

104HI21

by Cde Anu

Submission date: 29-Jul-2025 06:11PM (UTC+0530)

Submission ID: 2722366491

File name: 104HI21_FULL_BOOK.pdf (3.84M)

Word count: 76271

Character count: 378809

HISTORY OF MODERN WORLD I (Till 1914)

M. A. History First Year
Semester – I, Paper-IV



Director, I/c

Prof. V.VENKATESWARLU

MA., M.P.S., M.S.W., M.Phil., Ph.D.

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION

ACHARAYANAGARJUNAUNIVERSITY

NAGARJUNANAGAR – 522510

Ph:0863-2346222,2346208,

0863-2346259(Study Material)

Website: www.anucde.info

e-mail:anucdedirector@gmail.com

SEMESTER-I

ACHARYA NAGARJUNA UNNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY ARCHAEOLOGY

M.A. (HISTORY): PAPER – IV (H 1.4)

104H121 -HISTORY OF MODERN WORLD I (till 1914)

UNIT I : Colonialism – Imperialism – Mercantilism – Nation – States – Progress of Science and Technology.

UNIT - II : French Revolution – The Revolution of 1830 and 1848 – Question of Slavery – The Opium wars – Meiji Restoration.

UNIT - III : Unification of Italy – Unification of Germany – Growth of Militarism and Imperialism – Sino – Japanese war of 1894.

UNIT - IV : Industrial Revolution – Big Business in U.S.A – Open door policy of U.S.A in China.

UNIT - V : Russo – Japanese war of 1904 – 05 – Nationalism Balkan States – Liberal Reforms in Russia.

Suggested Readings:

1. Cipolla, C.M : Fontana Economic History of Europe, Vol. III (The Industrial revolution) Harvters, 1976
2. Evans, J : The Foundations of a Modern State in the 19th Century Europe
3. Hobsbawn, E : Nation and Nationalism (Cambridge, 1970)
4. Hobsbawn, E : The Age of Revolution (NAI, 1964)
5. Ivich, Charles: Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1840-1920 (University of and Barbara Washington Press, 1977)
6. Lichtheim, George: A Short History of Socialism (Glasgow, 1976)
7. Lucas, Colin, : The French revolution and the Making of Modern Political Culture, Vol.2 (Pergamon, 1988)
8. Nove, Alec : An Economic History of the USSR (Penguin, 1972)
9. Porter : Andrew, European Imperialism, 1860 - 1914 (1994)
10. Roberts, J.M : Europe 1880 – 1945 (Longman, 1989)
11. Wood, Anthony : History of Europe 1814 – 1960
12. Carnoll, Peter and : Free and Unfree: A New History of the United States David Noble
13. Faulkner, U : Economic History of the United States of America
14. Kristol, Irving, : America's Continuing Revolution (AM. Enterprises, 1975)
15. Pratt, W : A History of the United States Foreign Policy
16. Randall, James, et al : The Civil war and Reconstruction (Health & Co 1969)
17. Allen George : A short Economic History of Japan (London, Eirifngird & Nicolson, 1963)
18. Beckmann, George M : Modernization of China and Japan (Harper and Row, 1962)
19. Bia ci, Lucien : Origins of the Chinese Revolution, 1915 – 1949 (London, OUP, 1971)
20. Fairbank, John, et al : East Asia: Modern Transformation
21. Myers, Ramon H and : The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945 (Princeton University Press. 1987)
22. Mark R. Peattics (Eds.)
22. Pfeffer, Nathaniel : The Far East: A Modern History

HISTORY OF MODERN WORLD I

(Till 1914)

CONTENTS

S.No.	TITLES	Page No's
1	COLONIALISM	1 – 14
2	IMPERIALISM	15 – 20
3	MERCANTALISM	21 – 33
4	EMERGENCE OF NATION STATES	34 – 41
5	PROGRESS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE MODERN PERIOD	42 - 48
6	THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789)	49 – 55
7	1830 REVOLUTION	56 – 63
8	1848 REVOLUTION	64 – 71
9	11 QUESTION OF SLAVERY	72 – 87
10	OPIUM WARS	88 – 98
11	MEIJI RESTRATION	99 – 104
12	UNIFICATION OF ITALY	105 – 155
13	INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION	156 – 182
14	RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR	183 – 190
15	6 THE EASTERN QUESTION AND BALKAN NATIONALISM	191 - 201
16	LIBERAL REFORMS IN RUSSIA	202 - 216

LESSON 1-1

COLONIALISM

1.1.0. Objective of the Lesson:

¹³ The European colonial period was the era from the 16th century to the mid-20th century when several European powers (Particularly but not exclusively, Portugal, Spain, Britain, the Netherlands, Russia, Italy and France) established colonies in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. But ⁹ the main objective of the lesson is to explore the significance of colonialism in Asia.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 1.1.1 Introduction
- 1.1.2 Colonialism India
- 1.1.3. 1st Phase of Colonialism
- 1.1.4. 2nd Phase of Colonialism
 - 1.1.4.1. Constitutional Reforms
- 1.1.5. 3rd Phase of Colonialism
- 1.1.6. Colonial Policy and India
 - 1.1.6.1. Economic Effects
 - 1.1.6.2. Social Effects
 - 1.1.6.3. Political Effects
- 1.1.7. Colonialism in Asia
 - 1.1.7.1 Summary
 - 1.1.7.2. Self Assessment Question
 - 1.1.7.3 Reference Books

1.1.1. Introduction:

Colonization means process or a system under which a powerful nation manipulate to bring another nation under its subordination or control. Such a method of subordination can be either direct war or gradual expansion with the help of traders or religious missionaries. The

nation which thus establishes its control or authority fully saddles itself its authority in the colony. Whatsoever may be method of expansion, basic characteristics of colonialism remain unchanged.

1.1.2. Colonialism in India:

1 After having their foothold in India both the East India Company as well as the British government followed certain basic principles. These were:

- 1) The British believed that they have won India with the help of wars and as such they have every right to rule over India.
- 2) The British people in India followed the policy of exploitation of India's economic and manual resources and as such their policy resulted in exploitation of Indians, reducing them to poverty. This also resulted in large scale poverty.
- 3) The British during their stay in India tried to make India dependent on Britain. They therefore, did not make any effort to industrialize India.
- 4) The British felt that Indians knew fear and as such maximum use of force should be made so that they could be kept under control and subordination.
- 5) The British policy in India was that of divide and rule. They wished that Indian communities should be made to fight with each other. As long as there quarreled, British rule in India was quite safe.
- 6) The British people were of the view that the Indians were not capable of ruling themselves. They, therefore, did not feel the necessity of associating them in running their own administration.
- 7) During their long stay in India British government always felt that economic interests of Britain were more important than those of India. Finance minister in India cared more for British than Indian finances. The taxes were so imposed that British interests were better served than those of the interests of India.
- 8) British people in India followed free trade policy main aim of this policy was that Indian hand-made goods should compete with British machine-made goods. Since Indian industries could not compete with British goods without any protective policy, therefore, Indian industries were ruined and Indian cottage industries which were the basis of Indian economy were shaken from the grass-roots reducing those employed in the industries to the status of manual labourers as carpenters and masons.

- 9) In order to have their firm roots in India, Britishers in India sent their missionaries so that they could spread Christianity. Once the people of India were converted to the new faith then the question of leaving India did not arise.
- 10) The British fully well knew that India was a vast country and each part of India needed to be linked with the other. Yet in spite of this no efforts were made to develop means of transportation and communication in India.
- 11) British people in India and Britain always felt and fully realized that they were superior and it was their responsibility to train and civilize Indians who were much inferior to them in all respects.
- 12) As a colonial power British government in India ensured that it maintained certain controls and levers which were essential for running administration. Accordingly all the key posts were kept by the British people themselves.

In this way in India colonialism worked to its full. All characteristics and features of colonialism were fully operative in India and at the end when Britishers left India, the nation was bleeding. There was poverty, unemployment and non-industrialization.

The British colonialism in India broadly we can divide into three phases.

1.1.3. First Phase of Colonialism

First phase of colonialism may be called as mercantilism phase began with East India Company entry into India. The Company started with a trading centre at Surat and it began to expand. It was during their period that the East India Company got absolute trading rights in India from British government. At that time Mughal Empire in India was deteriorating stage and whole country was divided into several small states. Each state was incapable of depending itself.

These states were ill-equipped and did not know the use of the latest war equipments and techniques. Moreover these states were always quarreling with each other and thus nowhere near-unity.

But for the trades situation was not easy because European trading companies particularly the English, French, Portugal and Dutch were very keen to have exclusive control over Indian trade. These began to quarrel with each other. East India Company had Clive, a brilliant leader who was governor general of the company. His opponent French Governor General Duplex was no match for him. One after the other East India Company began to defeat the opponents and at last it was successful in eliminating other companies from the race.

After establishing full control over the soil of India, the Company started exploitation of manual and material resources of the country. While at that time in England, Industrial Revolution was in progress for that purpose it required raw material for feeding industries and markets for dumping manufactured goods in the country. The company, therefore, followed the policy of exploitation by way of killing India's small-scale and cottage industries. After the defeat of Nawab of Bengal at the Battle of Plassey East India Company got immense opportunities to exploit the people of Bengal. The Situation so much worsened that each servant of the company became a horror. The peasants and shopkeepers ran away from their fields and shops as soon as they saw a servant of the company. Not only this, but they were forced to pay taxes even by selling their utensils. There was no consideration whether there were floods or famines in the country resulting in untold miseries for the farmers.

By the time the company had established the trading centers along the coastal lines and that made the exploitation of all parts of India comparatively easier.

The company along with exploitation followed the policy of conquests. It waged wars against Indian Princes on one pretext or the other. It wanted to conquer Karnataka and then Mysore wars were fought. The Begums of Oudh were deprived of their treasurers. In Bengal, Battle of Plassey was fought. In fact there was no part of India in which during this period company did not fight wars. It won the battle at Buxar and Signed Treaty of Allahabad. The Mughal Emperor was deprived of all his powers and he was forced to accept only a small pension by which he could just maintain himself. He was made virtual prisoner of the British. The company created such a situation by which it had all rights, powers and privileges but no responsibilities either to the Mughal Emperor, or the British government or the people of India.

But the British East India Company proved wise in one respect. It did not interfere in the social life of the people. It rightly felt that it was a sensitive area and should not be touched. It, therefore, neither touched religion nor society of India. The old administrative and judicial system was allowed to continue and not disturbed. But in order to run its own affairs and to ensure that the work of the company ran smoothly, it passed several Acts. These began with the Act of 1773 and, thereafter, after every 20 years a new Act was given to the people of India. But in the beginning main aim of these Acts was to regulate the affairs of the company. It was with the help of these Acts that relations of Governor General with other member of his Council were to be regulated. Again these Acts also discussed the relation of Governor General with the Presidencies on the one hand and the Boards of Directors and control in India on the other. Gradually provisions of these Acts began to be extended to the territories which the company acquired. This created many problems

because existing legal system in India very much varied from the one which was introduced by East India Company in India with the help of these Acts.

During this period East India Company also did not interfere in Indian Village administration and villages were allowed to enjoy their autonomy as long as they continued to pay their revenues.

But the company was not satisfied with conquests only. It also followed the policy of consolidation. It quickly consolidated its gains. In some cases this was done only by retaining the old rule on the throne but making him only puppet. It also followed the policy of Subsidiary alliances by which East India Company was authorized to station its armies in the territory of the state, for which the state concerned paid all expenses. In turn the company took upon itself the responsibility of defending the state if there was any aggression from any quarter, Indian or foreign. The state also agreed that its foreign relations will be regulated by East India Company. The result of the arrangement was that the company should maintain a very good army at the cost of the states which joined this system. Since the scheme did not cost the company anything therefore, it was very much liked by Lord Wellesley, who operated it fully, though he became unpopular and the system became one of the causes responsible for subsequent troubles for the company in India.

Though during this period East India Company fought many wars with the brave Rajputs, the Marathas and the Muslims, yet it paid least for it. It made the Indian Princes fight with each other at their own cost. Not only this, but it made huge profits out of this policy and got heavy gifts and monetary and territorial concessions for making one brother fight with the other for getting throne over which company had not right.

In other words it can be said that during their early phase which came to an end in 1813. East India Company followed the policy of conquests which resulted in many wars. The pivot point of the whole system was exploitation of manual and material resources of the nation. It wanted to have monopoly of trade in India for which it was prepared to wage any war or adopt any underhand means. It did not touch Indian Culture and religion which it left to the care of Indians. It also did not wish to bring changes at the administrative level, particularly at the village level.

One significant feature of this period was that where as the people were exploited ruthlessly, no steps were taken for their welfare. No activity was undertaken which could be characterized and considered as welfare.

1.1.4. Second Phase of Colonialism

Second phase of colonialism started with the British policy of free trade in 1813 and ended in 1857. It was during this period that Indian Industries and handicrafts were ruined. It was again during this period that poverty among the people of India was allowed to increase.

Before the advent of British people to India the nation was one of the most advanced nations of the world in the industrial field. Indian goods were much in demand in the world market and India had a favourable balance of trade. Bengal was one of the most advanced industrial centers and supply textiles to whole of South East Asia and also that of East Africa and the Arab World. Indian traders went to far off places to sell their goods and European nations always complained that Indian traders went back with huge wealth. Textiles, dyes, wood carving, beedi work was quite popular in those days. Raw silk and sugar were also exportable articles. India was exporter of many finished goods. In fact, till the beginning of 18th century India and China were the only countries which had their own ships which carried their goods for sale in far off countries. The industries were fully well organized and every effort was made to see that goods of high quality and standard were supplied so that India's reputation as an exporter did not come down. In this connection, it may be noted that in the whole process patronage of the kings and the Nawabs was always available, who encourage every commercial activity and extended all sort of help to the traders. In fact it can be said that the whole industry was flourishing and the nation's economy was in a happy state.

4 It was, however, with the coming of East India Company that the situation altogether changed. Change particularly came when Clive defeated Duplex and it became almost clear that East India Company was going to play a role in India's economic life. Trade policies were so made that Indian traders were the losers primarily because policy makers were the Britishers or the East India Company. The Company followed the trade policy knowing it fully well that it will ruin Indian Industries. The policy followed was:

1. Trade interests of East India Company were Paramount and must be protected at all costs.
2. It was the duty of India to supply raw material to Britain at the cost of Indian trades.
3. British goods in India should be sold cheap so that in the competition Indian industry is wiped-out.
4. Indian goods should be highly priced in the world market so that these do not compete in the international market.

5. Restrictions should be put on the entry of such goods in return and other colonies of the British Empire which were very popular and acceptable to the people, particularly the textiles goods.
6. India should be made an economic colony of Britain and for this if need be, with predominant agricultural character should be changed.

If was during this phase of colonialism that free trade policy was followed and Indian Handicrafts were made to face a tough competition from the British machine made goods under adverse conditions for Indians. Heavy duties were impose on Indian goods and their exports too was stopped to Britain to eliminate even the least possible competition and check the export market as well as popularity of Indian goods. Duties on Indian textiles went up to 67 ½%, it was unprecedented and high enough to discourage the export of goods and their acceptable in the foreign market. This became necessary because Indian textiles goods, particularly silk and cotton goods were so popular and cheap that had such restrictions not been put factories in England, it has been forced to beclosed down. Thus combination of trade and political power in the hands of East India Company resulted in the ruin of the Indian Industry because of misuse of power of Company.

As a result of this policy Indian money began to be drained out from India and started pouring into England. Indian trade became a manual labourer and it became difficult for him to feed himself and his family with what he got from his industry, which was once that most flourishing activity in India.

The policy of free trade as if it was not enough to ruin India that the British people did not face Indian agricultural system as well. Every possible effort was made to ruin that as well, for agriculturalists no facilities were provided. No effort was made to supply them better agricultural facilities, equipments, seeds, manures or look after their interests in any away. On the other hand land revenue was put as high as 50% of their total gross produce. This left nothing with the former to eat for the whole year, who had to beg of the money lender for his seed and equipments for cultivation. The conditions of agriculturalists were as miserable as those of the traders. Both were sailing in the same boat. With this policy resulted in increased agricultural indebtedness. Since the money once borrowed could not be paid, the result was that the land of the peasant was gradually taken over by the money-lender and real owner of the land was either the East India Company or the big land lord. Poor peasant was purely at their mercy.

In India British East India Company followed a policy of organized and systematic exploitation. No opportunity was loss to loot the people and that looting was open.

It was systematic in the sense that British government and parliament was taken into confidence of the basic principles of exploitation, though at that times extent of exploitation was concealed and it became to light after the result of some enquiry committee or commission. All the restrictions on the import of goods were placed with the approval of the government and by the government itself. In addition, all protective duties were also imposed with approval of the British government.

When that was the situation on industrial front the burden fell on the agriculture. But conditions there too were unsatisfactory because:

- Rate of the land and revenue was very high and left nothing with agriculturalist after he had paid land revenue.
- Indian agriculturalist was illiterate and did not know means and methods of improving his produce.
- Indian population was rapidly increased and it was not possible for the land to bear the burden of increasing population. There was immense surplus mean power working on the land which could easily be spared, if alternative sources employment were available.
- Due to poverty Indian agriculturalist had to depend on money lender who exploited them ruthlessly. Agricultural indebtedness increased beyond all proportions and it became impossible for the cultivator to repay even small loans. The result was that gradually their land began to be owned by money lenders and owners of land began to shift as cultivators of the land.

1.1.4.1. Constitutional Reforms:

² The British East India Company of course followed uninterrupted and undisturbed policy of economic exploitation both of the manual and material resources, at the same time, some constitutional reforms were introduced. These became unavoidable because the policy of exploitation followed by the East India Company was so much under heavy criticism in England that the traders could not face the same. The stories of exploitation were told in every house and India was on the brink of colonial collapse.

Need for these reforms also arose because British East India Company by now fully well realized that in case some administrative and other reforms were not immediately introduced it will be impossible for them to carry out their own administration widely as well as top heavy. In order to deal with the situation, the company introduced some changes in the means of transportation and communication on the one hand and educational system on

the other. But this change was only marginal and to the extent to which these suited the British ends.

In order to introduce these reforms Acts were passed in 1813, 1833, and 1853. In all these Acts trade interests of the East India Company were fully protected. At the same time no attempt was made to associate Indians in the running of their own administration. The East India Company, therefore, had no eyes and ears in so far as India was concerned. It remained unaware of the plight of the Indian and the extent of their dissatisfaction. The result of all this was that in 1857 the people of India raised in revolt against the Company. Of course the rising was suppressed with the help of superior arms on the one hand and lack of leadership and planning in India on the other, yet it was clear that the main cause of rising were economic unrest, poverty, unemployment, and agricultural discontentment on account of policy of free trade followed by the British government in India without necessary checks and periodical assignment about its effects and consequences. One effect of rising of 1857 was that policy of free trade stopped and naked exploitation of the people somewhat checked.

1.1.5. Third Phase of Colonialism

The third phase of colonialism in India started after the rising of 1857 and continued till India obtained independence in 1947. Salient features of their period basically were:

1. Indians nominally began to be associated in the running of their own administration. Those who were associated did not represent the people. But one effect of their association was that to an extent of financial, economic and industrial interests on the one hand and agricultural interests on the other somewhat to be protected.
2. The revolt of 1857 was primarily against the exploitation of the masses to an extent which was intolerable for the people of India. The British government now fully well realized that if that ruthless and naked exploitation was continued then there may be another rising, which may be difficult to come under control.
3. Many Indian national leaders tried to establish that poverty of India was not due to increase in population, as the British government made the people to realize and feel, but it was due to policy of economic drainage which the government was vigorously following, without caring for the interests of Indians. They made it clear that as long as this policy continued, poverty from India could not be banished.
4. The British government in India and England made the people realize that since the administration of India had changed from the company to the Crown, there was perfect political stabilities in the country. Accordingly there was suitable climate for

investment not only this, but the foreign investors were also assured safe returns of their money. This proved very attractive. The British investors in India began to make heavy investments in India and in turn got huge profits for their investments. Since they had better technical knowhow and also patronage of the government therefore, they dominated almost every industry.

5. Old policy of non-industrialization of India continued. Every effort was made to see that India very much depended on England for every commodity.
6. Due to national movement and other allied factors the people of India particularly the educated masses, became quite conscious of the economic policies of wealth drainage which British government had been following and continued to follow. Thus the period of ignorance about exploitation began to come to an end.

1.1.6. Colonial Policy and India

1.1.6.1. Economic Effects:

1. In India poverty and unemployment increased and the rich became richer and the poor still poorer.
2. British finance capital resulted in drainage of Indian wealth from outside India.
3. Cottage Industries were ruined resulting in much unemployment.
4. Industrialization process was slow and no infrastructure was built by which sound industrial base could be built. Industrial entrepreneurship in India was not encouraged.
5. Agriculturists were paid no attention and as such problem of agricultural indebtedness very much increased. Agrarian reforms, if any, were introduced only to exploit available natural and other resources.
6. In the name of introducing reforms and undertaking development activities the people were heavily taxed, which were beyond their capacity to pay with the result that they very badly suffered.
7. Since no attention was paid to agriculture, therefore, ⁴agricultural production decreased and was not sufficient even to meet the needs of increasing population. India which was predominantly an agriculturalist country had to depend on England for meeting her food needs. Not only this, but there were many famines in the country as well.

8. Since there were no openings for the people in the industry commerce and similar other activities, therefore, burden on agricultural land very much increased.

1.1.6.2. Social Effects:

Colonialism in India had social effects too. These were for reaching in many cases e.g.

1. In India people believed in caste system. Since the rulers did not believe in this system, therefore, except due to political considerations, the system was not encouraged.
2. In India there was joint family system, which now came under heavy strains. It began to be replaced by single family system. In addition, outlook about marriage also began to change and it did not remain a religious institution as it was in the past.
3. Though the condition of women did not much improve, yet a change started coming. Outlook about women began to change and female education started.
4. Christianity spread in India and this influenced other religions. The change was for the better in so far as orthodoxy in religion was concerned.
5. English system of education was introduced which had both good and bad effects. It very much helped in the increase of knowledge but at the same time it resulted in producing a class of people which had un-Indian like character in many ways. This class was arrogant and felt it had the monopoly of all wisdom.
6. It increased division in Indian society. The Hindus and the Muslims were divided and feelings of communal hatred were created among both the communities. The seeds of hatred sown ultimately resulted in the partition of the country. Its effects were so far reaching that constant efforts are needed to maintain communal harmony.

1.1.6.3. Political Effects:

In the political field India too was effected by British colonialism e.g.:

1. India was land of monarchy before she went under British influence. There was no system of written laws. This was replaced by a bureaucratic system and with a written code of laws.
2. Rural in India used to look after the welfare of the people in spite of their autocratic rule. But now for a very long time there was no care for the welfare of the people. The whole system of administration was based on exploitation.

3. Since Indians were not associated for a very long time in political processes and system, the result was that they not get political training. The British government tried to leave an impression that Indians were incapable of governing themselves.
4. In India religion in the negative sense was introduced in politics and whole political activity began to revolve round it. Religious leaders began to play the role of political leaders as well.
5. India was a unitary state, but it was under British colonialism that federal concept was introduced, which stood on the path of unity of India.

Thus in India, British colonialism had both its good as well as bad effects, but on the whole evil effects outweighed the good effects. The result was that feelings of nationalism and patriotism so quickly developed that within 60 years of the founding of the Indian Nations Congress, British colonial power, on whose empire such never set.

1.1.7. Colonialism in Asia

1 Of course British colonialism in India is a glaring example of how colonialism and imperialism functioned in an Asian country and how the prosperity of the people changed into naked poverty and exploitation of natural resources on the one hand and drainage of wealth on the other. But almost the whole of Asia was victim of this policy and Britain was the main colonial power. The policy followed for expansion and acquisition of territories was just to find a pretext for war and impose a war on the weak nation.

Britain pursued her colonial policy both in Burma, Afghanistan and Tibet. She fought many wars with these countries, on one the pretext or the other. British were successful in annexing Burma to the empire, though somehow Tibet and Afghanistan could not form part of the British Empire. Britain was however, successful in conducting friendly treaties with the other two countries.

In fact Britain made such arrangements that almost every Asian and European nation accepted that Britain had paramount rights in Asia. After establishing her supremacy Britain everywhere followed the same colonial policy as was followed in India, with almost similar results. The pivotal point of the policy was divide and rule.

In 1866, Britain annexed Burma, after waging a war with the king of the country. It was under the Act of 1935 that was recognized as an independent state. She also ensured that Thailand remained under her influence. In Asia United States of America occupied the Philippines islands. Though the latter revolted against their U.S.A. masters yet the revolt was suppressed and had to accept U.S. supremacy. Britain and Russian interests were

clashed over Afghanistan. After prolonged discussion Russia agreed that Afghanistan was under British area of influence and the latter agreed not to annex Afghanistan. There was also dispute over Russia between these two powers, which were solved by dividing the areas of influence in that country. Joint Anglo-Russian control was discovered in that country every big power tried to have its control over it.

Every big European power had both greed and desire to have more and more colonies in Asia. For this the Dutch, the French, the Portuguese and the British all made maximum efforts and fought wars both in India and Europe. In the race during the 19th century Russia and Spain did not lag behind. But as an outcome Britain emerged successful. In one way or the other she tried to exercise direct or indirect control over every Asian country, whether that was by way of threat of use of force, actual use of armed strength, annexation or treaties. In India whole of Indian would have been brought under British domination had 1857 rising not taken place in the country.

