. In August 1945, following the surrender of the Japanese, Ho Chi Minh declared the whole of Vietnam as the independent Republic of Vietnam in September 1945, before the arrival of Allied soldiers in the North. After the withdrawal of the British forces of occupation the French returned not only to the South but also to the North

The Geneva Agreement:

By the Geneva Agreement (1954), Laos and Cambodia were to be independent, and Vietnam was temporarily divided into two states at the 17th parallel. Ho Chi Minh's government was recognized in North Vietnam. South Vietnam was to have a separate non-communist government for the time being, but elections were to be held by 1956 for the whole country, which would then become united. Ho Chi Minh was disappointed at the partition, but was confident that the communists would win the national elections. As it turned out, the elections were never held, and a repeat performance of the Korean situation seemed likely. A civil war gradually developed in South Vietnam, which eventually involved the north, and the United States.

The South Vietnamese government under President Ng Dinh Diem refused to make preparations for the elections for the whole of Vietnam. The United States, which was backing his regime, did not press him for fear of a communist victory if the elections were held for the entire country. The President of the United States, Eisenhower (1953-61) was just as worried as Truman had been about the spread of communism.

The National Liberation Front:

The news of the success of the insurgents, and the consequent embarrassment of Diem, was observed with considerable satisfaction by the North Vietnamese government, which now proceeded to build on these foundations. In December 1960 the National Liberation Front (NLF) for the South, closely resembling the former Viet Minh, was formed. The NLF demanded a democratic national coalition government, which would introduce reforms and negotiate peacefully for a united Vietnam. The Buddhist monks had their own special brand of protest - committing suicide in public by setting fire to themselves. Diem's credibility declined further when he dismissed all criticism, however reasonable, and all opposition as communist inspired. In fact the communists were only one section of the NLF. Diem also introduced harsh security measures. He was overthrown and murdered in an army coup (1963), after which the country was ruled by a succession of generals, of whom President Nguyen Van Thieu lasted the longest (1967-75). The removal of Diem left the basic situation unchanged and the guerrilla war continued.

American Involvement in South Vietnam:

As the situation in the South deteriorated the United States increased its military aid and sent more military advisers. By 1963 there were 20,000 advisers in South Vietnam. Having failed to defeat communism in North Korea and Cuba, the United States felt a strong stand against communism should be taken in Vietnam. Both Kennedy and his successor, Lyndon Johnson, were prepared to go further than just economic aid and advisers. In public the Americans said their intervention was to protect the independence of the Vietnamese people, but the real reason was to keep the country securely in the non-communist bloc.

Soviet Interest in Vietnam:

In 1964 there was a year of chaos in which order was barely preserved by the South Vietnamese army. The Viet Cong acquired control of increasingly large areas, and began to launch attacks on South Vietnamese airfields. Elements of the North Vietnamese army entered South Vietnam and the Americans were faced with the choice of abandoning South Vietnam to its fate or intervening with air support and US Marine garrisons to guard American bases. President Kosygin of the Soviet Union visited Hanoi, seeking Russian involvement in the impending takeover of South Vietnam, while President Johnson (1963-69) of the United States, having taken the decision to employ American troops, had to ensure that they were effectively used.

US Bombardment of North Vietnam:

President Johnson was not deterred by reports from American advisers in 1964 that the Vietcong and the NLF controlled about forty per cent of South Vietnamese villages and that the peasant population seemed to support them. He assumed that the Vietcong were controlled by Ho Chi Minh and decided to bomb North Vietnam (1965) in the hope that he would call off the campaign. Over the next seven years a greater tonnage of bombs was dropped on North Vietnamese cities than fell on Germany during the Second World War. In addition, over half a million American troops arrived in the south.

End of the Vietnam War:

All these American tactics and strategies had no success. At the end of 1972, the Vietcong controlled the entire western half of the country. By this time Nixon was under pressure both at home and from world opinion to withdraw from Vietnam. Several factors caused revulsion of feeling against the Vietnamese war. The terrible bombing of North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia caused death of numerous innocent people. In desperation to win the war against the communists, the United States used of chemicals to destroy jungle foliage and inflammable napalm jelly, which burned people alive. Thousands of innocent civilians lost their lives and property in the inhuman use of chemical weapons by the United States.