1.1.7.1. Summary:

Imperialism of every nation in Asia was based on the principle of naked exploitation. Asian countries were used as markets for dumping manufactured goods and draining away of wealth and raw material. Culture and civilization, which has all along been pride of the east, was no lure for them. In fact when an imperialistic and colonial power left an Asian country, she left behind poverty, illiteracy, backwardness, unemployment and non-industrialization as legacy. Not only this but she created such a situation during her stay, that there were no feelings of national unity and nationalism resulting in political instability, increased dependence and hunger and starvation. In fact every new freed nation was got involved in the never ending circle of devise for self sufficiency, increased dependence on developed nations and defense of the nation on the one hand and maintenance of political stability on the other.

1.1.7.2. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Define Colonialism. Briefly examine the nature and the course of Colonialism over the centuries.
2. Explain the various factors which led to the Colonialism in India through the different phases by Britain.
3. Explain briefly the factors which led to colonialism in Asia by the Western powers and effect on colonial countries.

1.1.7.3. Reference Books:

1. Buss Claud, :Historyof Asia
2. Cipolla, C.M. :Fontana Economic History Of Europe, Vol. III
3. Davies, : World History
4. Fisher, H.A.L. : A History of Europe
5. Raj Hans, : History of Modern World
6. Hunter, W.W. :The Indian Empire
7. Lyall, A.C. : The Rise of the British Dominion in India
8. Rao, B.V. : World History
9. Wells, H.G., :An Outline History of the World
10. Woodruff, P. : The men who ruled India, Vol.2.

Lesson 1.2

IMPERIALISM

1.2.0. Objective of the Lesson:

Colonialism and imperialism were the twin characteristics of the 19th century. Western imperialism and colonialism spread quickly both in Africa and Asia. The whole process was backed on exploitation but it was very rapid and quick in 19th and 20th centuries is the main concept of this lesson.

9 Structure of the Lesson:

1.2.1. Introduction

1.2.2. Imperialism prior to and during the 20th Century

1.2.3. Imperialism in operation

1.2.4. Reasons for spread of Imperialism

1.2.4.1. Spread of Christianity

1.2.4.2. Increasing Nationality

1.2.4.3. Summary

1.2.4.4. Self Assessment Questions

1.2.3.5. Reference Books

1.2.1. Introduction:

1 The imperialist and colonial powers however, quarreled one and other to have their own influence over the colonies. The colonial power did not at all care for the interests of the peoples of the colonies.

European powers (particularly but not exclusively Portugal, Spain, Britain, the Netherlands, Russia, Italy and France) have always been keen to expand their power and to have as many colonies under their control and influence, as possible these could. It was a time when most of the European nations had feudal economies and agriculture was their main occupation. Gradually many of these nations become economically powerful. These then tries to expand and captured many colonies both in the East and in Africa. These were retained for a long time when a wave of nationalism came among the people of the colonies and they rose in revolt. Many imperialist powers were forced to leave their colonies; some however, did not regret the loss.

During the 19th century again thinking developed that the colonies were most essentially needed for economic development of the colonial power and that politically these provided both prestige as well as stability. An era of imperialism thus again started. As the system developed with the exploitation of the peoples of colonies, negligence of their economic

prosperity, mental development, lack of industrialization of the colonies, disrespect for the people and their customs and traditions became very common. In the struggle that followed, colonial powers were forced to leave the colonies. Thus the circle started and completed itself.

But some changes came during the two intervals and in stages. In the first stage imperial powers left the colonies in hatred without maintaining or keeping any contacts with the people of the colonies. But in the second phase colonial power left the colony but with a desire to maintain some contacts and relations with that and keep that under its influence.

1.2.2. Imperialistic Norms Prior to and During

18th Century:

From 16th century to up to the end of the 18th century England followed what is commonly known as the old colonial system. Main features of this system were economic exploitation, discouragement of colonial industry and tight control over colonial trade and shipping. In the 17th century England passed several navigation laws by which it was provided that commodities from any part of Asia, Africa and America imported into England or Ireland should be carried in England and colonial ships.

In the economic field there was clear exploitation. It was believed that interests of the mother country were supreme and paramount. Underlying philosophy of the system was that the colonies existed for the sake of mother country. These were not to export anything to any country except the mother country. A colony was not allowed to manufacture any commodity, which was likely to create competition of a commodity already being manufactured by the mother country. Not only this, but colony was to hire ships of the mother country for exporting goods. The colonies were treated as a market by the mother country. Raw material was exported from the colony into the mother country at low rates and in turn finished goods were dumped in the colony at much higher costs. There was in short pure and simple exploitation of manual and natural resource of the peoples of the colony by the mother country.

Another feature was that under their system trade and industries were not to be encouraged. Mother country paid least attention to the industrialization of the colony. It was for two important reasons. First reason was the industrialization will produce the dependence of colony on the mother country. Another reason was that it would reduce trade of the mother country with the colony. Only an increased trade could result in drainage of wealth from the colony to mother country. The result was that no industry was set up in the colony. Even for consumable goods colony was to see to the mother country.

Then another feature of early imperialism or colonialism was that there was no stress on capital formation. But this what was meant is that in the country no such infrastructure was

created by which roads, buildings, machines etc., were build so that if need be at any time, the colony could keep pace with and walk on the path of industrialization and modernization. Stress was laid on the supply and consumption of only consumable articles.

Poverty was another characteristic of imperialism. Colony people were not paid high wages for the work got done from them. They were highly taxed. Their living standard was internationally kept low.

Then another feature of the system was that the people of the colony were not politically awakened. No political education was given to them. In fact no arrangements were made to teach them 3 Rs. Illiteracy was made an integral part of the whole system. Lack of political education kept the people politically backward.

In the early colonial system, there was no system of associating the people of the colonies in the running of their own administration. Every effort was made to run the administration of the country with the help of the strong bureaucracy which was responsible to the mother country and not to the colony. The personnel of the bureaucracy were recruited and trained in a particular fashion in the mother country which believed that fear was the only thing which the people of the colony knew.

But when the people of the colony began demanding political rights the mother country gave them some rights but these were given by one hand and taken by the other hand. This was done on the plea that the people of the colony were not capable of running their own administration and secondly, that if they were associated in administration they will come to know of actual weakness of administration and expertise to run the administration of their country.

One of the methods which imperial power used was to give right to vote to minimum number of people. This is done by putting some educational and property qualifications. Similarly the people of the colony were not encouraged to higher civil services.

Then another feature of imperialism has always been that of imposing taxes without the approval of the representatives of the people so that the failings and high handed of bureaucracy is not exposed to the public.

1.2.3. Imperialism in Operation

Imperialism had and continues to have these features, though method of achieving the purpose, to an extent has changed, under imperialism. During the 17th and 18th centuries all these countries which industrialized themselves, were keen that they should become big imperial powers. Thus imperialism found its manifestation in several parts of the world. In this process of expansion and imperialist design no part of the world remained uninfluenced. The process once started continued till 1820, when many European powers lost their colonies. Both in the East as well as in America, France lost her colonies. During the

American war of Independence, England lost the whole of America colonies. South American possessions were lost to Spain during this very period. In 1822, Portugal lost Brazil. But there was not much of a weeping in the world over the losses because in many quarters there was a feeling that colonies were not an asset. In Germany, iron Chancellor Bismarck also held the view that a mother country did not enjoy any real advantage by maintaining colonies.

But as vigour of Adam Smith's philosophy of free trade slow down with that imperial powers again thought of having their colonies. There was again a thinking and desire that colonies were unavoidable for prosperity and happiness of the people of the mother country. Without such prosperity mother country was bound to face many problems. But Britain, France, Holland, Spain and Russia started on their expansion programmes and activities. France was a success in creating an empire in Indo-China as well as Africa. British Empire became so vast that it was said that the sun never set on that empire. Germany had her possessions and areas of influence in Pacific Islands and some parts of Africa. Africa was also divided among Spain, Holland and Belgium. In Asia, Holland also occupied East Indies. Japan occupied both Formosa and Korea. Thus by the beginning of the 20th century many imperialist powers of the west were in a position to occupy many parts of Africa, West Indies and Asia.

1.2.4. Reasons for Spread of Imperialism

In the beginning imperialism did not spread peacefully. For acquiring colonies or territories there was a vigorous capitulation and wars which was usually fought on one pretext or the other between the powers which wished bring territories under their control. Every expansion was thus accompanied by bloodshed, miseries and waste of manual and material resources. A problem therefore, which needs attention in as to why was a desire and what was the need for imperialism.

Foremost thing to have colonies for dumping of the manufactured goods with most of the countries of the west having industrialized themselves there was increased production. Goods in large quantities were produced which under no circumstances could be consumed at home level. The alternative being was international market for dumping these international levels. Thus need for expansion and following policy of imperialism became unavoidable.

Another reason for imperialism was that of providing employment to both skilled and unskilled labour of the mother country. Because of industrialization machine had replaced man. So there was a surplus man power in every industrialized country. Since home

market was not in a position to absorb man-power therefore, only other alternative was to find employment somewhere else. The only other place could be the colonies.

Then another reason which prompted imperialism was that most of these countries were militarily weak. To worsen the situation the countries were divided in small independent units; each unit or state fighting with the other. There was no sense of unity and that did not come even in the face of great and grave threat which foreign powers posed to their independence. Once Western powers came to know of this weakness, process and speed of expansion became rapid.

Availability of raw material and desire for exploitation of natural resources was a very important reason for imperialism. Natural resources in some of these countries were very vast. But many of these nations were aware of the existence of these resources in Asian and African countries. These wanted to exploit these resources to their own advantage. Another significant reason for the imperialism was political stability at home. Every government realized that expansion meant honour, respect and prestige at home and nations among. If expansion programme was going on smoothly the chances of removal of political party from power became remote. Thus imperialism got closely linked with political stability. Prestige among western nations regarding to imperial expansion tempted western powers to follow imperialistic policy. These powers wanted to excel each other in controlling and occupying more and more colonies because more a power had colonies, more was its prestige and respect in the world.

1.2.4.1. Spread of Christianity:

Almost all the Western powers believed that Christians were the most civilized people of the world and thus it was their religious duty to spread the message of Christ all over the world, particularly among Asian and African people, whom they considered as uncivilized or semi-cultured. According to them this could best be possible, when countries of this part of the world, were under their domination and supremacy.

1.2.4.2. Increasing Nationalism:

Lastly imperialism became so popular with countries because of the feelings of nationalism. It was a time when political leaders on the one hand and political philosophers and literary figures on the other spread the message of nationalism in the country. Nationalism in the international field demanded more and more colonies, so that no other nation excelled theirs. Therefore, feeling of nationalism resulted in a hot race for acquiring more and more territories and colonies.

1.2.4.3. Summary:

Imperialism system, as it operated in between 16th and 20th centuries was based on simple exploitation of the people of the colony. It cared least for their interests, economic or

political. The only aim of the system was to protect ¹⁵ the interests of the mother country. The result of the bad policies was that the system began to decay. There were several wars of independence, rebellious and revolutions in the colonies against the mother countries. Powers were gradually forced to pack up from the colonies, though much against their wishes and with many bitter tastes and memories behind.

1.2.3.4. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Examine the factors responsible for the spread of Imperialism.
2. Describe the characteristics of imperialism and its impact on colonial countries.

1.2.3.5. Reference Books:

1. Buss Claud, :History of Asia
2. Cipolla, C.M. : Fontana Economic History of Europe, Vol.III
3. Davies, : World History
4. Fisher, H.A.L. : A History of Europe
5. Raj Hans,: History of Modern World
6. Hunter, W.W. :The Indian Empire
7. Lyall, A.C.: The Rise of the British Dominion in India
8. Rao, B.V. : World History
9. Wells, H.G. :An Outline History of the World
10. Woodruff, P. : The men who ruled India, Vol.2.

MERCANTALISM

1.3.0. Objective of the lesson:

Mercantilism is a commercial revolution and it became very popular in the 19th century and its impact in the colonial countries is main topic of this lesson.

9

Structure of the Lesson:

- 1.3.1. Introduction
- 1.3.2. History of Mercantilism
- 1.3.3. Need of Mercantilism
- 1.3.4. Features of Mercantilism
- 1.3.5. A Case for Mercantilism
- 1.3.6. A Case against Mercantilism
- 1.3.7. Age of Commercialization
- 1.3.8. Mercantilism in England
 - 1.3.8.1. Mercantile policy of Tudor and Stuart Kings
 - 1.3.8.2. Summary
 - 1.3.8.3. Self Assessment Questions
 - 1.3.8.4. Reference Books

1.3.1. Introduction:

Mercantilism, as an economic theory was quite popular during the 19th century. But the basic ideas underlying it were known much earlier. In the middle ages economics was domestic affairs of each nation. But gradually idea of protection and control of the trade and

industry began to get roots in every state. ⁵ Growth of commerce especially after the discovery of the new world and the influx of gold and silver shifted attention from agriculture and barter to foreign trade. National monarchies now began to take care of international trade, a function which hitherto was being looked after by other organizations. This resulted in international rivalries.

¹ 1.3.2. History of Mercantilism:

Need for international trade was also felt because money was needed for maintaining strong armies and gradually commercial interests began to govern foreign policies of the nations. It was now realized that commercial gains of one nation could only be at the cost of the other. This was one reason as to why there was hostility among the nations throughout 17th century and many wars had to be fought to gain supremacy and the markets.

It was out of this situation i.e. need for international trade and control over every other nation that mercantilism arose. It was economic aspect of vigorous nationalism of the period. It was primarily an economic theory which got linked political philosophy of nationalism.

The practice of mercantilism began in 1516 when Charles V on his accession to the throne of Spain began retaliatory measures against commercial policy of Venice. It was first of all systematically stressed by Italian writer Serra. In England, Sir William Petty, the leading person who stressed importance of mercantilism, and he laid emphasis on gold, silver and jewelry in the national wealth. Subsequently Thomas Munro, a Director of East India Company, laid stress on international trade. During the latter part of the 17th century on mercantilists theory much, stress was laid especially by the Whig Party. The writings of Dudley, North and Josiah Child propagated that world was a commercial unit under that supply and demand should determine price of a commodity.

In France restrictive policies of mercantilism were carried out by Jean Colbert (1619-83). He used protective tariffs to improve trade and industry and also taxation system. In German states mercantilist view point supported by Karmaralism, which aimed at finding out how royal income could be maintained increased and administered. But philosophy of mercantilism became popular in France, England and Holland and much less in German states. Whereas in England mercantilists were businessmen and pamphleteers, the German Karmaralists were professors of Finance who wrote volumes and systematic treatises on this subject and illustrated to make the whole subject of study very interesting.

1.3.3. Need for Mercantilism:

International trade was the only important source for earning money for the monarchies, throughout middle ages. This could be done only when the state controlled both national as well as international trade and protected industries at home. It was felt that without such a trade neither there could be prosperity nor stability. The result was that every state began to put maximum pressure on its merchant classes, so that they could produce as well as sell their commodities in the international market. The state also began to give necessary and needed protection. Thus basic idea was to promote international trade and to earn wealth. For the purpose initiative in some countries came from the Government, while in others from the individuals or group of merchants, who were interested in such a trade.

In mercantilism both agriculture and industrial revolutions played a very significant role. In addition the roles of colonies and international trade too played a vital role. The pressure of merchant classes in the government in no way was significant.

The process was expedited because the king, the government and the merchants all equally realized and visualized anticipated growth of trade activity. The traders looked towards government both for protection and trade facilities.

1.3.4. Features of Mercantilism:

But from whatsoever source initiative came mercantilism had its own features or characteristics. These were:

1. The first characteristic was that it needed the collaboration of the merchant class with the monarchies. Both felt that without one the other could not proceed further. The kings needed trades so that the goods could be sold in the international market. On the other hand, the traders required royal protection and patronage while they were abroad, so that they could sell their goods. Such a collaboration as previously unknown, because the monarchs did not care for the trade, which was considered private affair of the individual.
2. Then another feature was that this resulted in craze for colonies and more markets. Need for colonies were felt and were closely linked with international trade. It was realized that unless there were colonies goods produced could not be sold.
3. Still another feature was that manufacturers were now exalted over every other class of workers. Before mercantilism maximum stress was laid on agriculturists. Now this

stress shifted to manufacturers. Agriculture, of course, continued to occupy a strong position in the economy, but stress began to shift from it to trade.

4. So for domestic trade was considered very important and paid maximum attention. Now this fell in the background. In its place international trade began to be paid more and more attention. Every nation now wanted to have favorable balance of trade. It was only then that the nation could expect more from abroad.
5. Every nation which got involved in the international trade felt great need for new type of laws which otherwise it would not have thought. Several navigation laws had to be passed in order to provide facilities to navigators who sailed abroad. This law had to be passed to protect their interests when they were abroad. Similarly steps had to be taken to protect their lives and property when they were on the high seas. Arrangements had to be made with the trading countries for providing facilities to the traders while in the country.

Not only this, but in the country several type of new laws had to be passed. Domestic industries needed legislative protection so that these were not killed in the international competition. In addition, of incentives had to be provided to the traders and so on.

6. Still another feature of the system was rivalry at national and international levels. Each nation wanted favourable balance of trade. This could be possible only in a monopoly situation. The result was that nations began to fight with each other to protect the interests of their traders and merchants. Such a rivalry was unavoidable and subsequently resulted in many wars.
7. In this age of mercantilism, there was a consistent stress on wealth. It was believed that earning national wealth should be the aim of the state. Such state wanted to expand and powers go hand in hand and that both were inseparable. Eyes of every nation were looting and instances of violence of the worst kind for earning wealth. The wealth of each nation was measured in terms of precious metals which it possessed. This could be possible when the nation had favourable balance of trade and colonies to provide cheap raw material and markets to consume finished products. Under this policy each nation tried to be self-sufficient by itself and make the other nations dependent on it.
8. Each power which could manage to increase her international trade became an exploiter. It was unfortunate that instead of making the colony a partner in

international trade and prosperity, colonies began to be considered as the suppliers of raw material. Each trading nation wanted to be economically self-sufficient without caring for the interests of the others. The colonies began to be considered as potential aligners in the international market and thus an attempt was made to always keep them dependent on the country.

9. Mercantilism brought certain notions and beliefs with it. It was believed that wealth of a nation could be measured in terms of precious metals which it possessed. It was also believed that population was a source of strength for the nation and as such it should be increased. Importance of bullion was especially stressed. In short mercantilism aimed at creating a strong, populous and self-supporting state.

1.3.5. A Case for Mercantilism:

Mercantilists believed basically in two things. According to them the state should try to earn wealth through international trade and also that necessary protective measures should be taken by the state for promoting trade and industry. These two basic factors significantly contributed several ways:

1. Since stress was laid on earning wealth therefore; monarchies were in a position to earn more wealth. This put them on sound footings and this could effectively deal with feudalists and the other who challenged the authority of the kings.
2. Need and necessity of money in national economy was fully realized. Previously for meeting financial needs only domestic resources were exploited. This burdened both domestic trade as well as agriculture. This put financial burden on the population and in many cases so unbearable that the people even rose in revolt against their monarchs.
3. The people now began to study economic problems quite rationally and in a scientific way. They began to measure everything in terms of profit and loss. In this way new ethos for work developed.
4. Then another contribution of mercantilism philosophy was that the need of industry in national economy was fully realized. Many states which were hitherto only agriculturist countries now became industrialized nations. In this way industry received great encouragement, because without that there could be no trade.
5. That state was forced to adopt certain protective measures for the welfare of their traders. The result was that much wanted relationships between the government and the traders got fostered and improved.

6. Though in mercantilism trade was state controlled yet the state never undertook directly nor did it claim ownership of any means of trade. In this way the traders continued to take initiative in trade.

7. It was due to restrictive trade policies that Fredrick, the Great, of Prussia was in a position to build sound finances and undo unfavourable effects of Seven Year War.

8. Mercantilism, in the political field developed the feelings of nationalism. Every nation, particularly England, France and Holland, began to assert that their international trade should be brisk. The result was that whereas on the one hand they adopted protective measures, on the other, these nations developed a feeling of nationalism and sacrifice among the people, so that their favourable balance of trade was not adversely affected.

1.3.6. A case against Mercantilism:

Mercantilism of course, did some good to some states, but on the whole, it also much harmed the people as well e.g.:

- (a) One of the greatest harm that it did to the society was that it resulted in the exploitation of the colonies. The traders aimed at earning maximum wealth. In fact they had come to far off places only in search of wealth. The result was that there was naked exploitation of the people of the colonies. It had its adverse effects both on the civilization and mankind.
- (b) Mercantilism resulted in international rivalries. Those countries of the world which wanted to have international markets, instead of cooperating with each other, quarreled badly with each other. These nations fought many wars both in their own countries as well as in the colonies. The result was that feelings of brotherhood and understanding disappeared.
- (c) Then another effect was that due to mercantilism narrow national outlook or what is called as narrow nationalism developed. Narrow outlook is always dangerous, but it became very dangerous during this period, when no nation was at all prepared to accommodate the other.
- (d) It was due to mercantilism that state interference in every walk of life very much increased. It was felt by the people that the State should be allowed to regulate every walk of life, if it desired that more wealth should pour into the country. No objection was raised to state interference in economic, social and political life of the people. As is well known this created many problems in the years to come.

- (e) One of the basic principles of mercantilism was that colonies were potential challengers to the mother country in trade and as such these should not be allowed to develop. In order to achieve this objective, the colonies were always kept as dependent. This was not good and desirable on any ground even in those days. But its evil effects are felt even today. The world of today is divided into economically advanced, poor and backward nations.
- (f) In order to maintain colonies and their own commercial interests the states maintained strong armies. This was done at the cost of the welfare of the people. In addition, with the help of these armies rights and liberties of the people were suppressed.
- (g) In order to promote international trade and as a protective measure, many taxes were levied on the people, for providing aid to those who produced goods. This was badly resented by them in every nation and as such an undercurrent of discontentment began to flow everywhere.
- (h) The states of course earned money, but the wealth so amassed was used by the ruling oligarchies either, for raising strong armies or for fighting the wars. Thus hard earned wealth was not used for developmental purposes. This can't be justified on any ground.
- (i) Basic principle of mercantilism, which aimed at providing protection to the industries, was opposed to the principle of laissez faire or free trade. Nobody can deny that free trade system had its own advantages. That was the reason as to why the viewpoint of Adam Smith was appreciated for a very long time.
- (j) Mercantilism resulted in stressing on trade, which inter-alia meant industry. This gave great set back, to agriculture. Since agriculture was the main occupation of the people, therefore, whereas those few were engaged in the industry gained, vast majority of the population suffered for want of state attention.
- (k) In the political life mercantilism absolutely subordinated man to the State. The State was put on high pedestals and the individual expected to worship it. This was against individual and stood on the way of his social and physical as well as moral development. No initiative was left with the individual. The principal of the survival of the fittest was bade farewell.

- (i) The mercantilism ¹believed that wealth of a nation should be measured in terms of its precious materials. But obviously it is not very true. Wealth consists in national resources etc.

1.3.7. Age of Commercialization:

This period in the history of Europe can also be called as age of commercializing. It was during this period that everything began to be viewed from commercial view point. Income and money became measuring standard for everything. In fact success and failure of political system, which a country followed, began to be measured in terms of monetary returns. Commercial outlook dominated every other approach. In England Navigation and Corn Laws had to be passed. International relations and treaties began to be signed purely on commercial basis. Wars started as well as came to an end only after commercial disputes, even in far off colonies, were settled. There was in fact no country of the world which was directly or indirectly not influenced by this commercial approach.

But this age of commercialization very much effected social system. The State gave preference to tradingclasses over agricultural classes. In this way of society got divided between two rigid parts. The gulf once created continued to be widened. The rulers therefore, became arrogant. They now did not care for social sentimentsand feelings. This they felt could be crushed.

Not only this, but in the society there was hectic activity. Everyone seemed to be working for self as well as for the nation. Though many protective steps had to be taken, yet on the whole, the people began to earn more wealth in the mother countries. They tasted some sort of prosperity and thus began to rise above poverty. Social outlook changed because social problems of agricultural economy, as we know, were definitely different from those which were created by mercantilism. In many societies materialists outlook developed which with the passage of time got deep rooted. Today it has so deep roots that it is difficult to dig out.

In the society more opportunities for employment arose. More hands were needed for producing goods which could be exported. This raised living standards of the people. This increased their tax paying capacity as well. It became easy for the government to realize taxes. With some money in their pockets the people had better sense of security.

So far it was believed that concentration of wealth on the one hand and that of earning profits on the other was not moral. It was also not religious. It was primarily because religion dominated society. But now whole outlook changed. Religious outlook was replaced

by materialistic outlook. Now their concentration for amassing of wealth was neither considered undesirable, nor earning of profits was condemned by the society.

Thus another effect of commercialization was that business did not remain an individual affair. It was by now clear that a single person could not do all that was needed for a business. Hitherto it was possible because business was on a small scale. Now business could be possible only on a large scale. From individual enterprise business became a group activity. In addition, from small scale it became.

Still another effect on the society was on moneylending system. Before mercantilism developed commercial outlook, it was believed that money-lending and receiving interests on the money loaned was a sin. Therefore no one liked either loaning money or receiving interests on that. But this outlook also changed. It was now realized by the society that unless money was forthcoming no business activity could go on. Those who owned money were encouraged to come forward with their money and loan that so that they could help in business activity. For putting their money in risk, it was thought proper that they should receive some interest. This enabled hidden wealth to come out for commercial activity. Prestige of wealthy money-lenders very much increased.

Then another effect on the society was that stress and importance of landed property considerably decreased. Previously prestige of a person was valued in terms of his landed property. It was because agriculture was main occupation of people. But now his prestige was measured in terms of his business activities, capacity to commercialize his goods and articles which were under his possession.

Bargaining was considered as immoral as cheating. It was believed that in business one should be simple and straightforward. Prices should be reasonable and once fixed there should be no bargaining. But now all this was considered out-dated philosophy. It was now believed that we are living in a situation of competition. Everyone was keen to capture colonies and for the purpose prepared to bargain as well. Without bargaining and competition nothing could be possible. These were thereafter; considered as commercial activities.

1.3.8. Mercantilism in England:

The policies which the Tudors and Stuarts and also first Hanoverian kings adopted towards their colonies on the one hand and trade and industry on the other have been characterized as "mercantilism". It was a system aimed at increasing national wealth. For the purpose several laws were passed. Though all these laws were not passed at one and the same time, yet these have been grouped together and given the name of mercantilism became basic aim and object of all these was the same i.e. increase in national wealth. The system in England, as everywhere else was that the state should be so regulated that the

nation always should have favourable balance of trade, for the purpose the mercantilism believed that it was most essential that the state must try to be self-sufficient. It should not depend on any other state either for meeting necessities or comforts of life. They therefore, stood what can be called as economic nationalism.

They were also of the view that the state should control economic action of very individual and should be very careful about every economic action. According to them, "commerce must be maneuvered like a regiments in the interests of the State". They also opined that it was very essential that the colonies should be treated as the supplied of the raw material and markets for dumping for finished goods. In the words of Griffith, "Mercantile system was a self-contained aggressive economic nationalism. It implies the study of Corn Laws, Navigation Acts and Colonial Trade regulation enacted by British Parliament from the 15th century in order to exalt the country in the economic system."

1.3.8.1. MERCANTILE POLICY OF TUDOR AND STUART

KINGS:

Both the Tudors and Stuarts wanted that England should be economically sound and prosperous. They therefore did not leave any sphere of economic life untouched. Their policies can broadly be discussed under (a) agriculture; (b) industry; (c) trade; and (d) navy and colonies.

(a) **Agriculture:** In England throughout the middle ages ⁴ agriculture was the main occupation of the people. But the whole agricultural system was unprogressive and completely outdated. Much of the land was wasted in barks and common land. Large scale cultivation was not possible and agricultural produce was not sufficient even for meeting increased needs of growing population. The landlords were turning their lands into pastures as these were more profitable to them than keeping the land under cash crops. For food products the country was becoming dependent on other countries. This was adversely affecting the peasants and their conditions were worsening day by day. In the country an Enclosure movement against enclosure system was started. The tillers ⁵ could not graze their cattle on the common land due to enclosure system.

The mercantilists ⁵ were opposed to enclosure system and forced the Government to stop the same. In 1489, ⁵ Henry VII passed a law by which he forbade enclosure of land for pasture purposes. In 1580 Queen Elizabeth passed a law by which possessing more than 2000 sheep by any person was declared illegal.

In 1550, Corn Law was passed by which import of corn below a certain minimum price level was forbidden. In order to give protection to British agriculturalists Corn Laws were also passed in 1600, 1660 and 1689. These laws greatly discouraged foreign traders but were continued for about 200 years till these were finally removed in 1846.

(b) **Industry:** industry in the middle ages in England was completely controlled by the guilds and the king did not take any interest in industrial development. Edward III was perhaps the first monarch who realized that one of the duties of the king was to look after the interests of the people and accordingly paid attention to industry. He invited Flemish weavers to England for the purpose of getting English weavers trained. This gave great encouragement to textile industry in the country. Tudor kings as well as the mercantilists were fully convinced that for promotion of industry it was essential that guilds which had become corrupt should be controlled.

The Tudors passed several laws to reduce the powers of corrupt guilds. Edward VII passed a law in 1504 by which it was provided that all guilds must submit their regulations to the justices of peace. In 1549 Edward VI passed another Law by which he declared that no guild was to perform any socialistic functions. Queen Elizabeth passed Statute of Artifices (1563) by which it was provided that the wages of the laborers employed in agriculture and industry will not be fixed by the land lords or guilds but by the Justices of Peace. The Act also provided for the training of the laborers. Industries were now gives active support. The result was that many new industries like sulphur, glass, salt, silk, starch and paper etc. started. The Queen also encouraged Huguenots, the Protestant inhabitants of France, who were noted for their skills in craft to come and settle down in England.

Though Charles I did not take any steps for the encouragement of industries, yet these received great fillip both under Cromwell as well as Charles II. The old banking system controlled by the goldsmiths was declared. New banks on modern lined were started and Bank of England as well as Bank of Scotland was started.

(c) **Trade:** The mercantilists followed a very vigorous policy in the field of trade. They believed that in having favorable balance of trade laid real prosperity of the nation. They therefore, stressed on the monarchs that the trade should be so regulated that the nation always had a favourable trade balance. Henry VII therefore, put many restrictions on the working of German trading companies and denied them many privileges which these hitherto enjoyed. Venetian companies operating in England were asked to wind up their business so that wealth of the nation did not go out of England. Many new companies were chartered to trade with foreign countries. Some such companies were Muscovy Company, the Levant Company and the East India Company. These companies were given monopoly rights in their respective trades.

The mercantilism got several Navigational Acts passed in England. These Acts were passed by Henry VII and under Cromwell in order to give set back to French and Dutch traders, who were adversely affecting British trade. After Glorious revolution trade with France was forbidden as she was becoming a rival of England in finished goods. In 1703 a treaty was concluded with Portugal by which she agreed to import woolen goods from England and in turn England agreed to import wine from that country. Thus every effort was

made to see that British trade developed to the advantage of England.

(d) **Navy and Colonies:** According to Mercantilists it was the responsibility of the colonies to provide maximum raw material to England and also to consume maximum finished goods of that country. They also believed that the colonies had no right to trade with any other country. If such a trade was must it should be so regulated that economic interests of England in no way were prejudicial. It was in this background that several Navigation Acts were passed. By a Navigation Act passed as early as in 1332 it was provided that all the trade of England was to be carried in British ships. In 1485 Henry VII passed another Navigation Act by which it was made compulsory that French wine and wood in England will be brought in British ships. He also founded merchant navy to get this Act enforced. In 1651 Cromwell passed another Navigation Act. By this it was provided that in the Commonwealth produce of no country will be allowed except in vessels owned and manned by Englishmen. Not only this, but it was also provided that imports from foreign countries of Europe sailed in ships the ownership of which belonged to the nations in which goods were produced. In this way with the help of this Act beginning of old colonial system was made.

In 1660 Charles II also passed a Navigation Act, which added Enumeration Articles. By these articles it was provided that such articles as sugar, cotton, dyestuffs etc. which were primarily produced in the colonies will not be shipped to any other country save England or another colony wanted these goods, she should purchase these from England. By another Navigation Act passed in 1683 it was provided that if any other country wanted to sell any goods to any British colony, first of all these should be brought to England. In this way England tried to control foreign trade of the colonies. These were resented by many colonies and some for these even took to arms but for centuries England continued to have these.

After glorious Revolution when Whigs came to the power, it became clear that Navigational Acts will not be revoked. It was because they are under the influence of mercantilists. They therefore established a Board of Trade under Blathway. As expected the Board put still more restrictions on the colonies. It was provided that the colonies will be crown colonies and the Governor of the colony will be nominated by the crown. Trade of the colony was to be regulated by a Board of Trade.

In 1773 Walpole passed an Act by which duties were imposed on the import of French molasses. The results of these measures in so far as England was concerned were really serious. Colonies got completely disgusted and dissatisfied with England. There were armed revolts everywhere, which could be crushed on with the help of armed forces and strength. In America this ended with open revolt in 1776.

1.3.8.2. Summary:

Mercantilism totally changed the fate of colonial countries, such as economically very poor and industrially they became as raw material producing to colonial masters and also these were served as the markets for the products of colonial masters. For that purpose, the European nations particularly England, France, Spain, etc. changed their foreign policy and enacted the protective trade policies to their mercantile people. With this, finally, owing to their weak economies and disunity among the people of eastern countries surrender their political power also.

1.3.8.3. ¹²Self Assessment Questions:

1. Examine the nature and course of the mercantilism over centuries.

2. Write about the mercantile policies in Britain.

1.3.8.2. Reference Books:

1. Buss Claud :History of Asia
2. Cipolla, C.M. : Fontana Economic History Of Europe
3. Davies : World History
4. Fisher, H.A.L. : A History of Europe
5. Raj Hans : History of Modern World
6. Hunter, W.W. :The Indian Empire
7. Lyall, A.C. : The Rise of the British Dominion in India
8. Rao, B.V. : World History
9. Wells, H.G. :An Outline History of the World
10. Woodruff, P. : The men who ruled India, Vol.2.

LESSON-1.4

EMERGENCE OF NATION STATES

1.4.0. *Objective of the Lesson:*

The emergence of nationalism and nation states in modern period and their importance in European States is the main objective of this lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 1.4.1 Introduction
- 1.4.2 Causes Responsible for the Rise of Nation States
 - 1.4.2.1. Role of the Church
 - 1.4.2.2. Decline of Feudalism
 - 1.4.2.3. Rise of Powerful Rulers
 - 1.4.2.4. The Crusades
 - 1.4.2.5. Rise of the Middle Class
 - 1.4.2.6. Lucrative Enterprises Abroad
 - 1.4.2.7. Availability of Money
 - 1.4.2.8. Invention of Gun Power
 - 1.4.2.9. Costly and Bloody Wars
 - 1.4.2.10. Writings of the Scholars
 - 1.4.2.11. Characteristics of Nation States
- 1.4.3. Nation State Ideology in some European Countries
 - 1.4.3.1. Summary
 - 1.4.3.2. Self-Assessment Questions
 - 1.4.3.3. Reference Books

1.4.1. *Introduction:*

The world has always been divided in States, each state trying to have full control over the area under its jurisdiction and control. In the past however, there used to be both small states as well as big empires. Both of these existed side by side. But each one made utmost effort to ensure that its interests were fully protected. It was during the 16th century that the concept of nation state began to gain ground. In nation state the people had common language and literature and also had deep love for their nation. They were willing to give unqualified support to their monarch whom they considered was defender and protector of their interests. They were prepared to surrender their everything to the monarch so as to ensure that their state was protected. As the time passed this desire of the people was fully

exploited by the rulers who in some cases tried to become absolute and began to use their authority for exploiting the people in the name of protecting their national interests. The process was sufficiently completed by 16th century when the concept of nation state had fully established itself. By now it was believed that the:

- (a) The king should not be challenged because he was protector and defender of the interests of the people.
- (b) The king was the Deputy of the God on the earth;
- (c) The king alone could save the state.

In fact the people by now had started tolerating even absolute authority and powers of the king. In England, France, Spain, Poland etc. the kings ruled over their subjects with an iron hand but instead of protesting against this, the subjects extended their cooperation to the monarch so that their national borders were fully protected and their literature and national pride was not touched.

1.4.2. **CAUSES FOR THE RISE OF NATION STATES**

By 16th century nation states had fully come into progress and for this not one but many causes were responsible. Some such causes being:

1.4.2.1. Role of the Church: In Europe there was an international church. The command of the Pope sitting in Rome were obeyed by all Christians irrespective of the country in which they were living. Wealth from all the countries poured in Rome and the Pope and the clergy began to lead a life of luxury. With the passing of the time evils, corruption and irregular acts of the Pope came to light. In the beginning the church tried its best to ensure that its authority was not challenged. It followed the policy of confrontation with monarchies. The weak monarchies also obeyed the commands of the Pope and accepted the supremacy of the church. When the people withdrew their support from the church organization, they extended their support to the monarch. The church had no alternative but to follow the policy of lying low. This provided a good opportunity to the monarch to fully establish their authority in their own countries.

1.4.2.2. Decline of Feudalism: The feudal lords were posing a great threat to the authority of the monarchs everywhere. In fact the latter always depended on the former in many ways. But again due to wrong policies followed by these lords, the people got disillusioned with them. Their way of exploitation completely alienated the sympathies of the people from them. When the powerful monarchies struggled to crush their authority and powers none lamented for them. Once their power was crushed, the rulers established their absolute authority over their subjects. This automatically developed nationalism and nation state.

1.4.2.3. Rise of Powerful Rulers: It was a matter of chance that during the 15th and 16th centuries many powerful rulers came on the thrones of European States. Each one of them was quite keen to establish his own supremacy without any outside interference, may that be from the church or the feudal lord or any outside super power or authority. These rulers were quite keen to protect the interests of their peoples on the one hand and their own on other. They were prepared to wage war or to impose any tax on the people. This was another important cause which helped in the rise of nation states.

1.4.2.4. The Crusades: The crusades were the holy wars which were fought between the Christians and the Muslims. It was during these wars that the people of Europe came to know how the oriental people were governed. It was liked by them and they wanted to practice it towards them by their rulers and in the similar way they wanted to get protection by their rulers.

1.4.2.5. Rise of the Middle Class: Under the feudalism there was no middle class. The people were either extremely rich or absolutely poor. But when new scientific inventions and discoveries were progress, with that middle class which was mostly engaged in trade came into help. This class was keen that their interests should be fully protected and safeguarded both in their own country as well abroad. This they felt could be possible only when there was a powerful monarch on the throne, otherwise their trade will be completely ruined.

1.4.2.6. Lucrative Enterprises Abroad:

Before geographical discoveries and finding of new land, both the feudal lords as well as church-men concentrated all their attention to their domestic affairs. In a bid to establish their own authority they fought among themselves and faded each other. But when new sea and land routes to new countries were discovered, their attention was drawn to the trade which was going on with these countries. In the same way the trading companies also wanted that there should be powerful monarchs on the throne who should be in a position to protect their commercial interests abroad so that these wars not jeopardized by the activities of other trading companies.

1.4.2.7. Availability of Money: One important cause for the rise of nation states was that each powerful monarch could get sufficient money to defend his own country from outside aggression and crush internal risings. Money became available when the nations refused to send money annually to the Pope. Similarly the monarchs refused to send him costly gifts as a token of their subordination to the supreme religious head. The kings were now also in a position to collect taxes with their own strength from the people. When feudal

lords were crushed the money which they used to collect from people by way of taxes now became available to the monarch who used that for raising their armies, maintain law and order and strengthening their national borders.

1.4.2.8. *Invention of Gun Power:* When gun power was invented all means and methods for fighting the wars radically changed. It now became easy for the monarch to pierce the strong forts of the feudal lords, if they decided to rise in revolt against the authority of the king. The importance of soldiers on foot or fighting on horseback considerably decreased. On the other hand the significance of guns very much increased. Since the gun power could only be used by the king therefore, the power and position of the monarch went up in the eyes of the people, who were prepared to extend their support to the rulers.

1.4.2.9. *Costly and Bloody Wars:* Wars in the past neither used to be bloody nor costly. As the time however, passed these became prolonged, costly and devastating. Obviously both the people as well as the rulers realized that unless they took care of their own interests and made maximum sacrifices for defending their own country both their independence and self-respect will be lost. This developed among them feelings of nationalism and national hood.

1.4.2.10 *Writings of the Scholars:* During this period many powerful writers developed among the people feelings which significantly contributed towards the rise of the national state. Mention in this may be made about Machiavelli, Bodin and Hobbes.

Machiavelli, in his famous treatise 'The Prince' tried to say that it was the fore most duty of a prince in the state to take care of the interests of his own people. He should also treat his neighbouring states as his own enemy. He should know how to play both lion as well as fox. He should honour international treaties and obligations as long as these suit his own state and discard these when his interests are not served by that. Not only this, but he should be ready for commit every sin and wrong for the sake of his state. He should be ready to fight every war. According to him success justifies every action. He suggested his prince that he should so behave that his people fear from him. In this way Machiavelli elevated his king to high pedestal. According to him the king should never be disobeyed. In this way he tried to develop the concept of the nation state and was much success in that.

Then concerned to Bodin, he developed the theory of absolute monarchy. According to him the king should be absolute in all respects. The people have no right to either defy his authority or rise in revolt against him. He was responsible to God alone for his acts of omission and commission. In this way he preached the theory of Divine Origin of State and believed that the king was the deputy of God on the earth. According to him there should be no constraints on him. He was the source of all laws and had absolute right to impose taxes. The subjects were duty bound to pay these without any grudge and grumble.

Hobbes was a social contract philosopher. He believed that both the state and the sovereign came into being as a result of contract between the people and the king. According to him the king was bound by no contract. He was the supreme head of the state and source of all laws. Every law given by him was final. He also believed that the king was the deputy of God on the earth. He put his king on high pedestals. Not only this, but he bitterly opposed individualism and such concepts as natural rights or fundamental rights of the people. All property in the state belongs to the king, he argued. In this way he also developed the idea of absolute monarchy and unlimited rights for the monarchs.

1.4.2.11. Characteristics of Nation States: What were the main features or characteristics of nation states? Some such common features were:

1. It was believed that their own state is supreme and no other state has either any right or should dare to challenge territorial integrity of the state.
2. The king is the defender of the State and rights and interests of the people. He should be given full cooperation.
3. The king is the final authority in the State. He is both law giver and its interpreter. The people have no rights at all to disobey him.
4. These States were absolutely opposed to the concept of natural rights and individual freedom. They thus did not contribute to the idea of individualism.
5. These states did not contribute to the concept of the international church but in the concept of national concept and national church.
6. The state should be politically independent and economically self-sufficient.
7. The king had every right to levy taxes and the subjects were duty bound to pay the same.
8. The state should expand and for the purpose they supported the idea of setting up new colonies abroad.

1.4.3. NATION STATE IDEOLOGY IN SOME EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

The idea of nation state very soon caught the imagination of the people. In England this idea got roots with the out coming of the Tudor rulers on the throne of England. Henry VII practically ended feudalism after the War of Roses. Henry VIII for whatever reasons, very much reduced the influence of the Church of Rome in England and in fact relieved the nation from the influence of this foreign church. Queen Elizabeth established her full authority over the people and the state after defeating Spanish Armada. As already said Henry VII defeated the feudal lords and confiscated their properties and wealth and ended their influences in state matters. He put down every act of disorder with heavy hand. Under the

Tudors England was completely a nation state brooking no outside interference from any quarter. England became colonial power and it became difficult to think of defeating her both in Europe or outside that.

New absolute monarchy also developed in France as well, where the feelings of nationalism and nation state became strong. France became politically conscious under the rulers of Capet dynasty. Phillip IV of this dynasty compelled of Roman Pope to shift his headquarters from Rome to Avignon, which very much helped in raising the prestige of France. In that state it was clearly understood, that the king was source of law and justice. He was both law giver as well as its interpreter. The parliament enjoyed very little powers in that country. The people enjoyed very few privileges. Thus in the country there was centralized government.

The concept of nation state however, developed when Henry IV (1589-1610) came to the throne. He had the fortune of having an able minister named Sully. Both of them did a lot for making France a self-respective nation. When Louis XIII came to throne he picked up the Richelieu (1624-1642) as his Chief Minister. He was very able person and served his country with devotion. He brought all unruly elements under control and raised the prestige of his king. Both of them however, died in the same year thus creating a vacuum. Louis XIII's successor was five year old child Louis XIV. He had to fight many wars which took the country towards bankruptcy. But credit goes to him for doing hard work. He was also very wise able ruler and knew many administrative details. During his time feelings of national state very firmly developed. On his death bed he advised his son to avoid wars and have faith in God. He also suggested him to redress the grievances of the people at the earliest and not to follow him in his wars policy.

Louis XV was however, not an able ruler and for the time being the idea of nation state received some set back.

During 18th century France had to fight many wars which considerably strengthened the feelings of nation state. These feelings became stronger during Napoleonic wars and during the days of French Revolution. It was during these wars that France as a nation stood against Europe and French nationalism surpassed many European nations.

Like France the nation state ideology developed in Spain as well. She emerged as a nation by the Union of Aragon- Castile and Grenada. Subsequently it began to expand in America and managed to get a papal Bull by which European states were asked not to interfere in America and thus disturb Spanish expansion in that country. The monarchy became strong during the days of Ferdinand and Isabella who tried to bring absolutism in administration. They tried to win the cooperation of middle classes and crushed the powers of the nobles and the feudal. The functions of the parliament were transferred to Royal

Commissioners and state officers. It was due to their untiring efforts that during 16th century Spain became a nation state.

¹⁸ After the defeat of Napoleon, Congress of Vienna (1815) was convened in which it did not respect for the feelings of people of many states. But in Spain feelings of nation state were getting deep roots. In that country in 1820, this cause received some set back when the people rose their voice against their ruler Ferdinand, but their rising was crushed and Spain exerted itself as a nation state.

The feelings of nation states also developed in Denmark and Sweden where the powers of the feudal lords were crushed and those of the monarch considerably increased. In these countries neither the church nor the parliament was allowed to grow but the people were made to believe that the King was supreme and his authority must be accepted under all circumstances.

¹⁵ The feelings of nation state very much developed both in Italy and Germany. The Congress of Vienna had divided Italy into small states but soon desire for unity developed in the country and the people realized injustice which had been done to them. Italian youth extended their fullest cooperation to a nationalist secret society named Carbonari, which propagated Italy for Italians. Many secret societies came into existence which demanded freedom of the country. In 1831 Mazzini founded Young Italy society and also started a paper "Young Italy" while he was in exile in France. But all revolutionary societies were crushed by Austria and for the time being the cause of nation state in that country received a setback. But forces of nationalism and those favoring nation state for Italy continued to struggle and were a success by 1870. Italy was unified and the cause of unification was complete.

⁵ The idea of nation state also developed in Germany. The congress of Vienna was opposed to the concept of unification of Germany. In 1831, however, 18 states joined in a tariff union called Zollverein. In 1843, as many as 39 states created a united Germany at Frankfurt. After sometimes Prussia emerged as the leader of German states. But whole process got expedited after Bismark became the prime minister and Austria was thrown out of German confederation. In 1871, Bismark completed the difficult task of unification of Germany.

1.4.3.1. **Summary:** The whole process of emergence of new absolutism and creation of new states was both time consuming as well as difficult. It took a very long time for the nations to emerge as self-identity beyond the influence of other church or any other state in the modern period. ² Growth of trade and commerce resulted in the birth of a new middle-class which became a staunch supporter of enlightened monarchy. Medieval ideas nations

were withered away after the discovery of new lands. Europe witnessed the revival of strong monarchies everywhere which worked for nationalist self-interest

1.4.3.2. **Self-Assessment Questions:**

1. Describe the causes responsible for the nationalism and national states in Europe.
2. Describe the Nation state ideology in some Western European Countries.

1.4.3.3. **Reference Books:**

1. Briton, Crane, et. al. Modern Civilization : A History of the Last Five Centuries
2. Evans, J :The Foundations of a Modern State in the 19th Century
3. Fisher, H.A.L. : A History of Europe
4. Gooch, G.P. : History of Modern Europe.
5. Hobsbawn, E : Nation and Nationalism
6. Ketelby, C.D.M. : A History of Modern Times
7. -----, : The Age of Revolution
8. Palmer, R.R. and J. Colton, A History of the Modern World
9. Wells, H.G. : An Outline History of the World
10. -----, : A Short History of the World

LESSON-1.5

PROGRESS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE MODERN PERIOD

1.5.0. Objective of the Lesson:

Progress of the science and technology in the modern period in some basic subjects of sciences and its impact on modern civilization is the prime objective of this lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

1.5.1. Introduction

1.5.2. Terms of Science and Technology Defined

1.5.3. Geology

1.5.4. Astronomy

1.5.5. Development of the Science of Physics

1.5.6. Modern Physics

1.5.7. Development in Chemistry

1.5.8. Progress in Biology

1.5.9. Progress in Medical Field

1.5.10. Technological Innovations

1.5.11. Motion Picture.

1.5.12. Technological Innovations in the means of Transport

1.5.13. Motor Vehicles

1.5.14. Revolution in Communication System.

1.5.15. Summary

1.5.16. Self-Assessment Questions

1.5.17. Reference Books

1.5.1. Introduction:

It may not be an exaggeration to say that the Industrial Revolution in England gave a tremendous fillip to the growth of science and technology. The textile industry which needed large scale bleaching and dying gave stimulus to practical chemistry and machine technology. The transport of material and finished goods by sea required navigational

innovations and it was not long before the sextant chronometer was invented. So during the next few centuries a chain of scientific discoveries and technological innovations continued to take place in the world. The people who marveled at these things thought of establishing Academies of Science, and the industrialists who got immense benefits out of this felt the need founding Industrial Research Laboratories.

1.5.2. **Terms of Science and Technology defined:**

By science we mean a "Cumulative body of systematized knowledge gained by observation, experimentation, and reasoning." The word "technology" is defined "the fundamental application of scientific knowledge to the practical arts, resulting in improved industrial and commercial product of greater value to the people". These two things became hand-maids of modern civilization. They marched hand in hand and rendered great services to the growth of human civilization. Scientific discoveries and innovations changed the very approach to life. There was the scientific temper pervading or developing in the western society. We call this as the intellectual revolution. Every aspect of nature came to be thoroughly studied and formed a separate subject-matter. Let us examine the achievements of each subject of natural sciences.