East Timor:

East Timor was half of the small island in the East Indies; the western half belonged to Holland and became part of Indonesia in 1949. In 1975, East Timor's nationalist movement (FRETILIN) won a short civil war against the ruling group, which wanted to stay with Portugal. The USA denounced the new government as Marxist, which was not entirely true. After only a few weeks, Indonesian troops invaded East Timor, overthrew the government and incorporated it into Indonesia. The USA continued to supply military goods to the Indonesians, who were guilty of various atrocities both during and after the war. It is estimated that about 100,000 people were killed, which was nearly one-sixth of the population, while another 300,000 were put into detention camps. Resistance was still continuing in the early 1990s, but although the UN condemned Indonesia's action, East Timor was too small and, unlike Kuwait, too unimportant to warrant any sanctions being applied against Indonesia.

Angola and Mozambique:

The main Portuguese possessions were Angola and Mozambique, and the small West African colony of Portuguese Guinea. They also still owned the eastern half of the island of Timor in the East Indies. The right-wing Portuguese government of Salazar ignored nationalist developments in the rest of Africa, and for many years after 1945 the Portuguese colonies seemed quiet and resigned to their position. They were mainly agricultural colonies. In 1956 there were few people in the whole of Mozambique who had received any secondary education. Though nationalist groups were formed in all three colonies in 1956, they were insignificant. However, by 1960 the situation in the Portuguese colonies had considerably changed. The nationalists were greatly encouraged by the large number of other African states winning independence. The Salazar regime, having learned nothing from the experiences of the other colonial powers, stepped up its repressive policies, but this only made the nationalists in the colonies more determined to win independence. Fighting broke out first in Angola (1961) where Agostinho Neto's, People's Movement for Angolan Liberation (MPLA) was the main nationalist movement. Violence soon spread to Guinea where Amilcar Cabral led the resistance, and to Mozambique, where Eduardo Mondlane organized the FRELIMO guerrillas. These nationalists, who had strong Marxist connections, received economic and military aid from the communist bloc. The Portuguese army found it impossible to suppress the nationalist guerrillas. The Portuguese troops became demoralized and the cost of fighting the colonial guerillas escalated. Until by 1973 the government was spending forty per cent of its budget fighting three colonial wars simultaneously. Still the Portuguese government refused to abandon its policy of suppressing nationalist movements in its colonies. However, the public opinion and many army officers were sick of the wars, and in 1974 the Salazar dictatorship was overthrown by a military coup. Soon all three colonies were granted independence. Guinea, which became independent in September 1974 took the name Guinea-Bissau. Mozambique and Angola became

independent the subsequent year. This caused a serious crisis for Rhodesia and South Africa. They were now the only states left in Africa ruled by white minorities, and their governments felt increasingly threatened.

13.8 SUMMARY

Decolonization and emergence of independent nations in Asia and Africa following the Second World War was an important chapter in the history of contemporary world. Although some states, particularly Britain, handled decolonization better than others, in general the decolonization was a painful process that led to violence, and terrorism on the part of the colonists and repression and violation of human rights on the part of the European colonial powers. Especially, the decolonization process was accompanied by long drawn wars in the African continent. With lack of infrastructural facilities, poor education and health services and shortage of trained political and administrative personnel, the newly emerged independent African nations became victims of chronic power struggle and civil wars. Though there were some gains for the new states, which had much more control over their internal affairs, and there were some gains for ordinary people, such as advances in education and social services, the new nations had to face a number of new problems. Soon some of the nation became victim of cold war.

13.9 QUESTIONS

- 1) Describe the factors responsible for the decolonization process.
- 2) Examine the process of decolonization in the French colonial empire.
- 3) Give an account of the decolonization process in the Dutch and Belgian colonies.
- 4) Trace the development of cold war in decolonized nation

13.10 ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Hazen Charles, Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand, 1992.
- Grant and Temperley: Europe in 19th & 20th Centuries 1940 5th Ed. New York Longman 2005.
- Hayes C.J. H. Contemporary Europe Since 1870-1955 New York Macmillan
- Lipson E. Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries – 1916 London. A.H. Black.

- Lowe Norman, Mastering Modern World History -4th Ed. 2005, Palgrane Macmillan.
- Taylor's A.J.P. The struggle for Mastery in Europe (1848-1918) – 1954. Oxford.

Process Of Decolonization
And Cold War

munotes.in