1.5.3. **Geology:**

The credit for laying the foundation for the subject of Geology goes to Nicolaus Steno, a Dane, who found curious fossils of marine life on the mountains. Abraham Werner (1750-1817) was a German scientist who contributed much to the study of crystallography and different forms of rocks. Giovanni Arduini (1713-95), an Italian scholar, worked on the geological chronology and correctly estimates the successive ages of the earth's crust. His work followed by an Englishman, James Hutton, in 1795. Louis Agassiz contributed much to marine life and the glacial geology by publishing his works on the *Fresh Water Fishes*, *Research relating to Fossil Fishes*, and *Study relating to Glaciers* during the 1840s. William Nicol (1810-70), a Professor in Edinburgh rendered much contribution to the development of petrography, the microscopic study of rocks and fossils. His research methods later came to be applied by Henry Sorby for his study of crystals (1858). Charles Lyell (1797-1875) studied at Oxford and published his *Principles of Geology*. He was the first to "conceive the idea of classifying tertiary formations of the Cenozoic Age into four divisions Eocene, Oligocene, Miocene and Pliocene." All these terms are in common use by the geologists. Thus, the development of Geology as a scientific subject for study extended its scope and widened the horizon of human knowledge on the earth we live in.

1.5.4. Astronomy:

Halley's discoveries: In the field of astronomy, Edmund Halley, an English astronomer, studied the comet which appeared in 1682 and discovered that the same comet had appeared in 1606, i.e., 76 years earlier. After studying its orbit he predicted that it would be seen again in year 1759. Some of his achievements include the discovery of the "periodicity" of comets and method to measure the distance between the Sun and the Earth. Balthasar Bekker, a Netherlander, made a deep study on comets and published his findings in the *Inquiry into the meaning of Comets* in 1683. A year earlier, Pierre Bayle had published his book *Various Thoughts on Comets* in which he exploded the myth that the appearance of comets portends disasters. In 1796, Pierre Simon de Laplace published a book, *System of Universe*, wherein he declared that all planets and the stars had taken birth from the same source— a rotating nebula of incandescent gas. One of the most remarkable astronomers of the 18th century was William Herschel (1738-1822). Besides producing Telescope and discovering the planet Uranus and the sixth satellite of Saturn, he drew up a picture of the shape of the Galaxy. It resembled "the form of a double convex lens with Sun near the middle". Astronomy made some more progress with the findings of John Couch Adams, Urbain Leverrier, Gustaf Kirchhoff and Robert Bunsen. The last two contributed to astrophysics since they tried to determine the physical nature of stars. One of the greatest astronomers of the 19th century was Giovanni Schiaparelli (1835-1900) who said that comet stop shining and become meteors. He made special study of three planets, Mars, Venus and Mercury. He observed "canals" and climate resembling that found on the earth on the planet Mars.

1.5.5. Development of the Science of Physics:

Physics studies different forms energy and matter. It made rapid strides of progress due to the impetus provided by the Industrial Revolution in England. Some physicists were interested in understanding how the steam engine covered heat into motion. They applied the results of their researches while inventing gasoline engine and the like. Other physicists studied metals and produced new metals like steel, etc. During the 19th century James Clerk Maxwell and Heinrich Hertz did research work in electromagnetic waves and energy. It may be remembered that Michael Faraday experimented with magnetism and later on invented the 'dynamo' which produced electricity. A little later a group of physicists were interested in electricity and magnetism, and a major breakthrough took place when Heinrich Hertz established the existence of electro-magnetic waves. The contributions of Hertz pave way for the invention of wireless. It also made it possible to enter a new field of physical research, electronics. Ernest Rutherford took much lead in this field.

2 1.5.6. **Modern Physics:**

Modern Physics is of recent origin and it was nurtured by John Dalton and Max Planck. The last one came forward with a new theory on light as well as the quantum theory. The latter explained the properties of atom. With advent of the 20th century the world witnessed the birth of Nuclear physics. It began with Roentgen who discovered X-rays and subsequently a French couple, Pierre and Marie Curie found out the Radium also gives off radiation. It was not long before the scientists discovered marvelous things about the atom. Later, Albert Einstein predicted that by splitting the atom tremendous energy can be released. His theory paved way for the production of Atom bomb and the Americans dropped it on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with catastrophic results. The age of the Atom bomb began since the middle of the 20th century.

2 1.5.7. **Development in Chemistry:**

Chemistry had its humble beginning and it took time to grow as an independent science became it had been shackled by alchemy. The name of George Stahl, Henry Cavendish and Antoine Lavoisier helped to develop this subject. Henry Cavendish obtained the hydrogen gas after experiments and discovered that water is an element but compound of hydrogen and oxygen. Antoine Lavoisier is described as "the Newton of Chemistry". He burnt different substances in his closed chamber and discovered that their basic elements remained the same though they had altered in appearance. An English chemist, John Dalton, tried to explain this new phenomenon through his atomic theory. According to Dalton's theory, all matter is made of minute atoms or building blocks, and the atoms of different elements differ in sizes and traits. Although the elements mix to form a new substance, their atoms always remain intact. Extending this line of thinking, a Russian scientist, Dmitri Mendelyev prepared a table of all the identified elements according to their atomic weights. Today, we know there are about 200 elements and the properties of each element are fully investigated. Research in chemistry led to its being utilized for the material prosperity of man. Chemistry has enabled us to create synthetic materials, fertilizers, plastics, pesticides, and has also played useful role in refining petroleum. The chemists also helped man by creating life-saving drugs.

1.5.8. **Progress in Biology:**

Biology is study of all living things. Several distinguished sciences are associated with its development. Garolus Linnaeus, a Swedish scientist, divided all natural objects into stone, animals and vegetables. He also invented the system of giving biological nomenclature to all plants and animals. Rene de Reaumur made a special study of insect life. He is also credited with inventing a thermometer and an unpublished manuscript,

Natural History of Ants. John Hunter was interested in studying comparative anatomy animals and birds. Cuvier studied not only the animal world but also the past life of the Earth (Paleontology). Some biologists studied the "living jelly" or protoplasm. There were others who took interest in nutrition. One of the most revolutionary figures in modern biology was an English Naturalist, Charles Darwin. His *Magnum opus* was the *Origin of Species* which was published in 1859. Darwin said that living organisms had been evolved from a common ancestor which was the first to take birth on the earth hundreds of millions of years ago. The living species-including man-which exist today are the result of a long process of evolution. This long process was painful and slow since many died in between. In other words, Nature did not allow all species to multiply, and selected only those which could best adapt themselves to the existing environment. So the long and painful process of evolution was characterized by a struggle for existence. That was how the numbers in each kind of species were kept more or less constant.

The long process of evolution of living species and the change in their forms led to the development of the new science called genetics. Francis Galton (1822-1911), a cousin of Darwin studied the hereditary characteristics of geniuses and published work on it. While Galton's contribution may be strictly assigned to the science of Eugenics, the foundation for the science of genetics was laid by an Austrian monk, Gregory Mendel. Mendel experimented with garden peas by bringing about the cross- breeding of its many varieties. He finally discovered that hereditary characteristic of each are passed on in a definite form or pattern. Mendel's law (Gregory Mendel 1822-1844) propounds that "when two or more contrasted characters are crossed, the characters separate out in the later generations independently of each other." The science of genetics has been of immense benefit for it enables breeding superior varieties of plants and animals.

1.5.9. Progress in Medical field:

Medical science has made enormous strides of progress during the last 150 years and thereby extending the average life-expectancy of mankind. It may be remembered that before 1796 there were no vaccines against small-pox, plague and other types of fever. The victims were left helpless and many crude native remedies were adopted. An English doctor, Edward Jenner, found out that those who had cow-pox (a mild disease) earlier appeared to be free from the attack of small-pox. He experimented with a young boy by inoculating him with cow-pox serum. Jenner's experiment against the deadly disease, small-pox, proved highly successful. That was how vaccination (1796) against certain diseases became popular. Nobody knew how these diseases were caused. However, it was not until 1865 that a French Professor, Louis Pasteur (1822-95), showed that these infectious diseases were caused by germs. He explained how fermentation takes place i.e., souring of

milk and putrefaction of meat. He correctly guessed that the silk industry in France had been destroyed by plague. He also discovered the cause for the cattle-disease. But his Outstanding achievement was his discovery of successful treatment of persons suffering from hydrophobia (disease caused by the bite of mad dog). For a couple of years the germ theory of Louis Pasteur was ridiculed but it assumed credibility under a German scientist, Robert Koch (1843-1910). With the aid of microscope, Koch discovered the germs which caused diseases known to us as 'cholera and tuberculosis. When the germ theory was accepted as a fact, doctors started discovering vaccines or serums to protect the people from such diseases like diphtheria and the like. Emil von Behring protected children from diphtheria by vaccination. His success led to the discovery of several vaccines on such diseases like typhoid fever, tetanus and others. Walter Reed, an American doctor, found that yellow fever was spread by mosquitos. Over a span of half a century, scientists discovered powerful drugs such as penicillin and sulfa to combat these deadly germs. Today we have the most powerful antibiotic drugs used against diseases raging from infantile paralysis to diseases like cancer and heart-trouble. In the field of surgery, the discovery of anesthetics happened to be a milestone. It is used to deaden the pain of a patient during the time of surgery. Another important factor in the field of surgery was the discovery of X-rays. It enabled surgeons to see the affected part or organ of the body. Since the advent of the 20th century, scientists discovered the energy producing and health-giving properties of various kinds of food. Their deficiencies led to the deteriorating physical conditions of a person. It was in 1906 that scientists discovered vitamins as essential for maintaining good physical condition. Meanwhile, the dangers from surgical operations on patients were minimized by sterilizing the tools used by the doctor before the operation. In the bygone days Lord Lister a British doctor, used carbolic acid to prevent festering of wounds.

1.5.10. Technological Innovations:

The use of iron and steel marked the beginning of the modern world. It was Sir Henry Bessemer who invented a method for "removing the impurities from iron and making it harder." This refined iron was called as steel. Iron and steel were used for making machines and tools. Mechanical sewing was introduced by an American, Isac Singer, with the help of a sewing machine operated by a treadle (1851). The steam-driven printing press was introduced in 1813 by two Germans, Friedrich Koenig and Andrew Bauer. Ottmar Mergenthaler invented the linotype printing technique. Tobler Lanston invented the monotype printing method. The manufacture of paper with the help of a machine was made possible by Henry Fourdrinier. In 1867, an American, Christopher Sholes, invented the typewriter and the Remington factory bought Shole's rights for manufacture of typewriters.

The development of photography began with the efforts of Thomas Wedgwood who produced contact prints. The next important milestone in the sciences of photography was achieved when Joseph Niepce discovered the method of making permanent photographic images. The next important person who greatly contributed to the modern photography was an American, George Eastman. He invented the "Kodak" camera.

1.5.11. Motion Picture:

With the invention of photography it was not long before the motion pictures came into vogue. This was made possible by Charles F. Jenkins who produced a motion picture projector in 1894. Gabriel Lippman introduced colour motion pictures. The earliest movies were silent movies and were soon replaced by talkies. Cartoon movies were produced by Windsor McKay.

1.5.12. Technological Innovations in the means of Transport:

Technological innovations in the methods of transport began in the early years of the 19th century in England. The first Railway locomotive was built by Richard Trevithick and its first journey took place in 1804. In 1807 an American, Robert Fulton, built a steamboat which commenced its regular service on the river Hudson. Refrigerators and cars were introduced in 1875. The first rail-road service was opened to public in England in 1825. The first steamship to cross the Atlantic in 1833 was a Canadian vessel, *The Royal William*.

1.5.13. Motor vehicles:

Karl Benz, a German engineer, introduced motor transport by inventing his motor-car in 1885. During the same year, another German engineer, Gottlieb Daimler introduced a gasoline engine which was introduced to run a motor-cycle. The Modern Air Transport began in the early 20th century. The Wright brothers flew a motor-driven plane successfully in 1903. In 1908 they travelled nearly 100 miles on their motor-driven plane. In 1919 Alcock and Brown flew in plane across the Atlantic. The first flight around the world was in 1924. The next adventure was made by Charles Lindbergh who flew from Long Island in New York to Paris alone in 1927. During World War I planes were used for reconnaissance and bombing. The Germans used "Zeppelins", a large floating air-ship filled with nitrogen gas. It carried some adventurous passengers across the Atlantic. The first commercial jet service started with the flight from New York to Miami. In recent years, an average of 350 passengers is carried by the Jumbo Jet (747) passenger Aircrafts. Military jets fly at a faster rate and at very high altitudes. After the development of rockets, man has been able to fly in space and reach the moon.

Lesson-2.1

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789)

Objective of the Lesson: The importance of the 1789 French Revolution and its results is the main objective of the lesson.

Structure of the lesson:

- 2.2.1. Introduction**
- 2.2.2. Social Causes**
- 2.2.3. The First Estate**
- 2.2.4. The Second Estate**
- 2.2.5. The Third Estate**
- 2.2.6. Political Causes**
- 2.2.7. Economic Causes**
- 2.2.8. Intellectual Awakening**
- 2.2.9. Role of the King**
- 2.2.10. Course of the Revolution**
- 2.2.11. Constitution of the 1795**
- 2.2.12. Results of the Revolution**
- 2.2.13. Summary**
- 2.2.14. Self Assessment Questions**
- 2.2.15. Reference Books**

2.2.1. Introduction:

Towards the closing years of the 18th century Europe was shaken by the French Revolution - considered by many historians as the most important landmark in human history. The Revolution which occurred in 1789 swept away existing political institutions and aimed establishing a more egalitarian society and responsible government than what existed before. The revolution began with fall of Bastille on July 14, 1789 and continued until the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte to power. Let us examine the causes which led to the sudden overthrow of the French Monarchy in 1789.

2.2.2. Social Causes:

Invidious distinctions and unjust privileges marked the character of the French society. The society was divided sharply in three classes. The first estate was constituted by the higher clergy like archbishops, bishops, and the abbots who governed the church of France.

2.2.3. The First Estate (The Church):

The Church owned one-fifth of the cultivated lands in France and enjoyed great influence with the Government. Like the nobles, the higher clergy was also exempt from paying most of the taxes. With the nobles they supported absolute monarchy. The Church collected tithe, a tax from the people for providing community services. It also maintained institutions of learning. The lower clergy lived in miserable conditions even though they were good at ecclesiastical matters.

2.2.4. The Second Estate (The Nobles):

There were 80,000 families in France who belonged to nobility—the second Estate. Even though feudalism disappeared in France since the days of Richelieu, these families continued to enjoy all the privileges such as non-payment of most of the taxes, avenues to higher positions in the French administration, and income from various dues of the peasants. It may be noted that most of the nobles were absentee landlords. This idle aristocracy became a parasite and made peasants feel that they were paying taxes to them for their luxury.

2.2.5. The Third Estate (The Common People):

The bulk of the French population belonged to the third estate. They were the middle classes members, the peasants and artisans. The educated middle-class, which considered of merchants, lawyers, teachers, doctors and others, was conscious of inequalities in the social order and unfair and oppressive taxes resorted to by the despotic monarchy. The government hardly cared for their welfare. It was from them that the main thrust for revolution came. The peasants complained of overburdening taxes which reduced them to penury. After paying taxes to the landlords, the church and the state, a poor peasant could hardly make both ends meet with 18 per cent of his income. He was further subjected to humiliation when the nobles destroyed his field while hunting animals. The French artisans complained of the regulation of trade-guilds which favoured their masters and left them with meager income.

2.2.6. Political Causes:

Royal absolutism, as witnessed during the glorious period of Louis XIV, came to an end with his death in 1715. His great-grandson, Louis XV, who ascended the throne at the tender age of five, neither had the capacity nor the ability to govern the country effectively.

France drifted towards chaos by involving herself in numerous wars. Mindless of the financial burden that would fall upon the poor peasantry, she fought the wars of Austrian Succession and the Seven years' war with the result that she lost her empire. Poor peasants who could not pay the taxes were sent to the prison and those who spoke against royal despotism and tyranny also suffered. King Louis XV never evinced keen interest in governing the country but engaged himself in pursuit of worldly pleasures. When his ministers tried to discuss with him the serious problem of the state, he said, "After me, the deluge". He sadly neglected the affairs of the state and appointed his favourites to important offices. The treasury was empty after the wars, and the king remained, as usual indifferent. He also adopted a policy of repression by imposing curbs on the freedom of the press and speech. The king did little to alleviate the sufferings of the common people. Louis XV's successor was Louis XVI. He was twenty years old when he came to power. He was intelligent and well intentioned. But he had no will to carry out some bold reforms to set right the deteriorating conditions prevailing in France. His judgment was influenced by flattering courtiers and his ill-advised queen, Marie Antoinette.

Unfortunately, France had no uniform code of laws. A law which was regarded as just and fair in one province was not so in another. Nepotism and corruption in every government department further alienated the sympathies of the people.

The Bourbon monarchy discarded the practice of consulting the Estates-General on state matters since the days of Louis XIII. They thought that it served little purpose. In the absence of the Estates-General, the kings of France arrogated powers for themselves but were advised by able chief ministers like Cardinal Richelieu, Mazarin and finance ministers like Colbert. However, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the French monarch was not having such able ministers to guide the destiny of the country.

2.2.7. Economic Causes:

The French system of taxation was both just and unfair despite the fact that peasants in the neighbouring countries suffered much more than them. Nevertheless, French peasants suffered due to oppression of the tax-farmers and uncertain imposition of the taxes. The privileged classes did not pay most of the taxes and the burden was naturally shifted on the shoulders of the poor peasants.

2.2.8. Intellectual Awakening:

It is said that ideas govern the world and they come from the philosophers. France produced great philosophers during the eighteenth century. Voltaire became internationally famous as a great writer and critic whose style and pungent criticism were inimitable. It was through his plays and writings that he launched his bitter attacks against the existing institutions like the church and the state. He made fun of the eccentricities of the nobles.

Writings about Voltaire (1694-1718), Macaulay says, "Of all the intellectual weapons ever wielded by man the mockery of Voltaire was the most terrible."

While Voltaire would have liked enlightened despotism, Montesquieu(1659-1755), a good student of constitutional government, preferred constitutional monarchy in France such as the English type. He summed up his ideas of such a government in his important work *De l' Esprit des Lois*. It was in this he popularized the theory of separation of power and of its exercise by three branches of government- the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary. If this is done, he argued, there would be no tyranny and the liberty of the individual could be safeguarded.

Probably the greatest French philosopher of the age was Jean Jacques Rousseau. In his *Social Contract*, he explained that the King and his subjects are parties to a contract, and therefore if the King does not rule the people according to their general will, he loses their loyalty. The people have every right to overthrow the monarchy under such circumstances. Rousseau was advocating popular sovereignty theory. His writings cast such on his admirers that they were ready to revolt against the oppressive monarchy. Diderot was another intellectual of the time who prepared an *Encyclopedie* containing the latest knowledge. He exposed the rotten system of administration in France and suggested several remedial measures.

2.2.9. The Role of the King:

When the American colonists revolted against the oppressive rule of the mother country and won a resounding victory at Saratoga, the French government decided to help them with men, money and materials. It caused a serious strain on the finances of the country and cast a heavy burden on the poor peasants. After the success of the American Revolution (1783), the French volunteers returned to their homeland and sowed the seeds of the revolution. The king ought to have reduced the expenses of the royal household and wisely dealt with the financial crisis. However, this was not to be because the queen and her advisers always came in his way. Turgot was appointed as the Minister of Finance to suggest remedies. He advised the king to tax the privileged class. He was summarily dismissed at the instance of the queen. The financial crisis reached threatening proportions and the government defaulted payment of salary to the armed forces. Unfortunately, France witnessed near-famine conditions in 1788 with the result there was serious food shortage. Coupled with this, there was unusual and severe winter in 1789. It was at this critical juncture the king was advised by his courtiers to summon the Estates-general (French Parliament) to get approval for further dose of taxation.

2.2.10. *Course of the Revolution:*

When the Estates-general were summoned, the king ignored the importance of the third-estate (600 representatives elected by the common people) and tried to consult the representatives of the three estates separately. The representatives of the third estate advised the king to bring together the representatives of all three estates at one place for discussion of state problems. The king discarded their advice. Subsequently, it led to a quarrel between the king and the representatives of the third estate. They, along with a few representatives from the other two estates, took a pledge (Tennis Court Oath) not to return home till the drafting of the new constitution was completed. The new constitution was to be framed to limit the powers of the king. When the king dismissed Turgot, rumour spread that he might dissolve the National Assembly also. It was then that an unruly mob in Paris stormed a medieval fortress-prison of Bastille(July 4, 1789), standing as a symbol of royal despotism. The Swiss guards were killed and a few political prisoners were set free. The royal power was weakened further when the revolutionaries drove out royal officials from Paris and established their own government in Paris. The king summoned troops to frighten the Paris mob. It led to further escalation of mob fury. Hungry women of Paris marched to the royal palace of Versailles and demanded bread. When there was no proper response, the mob entered the palace and ransacked it. They forced the king, the queen and their children to live in Paris. The National Assembly completed the drafting of the constitution in 1791. According to this new constitution the King's power came to be reduced. Laws were to be made by the Legislative Assembly, and members of this assembly were to be elected by tax-paying citizens. The king was not happy at the civil constitution of the clergy. However, he gave his consent to abide by the laws of the new constitution. Looking to the tense situation prevailing in the countryside (where the peasants rose in revolt against the nobles) and also a possibility of a war breaking out with Austria on the borders, the king thought it fit to flee the country. In June 1791, he attempted to flee with his family but was apprehended at the border town of Varennes. Thus, ended the hopes of the Moderates who had desired a Constitutional Monarchy. The Extremists gained ground in popularity and power. It led to the deposition of the king and his subsequent execution(1793). France was fast drifting towards a war with her neighbours as their monarchs were shocked at the execution of King Louis XVI. A total anarchy prevailed with the new constitution being set aside. The National Convention which met in September, 1792, began to draft a new constitution. It abolished monarchy and declared France as a Republic. Then it established a committee of Public Safety which was headed by the extremist leaders like Danton and Robespierre. These leaders enjoyed unlimited authority. The Girondins who were moderates were executed and the reign of terror began (Sept. 1792 to July1794)France witnessed the guillotining of

thousands of nobles and innocent men who had supported monarchy. Among the famous women who were executed were Queen Marie Antoinette and Madame du Barry.

2.2.11. Constitution of 1795:

After the death of Robespierre, the moderate elements gained predominance in the National Convention. The National convention framed a new constitution for France in 1795 according to which the executive power were vested with the Directory of five persons who were to be advised by a legislative body consisting of two chambers. When there was royalist uprising in Paris against the new constitution, troops were ordered to crush it. A Corsican youth named Napoleon Bonaparte took charge of the command, and after a 'whiff of grape-shot' dispersed the unruly mob which was about to attack the National Convention. This young officer was destined to rule France from 1799 to 1815.

2.2.12. Results of the revolution:

During its ten year course the French revolution brought about far reaching changes. Firstly, it destroyed the vestiges of feudalism and liberated the serfs. Secondly, it established a constitutional monarchy which also disappeared in due course of time. The declaration of the Rights of Man came to be included in the new Constitution as an article of faith. The nobles and the Church lost their property and their lands were distributed to the peasants. Slaves in the French colonies were set free. The watchwords of the French Revolution such as Liberty, Equality and Fraternity reflected the coming of a new democratic and social order in Europe.

Thirdly, the revolution roused national feelings. The common people were prepared to die for the sake of protecting the gains of the revolution. The French Citizen-militia fought the enemies on the French borders.

Finally, the French Revolution had a lasting effect on the people of Europe in the 19th century. Those who were groaning under the tyranny of foreign rulers derived their inspiration from the French. Europe was convulsed by frequent revolutions aimed at overthrowing oppressive governments.

2.2.13. Summary:

The French Revolution which started in 1789 and continued up to 1799 in a decade long changes with several twists and turns. And it was the landmark in the era of modern world, because it enshrined the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity from overthrowing the tyrannical regimes. Further it transformed the entire medieval system of the society.

2.2.14. Self Assessment Questions:

1. What were the causes of the French Revolution of 1789?
2. Write brief note on causes and course of the French Revolution.
3. Describe the significance of French Revolution and its results.

2.2.15. Reference Books:

1. Acton Lord, **Lectures on the French Revolution**
2. Bourne, **The Revolution Period in Europe**
3. Brinton, C., **A Decade of Revolution(1789-1799)**
4. Lefebvre, G., **The French Revolution**
5. Lowell, E.J., **The Eve of French Revolution**
6. Madelin, **The French Revolution**
7. Matthews , **The French Revolution**
8. Salvemini, G., **The French Revolution**
9. Shackleton, **Robert, Montesquieu**

UNIT-2

LESSON - 2.2.

1830 REVOLUTION

Objective of the Lesson:

The importance of 1830 Revolution and its causes and results are main objective of this lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 2.2.1. Introduction
- 2.2.2. The Constitutional Monarchy
- 2.2.3. Rule of Louis XVIII
- 2.2.4. Movements towards Liberalism
- 2.2.5. Reaction against tyrannical Regime in France
- 2.2.6. Outbreak of July Revolution in France
- 2.2.7. Impact of 1830 Revolution in Europe
- 17 2.2.8. Summary
- 2.2.9. Self Assessment Questions
- 2.2.10. Reference Books

2.2.1. Introduction:

¹ In France there was another revolution because Charles X, successor of King Louis XVII, tried to establish: the "old regime" he began to invoke the 'divine right' theory of kingship. He suppressed the freedom of speech and press and violated the constitutional laws of the country. He began to rule by royal ordinances. Therefore the revolution broke out in 1830 and he was forced to flee the country. The people chose Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, to rule the country.

The restoration in France, though provoking once more the spectacles of a King and a Court, made little change in the conditions of the French people. The *ancient regime* had gone forever. Society had been to profoundly alter by the vast convulsions of the Revolution and the Empire to recapture the irregularities, anomalies, and confusions which made the

government of the monarchy a mountain of abuses. The nobles never recovered their ancient sway. The Episcopal grand seigneur was a distant memory becoming steady fainter. All the main conquests of revolution, equally before the law, the liberty of the subject, the National Guard, the unity of the kingdom, the new judicial system, remained unaffected by the return of the Bourbons. Nobody had the power to repeal the Codes or to abolish the Legion of Honour or to dissolve the Napoleonic University. Even the Concordat, which was so offensive to clerical sentiment, was too strongly rooted to be torn up and cast to the winds. The restored monarchy, with its absolutist and clerical tradition, appeared ill adapted to society which was now profoundly equalitarian and, in its middle and most influential region, prevailingly secular.

2.2.2. *The Constitutional Monarchy:*

The experiment of a constitutional monarchy was started under every possible disadvantage. Not only was it hated by some and unfamiliar to all, but it implied a whole catalogue of political virtues which thrive only men are not too bitter and implacable to adjust their differences. The constitution of England could be copied. The good- humour, the moderation, the pleasant give and take, the graded loyalties which made the working of that constitution successful was less easy to emulate. Where as in England a newspaper of the period was full of sport and advertisements, in France, still trembling with the exasperation caused by the Hundred Days and by the White Terror which followed them, a newspaper was little more than a fierce political diatribe. The French legislator did not hunt the fox. No French Epsom or New market sweetened the severity or abated the logic of his political meditations. He thought with a bitter clearness, spoke with a bitter violence. If he was a diehard royalist, he assailed the Charter and the Concordat, and worked for the restoration of the estates which had been confiscated in the revolution. By the opposition school the noble and priest were hated with a rancor sharpened by apprehension, while the monarchy was denounced for its subservience to foreign powers, for its abandonment of the tricolor, and for its acceptance of a peace derogatory to the pride of a military nation.

2.2.3. *Rule of Louis XVIII:*

The position of Louis XVIII, uneasily poised between two nations, two philosophies, and two traditions, was one of extreme difficulty. He owed his throne to the national humiliation of Waterloo. He had been brought back in the baggage of the allied armies, an inglorious, unromantic figure, to rule over a people thirsting for glory and romance. The tyranny of circumstances constrained him to drastic and unwelcome economies. He could not go with the ultra-royalists who dominated his First Chamber since they pursued the fantasy of a return to the ancient regime. Equally he feared the revolutionary possibilities of liberalism. In the blinding violence of opposing factions the middle way was difficult to find

hard to keep. Louis both found and kept it. The electoral law of 1817, limiting the franchise to a narrow circle within the middle class, in its main principle governed France for thirty years.

It is to the credit of this sagacious and witty old gentleman that, after he had rid himself of his first impossible Chamber, which was more royalist than the King, he enlisted ministers by whose advice and support he was enabled to avoid the folly of extremes and to give to France a spell of peace and material prosperity, during which she put her finances in order, paid the war indemnity at a reduced rate, liberated her soil from foreign armies, and took a place once more in the Councils of Europe upon an equal and honorable footing. The names of Richelieu, of De Serre, of Decazes, and in a lesser degree of Villele, a good financier who disliked adventures, deserve to be honorably mentioned in roll of French parliamentary statesmen.

2.2.4. *Movements towards Liberalism:*

Outside a charmed circle of some 80,000 electors two opposing movements proceeded with accelerating velocity: first a renewal of the spirit and energy of the Roman Catholic Church, which set itself by a well-knit series of missions and schools to re-conquer for the Faith great tracts of French life which had lapsed into Paganism: and secondly a militant anti-clericalism, finding a new and secret organ in Carbonarism, a society derived from Naples, and aimed against tyranny in all its shapes. The liberalism of Europe was not, then, as Napoleon maintained, mortally stricken on the field of Waterloo. Not five years had passed before the conservative governments of the west were unpleasantly reminded that the spirit of revolution was still abroad. There was ferment among the university students in Germany, there were riots in Manchester, insurrections in Naples, Piedmont, and Spain, in Sicily a demand for independence, in Portugal the portent of a constitution, in Greece premonitory tremors of nationalism, in France a splutter of little Carbonarist revolutions, and the sensational murder in 1820 of the Duke de Berry, the King's nephew and the next King's eventual heir, by the dagger of Louvet, a fanatic. These movements were unripe, and even when most serious, as in Naples and Spain, easily put down by two obedient instruments of autocracy, the royalist armies of Austria and France. But when passions have once been roused to fever heat, wise government becomes more difficult than ever. After the Duke of Berry's murder, royalist feeling in Paris was too fierce to admit of a liberal ministry. To his keen regret Louis was compelled to dismiss his favorite Decazes, and to transfer his confidence to Villele, the mainstay of the Right. The press was muzzled. Heartened by an easy and almost bloodless progress across Spain, a French army, marching under the old royalist colours, put down the Spanish liberals, restored Ferdinand to power and freedom, and by this faint aureole of victory created in the old King's mind the illusion that all would yet be well with the legitimist cause in Europe. But already Canning was guiding British policy on

liberal lines: already Brazil, Peru, and Greece had declared their independence, and no shrewd observer could doubt but that the tides of liberalism were fast in the world.

2.2.5. Reaction against Tyrannical Regime in France:

Shrewdness and observation were alike denied to the elderly bigot who mounted the French throne in 1824. Charles X, differing from his pleasant, easy-going brother, was a man of strict, autocratic, and clerical principle. "I would rather chop wood," he said, "than reign after the fashion of the King of England." He was deaf to all the calls of the future, obedient only to the voice of the past. A lively and skeptical generation, still largely pagan and becoming increasingly liberal and Bonapartist, learned with amused contempt how the new King had got himself crowned after the ancient rites at Rheims, how he had lain prostrate on velvet cushions and allowed his body to be pricked in seven places by golden bodkin, that it might receive the blessing of the Holy Oil. And when this mediaeval ceremony was followed by a law granting pecuniary compensation to the émigrés, by another law enacting stern penalties for sacrilege, and by royal order dissolving the National Guard, who had demonstrated in favour of constitutional reform, amusement was succeeded by gathering volume of impatience, irritation, and fear. The idea spread, fomented by the unconcealed desire of the ultra-royalist papers, that the King meditated a *coup d'état* to overturn the constitution and to bring back the ancient regime. That this was in effect his design was made plain to all, when, dismissing Martignac, an able and moderate statesman, who might have saved the Crown, Charles summoned Jules de Polignac to his side.

Polignac, a visionary professing to receive direct guidance from the Virgin, was reaction personified. He had been one of the original émigrés, had been imprisoned under the Empire, and had refused to swear to the Charter in 1815. His very name was a challenge, and when it was known that Bourmont, the General who had betrayed Napoleon before Ligny, was to be Polignac's Minister of War, a mark of humiliation was added to the general distrust inspired by his Cabinet. Yet it is notable that under the last and weakest minister of her last and weakest legitimate King, France captured Algiers, inaugurating by that notable feat of arms the recovery of the north African coastal for the Latin races, and laying the wide African Empire which she is now studious as a makeweight against the man-power of Germany. Paris, however, was not interested in Algiers, but in the nearer controversy between priest and layman, crown and people, which soon drew to a sharp climax. On July 25, 1830, ordinances were issued from the Royal Palace of St. Cloud, limiting the freedom of the press dissolving the Chambers, and altering the electoral law. The King and his favourite had shown their hands. It was plain that they meant not only to refuse the demand for an enlarged franchise, which had been gathering force throughout the year, but to tear up the constitution itself and to blot out liberty in all its forms. The significance of

the royal programme was no sooner detained than it was regarded as intolerable insult. To the royalist coup *d'état* Paris responded by three days of fierce fighting, which drove the King from his throne and sealed the fate of the ancient monarchy of France.

2.2.6. Outbreak of July Revolution in France:

The revolution of July is notable as the act of a single city. Paris decided the fate of France. Before the royalists in the provinces had time to open their eyes, the issue was decided against the White Flag at the Paris barricades. Not less surprising to the multitude was the government which emerged from the tempest. A large share of the street fighting had been done by men like Cavaignac, who wanted a republic, or else by the Bonapartist supporters of a Second Empire. Yet the progeny of the revolution was neither a republic nor an empire but, the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe; the head of the House of Orleans and the son of that Philippe Egalite who had embraced the revolutionary cause, given a regicide vote, and perished on the scaffold. It was a good and ingenious notion cherished at that time by many men of liberal temper and notably by Thiers, a young Southerner of genius, then fast rising to the front in the sphere of history, politics, and journalism, that Louis of Orleans, who as a young man had fought in the revolutionary armies, and had afterwards tasted the sorrows and trials of poverty, would give to France the satisfying blessing of a democratic monarchy. None of the disabilities which had made Charles X impossible attached to Louis. He was a man of the new world, simple and homely in his ways, who would accept the tricolor and the lay institutions of a democratic state, and since the precedent of the English revolution of 1688 was much in the minds of the little knot of politicians who made the July monarchy, he appeared as a French William of Orange fated to heal the disorders of the nation and to inaugurate a long and prosperous constitutional rule in a country ill-used to temperance. Before the population of Paris realized what was afoot, the Prince had been brought by his adherents to the Hotel de Ville. There publicly adopting the tricolor, and embracing before the assembled crowd Lafayette, "the hero of two worlds," and the "grand old man of the revolution," Louis Philippe obtained for his new and unsteady government a necessary baptism of popular ovation.

2.2.7. Impact of 1830 July Revolution in Europe:

Sparks from the Paris furnace flew fast among the unsound timbers of "congress Europe." The Belgians rose against the Dutch, the Poles against the Russians, the Carbonari against the priestly governance of the Papal States. A wild clamour for a war of liberation to be undertaken in the grand old revolutionary manner in relief of suffering people ran along the Paris pavements. There were serious riots. For more than a year the new French government trembled for its. Eventually the storm was weathered. Louis Philippe would have nothing to say to the maniacs who would have involved France in a war with

England over Belgium, with Russia over Poland, and with the Austrian Empire over Italian nationalism. It is his chief title to statesmanship that, keeping the peace with the great Powers, he gave to his country eighteen years of prosperous and advancing economic life.

The revolution which broke up the ill-compacted Kingdom of the Netherlands started with a riot in Brussels on August 25, 1830. The Belgians had long annoyed under the stiff rule of their Dutch masters. They hated the Protestant religion and the Dutch spirit of religious tolerance and racial monopoly. They knew themselves to be more numerous and eloquent; they believed themselves to be more cultivated and denied. Accordingly they regarded it as intolerable that Dutch should be prescribed as the sole official language, that the Walloon populations should thereby be excluded from public life, and that almost every important civil and military office should be given to a Dutchman. To the countrymen of Rubens these Dutch airs of superiority were intolerable. Inflamed by the example of Paris, they determined to throw off the alien yoke.

A monument in the place des Martyrs in Brussels marks the burial place of six hundred Belgian volunteers, who died fighting in the streets against the Dutch regulars in September, 1830. Their sacrifice, which struck the imagination at the time, proclaimed but did not secure the cause of Belgian independence. The modern Kingdom of Belgium was made not by the military prowess of the Belgians but by Anglo-French diplomacy with some little help from the French army. Its architects were Palmerston, the new Liberal Foreign Minister in the Whig administration of Lord Grey, and Talleyrand, the well-chosen ambassador of France in London. Palmerstone's love of liberty, coupled with Louis Philippe's and Talleyrand's resolve never on any account to reopen the old quarrel with England, enabled the issue to be settled on the lines of Belgian independence without a general war. Had Palmerstone sided with the Dutch and autocracy, or had Louis Philippe accepted the Belgian crown which was offered to his second son, the old quarrel between France and England would have flamed out anew with consequences which must have been fatal to Belgian freedom. The cooperation of the two countries localized and solved the problem. The Belgian crown was offered to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, that long-headed, well-informed uncle of Queen Victoria, who, having taken his first wife from the English royal family, was now, as evidence of impartiality, prepared to marry a French Princess. A wiser choice could not have been made. Leopold surmounted all his difficulties, a dangerous Dutch invasion, a hardly less dangerous French rescue, and the deep dissatisfaction of the Belgian people at the loss of Luxemburg, which was imposed upon them by the powers at the Conference of London. The real triumph lay with the policy of Palmerstone. Belgium was free from Holland, but equally free from the risk of being incorporated in the military and commercial system of France. A regime of perpetual neutrality was imposed on her. Under the famous treaty of 1839, which seventy-five years later was described as "a scrap of

paper," Belgian neutrality was guaranteed by five Powers, among which were numbered Prussia and France, in addition to England, who by this expedient of neutrality secured, as she thought, the prime political interest which she had defended through many centuries with the blood of her sons.

Far removed from the protection of the liberal diplomacy of the west the Polish insurrection of 1830 ran a very different course. The Tzar Nicholas, who had viewed with indignation and alarm the July revolution in Paris, was preparing to inflict condign punishment upon the insolent democracy of France, when he was stopped short by a serious insurrection in Warsaw. Here a body of Polish officers and landowners, ill relishing the prospect of being marched off against their friends the French, and hoping that something good might result for Poland from the spread of the revolutionary flame, captured the government, and having the treasury and army of a small constitution state at their disposal, flung a challenge to the might of the Russian Empire. For hard upon a year the Poles fought valiantly against their giant opponent, receiving and inflicting heavy losses, but eventually (September, 1831) succumbing in the unequal contest. An end was then made of the last vestige of Polish liberty. Congress Poland was deleted from the map, and absorbed in the leveling and autocratic system of the Russian Empire, gaining thereby in industrial strength, but losing, as Polish historians assert, the spiritual virtues of passion and faith which result from freedom.

One consequence of this frustrated movement was an emigration of Polish artists and writers to Paris, which for many generations after 1831 became the intellectual capital of the Polish race. The early dispersion of Polish Soldiers of fortune was reinforced by a flight of professors, poets, and musicians who advertised the claims of the Slavonic genius in the most polite capital in Europe.

The Polish revolution therefore, of 1830, though it appeared to result in tragic failure, was not altogether in vain. It reminded Europe of the existence of a body of national sentiment, which was still strong, of national wrongs which were still unappeased, and of a national temper which was bold to the point of audacity. The French did not forget that the Polish rebellion was a consequence of their domestic insurrection, that it had been encouraged by prominent Frenchmen and that at a critical moment it had shielded them from the possibility of a formidable attack. To these considerations they remained sensitive. A bond was formed between Poland and France which is still an appreciable factor in the politics of Europe.

2.2.8. Summary:

⁷ The View of Grant and Temperley is that the July Revolution was largely due to Lafayette and Talleyrand. Their plan was a constitutional monarchy of the British Type with

Louis Philippe as a good solid bourgeois and constitutional king. With comparatively little difficulty, the public was persuaded to try the experiment. The choice of Louis Philippe was not a bad one and the event impressed Europe a good deal. The Revolution in France was bloodless and it set up a solid constitutional monarchy. It seemed to hail the approach of the millennium when all nations would have their parliaments and carry the Magna Carta written on their hearts.

4

2.2.9. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Examine the Causes and consequences of the 1830 Revolution.
2. Write a note on the importance of the 1830 Revolution.

2.2.10. Reference Books:

1. Artz, F.B., **Reaction and Revolution, 1814-32.**
2. Bury, J.P.T., **France 1814-1940**
3. Dickinson, G. Lowes, **Revolution and Reaction in Modern France.**
4. Elton, G., **The Revolutionary Idea in France (1789-1871).**
5. Fisher, H.A.L., **A History of Europe.**
6. Plamenatz, J., **The Revolutionary Movements in France (1815-1861)**
7. Schapiro, J.S., **Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism : Social Forces in England and France (1815-1870).**
8. Taylor, **The Struggle for Mastery of Europe.**

Unit-2

Lesson-2.3

1848 REVOLUTION

Objective of the Lesson:

The importance of 1848 Revolution and its results is the main objective of the Lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

2.3.1. Introduction

2.3.2. Towards Revolution

2.3.3. Socialists Demands

2.3.4. The Catholics Dissatisfaction against July Monarchy

2.3.5. Feelings of Patriots

2.3.6. The Reformers Demands

2.3.7. Outbreak of the Revolution

2.3.8. Results of the Revolution

2.3.9. Summary.

2.3.10. Self Assessment Questions

2.3.11. Reference Books

2.3.1. Introduction:

The first five years of the reign of Louis Philippe were marked by revolts, strikes and demonstrations. These were largely due to the feeling among the Republicans that they had been cheated in 1830. At Lyons, wages were very low and there had been experiments in collective bargaining with the employers for minimum wage scales. In November 1831, the silk workers at Lyons broke out into open insurrection and the immediate cause for it was that 104 out of 1,400 manufacturers in the area refused to observe the agreements with their workers and threatened to close down. The Government was afraid that the revolt may not spread and consequently had stepped in and not only crushed the rising but also declared collective bargaining illegal. The result was that the working class lost faith in the Government and began to look to the secret Republican societies for help. There were a large number of such societies and they ranged from fairly open associations like the Society of the Rights of Man to the traditional type of conspiracy such as the "Families" or the "Seasons". Even the Rights of Man aimed at a Republic in which economic inequalities would be less. The societies influenced by Philippe Buonarroti or Auguste Blanqui were more frankly and thoroughly socialistic or communistic in their aims.

Auguste Blanqui was one of the most outstanding of the professional revolutionaries who haunted Paris under the July Monarchy. He inherited the role and many of the ideas of Buonarroti who died 1837. Blanqui was the son of a Napoleonic official and was born in 1805. He joined the Carbonari as a student. He was awarded a medal by the new Government for his part in the rising of 1830. He spent nearly half of his long life in 15 different prisons and much of that time was spent in solitary confinement. In April 1834, the Government passed a law restricting the right of association. There were protests against the new law and there was bitter fighting for 6 days. Another rising was planned by the Society of the Rights of Man in the eastern districts of Paris. The rising was suppressed by Adolphe Thiers. Thiers was hated by the Republicans for what came to be known as the "massacre of the Rue Transnonian." Blanqui set up a new secret society which was powerful enough to secure political ends but secret enough to evade police espionage. The result was the Society of Families which was modeled on the principles of the Carbonari. Its immediate object was military action. A unit of 6 members was called a family. Five or six families under one chief, constituted a Section. Two or three Sections made up a quarter. It was so organized that its leaders would remain unknown until the moment came for action and orders were issued by a Central Committee of unknown membership. By 1836, it numbered some 1,200 people. It had infiltrated into regiments of the garrison for Paris. It owned dumps of arms and a factory for making gunpowder. It had to be dissolved to avoid the police. Immediately another organization called the Society of the Seasons was set up. Each group of six of this society was known as a week and was commanded by Sunday. Four weeks formed a month under the orders of July. Three months formed a season and were led by spring. Four seasons formed a year and were directed by a special agent of the Central committee. This society was led by Blanqui, Martin Bernard and Armand Barbes. The spring of 1839 was fixed for the rising. The Society published secret newspapers and organized working class support in Paris, Lyons and Carcassonne. On account of economic distress, the membership of the society increased. On Sunday mornings, its members marched in formation but were not observed by the police because they mingled skillfully with the Sunday crowds. However, they were "reviewed" by Blanqui from some secluded spot. On 12 May 1839, they were summoned to action stations. It was hoped that the police would be busy in controlling the crowds at the races at the Champs de Mars. The forces of the conspirators concentrated themselves around the gunsmiths' shops and stores in the Paris districts of Saint Denis and Saint Martin. The stores were raided and barricades were thrown up. The Palais de Justice and the Hotel de Ville were occupied and the republic was proclaimed. The mob shouted the Marseillaise. A few soldiers were killed. The National and Municipal Guards were called out. The military garrisons stood to arms. The insurgents were driven back behind the barricades in the working class districts. By nightfall, they were completely routed and most

of their leaders were captured. Blanqui himself was caught after 5 months of living in cellars, attics and sewers and was sent to prison for the next eight and half years. It was the revolution of 1848 that made him free again. The conspirators failed because they had relied upon the readiness of the people of Paris to support them once the revolt was started. This discredited the men and methods of the secret societies. The result was that the Government became free from the standing threat of insurrections. This does not mean that the revolutionaries did nothing in their prisons. That was due to the fact all kinds of people were put in jails and prison life became one of the main breeding grounds for republican propaganda and socialist ideas. However, as the working classes were without leaders working with them for long periods, there was no touch between them and their leaders.

2.3.2. Towards Revolution:

By 1846, however, the middle-class monarchy of Louis Philippe became very unpopular with all sections of the people. The Legitimists regarded Louis Philippe as a usurper because in their eyes, the Count of Chambord, the grandson of Charles X, had a better title to the throne than he himself had. They also considered his government as revolutionary and bourgeois. The Republicans aimed at the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of a republican government in the country. They stood for universal manhood suffrage and were completely dissatisfied with the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe.

2.3.3. Socialists Demands:

The socialists also condemned the bourgeois government of Louis Philippe. The lot of the working men was unsatisfactory and the government had done practically nothing to improve it. As a matter of fact, it had used force to crush meetings of workers and passed laws to stop the formation of their organizations. The important French socialists were Saint-Simon, Fourier, Cabet, Louis Blanc and Proudhon. Saint-Simon stood for a co-operative State directed by scientists and engineers. His disciples established a socialist humanitarian cult near Paris and were a source of nuisance to the government during the 1830s. Fourier was in favour of the establishment of co-operative communities called Phalanxes. He had some following in France during the 1830s and 1840s. Louis Blanc was a popular agitator who demanded that the State must guarantee a living wage to all workers. To quote him, "To the able-bodied citizens the State owes work; to the aged and infirm it owes aid and protection. This result cannot be obtained except through a democratic power. A democratic power is that which has the sovereignty of the people for its principle, universal suffrage for its origin and for its goal the realization of the formula: Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." Proudhon was a radical revolutionary. He stood for the destruction of private property and authoritarian government and the establishment of a new order on the basis of voluntary co-

operation. The followers of Proudhon were small in number but they were determined to destroy rather than to construct anything. The socialist propaganda did a lot to add to the discontentment of the people.

2.3.4. The Catholics Dissatisfaction against July

Monarchy:

The Catholics of France were not happy with the corrupt politics of Guizot who was a Huguenot. They also did not approve of the liberal policy of the government in matters of religion. They condemned the undemocratic nature of July monarchy and demanded legislation in the interests of the working class. The Patriots condemned the submissive foreign policy of Louis Philippe. They were not prepared to subordinate their foreign policy to that of England. They stood for national honour and national glory. They condemned the king for dismissing Thiers who stood for the honour of the country. Thiers became the leader of the Patriots against the Guizot administration.

2.3.5. Feelings of Patriots:

The patriots were helped by the growth of the Napoleonic Legend during the regime of Louis Philippe. While the shortcomings of Napoleon were forgotten, his achievements were glorified. He was considered to be the personification of national glory. He was regarded as a hero and regenerator of society. Louis Philippe completed the Napoleonic Arch of Triumph which commemorated the achievements of Napoleon Bonaparte. He allowed streets to be named after the battles of Napoleon. He persuaded the British Government to allow the dead body of Napoleon to be brought from St. Helena to Paris where it was buried with great ceremony. The Napoleonic Legend also gained in popularity on account of the writings of Louis Napoleon who was the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte. The result of the Napoleonic legend was that the government of Louis Philippe became who compared his achievements with those of Napoleon Bonaparte and found practically nothing.

2.3.6. The Reformers Demands:

The Reformers also condemned the government of Louis Philippe. That was because in spite of their moderate demands for reforms like the broadening of franchise and the eradication of corruption, Guizot and Louis Philippe refused to move in the matter and continued to follow a policy of "do nothing." They depended upon the use of the police, censorship of the press, and the banning of meetings.

2.3.7. Outbreak of the Revolution:

In 1847, the liberal reformers began to arrange banquets in which questions of reforms were discussed and efforts were made to mobilize the public opinion. On some

occasions, glasses were raised "to the amelioration of the lot of the working classes." On one occasion, Lamartine predicted the fall of monarchy. The Reformers fixed a monster banquet for 22 February 1848, but the government banned the same and that precipitated matters. On the appointed day, workers and students assembled and shouted for reforms. The Marseillaise was sung and bonfires were lighted in the streets. On 23 February 1848, the National Guards were ordered to restore order, but instead of doing so they joined the people. The people shouted "Down with Guizot" and the king asked Guizot to resign. The affairs might not have taken a serious turn had not a detachment of soldiers guarding the residence of Guizot fired on the demonstrators and 23 of them were killed and 30 were injured. The demonstrators put the dead bodies on a wagon and displayed the same to the people of Paris in the glaring torch-lights. The result was a revolution. Barricades were put up in the streets of Paris and placards with the following contents were fixed up in all parts of the city, "Louis Philippe massacres us as did Charles X, let him go to join Charles X." Louis Philippe tried to handle the situation but failed. Ultimately he abdicated in favour of his grandson, the Count of Paris, and left for England as Mr. Smith.

The manner in which the Revolution of 1848 took place has been described thus: "I had not yet completed my fourth year when one morning my mother took me out of bed, and my dear father, who had put on his National Guards' uniform, embraced me tenderly. He had on his shako, with a golden cock and a red tuft. The call to arms sounded from the street and the gallop of horses echoed from the pavement. Now and then we heard the sound of shouting, and, in the distance, of the crackle of musketry. My father went out. My mother went to the window, lifted the muslin curtains, and burst into tears. It was the revolution." (Anatole France).

2.3.8. Results of 1848 Revolution:

Louis Philippe fell because he failed to win over all the sections of the country. He merely depended upon the support of the middle class which was very small in number and which had no moral or historical right to control the government which was hated by the aristocracy and the masses. If Louis Philippe had made reforms in the social and political fields, there is every reason to believe that he would have been able to win over the support of the people, but he did not do so. He could have appealed to the patriotism of the French people by following a vigorous foreign policy, but even that was not done by him. The result was the fall of the July monarchy.

As Louis Philippe faded out of France, Louis Bonaparte stepped in, a man of forty, at once mystic and Lothario, looking like an opium eater and speaks French like a foreigner. A little later, finding the moment unpropitious, but having ably advertised his existence, he withdrew to England to await his call. For the second time a revolution in Paris had

determined the fate of France, but now it was a revolution which liberalism was unable to capture or direct. Under the violent pressure of the mob a Republic was proclaimed, and pending the summoning of a constituent assembly a provisional government was named in two newspaper offices, one socialist, the other radical, to administer the affairs of the country. The difficulties of the situation which confronted this small body of untried and widely differing men were immense. The city was in state of delirious excitement, vast schemes of social organization being demanded by some, while others with equal fury and insistence called for an instant war against the tyrants of Europe. It is to the credit of Lamartine, the pacific foreign minister, that he refused to substitute the red flag for the tricolor and in place of a dangerous military crusade contented himself for the moment with a liberal manifesto. The social revolution was kept at bay by a brave but disastrous promise of employment for all, and by the establishment of national workshops for the relief of the unemployment.

The new assembly was to be elected by universal suffrage. A truth was then discovered which, had it been divined by Louis Philippe and his ministers, might have saved the monarchy. In a land of peasant proprietors universal suffrage may well yield not a radical but a conservative result. An electorate of two hundred thousand well-to-do bourgeois guaranteed neither loyalty in the Chamber nor confidence in the country, encouraged corruption, aroused jealousies, deadened enthusiasm. But universal suffrage would have been for the monarchy a gilt-edged investment. On its first application after the revolution of February, the poll being the heaviest on record, it returned a Chamber of bourgeois, in which the republicans were only as one to eight. To the members of this Parliament, the first to be elected in France on such a system and therefore the first to reflect in adequate measure the antique pieties of the countryside, it was a matter of life and death to conquer the red peril in Paris. How precarious their position was, despite the tremendous weight and authority of the provincial vote, revealed itself on May 15, when a mob invaded the Chamber, decreed its dissolution, and declared war against the Kings of Europe. A desperate situation was then saved by the timely appearance and correct behavior of the National Guard; but what if the attack was repeated? It was decided to grapple firmly with the evil at its source and, as a first step, to close the national workshops which had been running at a ruinous loss and had been the means of attracting a vast concourse of unemployed men into Paris. Upon that stern and necessary decision there ensued a struggle in the streets of Paris which suffices to explain, such was the deep horror which it inspired, the surprising political manifestations of the ensuing months. For four torrid Junedays the regular and National Guard under General Cavaignac fought an insurrection, so formidable and desperate, though it was conducted without leaders and apparently without contemplations, that ten thousand casualties were the price of victory. The vast majority of the French population, having

property in land or in the funds, acclaimed the triumph of the army, noted the scale of the peril and demanded of their future governors so to rule that the red specter should not again dare to raise its head.

In the midst of these dreadful anxieties the Assembly produced a preposterous constitution, organized for deadlock and manacled against change. The new Republic was equipped with the rival autocracy of a single Chamber and a President, each elected by universal suffrage. The inspiration of America was oblivious; but it was forgotten that while the powers of the American President are limited by the rights of the States of the Union, the new President of the French Republic, who was to be chosen for four years and not to be re-eligible, would be master of a bureaucracy which interfered with the life of every town and village in the land.

In the plebiscite which ensued (December 10, 1848) Louis Bonaparte was returned head of the poll, by more than four million votes, above Cavaignac the savior of society, above Lamartine the orator, and despite his thirty-nine years of shabby inglorious exile. The name of Bonaparte was enough standing in every cottage of the land for discipline, power and renown.

Yet he was not a free agent, but confronted by a Chamber, fresh from the polls, conservative in complexion, and prepared, if Legitimists and Orleanists could compose their differences, to restore the monarchy; a Chamber in which he had no personal following and from which he could expect no loyal or enduring support. A liberal and nationalist by temperament he was compelled to trim his sails to clerical and conservative winds, and abjuring his past as an Italian Carbonaro, to send aid to the Pope against the Roman Republic. The coup d'état of December 2, 1851, was his stroke for liberty and power. By that contrivance of consummate force and fraud, breaking an oath, violating a constitution, imprisoning many leading soldiers and politicians, and shooting some twelve hundred innocent citizens in the streets of Paris, Louis Bonaparte made himself master of France. The Chamber was dissolved, its members were imprisoned or dispersed, his own lease of power was prolonged; and yet, though the coup was denounced by Victor Hugo and Tennyson, on "the morrow of it," as has been well said, "Louis Napoleon appeared not as a tyrant but as a tyrannicide". As against the Chamber which had voted itself a salary, disfranchised three million electors by an electoral law the full consequences of which were perhaps not perceived, and refused revision, the President appeared well justified. "The people," said Broglie, "has the government it prefers and the bourgeoisie the government it deserves." To the Sardinian Minister the Prince President, who was now Emperor in all but name, observed, "Now I can do what I want. I shall do something for Italy."

2.3.9. Summary:

A new page of European history was about to unroll itself, marked by the triumph of nationalism, with its brilliant idealism, its disciplined citizenship, its vivid political interests, but also with its blind passion, its great conscript armies, its wars of extermination, its standing threat to international harmony and peace. In the initial stages of that great movement of the human spirit, which has brought new perils into Europe, Louis Bonaparte played a decisive role. After attacking European reaction where it was its worst in Russia, the author of the crime of December more than half achieved the union and the liberty of Italy.

According to Prof. Hayes, "The February Revolution of 1848 was not basically different from the July Revolution of 1830. Both the revolutions were chiefly Parisian affairs, both were essentially political and only incidentally social; both were primarily 'liberal.' One, it is true, set up a monarchy, with a restricted franchise, while the other established a republic, with universal manhood suffrage. But both recognized the principle of popular sovereignty, both employed the Tricolour and the Marseillaise, and, much more significant, both eventuated in the triumph of property-owners and the adoptions of policies which reflected the wishes of property owners."

2.2.10. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Examine the Causes and consequences of the 1848 Revolution.
2. Write a note on the importance of the 1848 Revolution.

2.2.11. Reference Books:

1. Artz, F.B., **Reaction and Revolution, 1814-32.**
2. Bury, J.P.T., **France 1814-1940**
3. Dickinson, G. Lowes, **Revolution and Reaction in Modern France.**
4. Elton, G., **The Revolutionary Idea in France (1789-1871).**
5. Fisher, H.A.L., **A History of Europe.**
6. Plamenatz, J., **The Revolutionary Movements in France (1815-1861)**
7. Schapiro, J.S., **Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism : Social Forces in England and France (1815-1870).**
8. Taylor, **The Struggle for Mastery of Europe.**

Unit –2

Lesson-2-4

QUESTION OF SLAVERY

Objective of the lesson:

How slavery caused for the bitter Civil War in U.S. and its reconstruction Programme is the main objective of this lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 2.4.1. Introduction
- 2.4.2. Slavery Hardens into the Economy
- 2.4.3. Debate Over Slavery Mounts
- 2.4.4. Civil Conflict Draws Nearer
- 2.4.5. The Split Grows Deeper
- 2.4.6. Lincoln Attacks Slavery
- 2.4.7. Civil War Begins
- 2.4.8. Bloody Battles in East and West
- 2.4.9. The Tide Peaks and Ebbs
- 2.4.10. "With Malice toward None"
- 2.4.11. Opposing Views on Reconstruction
- 2.4.12. The War's Aftermath
- 2.4.13. Summary
- 2.4.14. Self Assessment Questions
- 2.4.15. Reference Books

2.4.1. Introduction:

In the middle decades of the 19th century no country in the world was more interesting to other nations than the United States, and few attracted more distinguished visitors. One of these was the French political writer Alexis de Tocqueville, whose book ***Democracy in America***, first published in 1835, won a cordial reception on the European continent. The verdict on the new country became more and more favorable. Travelers arrived to find the bay and city of Boston beautiful; to marvel at the way in which "one flourishing town after another, such as Utica, Syracuse, and Auburn," had risen from the wilderness; to find, as they traversed the northern states, "everywhere the most unequivocal proofs of property and rapid progress in agriculture, commerce, and great public works."

The national territory now stretched over forest, plain, and mountain. Within these far-flung limits dwelt 23 million people in a Union comprising 31 states. The land of promise had never before seemed so truly the land of performance. In the east, industry boomed. In the Midwest and the south, agriculture flourished. The railways knitted the settled parts of the country together, and the mines of California poured a golden stream into the channels of trade.

Yet visitors quickly found that there were really two Americas- a north and a south. And the speed of progress itself held latent dangers for the maintenance of sectional harmony. New England and the Middle Atlantic States were the main centers of manufacturing, commerce, and finance. Principal products of the area were textiles, lumber, clothing, machinery, leather, and woolen goods. At the same time, shipping had reached the height of its prosperity, and vessels flying the American flag plied the seven seas, distributing wares of all nations.

In the south, the chief source of wealth was the cotton crop, although there was rice culture along the coast, sugar growing in Louisiana, tobacco raising and general farming in the border States, and scattered manufacturing. With the fuller development of the rich, black lands of the Gulf plains, cotton production nearly doubled during the 1850s, and wagon, barge, and railroad carried the bales to markets in both the north and south. Cotton furnished raw material for northern textile mills and more than half the nation's foreign exports as well.

The Midwest, with its boundless prairies and swiftly growing population, shared fully in the good times. Its wheat and meat products were in demand by both Europe and the older settled parts of America. The introduction of labour saving implements-notably the McCormick reaper-made possible an unparalleled increase in farm production. Some 500 reapers were used in the harvest of 1848 and over 100,000 in 1860. The nation's wheat crops meanwhile swelled from some 35 million hectoliters in 1850 to nearly 61 million in 1860, more than half being grown in the Midwest.

An important stimulus to western prosperity was the great improvement in transportation facilities; from 1850 to 1857 the Appalachian Mountain barrier was pierced by five railway trunk lines. In the expansion of the railway network, the south at first had much less part, and it was not until late in the 1850s that a continuous line through the mountains connected the lower Mississippi River with the southern Atlantic seaboard.

2.4.2. SLAVERY HARDENS INTO THE ECONOMY

Conflicting interests in north and south became increasingly apparent. Resenting the large profits amassed by northern businessmen from marketing the cotton crop, southerners

attributed the backwardness of their own section to northern aggrandizement. Northerners, on the other hand, declared that slavery- the "peculiar institution" the south felt to be essential to its economy was wholly responsible for the region's relative backwardness.

As far back as 1830, sectional lines had been steadily hardening on the slavery question. In the north, abolitionist feeling grew more and more powerful, abetted by a free-soil movement vigorously opposed to the extension of slavery into the regions not yet organized as states. To southerners of 1850, slavery was a condition for which they were no more responsible than for their English speech or their representative institutions. In some seaboard areas, slavery by 1850 was well over 200 years old, an integral part of the basic economy of the region. In 15 southern and Border States, the Negro population was approximately half as large as the white, while in the north it was an insignificant fraction.

From the mid-1840s, the slavery issue overshadowed all else in American politics. The south, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi River and beyond, was a relatively compact political unit agreeing on all fundamental policies affecting cotton culture and slavery. The majority of southern planters came to regard slavery as necessary and permanent. Cotton culture, using only primitive implements, was singularly adapted to the employment of slaves. It provided work nine months of the year and permitted the use of women and children as well as men.

2.4.3. DEBATE OVER SLAVERY MOUNTS

Political leaders of the south, the professional classes, and most of the clergy, as they fought the weight of northern opinion, now no longer apologized for slavery but became its ardent champions. It was held to shower benefits upon the Negro, and southern publicists insisted that the relations of capital and labour were more humane under the slavery system than under the wage system of the north.

Before 1830, the old patriarchal system of plantation government, with its easygoing methods of management and personal supervision of the slaves by their master, was still characteristic. After 1830, however, with the introduction of large-scale cotton production in the lower south, the master gradually ceased to exercise close personal supervision over his slaves and employed professional overseers whose tenure depended upon their ability to exact from slaves a maximum amount of work.

While many planters continued to treat their Negroes kindly, there were instances of heartless cruelty, especially those involving the breaking of family ties. The most trenchant criticism of slavery, however, was not the inhumanity of overseers, but the violation of every man's basic right to be free.

Cotton culture and its labour system came to represent a vast investment of capital in the south. From a crop of negligible importance, cotton production in 1800 leaped to about

16 million kilograms, rose to 72 million kilograms in 1820, and by 1840, reached a total of more than 301,500,000 kilograms. By 1850, seven-eighths of the world's supply of cotton was grown in the American south.

Slavery increased concomitantly, and in national politics southerners chiefly sought protection and enlargement of the interests represented by the cotton-slavery system. Expansion was considered a necessity because the wastefulness of cultivating a single crop, cotton, rapidly exhausted the land, and new fertile areas were needed. Further, in the interest of political power, the south needed new territory for additional slave states to offset the admission of new Freestates. Antislavery northerners saw in the southern view a conspiracy for proslavery aggrandizement, and in the 1830s their opposition became militant.

An earlier antislavery movement, an offshoot of the American Revolution, had won its last victory in 1808 when Congress abolished the slave trade with Africa. After that, opposition was largely by the Quakers, who kept up a mild and ineffectual protest, while the cotton gin was creating an increasing demand for slaves. The 1820s saw a new phase of agitation which owed much to the dynamic democratic idealism of the times and to the new interest in social justice for all classes.

In its more extreme form the abolitionist movement in America was combative, uncompromising, and insistent upon an immediate end to slavery. This extremist approach found a leader in William Lloyd Garrison, a young man of Massachusetts, who combined the heroism of a martyr with the crusading zeal of a demagogue.

On January 1, 1831, Garrison produced the first issue of his newspaper, ***The Liberator***, bearing the announcement: "I shall strenuously contend for the immediate enfranchisement of our slave population.... On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation.... I am in earnest – I will not equivocate – I will not excuse – I will not retreat a single inch - and I will be heard."

Garrison's sensational methods awakened northerners to the evil in an institution many had long come to regard as unchangeable. His policy was to hold up to public gaze the most repulsive aspects of Negro slavery and to castigate slaveholders as torturers and traffickers in human life. He would recognize no rights of the masters acknowledge no compromise, tolerate no delay. Less violently inclined northerners, unwilling to subscribe to his law defying tactics, held that reform should be accomplished by legal and peaceful means.

One phase of the antislavery movement involved helping slaves escape to safe refuges in the north or over the border into Canada. Known as the "Underground Railroad," an elaborate network of secret routes was firmly established in the 1830s in all parts of the north. Its most successful operation was in the Old Northwest Territory. In Ohio alone, it is

estimated that from 1830 to 1860 no fewer than 40,000 fugitive slaves were helped to freedom. The number of local antislavery societies increased at such a rate that in 1840 there were about 2,000, with a membership of perhaps 200,000.

Despite the efforts of active abolitionists to make slavery a question of conscience, the people of the north as a whole held aloof from the antislavery movement. Busy with their own concerns, they considered slavery a problem for southerners to solve through state action. In their view, the unbridled agitation of the antislavery zealots was a threat to the integrity of the Union itself.

In 1845, however, the acquisition of Texas- and, soon after, the territorial gains in the southwest resulting from the Mexican War-converted the moral question of slavery into a burning political issue. Up to then, it had seemed likely that slavery would be confined to the areas where it already existed. It had been given limits by the Missouri Compromise in 1820 and had no opportunity to overstep them. The new territories made renewed expansion of slavery a real likelihood.

Many northerners believe that, if kept within close bounds, slavery would ultimately diminish and die. To justify their opposition to adding new slave states, they pointed to the statements of Washington and Jefferson and to the Ordinance of 1787, which forbade the extension of slavery into the northwest. As Texas already had slavery, she naturally entered the Union as a slave state. But California, New Mexico, and Utah did not have slavery, and when the United States prepared to take over these areas in 1846, there were conflicting suggestions on what to do with them.

Extremists in the south urged that all the lands acquired from Mexico be thrown open to slaveholders. Strong antislavery northerners demanded that all the new regions be closed to slavery. One group of moderates suggested that the Missouri Compromise line be extended to the Pacific with Free states north of it and slave states to the south. Another group proposed that the question be left to "popular sovereignty" – that is, the government should permit settlers to flock into the new territory with or without slaves as they pleased and, when the time came to organize the region into states, the people themselves should determine the question.

Southern opinion held that slavery had a right to exist in all the territories. The north asserted that it had a right in none. In 1848, nearly 300,000 men voted for the candidates of a Free Soil Party, which declared that the best policy was "to limit, localize, and discourage slavery."

In January 1848, the discovery of gold in California precipitated a headlong rush of more than 80,000 immigrants for the single year 1849. California became a crucial question, for clearly Congress had to determine the status of this new region before an organized government could be established. The hopes of the nation rested with Senator Henry Clay,

who twice before in times of crisis had come forward with compromise arrangements. Now once again he halted a dangerous sectional quarrel with a well-wrought plan.

His compromise (as subsequently modified in Congress) proposed, among other things, that California be admitted as a state with a free-soil (slavery-prohibited) constitution while the remainder of the new annexation be divided into the two territories of New Mexico and Utah and organized without mention of slavery; that the claims of Texas to a portion of New Mexico be satisfied by a payment of \$10million; that more effective machinery be established for catching runaway slaves and returning them to their masters; and that the buying and selling of slaves (but not slavery) be abolished in the Washington (District of Columbia). These measures – famous in American history as the “Compromise of 1850” – were passed, and the country breathed a sigh of relief.

For three years, the compromise seemed to settle nearly all differences. Beneath the surface, however, the tension grew. The new Fugitive Slave Law deeply offended many northerners, who refused to have any part in catching slaves. Instead, they continued to help fugitives to escape, and made the Underground Railroad more efficient and more daring than it had been before.

2.4.4. CIVIL CONFLICT DRAWS NEARER

Those who thought the slavery problem would solve itself were reckoning only with politicians and editors. Time proved that a single book, published in 1852, would exert a far greater influence than legislators or the press: *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, by Harriet Beecher Stowe.

When Mrs. Stowe began writing her book, she thought of it as only a minor sketch, but it widened in scope as the work progressed. Immediately upon its publication, it caused a sensation. More than 300,000 copies were sold the first year, and eight power presses ran day and night to keep up with the demand. It was soon translated into many languages.

The novel showed how inseparable cruelty was from the institution of slavery and how fundamentally irreconcilable were free and slave societies. The rising generation of voters in the north was deeply stirred by it. It inspired widespread enthusiasm for the antislavery cause, among young and old, appealing as it did to basic human emotions – indignation at injustice and pity for the helpless individuals exposed to ruthless exploitation.

In 1854, the old issue of slavery in the territories was renewed and the quarrel became bitterer. The region that now comprises Kansas and Nebraska was already attracting settlers, and, with a stable government instituted, it promise rapid development.

2.4.5. THE SPLIT GROWS DEEPER

Under the Missouri Compromise, this entire region was closed to slavery. However, dominant slave-holding elements in Missouri objected to letting Kansas, which adjoined her on the west, become a free territory. For Missouri would then have three free neighbors and, yielding to an already strong movement, would probably soon be forced to become a free state herself. For a time, Missourians in Congress, backed by southerners, blocked all efforts to organize the region.

At this point, Stephen A. Douglas, senior Senator from Illinois, stirred up a storm by proposing a bill that enraged all free-soil men. Douglas argued that since the Compromise of 1850 left Utah and New Mexico free to decide on slavery for themselves, the Missouri Compromise had long been superseded. His plan called for two territories, Kansas and Nebraska, and permitted settlers to carry slaves into them. The inhabitants themselves were to determine whether they should enter the Union as free or slave states.

Northerners accused Douglas of currying favour with the south in order to gain the Presidency in 1856. Angry debates marked the progress of the bill. The free-soil press violently denounced it. Northern clergymen assailed it. Businessmen who had hitherto befriended the south turned suddenly about face. Yet, on a May morning, the bill passed the Senate amid the boom of cannon fired by southern enthusiasts. At the time, Salmon P. Chase, an antislavery leader, prophesied: "They celebrate a present victory, but the echoes they awaken shall never rest until slavery itself shall die." When Douglas subsequently visited Chicago to speak in his own defense, the ships in the harbor lowered their flags to half-mast, the church bells tolled for an hour, and a crowd of 10,000 hooted so that he could not make himself heard.

The immediate results of Douglas' ill-starred measure were momentous. The Whig Party, which had straddled the question of slavery expansion, sank to its death, and in its stead a powerful new organization arose, the Republican Party, whose primary demand was that slavery be excluded from all the territories. In 1856, it nominated for the Presidency John Fremont, whose five exploring expeditions into the far west had won him renown. Although it lost the election, the new party swept a great part of the north. Such free-soil leaders as Chase and William Seward exerted greater influence than ever. Long with them appeared a tall, lankly Illinois attorney, Abraham Lincoln.

The flow of both southern slaveholders and antislavery men into Kansas resulted in armed conflict, and soon the territory was being called "bleeding Kansas." Other events brought the nation still closer to upheaval: notably, in 1857, the Supreme Court's famous decision concerning Dred Scott.

Scott was Missouri slave who, some 20 years before, had been taken by his master to live in Illinois and Wisconsin, territory where slavery was forbidden. Returning to Missouri and becoming discontented with his life there, Scott sued for liberation on the ground of his residence on free soil. The southern dominated Court decided that by voluntarily returning to a slave state, Scott had lost the right to be free and ruled that any attempt by Congress to prohibit slavery in the territory was invalid.

The Dred Scott decision stirred fierce excitement throughout the north. Never before had the court been so bitterly condemned. For the southern Democrats, the decision was a great victory, since it gave judicial sanction to their justification of slavery in the territories.

2.4.6. LINCOLN ATTACKS SLAVERY

Abraham Lincoln had long regarded slavery an evil. In a speech in Peoria, Illinois, in 1854, he had declared that all national legislation should be framed on the principle that slavery was to be restricted and eventually abolished. He contended also that the principle of popular sovereignty was false, for slavery in the western territories was the concern not only of the local inhabitants but of the United States as a whole. This speech made him widely known throughout the growing west.

In 1858, Lincoln opposed Stephen A. Douglas for election to the U.S. Senate from Illinois. In the first paragraph of his opening campaign speech, on June 17, Lincoln struck the key note of American History for the seven years to follow:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved- I do not expect the house to fall-but I do expect it will cease to be divided."

Lincoln and Douglas engaged in a series of seven debates in the ensuing months of 1858. Senator Douglas, a sturdy five footer known as the "little giant," had an enviable reputation as an orator, but he met his match in Lincoln, who eloquently challenged the concept of popular sovereignty. In the end, although Douglas won the election by a small margin, Lincoln had achieved stature as a national figure.

Sectional strife again became acute. On the night of October 16, 1859, John Brown, an antislavery fanatic, who had struck a bloody blow against slavery in Kansas three years before, with the help of a few abolitionist extremists, seized the federal arsenal at Harper's Ferry in what is now the state of West Virginia. When dawn came, armed citizens of the town, aided by some militia companies, began a counterattack, and Brown and his surviving men were taken prisoner.

Alarm ran through the nation. For many southerners, Brown's attempt confirmed their worst fears. Antislavery zealots, on the other hand, hailed Brown as a martyr to a great

cause. Most northerners repudiated his exploit, seeing in it an assault on law and order and on democratic methods of obtaining social progress. Brown was tried for conspiracy, treason, and murder, and on December 2, 1859, he was hanged. To the end, he believed he had been an instrument in the hand of God.

In the presidential election of 1860 the Republican Party nominated Abraham Lincoln as its candidate. Party spirit soared as leaders declared that slavery could spread no further. The party also promised a tariff for the protection of industry and pledged the enactment of a law granting free homesteads to settlers who would help in the opening of the west. The disunity of the opposing Democrats, led by Stephen A. Douglas, helped the fledgling Republican Party win the election.

South Carolina's secession from the Union, if Lincoln were elected, was a foregone conclusion for the state had long been waiting for an event that would unite the south against the antislavery forces. Once the election returns were certain, a specially summoned South Carolina convention declared "that the Union now subsisting between South Carolina and other states under the name of the 'United States of America is hereby dissolved.'" Other southern states promptly followed South Carolina's example, and on February 8, 1861, they formed the "Confederate States of America".

2.4.7. CIVIL WAR BEGINS

Less than a month later, on March 4, 1861, Abraham Lincoln was sworn in as President of the United States. In his inaugural address, he refused to recognize the secession, considering it "legally void." His speech closed with a plea for restoration of the bonds of union. But the south turned deaf ears, and on April 12, guns opened fire on Fort Sumter in the Charleston, South Carolina, harbor. All hesitation was now swept from the minds of the northerners.

In the seven states that had seceded, the people responded promptly to the appeal of their President, Jefferson Davis. The action of the slave states that thus far had remained loyal was now tensely awaited by both sides. Virginia took the fateful step on April 17, and Arkansas and North Carolina followed quickly. No state left the Union with greater reluctance than Virginia. Her statesmen had had a leading part in the winning of the Revolution and the framing of the Constitution, and she had provided the nation with five Presidents. With Virginia went Colonel Robert E. Lee, who declined the command of the Union army out of loyalty to this state. Between the enlarged confederacy and the free-soil north lay the Border States, which, proving unexpectedly nationalist in spirit, kept their bonds with union.

The people of each section entered the war with high hopes for an early victory. In material resources the north enjoyed a decided advantage. Twenty-three states with a population of 22 million were arrayed against 11 inhabited by 9 million. The industrial superiority of the north exceeded even its preponderance in manpower, providing it with abundant facilities for manufacturing arms and ammunition, clothing, and other supplies. Similarly, the network of railways in the north contributed to federal military prospects.

2.4.8. BLOODY BATTLES IN EAST AND WEST

Most of the navy, at the war's beginning, was in Union hands, but it was scattered and weak. Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles took prompt measures to strengthen it. Lincoln then proclaimed a blockade of the southern coasts. Although the effect of the blockade was negligible at first, by 1863 it was almost completely preventing shipments of cotton to Europe and the importation of munitions, clothing, and the medical supplies the south sorely needed.

Meanwhile, a brilliant naval commander, David Farragut, had conducted two remarkable operations. In one, he took a union fleet into the mouth of the Mississippi, where he forced the surrender of the largest city in the south, New Orleans. In another, he made his way past the fortified entrance of Mobile Bay, captured a Confederate ironclad vessel, and sealed up the port.

In the Mississippi Valley, the Union forces won an almost uninterrupted series of victories. They began by breaking a long confederate line in Tennessee, thus making it possible to occupy almost all the western part of the state. When the important port of Memphis on the Mississippi was taken, Union troops could advance some 320 kilometers into the heart of the Confederacy. With the tenacious General Ulysses S. Grant in command, Union forces made a sudden attack at Shiloh, on the bluffs overlooking the Tennessee River, and held stubbornly until reinforcements helped repulse the Confederates. Grant then pushed slowly but steadily southward, with the paramount object of gaining complete control of the Mississippi, the lower reaches of which had been cleared of Confederates by Farragut's capture of New Orleans.

For a time, Grant was blocked at Vicksburg, where the Confederates had strongly fortified themselves on bluffs too high for naval attack. Then, in 1863, he began to move below and around Vicksburg, subjecting the position to a six-week siege. On July 4, he captured the town, together with the strongest Confederate army in the west. The river was now entirely in Union hands. The confederacy was broken in two, and it became almost impossible to bring supplies from Texas and Arkansas.

In Virginia, on the other hand, Union troops had met one defeat after another. In a succession of bloody attempts to capture Richmond, the Confederate capital, Union forces

were repeatedly thrown back. The confederates had two great advantages: strong defense positions afforded by numerous streams cutting the road between Washington and Richmond; and two generals, Robert E. Lee and Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, both of whom far surpassed the early union commanders. One union general, George McClellan, made a desperate attempt to seize Richmond. But in the Seven Days' Battles of June 25 to July 1, 1862, the Union troops were driven steadily backward, both sides suffering terrible losses.

2.4.9. THE TIDE PEAKS AND EBBS

On January 1, 1863, President Lincoln issued an Emancipation Proclamation, freeing the slaves in the rebelling states and inviting them to join the armed force of the north. The proclamation thus declared the abolition of slavery an objective of the war in addition to the declared objective of saving the Union.

The north continued to do poorly in the east. The overland advance on Richmond was still thwarted, and in a bloody battle at Chancellorsville, Union forces suffered a severe defeat. This Confederate victory was gained at a high price, however, for it cost the life of Stonewall Jackson.

None of the Confederate victories was decisive. The federal government simply mustered new armies and tried again. July 1863 brought the turning point of the wars. Believing that the crushing defeat of the north at Chancellorsville gave him his chance, Lee struck northward into Pennsylvania, almost reaching the state capital. A strong Union force intercepted Lee's march at Gettysburg, where, in a three-day battle, the confederates made a valiant effort to break the Union lines. They failed, and Lee's veterans, after crippling losses, fell back to the Potomac.

Grant's army was then taking possession of Vicksburg on the Mississippi. The blockade of southern coasts had become an iron cordon that few vessels pierced and the Confederacy was nearing the end of its resources. The northern states, on the other hand, seemed more prosperous than ever; their mills and factories were running full blast; their farms were exporting bumper crops to Europe; their manpower was being restored by immigration.

Grant's slow but inexorable advance on Richmond in 1864 foreshadowed the end. From all sides northern troops closed in and on February 1, 1865, General Sherman's western army began a march northward from Georgia.

On February 17, the Confederates abandoned Columbia, the South Carolina capital. Without a battle, Charleston fell into the hands of the Union fleet when her railroad connections with the interior were cut. Meanwhile the confederate positions in Petersburg

and Richmond proved untenable, and on April 2 Lee abandoned them. A week later, at Appomattox, Virginia, hemmed in by the enemy, he had no alternative but surrender.

The terms of surrender were magnanimous, and on his return from the conferences, Grant quieted the noisy demonstrations of his soldiers by reminding them, "The rebels are our countrymen again." The war for southern independence had become the "lost cause," whose hero, Robert E. Lee, had won wide admiration through the brilliance of his leadership and his greatness in defeat.

For the north, the war produced a still greater hero in Abraham Lincoln – a man eager, above all else, to weld the Union together again, not by force and repression but by warmth and generosity. Although he had to use unprecedented powers both in war and in peace, he never infringed upon the principles of democratic self-government. In 1864 he was elected for a second term as President.

2.4.10. "WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE"

Lincoln's second inaugural address closed with these words: "...With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan... to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Three weeks later, two days after Lee's surrender, Lincoln delivered his last public address, in which he unfolded a generous reconstruction policy.

On Thursday night, April 13, Washington was illuminated to celebrate Lee's surrender, and joyous crowds marched in the streets. The next day, the President held what was to be his last Cabinet meeting. That evening-with his wife and young couple who were his guests-he attended a performance at Ford's theater. There, as he sat in the presidential box, he was assassinated by a crazed actor, John Wilkes Booth, who sprang from the box to the stage and fled. Booth was captured some days later in a barn in the Virginia countryside.

Lincoln died in a downstairs bedroom of a house across the street from Ford's on the morning of April 15. Said poet James Russell Lowell; "Never before that startled April morning did such multitudes of men shed tears for the death of one they had never seen, as if with him a friendly presence had been taken from their lives, leaving them colder and darker. Never was funeral panegyric so eloquent as the silent look of sympathy which strangers exchanged when they met that day. Their common manhood had lost a kinsman."

The first great task confronting the victorious north-now under the leadership of Lincoln's Vice President, Andrew Johnson-was to determine the status of the states that had seceded.

Lincoln had already set the stage. In his view, the people of the southern states had never legally seceded; they had been misled by some disloyal citizens into a defiance of federal authority. And since the war was the act of individuals, the federal government would have to deal with these individuals and not with the states. Thus, in 1863 Lincoln proclaimed that if any state 10 per cent of the voters of recorded in 1860 would form a government loyal to the U.S. Constitution and would acknowledge obedience to the laws of the Congress and the proclamation of the President, he would recognize the government so created as the state's legal government.

Congress rejected this plan and challenged Lincoln's right to deal with the matter without consulting its members. Yet even before the war was wholly over, new governments had been set up in Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Louisiana. Some members of Congress advocated severe punishment for all the seceded states. One of them, Thaddeus Stevens, leader of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, even urged that southern planters be kept under rule for a period of probation.

To deal with one of its major concern- the condition of the now emancipated Negro- Congress, in March 1865, established the Freedmen's Bureau to act as guardian over Negro citizens and guide them toward self- support. And in December of that year, Congress ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, abolishing slavery.

2.4.11. Opposing Views on Reconstruction:

Throughout the summer of 1865 Johnson had proceeded to carry out Lincoln's reconstruction programme, with minor modifications. By presidential proclamation he appointed a governor for each of the seceded states and freely restored political rights to large numbers of southern citizens through use of the presidential pardoning power.

In due time conventions were held in each of the former Confederation states to repeal the ordinances of secession, repudiate the war debt, and draft new state constitutions. Eventually the people of each state elected a governor and a state legislature, and when the legislature of a state ratified the Thirteenth Amendment, the new state government was recognized and the state was back in the Union again.

By the end of 1865, this process, with a few exceptions, was completed. But the states that had seceded were not yet fully restored to their former positions within the Union because the Congress had not yet seated their U.S. Senators and Representatives, who were now coming to Washington to take their places in the federal legislation.

Both Lincoln and Johnson had foreseen that the Congress would have the right to deny southern legislators seats in the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives, under the clause of the Constitution that says: "Each house shall be the judge of the ...qualifications of its own members." This denial came to pass when, under the leadership of Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, those Congressmen who sought to punish the south refused to seat its duly elected Senators and Representatives. Then, within the next few months, the Congress proceeded to work out a plan of southern reconstruction quite different from the one Lincoln had started and Johnson had continued.

2.4.12. THE WAR'S AFTERMATH:

Wide public support gradually developed for those members of Congress who felt that the Negro should be given the full benefits of the citizenship. By July 1866, Congress had passed a civil rights bill and setup a new freedmen's bureau—both designed to prevent racial discrimination by southern legislatures. Following this, the Congress passed a Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, stating that "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the states in which they reside."

All the southern state legislatures, with the exception of Tennessee, refused to ratify the amendment, some voting against it unanimously. Certain groups in the north then advocated intervention to protect the rights of Negroes in the south. In the Reconstruction Act of March 1867, the Congress ignoring the governments that had been established in the southern states, divided the south into five districts and placed them under military rule. Escape from permanent military government was open to those states that established civil governments, took an oath of allegiance, ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, and adopted Negro suffrage.

In July 1868 the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified. The Fifteenth Amendment passed by Congress the following year and ratified in 1870 by state legislatures, provided that "The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

The reason for the tireless energy with which the Congress pushed the Reconstruction Act was that the act meant the defeat and humiliation of President Johnson. Congressional antipathy to Johnson was so great, for the only time in American history; impeachment proceedings were instituted to remove the President from office.

Johnson's sole offense was his opposition to congressional policies and the violent language he used in criticizing them. The most serious charge his enemies could level against him was that, despite a Tenure of Office Act, he had removed from his Cabinet the Secretary of War, a staunch supporter of the Congress. When the impeachment trial was

held in the Senate, it was proved that Johnson was technically within his rights in removing the Cabinet member and, even more important, it was pointed out that a dangerous precedent would be set if the Congress were to remove a President because he disagreed with the majority of its members. The attempted impeachment failed, and Johnson continued in office until his term expired.

Under the Reconstruction Act, Congress, by the summer of 1868, had readmitted to the Union Arkansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. How representative the new governments of these seven reconstructed states were can be judged from the fact that the majority of the governors, Representatives, and Senators elected were northern men who had gone south after the war to make their political fortunes. In the legislatures of Louisiana, South Carolina, and Mississippi, Negroes gained complete control.

In alarm, southern whites, seeing their civilization threatened and finding no legal way to stop the course of events, turned to illegal means. Soon violence became more and more frequent, and in 1870 increasing disorder led to the passage of an Enforcement Act severely punishing those who attempted to deprive the Negro of his civil rights.

As time passed, it became more and more obvious that the problems of the south were not being solved by harsh laws and continuing rancor against former Confederates. In May 1872, Congress passed a general Amnesty Act, restoring full political privileges to all but about 500 Confederates sympathizers.

Gradually southern states began electing members of the Democratic Party to office, by 1876, the Republicans remained in power on only three southern states. The election that year, one of the closest in American history, made it plain that the south would have no peace until northern troops were withdrawn. The next year, President Rutherford B. Hayes removed them, thereby admitting the failure of the "radical" reconstruction policy.

Northern rule was ended in the south. But the south was now a region not only devastated by war but also burdened by debt caused by misgovernment and demoralized by a decade of racial warfare. After 12 years of "false" reconstruction –from 1865 to 1877- real efforts to rebuild the south began.

2.4.13. Summary:

But after the slavery issue was closed in America the people concentration leaped to nation's development. By the end of 19th the U.S. became a developed country with proving its victory against Spain in Spanish-American War and industrial development.

2.4.14. Self Assessment Questions:

- 1.Examine the issue of slavery in the United States of America.
- 2.Explain the slavery how lead to the Civil War in U.S.A. and its results.
- 3.Comment on the issue of slavery.
4. Describe the Civil War and its Reconstruction programme In U.S.A.

2.4.15. Reference Books:

1. Carnoll, Peter and David Noble, **Free and Unfree : A New History of the United States.**
2. Faulkner, U., **Economic History of the United States of America**
3. Kristol, Irving, **America's Continuing Revolution**
- 4.Pratt., W., **A History of the United States Foreign Policy**
5. Parkes, H. B., **The United States of America: A History**
6. Randall, James, et. al., **The Civil war and Reconstruction**

Unit-2

Lesson-2-5

OPIUM WARS

Objective of the Lesson:

The Opium wars between China and Britain and their impact on China is the main Objective of this lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 2.5.1. Introduction**
- 2.5.2. Causes for the First Opium War**
- 2.5.3. Limited trade in China for Western Countries**
- 2.5.4. Lin Mission**
- 2.5.5. The Opium War I (1839-42)**
- 2.5.6. The Treaty of Nanking**
- 2.5.7. China the Treaty of Nanking and After**
- 2.5.8. Second Opium War (1856)**
 - 2.5.8.1. Lorch Arrow Incident and War**
 - 2.5.8.2. Main Provisions of the Treaties**
 - 2.5.8.3. Effects of the Treaties**
 - 2.5.8.4. Treaties of 1861 and After**
- 2.5.9. Treaty of Port System**
 - 2.5.9.1. Main features or characteristics of Treaty of Port System**
 - 2.5.9.2. Summary**
 - 2.5.9.3. Self Assessment Questions**
 - 2.5.9.4. Reference Books**
- 2.5.1. Introduction:**

China during the 19th century became victim of expansionist policy of the western powers. In spite of the fact that she was not prepared to go in for a war, she was forced to fight wars to her disadvantage. China, a land of ancient culture and civilization and a place where Buddha's message found acceptability with the people had to fight opium war not because Chinese wished war but because a war was always forced them. The country has vast territory and the highest world population. The people in the past however were satisfied with what they had. The whole country was divided into 18 provinces and ruled by an emperor who was in many respects absolute. He was known as 'Son of the Heaven'. Each province was under the charge of a viceroy and unlike many other Eastern countries

China had a well-developed bureaucratic system. Civil servants were selected with the help of a competitive examination. The people did not feel the need and necessity of any foreign trade and as such remained secluded from the western world. They were good in handicrafts and suffered from superiority complex.

2.5.2. Causes for the First Opium War:

After obtained the Industrial Revolution in England, she felt that need of world market for the sale of her industrial products. The result was that she became eager to have China market. She was sure that out of this market nation could make heavy and huge profits. But Chinese were in no mood to keep her country to open for trade with England or any other western country. Trade in China could be possible only through Chinese Chamber of Commerce whose membership was sanctioned by the emperor himself. There was Superintendent of Foreign Trade who closely supervised the arrival and departure of very foreign vessel who visited Chinese soil and ensured that none entered China beyond a particular point.

In 1792-93 British government sent Lord McCarthy to China for improvement of trade relations and allowing Britain to have free trade with China. The request was, however, not accepted. But she continued her relentless effort and in 1816 another Embassy was sent to China with the same mission. The Embassy faces the same repulsive, as expected. The main reason for this stiff attitude and arrogance was that Chinese felt that they were too superior for the western world and stood in no need for international trade. But Britain took each refusal as an insult to her national respect and prestige. Further her ambassadors in Chinese courts were not treated with respect and they were supposed to pay some types of respect which they were not ready to pay. Thus a situation was developed in which conflict between the two countries was almost unavoidable.

2.5.3. Limited Trade in China for western Countries:

Of course some trade was going on between China and western Powers through licensed shopkeepers but that was only one sided affair in the sense that whereas Chinese goods were exported against payment in silver, Western finished goods did not have any market in China. Thus the west always had adverse balance of trade which was putting very severe financial burden on many western countries, especially England. She was keen that this should be made favourable. British trade was carried through English East India Company at Canton.

China, however, imported opium for medical purposes and East India Company thought that existing trade gap could be reduced, if quantity of this item was increased. The result was that more opium began to be poured in to the country and by 1839 as many as

40.000 chests of opium were consumed by Chinese as against 400 in 1790. The Chinese became opium addicts. This caused concern in China because:

- a) Most of the addicts were high class bureaucrats and their addition caused many problems for the smooth running of administration.
- b) Socially it was unhealthy that a nation should have opium addicts.
- c) China which had favourable balance of trade all along now began to have adverse balance of trade.

2.5.4. Lin Mission:

The Emperor of China was much disturbed by increasing use of opium by Chinese officials on the one hand and adverse balance of trade on the other. He was very keen that this trade should be checked and use of opium reduced. He, therefore, issued a special decree by which he prohibited the import of opium in China. He also consulted his Governors in this regard who by and large supported the move and demanded that restrictions should be put on the use of opium and its import. One of the supporters of restrictions was Lin Tse Hsu, the Governor General of two central provinces of China namely Hupei and Hunan. He suggested that existing laws against the use of opium should be strictly enforced. The Emperor was very much pleased about his commitment to control opium consumption and made him responsible for the enforcement of opium laws and ensures that its import was reduced. He was appointed as Imperial Commissioner at Canton which was the main opium trading centre.

The imperial Commissioner Lin instructions to all foreign as well as native traders to surrender all their opium stocks and also demanded from foreign traders an assurance that in future they will not import this drug to china. He strictly enforced his orders and forced British Superintendent of Foreign Trade to surrender all opium stocks to Chinese authorities. He was, however, not prepared to give an assurance that in future this drug will not be imported into china. This complicated the situation. Lin was a success when he could get a surrender of 21000 opium chests which were subsequently destroyed.

Meantime day by day situation was getting complicated both for England and China. So far in china for opium trade East India Company enjoyed full monopoly. But now this monopoly was ended and British government wanted to have one political and trade representative in Chinese court, but the Government was not prepared for it. Then they also wanted that some solid arrangements should be made for the protection of British subjects in China. British government wanted to have her control over her subjects settled in China.

2.5.5. The Opium War I (1839-42):

Lin had thought that by forcing British traders to surrender opium chests and destroying these, the problem had been solved. But actually that was not so. In fact both

China and England were preparing themselves for a war. Lin on his part used fishermen in checking smuggling of opium and started strengthening of fortifications. The British Trade Commissioner continued with his stand of not giving an assurance that he will in future not import this drug and from Canton he retired to Macao. In England there was great resentment against Lin's action and surrender of opium chests. The parliament demanded payment of compensation for the loss.

Britain now prepared for a war and in July 1839 an English expedition reached Tinghai in Chusan and subsequently a naval fleet was sent to the entrance of Paiho River which was key to Tienstin. China wanted to avoid confrontation with Britain and posted Kishan at Canton with the instructions to bring changes, if any, in Chinese opium policy. The new Commissioner tried to satisfy the British officials by pulling down all defense works which Lin had constructed at heavy costs. He also disbanded local militia which had been trained by Lin at great pains and cost. He was quite hopeful that foreigners will be satisfied by these measures and if necessary some compensation will also be paid to them. But his hopes also did not prove true. The Britishers instead put forth some demands. These included:

- Island of Hong Kong should be handed over to them.
- The ports of Amoy and Foochow should be thrown open to them for trade.

Since China was not prepared to accept these demands therefore, in January 1841 Britain captured forts at the mouth of Canton and compelled Kishan to accept her terms. For Britain now the question was that of preserving national honour and now the nation was not prepared to tolerate any restrictions on free trade and liberty of individual traders. Britain was keen that China should have open door policy. Admiral Elliot was put in charge of war operations and in the summer of 1842 he blockaded Canton and Tinghai was taken over in no time.

It was during the course of war that the Chinese came to know about quality and efficiency of latest cannons owned by the west. They now realized that their war preparations, as compared with those of Britain, were nothing and of no great significance. British armies could easily capture Yangtze River. Emperor now realized that Chinese armies were no match for British armies and that their soldiers not as expert as they were expected. Even their cannons did not hit the targets. In the months of June and July 1842 in the face of tough resistance British armies could capture Shanghai and Chinkiang and thus Line of communication between the capital city and these two towns was completely cut, which was a great set back to the prestige of China. Forced by the circumstances China concluded a treaty with Britain. This treaty brought an end to first Opium War between Britain and China.

2.5.6. Treaty of Nanking:

The Treaty of Nanking was concluded in 1842. Main terms of the Treaty were:

- (a) Hong Kong was ceded to Britain, which was great moral boosting and real gain of the war.
- (b) British traders were allowed to reside and trade in the ports of Amoy, Foochow, Ningbo and Shanghai.
- (c) China agreed to pay a war indemnity of twenty one million silver dollars to Britain.
- (d) British traders were authorized to carry on their trade directly rather than through licensed dealers.

Through war was fought on the plea of getting compensation for the loss of opium, yet when the treaty was concluded no mention was made about compensation. Similarly no conditions was imposed that these concessions were available only to England and to no other western country.

Why was China Defeated? A very significant question which arises is as to why China was defeated in the opium war. For this not one but several causes were responsible. Some of the important causes for this failure were:

- a) The people of China were quite backward. They had medieval way of thinking and both their war equipment's and war ammunition was of medieval nature. Since the nation was keen to preserve medieval character and avoid entering modernity the obvious consequence was the defeat in any war with a western nation.
- b) They suffered from superiority complex for reasons which had no validity and which could not withstand the test of the time. Thus they failed to learn from modern situations.
- c) Senior public servants and leaders were more concerned about their own interests rather than those of the people. They deliberately did not voice the feelings of the people and allowed the situation to drift as long as their own position was safe.
- d) China continued to hold the old notion of nationality which was irritating for the west. They wanted to shatter this as quickly as possible.
- e) During the course of war China did not whole heartedly oppose Britain and took only calculated risk.
- f) Western powers came to know that defense system of China was very weak and that they had all along been unnecessarily afraid of China.

In this way China was defeated and this defeat proved to be a turning point in the history of China in the sense that its isolation was broken and she came in touch and contact with western powers. China now began to realize how advance and forward the while world had gone and how far Chinese had remained backward.

2.5.7. China Treaty of Nanking and After:

The period that immediately followed the Treaty was the one during which many other European nations demanded from China that these should also be given trade concessions of the type which had been given to Britain. China had seen that as compared with the war strength of western powers she was nothing. She by now also knew that in case concessions were refused force could be used which she could not withstand. Accordingly on July 3, 1844 China signed the Treaty of Wanghsia with USA by which details about extra territorial system were spelt out and Americans were given most favoured nation treatment. The treaty also specified that it will remain in operation for a period of twelve years. Treaties were also forced to sign on similar lines with Belgium, France, Norway, Portugal and Spain.

China was also forced to sign with Britain another treaty i.e. the treaty of Bogue, by which it was provided that if in future China agreed to give new benefits to any other country these will be available to Britain as well. Since China had given several concessions to several Western nations subsequent to the treaty of Nanking, therefore, a demand was made by Britain that Treaty concluded with that country should be reviewed. Both America and France supported Britain's demand.

2.5.8. SECOND OPIUM WAR (1856)

First opium war had come to an end with the Treaty of Nanking and China had hoped that she will be allowed to live peacefully after the desired concessions had been granted. But that did not happen because Western powers were bent up on getting more and more concessions. They had also realized that china was fully afraid of their military strength. They were, therefore, on the lookout of an opportunity by which they could again fight with China and get some more concessions. In these concessions it may be pointed out that though western powers otherwise fought with each other, yet when the question of getting concessions from China came these always united and became one.

2.5.8.1. Lorch Arrow Incident and War:

Since Western powers were in search of an opportunity that came to them in 1856. Chinese were already feeling much humiliated by the Treaty of Nanking and in the country there were anti-foreign feelings. These were growing day by day. There were outrages against them at several places. But the Britishers and other western powers allowed the situation to drift till it became explosive some action could be taken. In 1856 Canton police boarded a British ship Lorch Arrow for arresting some crew members whom they charged

with smuggling activities. They were arrested but British ship Commander immediately demanded the return of the crew since the arrest was made on a ship which flew their flag. There was some hesitation but ultimately High Commissioner Yeh who had arrested them returned the crew to British Ship Commander. But that was not the end of it because Britain felt that return was not proper because proper apologies had not been tendered by Yeh.

On this, British ship Commander dispatched gun boats along the river Canton and the city was bombed. In return the people of Canton sacked down the foreign settlements near the Canton. Britain and France combined together now sent an expedition which captured Canton and also Yeh, who was exiled to Calcutta. But China was even then not prepared to bend down. Both the countries therefore, sent their expeditions to capture the capital of China. Now Chinese government had no other alternative but to sue for peace. The war came to an end by several treaties which China was forced to sign under very compelling manner.

2.5.8.2. Main Provisions of the Treaties:

In order to end war china had to sign several treaties not only with England and France but also with USA and Russia. All these were such treaties by which China was to give concessions and to take nothing to return. Thus all was one-sided affair. The provisions of the treaties were:

1. So far China had thrown open only five ports for foreign trade. Now the number of these ports was increased to 16. In this way eleven new ports were opened for trade to western traders. These ports spread from New Chwang to Swatow.
2. Western traders were allowed to use river Yangtze for international trade.
3. All opium trade was legalized.
4. It was agreed that china was responsible for waging war and as such she should pay war indemnity both to England and France.
5. Foreign missions with their staff were permitted to stay in Peking.
6. All those foreigners who possessed valid passport were allowed to travel in any part of the country.
7. It was provided that foreign subjects residing in China will not be governed under Chinese law but by the laws and under jurisdictions of the state to which they belonged.
8. All those properties of Roman Catholic and other religious establishments confiscated by Chinese government so far will be returned.
9. French missionaries were permitted to rent as well purchase land in the provinces outside the treaty ports and erect buildings on such lands, if need arose.

10. Foreign Christian missionaries were to be permitted to preach their viewpoints in the country.

2.5.8.3. Effects of the Treaties:

The effects for the treaties thus signed were very far reaching for China. Some of these were:

- a) Western powers could get full control over Chinese trade for which these were so badly clamoring for such a long time.
- b) Western nations got extra territorial rights over their subjects settled in China. In this way these could indulge in anti-China activities without caring for the wrath of Chinese officers and government.
- c) It was clear that China was afraid of military strength of Western powers and thus under the threat of use of force anything could be got done in China.
- d) The use of River Yangste provided considerable freedom of movement of western nations.
- e) Since China allowed foreign nationals to travel in the interior of the country, therefore it became difficult for her to conceal her weaknesses from the western world.
- f) Since foreigners had access to the people of China, therefore, indirectly they began to take active interest in political life of China. One finds that western armies took part in suppressing Taiping Rebellion simply because western powers did not like that Manchu dynasty which had given them all these concessions should be thrown out of power.
- g) weakness of China in all walks of national life was fully exposed and now western world wanted and actually fully exploited that China was always forced to give concessions, whether she liked those or not and instead got nothing.

2.5.8.4. Treaties of 1861 and After:

Even these concessions which China had to give and also humiliations which she had to suffer did not end her miseries. One after the other more and more concessions was demanded and due to her own weaknesses she had to agree to even the most unreasonable demands of these powerful nations. One finds that Britain snatched away Hong Kong and a part of Kowloon from China. Russia grabbed territories north of Amour River and east of Ussuri. France forced China to surrender her rights over Tong king and Annow. Portugal established authority over Macao. In that way China was forced to

surrender much of what she owned in the past. As the time passed UK, France, Germany, Russia and Japan combined together for demanding more and more concessions from China. In between 1895-99, she was forced to open new ports for trade with the west on the one hand and water steam navigation facilities on the other. France got more concessions at Shinghai and many new ports were opened for trade with the west. Japan was allowed entry to Chinese ports and china agreed to keep away from Korea, where Japan will have free hand. Japan was also paid war indemnity in addition to Formosa and the Liaotung Peninsula in Southern Manchuria though subsequently these had to be returned to China under pressure from western powers.

In the race for grabbing Chinese land in fast no power lagged behind. Germany captured bay of Kiao Chao and subsequently agreed to have it on lease for 99 years and Britain that of the port of Wei-hai-wei. The situation so much worsened for China that European nations now thought that China was under their sphere of influence. Thus China which once considered herself to be the most superior nation of the world was brought to her knees with all humiliations which could be thrown on a nation by a victorious powers.

2.5.9. TREATY OF PORT SYSTEM

China for a very long time had been resisting the entry of western power into her land. It was because she was always afraid of intentions of European nations which believed that trade is followed by flag. Moreover, China also did not feel that there was any need and necessity for trade with the west. In addition she also suffered from superiority complex and treated European nations with contempt. But after the Treaty of Nanking she was forced to throw open some ports to European nations for trade. Once the process started it did not stop. The system under which China was forced to throw open ports under treaty obligations to European nations is known as "Treaty Port System". In the beginning the system was not very complex but it grew to be so as the time passed. Some of the salient features or characteristics of the system were as under.

2.5.9.1. Main features or characteristics of Treaty of

Port System:

Under this system whenever a port was thrown open to a European nation the traders were allowed to have some territory near their trading centre at least where they could settle and carry out their business. These areas were outside the city and served as residential colonies and warehouses of their goods.

2. Then its other feature was that it was not confined to any particular area. It was spread in the whole country from North to South as well as on the costs as well as in the towns on the Yangtze from Chinkiang to Chunking, including Nanking and Hankow.

3. The Consulars of the area had the right to regulate the community settled in the locality and in dealing with these people laws of the nationality of the resident were applied.

4. The Consulars had full liberty to decide about building regulations etc. on the areas in lease with them and Chinese were excluded.

5. When as a result of Taiping Revolution Chinese sought shelter in international settlements they agreed that they will abide by the laws of the nation whose settlement they took shelter. It was also decided that in a dispute if such Chinese were defendants Chinese courts will try the cases. On the other hand if Chinese were wrong doers then the authorities of the province could demand repatriation of such persons from settlement authorities.

6. The foreigners in China will not be tried by Chinese court. If any foreigner got involved in any offence civil or criminal he was to be handed over to settlement authorities of the nation to whom he belonged for necessary trial. If parties to the dispute were not of the same nationality then the law of the defendant national was to be operative. If in case a foreign national with whom China was not a party in the system then such a national was required to surrender himself to one of the nations with whom China was treaty bound. He was then supposed to be the national of the nation to whom he had surrendered.

7. Missionaries in China enjoyed extra territorial rights and thus freedom to preach their ideas and construct their churches. They could even build churches, schools, universities and lease their lands.

8. Under the system a provision was also made for the office of the Inspector General of Customs who dealt with customs on foreign trade. The office was held by a foreign national and helped in trade and tariff regulations which protected their interests.

9. Under the system steps were so taken that foreign goods were popular in China and had wide acceptability.

10. Under the system efforts were made to develop certain Treaty ports as major industrial centres e.g. Shanghai where some textile mills were established by Britain. The example set by Britain was followed by several other European nations.

11. The Port Treaty System was based on the principle that there should be large scale exchange of commodities between China and other countries of the world and this principle was very much followed to the disadvantage of China.

12. Treaty Ports became important centres for the flow of political ideas of west into China with ultimately resulted in revolt in China and resentment of old order by a new one.

13. After Boxer Rebellion Treaty powers forced China to give them a concession by which these could have permanent stations and troops for protecting the interests of their nationals. This power was very much misused by European nations and in Asia by Japan thereby creating many problems for China.

14. Gradually Port Treaty nations got a right to invest their capital in China and thereafter Britain, German, USA, France, Russia and Japan formed a consortium with a view to acquiring monopoly for advancing loans which China will in future need. But it had to be dissolved after some time, as USA withdrew from it.

In this way Port System had very adverse effects on the economy and social as well as political life of China. It was a big trap which once thrown so wrapped China that she was never in a position to come out of that. She went on involving herself in that more and more increasingly and the worst was that every step taken forward and for betterment by China proved backward and to her disadvantage.

2.5.9.2. Summary:

For centuries China was not prepared to talk with European traders on terms of equality but after the treaty of Nanking China had to accept the supremacy of western powers. Particularly after second opium war with the Peking Convention China agreed to open 16 ports for traders. Management of these ports was in the hands of the traders. On these ports Chinese accepted superiority. At the same time West adopted a very aggressive attitude towards China. The western powers forced themselves on that country. China did not wish to have any trade or diplomatic relations with the west, whereas these powers wanted to have their relations even with the use of force. China wanted to live in isolation and did not wish to be pierced through semi civilized European nations, whereas Europeans wanted to pierce through China at very cost. Such was the western attitude towards China. These powers were trying to impose and force themselves on China whereas China wanted to keep them as far away as possible.

2.5.9.3. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Explain the significance of opium wars in China.
2. Write a note on the importance of opium wars.
3. Critically examine the role of opium in the First Opium War.
4. Show how the Opium Wars led to western aggression in China

2.5.9.4. Reference books:

1. Allen George., **A Short Economic History of Japan**
2. Beckmann, George M., **Modernization of China and Japan**
3. Douglas., **Europe and the Far East**
4. Fairbank, John, et al., **East Asia: Modern Transformation**
5. Pfeffer, Nathaniel., **The Far East: A Modern History**
6. Whyte, Sir A.F. ., **China and the Foreign Powers**

Unt-2

Lesson - 2.6.

MEIJI RESTORATION

Objective of the Lesson:

In 1867 last of the Shoguns surrender his authority and power went back to Emperor who assumed the title of Meiji. The developments which were lead to the Meiji restoration are the objective of this lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 2.6.1. Introduction**
- 2.6.2. Steps leading to Restoration**
- 2.6.3. Calling of the Shogun**
- 2.6.4. Surrender of the Shogun**
- 2.6.5. Causes of Restoration**
- 2.6.6. Why was Restoration a Success?**
- 2.6.7. The Role of the Samurais**
- 2.6.8. Difficulties of Restoration**
- 2.6.9. Charter Oath of 1868.**
- 2.6.10. Significance of Oath**
- 2.6.11. Summary**
- 2.6.12. Self Assessment Questions**
- 2.6.13. Reference Books**

2.6.1. INTRODUCTION:

Restoration of 1868 was an important event in the history of Japan. It was after this Restoration that Japan made rapid social, economic and political changes. At the events subsequently proved Restoration helped in the modernization of Japan and taking the country to the path of progress and prosperity.

2.6.2. Steps Leading towards Restoration:

Since the inception of seclusion imposed by Shoguns i.e. about two and half centuries before the Restoration there was a relentless force on Shoguns to end the policy of Seclusion. They had to sign unequal treaties and various factors had already contributed to the undermining of the power and position of the Shoguns. The signing of treaties

provided a favourable atmosphere for the anti-Shoguns and pro-imperialist parties to come forward. They raised a slogan 'Revere the Emperor and expel the barbarians'. They had the active support of discontented elements in the country. The slogan of expelling foreigners soon caught the imagination of the people. Some of the overaggressive and ambitious supporters of the Emperor now started acts of violence against the foreigners. The Shogun was in a very precarious position. It had neither enough strength to expel the foreigners nor had it enough power to restore law and order in the country. Violence against foreigners became very common. In 1859 was the murder of Russian naval people. In 1861 the Britishers were attacked at Yedo. In 1862 British citizen Richard was killed. In 1863 there was bombardment on British ships. In 1864 Shimoseki was attacked by the Western countries. In 1868 few French citizens were killed.

In the encounters that followed between the Japanese and the western traders to check violence at Kogoshima and Shimonoseki, it became very clear that in military field Japan was no comparison with the Western Powers. This very much injured the Samurais, who were traditionally known for their bravery. They blamed the Shogun for such a situation, in which Japan had been placed. They therefore agitated for the revival of national power. They also started a movement that the reforms should be introduced in the country.

2.6.3. Calling of the Shogun:

When the situation became tense Shogun was called by the Emperor and ordered that a decree be issued by him to all the feudals that the foreigners be sent out of Japan. The orders were issued and accordingly Chosu feudal lord attacked an American ship but attack was replied by the joint forces of U.S.A., Britain Holland and France, stationed in Japan. They bombarded the places of Chosu and Satsuma feudals. This assured the feudals that they could not throw the foreigners out of Japan.

But the off-shoot of the incident was serious. Anti-Shogun powers in the country blamed that the Tokugawas had dragged the Emperor in to the controversy of signing the treaties with the foreigners. With those incidents their divinely descended Emperor had come under controversy. This very much weakened the position of the Shogun in the eyes of the people. In 1864, the Shogun was again called by the Emperor and he was made to agree that in further all the orders relating to powers and privileges of the feudals will be issued by him. The Emperor accordingly appointed the feudal lords of Chosu, Satsuma, Hizen and Tosa as his advisers. Chosu feudal tried to kidnap Shogun, an act which was resented by the Emperor who ordered him to punish the feudal. It was after two years the Shogun could send an army against Chosu feudal. But well equipped armies of Chosu feudal badly defeated the ill-equipped armies of Shogun. It was in that year that the Shogun died.

2.6.4. Surrender of the shogun:

Tokugawa Keiki now became new Shogun. In 1867, Emperor Kameki also died and was succeeded by his 15 years old son. Anti-Shogun Parties became very active in the court of the Emperor and the new Shogun realized that he was insecure and unstable. Accordingly he surrendered his resignation to the Emperor on November 9, 1867. In this way anti-Shogun forces were in a position to restore the powers of the Emperor to him, which had been forcibly snatched by the Shogun.

2.6.5. Causes of Restoration:

The Shogun had been ruling over Japan for centuries. They had a hold over the country. They had crushed the powers of the feudal lords and kept their families hostages at their capitals. But in spite of all that there was a strong movement in the country for Restoration against the authority of the Shogun. One such cause was that the Shoguns had failed to change the character of the society. The society continued to remain feudal and obsolete. It was not allowed to change with the changing times. This was primarily because the Shoguns had closed the doors of the Japan on West. Such a situation was bound to react and this reacted forcefully.

Then another cause was that the Shogun lived in Yedo, whereas most of the feudal lords did not live there. Thus there was no close contact between the Shogun and feudal lords. As long as the Shoguns were in power, the feudals accepted his authority, but soon after weakness of the Shoguns was known, the far away feudals asserted their authority and thus they became independent from control of the Emperor.

The Shoguns were military Chieftains. They exercised their control because they claimed military superiority. But for a long time Japan had to wage no war. Thus it appeared that the people were supporting an ideal warrior class. Gradually this class appeared to them a great burden which they wanted to throw away.

Legally the Shogun had no authority. Due to historical reasons they had snatched powers from the Emperor, who had to reconcile himself to the Shoguns. As long as Shoguns were in power, nobody bothered about the Emperor. But after some time Japanese scholars as well as the anti- Shoguns in the country cleared the historic position. They made it clear that the Shoguns had usurped powers from the Emperor and was exercising them in an unauthorized manner. They therefore demanded that Emperor be restored his powers.

2.6.6. Why was Restoration a Success?:

The conditions for restoration were favourable. We have already discussed that there were several factors responsible for undermining the power and position of the Tokugawa, but still it is amazing that how the military power of the Shogun agreed to surrender so quickly and without the show of the force. Not only this, but it is also surprising

that after surrender the Shogun did not make really very serious and whole hearted effort to get back their lost position. The main reason for this was that the anti-Shoguns elements in the country had made the Emperor, as their rallying point. Pro-imperialists in the country took full advantage of the situation which had been created by the resentment against the Shogun. Then another cause for such a peaceful restoration was that for centuries, Japan had not been invaded by any alien power. Japan also did not know the pangs of war and much less of humiliation. Accordingly when Japan came to realize that the military strength of Japan was much less than those of the West, patriotism awakened in them. They decided to throw away all those who had reduced them to this humble position. Accordingly Shogun was their target and Emperor their only hope. Still another reason was that the nationalist and patriotic elements in the country were watching with interesting the happening in China. They were sure that the same drama could be staged in their country. They were confident that they had been placed in an inferior position only due to their Shoguns. In this way the Shoguns had cut their oars and they could not retreat. In fact they had no alternative but to reconcile themselves to the situation in which they had been placed.

2.6.7. The Role of the Samurais:

The Samurais were a powerful soldier class in the country. Though it constitutes only 6% of the total population of the country, yet it was the backbone of national security and stability. These were the first to come forward for the restoration. Being a military race, they could not tolerate nation's humiliation, weakness and inefficiency that had crept into the army under the Tokugawa. They were interested to see the army strong. They could not tolerate this and these proud people exposed the Shoguns very quickly. Again the Samurais were responsible for starting a movement in the country which aimed at the revival of national power. They felt that such a movement was necessary because under Tokugawas the country was unprepared for fighting any war and that the Shogun was coward. Undoubtedly, the movement started by Samurai gained momentum with the passage of time. The Samurais made it amply clear that no amount of reform in the country could bring the desired changes and that the Tokugawas could not be expected to bring back national honour and prestige. Accordingly the role of Samurai was very laudable in the Restoration Movement in Japan.

2.6.8. Difficulties of Restoration:

But the restoration had its own difficulties. The greatest difficult was that of maintain law and order in the country. The Shoguns had surround but they were keen to get back lost

position. Then the monarch was also opposed by the feudals. The Emperor was also required to improve economic conditions of the people. In case the economy of country was not put to order the Emperor could not expect to enjoy the cooperation of the people. He was also required to remove illiteracy and superstitions. In this way the problems of restoration were really serious.

2.6.9. Charter Oath of 1868:

It was on April 6, 1868 that Emperor took charter oath before selected Assemblage. The main features of the Oath were:

1. The Emperor will rule the country according to public opinion.
2. The people belonging to all classes will be united in the enterprises.
3. Old, unworthy ways and customs shall be destroyed.
4. Knowledge shall be sought among nations of the world.
5. Welfare of the Empire will be promoted.
6. There will be a consultative Committee for running administration of the country.
7. The people of Japan belonging to all shades and opinion will unite for the advancement of the country.
8. All the sections of society will get an opportunity to meet their needs.

2.6.10. Significance of Oath:

One of the salient features of oath was that it wanted to end seclusion and stood for the promotion of modernization of Japan. In other words it ended anti-foreign elements and feelings which had been prevailing in the country for centuries together. Then second significant feature was that it contained a promise of deliberative Assembly. In the words of Arthur E. Tiedemann, 'this had been inserted to prevent unrest among the Samurai of various domains by assuring them that they were to have some voice in the government.'

2.6.11. Summary:

Thus the Restoration brought the old order to an end and in its place a new order was brought. Though the Restoration had its own problems, yet the country made wonderful progress in all walks of life under the Meijis.

2.6.12. Self Assessment Questions:

1. How far was the Restoration Movement Anti-feudal?
2. "The Meiji Restoration was not a revolution, not a change in the name of the Values.... Rather it was what is far more common in history a change carried in the name of old value". Discuss.
3. Evaluate the nature and character of Meiji Restoration of 1868.
4. Analyze the internal forces responsible for the Meiji Restoration.

2.6.13. Reference Books:

1. Allen George., **A Short History of Japan**
2. Beckmann, George M., **Modernization China and Japan**
3. Fairbank, John, etal., **East Asia: Modern Transformation**
4. Myers, Ramon Hand., **The Japanese Colonial Empire,
1895-1 945**
5. Peffer, Nathaniel., **The Far East : A Modern History**

Unit-3

Lesson- 3.1.

UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Objective of the Lesson:

How unification of Italy happened through different leaders is the main objective of the lesson.

9

Structure of the Lesson:

3.1.1. Introduction

3.1.2. The Rise of Nationalism in Italy

3.1.3. Mazzini

3.1.4. “Young Italy” Movement

3.1.5. 1848 Revolution

3.1.6. Cavour (1810-61)

3.1.7. Role of Garibaldi

3.1.8. Venice United with the Rest of Italy (1866)

3.1.9. Rome Liberated in 1870.

3.1.10. Summary

3.1.11. Self Assessment Questions

3.1.12. Reference Books

3.1.1. Introduction.

3.1.1. Introduction:

¹ Although Italy happened to be the home of Renaissance, it was a divided country. Numerous kingdoms had risen out of the ashes of the Roman Empire. Each was ruled by a Duke and the country suffered much because of their rivalry. It was this fact which pained Machiavelli who wrote *The Prince*. Italy began to play a minor role in the European affairs because she was dominated by big powers like Austria, Spain and France. So when Napoleon conquered Italy, the Italians began to regard him as a liberator. But when his oppressive rule started, they began to detest him. After the down fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna presided over by Prince Metternich considered Italy as a mere “geographic expression”. The principle of legitimacy was applied and Italy came to be divided. The Pope received his Papal States. The king of Sardinia got back his kingdom consisting of Piedmont and the island of Sardinia. The Spanish King recovered the kingdom of the two Sicilies (i.e., Naples and Sicily). Austria annexed Lombardy and Venetia to her empire, Small Duchies in northern and central Italy were revived and they were mostly ruled by Austrian princes. Out of all the rulers, only two were Italians, and they were Pope and the king of Piedmont. Both lacked patriotism so as to bring about the unification of Italy. Thus Italy lost her sense of identity, and remained, as Metternich had said earlier, as “geographic expression.” Austria was able to dominate the whole Italian peninsula by suppressing all liberal and nationalist ideas. She appointed spies and restored to brutal repression whenever people revolted.

3.1.2. *The Rise of Nationalism in Italy:*

Nationalism may be described as strong feeling of love and loyalty which people have towards their own country. But this feeling was lacking among the Italians in the early stages of the Italian unification. The first movement towards attaining freedom from foreign rule was started by the 'Carbonari Society'. It was a secret society formed mainly by charcoal burners and hence the name Carbonari. They organized revolts in 1821 and 1830 but they were brutally suppressed by Prince Metternich. The revolts failed because the 'Carbonari' were divided on the issue of the form of government to be established if they succeeded in gaining freedom. The task of unifying the Italians for grappling major issues facing the country became more difficult because of excessive parochialism.

This stupendous task fell on the shoulders of three great personalities of the unification movement-Joseph Mazzini, Count Cavour and Garibaldi. The first played the role of prophet, the second that of a statesman and the third of a brave soldier-cum-patriot.

3.1.3. *Mazzini(1805-72):*

Mazzini hailed from Genoa which came under the control of Piedmont. From his early childhood he was quite ambitious about the fate of his country. He always dressed himself in black garments fancying himself as a mourner. He gave up everything in order to fight for the liberation of his country. He joined the Carbonari which was the only revolutionary organization. He was arrested and imprisoned in

1831. Mazzini was disappointed at the attitude of the Pope and the ruler of Piedmont because they were the only Italians who could have done something to liberate and consolidate the country. As such he decided that if Italy became free, it was to become republic.

3.1.4. “Young Italy” Movement:

Soon after his release he founded a new organization called “Young Italy”. He firmly believed that young men of Italy could easily bring about at the liberation of their motherland. He declared “Place youth at the head of the insurgent multitude; you know not the secret of the power hidden in those youthful hearts nor the magic influence exercised on the masses by the voice of youth. You will find among the young a host of apostles of the new religion”. Mazzini appealed to the youth through his writings and speeches and established several branches of “Young Italy” in all the nook and corners of Italy. His appeal to the youth was to come forward for the task of unifying the country and liberating her from foreign rule. The need of the hour was self-sacrifice. Mazzini was able to create confidence and faith among the Italians that they had the capacity to undertake the arduous task which lay ahead. He gave them the ideal and strength to work for liberating their country from foreign rule. The Young Italy began to attract thousands of young Italians who were prepared to sacrifice their lives. The motto of Young Italy was “God and the people,” and its methods were educating the public through literary propaganda and agitations.

3.1.5. ¹1848 Revolution:

In 1848, Revolutions broke out in many parts of Europe and they were all directed against the tyrannical monarchs. In many parts of Italy too the people demanded reforms. Some rulers conceded the demands fearing revolts and the others refused. It may be remembered that Austria herself witnessed a revolution and Metternich was forced to flee the country. Therefore the rulers of Italy reluctantly granted people constitutional reforms. In Venice the Austrian rule was overthrown and a republic was established. Mazzini succeeded in establishing a republic at Rome. The ruler of Piedmont, King Charles Albert fought against the Austrians to liberate Italy but was defeated in the battle of Custoza. When he failed in the second battle i.e., the battle of Novara against the Austrians he abdicated the throne in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel. Victor Emmanuel made peace with the Austrians. Austria recovered and soon established her hold on Italy.

The Pope recovered Rome with the assistance of the French troops. Mazzini was forced to flee. He remained as an exile in Britain. But he continued to direct the national movement in Italy through secret correspondence. The failure of 1848 Revolution in Italy, though disappointing to many, made Italians more determined in achieving their goal. King Victor Emmanuel was ready to support the national movement.

3.1.6. Cavour(1810-61):

King Victor Emmanuel II was fortunate in having a leader of great caliber like Cavour to work for his kingdom. Cavour belonged to an aristocratic family in Sardinia. As an editor of a reputed newspaper, he urged the king to take the lead in liberating Italy from the Austrian control in 1848. Undaunted by the defeat Sardinia suffered at the hands of the Austrians; Cavour decided to work for the unification of Italy. He got elected to the Assembly and made speeches calculated to improve the state of affairs in Piedmont and Sardinia. The king was deeply impressed and he subsequently appointed Cavour as the Prime minister in 1852. Before Cavour emerged on the political scene, the Italians believed in the popular slogan "*Italia Fara da se.*" (Italy will look after herself). But Cavour was not convinced about this because of the failure of the 1848 revolution. He firmly believed that the kingdom of Piedmont and Sardinia was too small a power to strike a blow on the mighty Austria. So he was convinced that his kingdom could fight only if a foreign power helped her. He also realized that his kingdom should make enormous strides of progress before she could take upon the task of rallying other states to fight for freedom.

He diverted his energies to make his state- the kingdom of Piedmont and Sardinia- a model in all respects. He encouraged modern agriculture and rapid industrialization. He followed the policy of free trade. A network of canals was built. Roads, bridges and railways were laid to facilitate trade and bring economic prosperity. He introduced British system of budget and methods of taxation. He established a "free church in a free state." The Piedmontese army was reorganized.

He was waiting for an opportunity to take achieve part in international affairs. It was in 1855 that he decided that his state should join the Crimean war. The war was fought between Britain, France and Turkey on the one side and Russia on the other side. Although Cavour's state had no self-interest involved in the outcome of the war, even then Cavour thought that this was the way he should secure the sympathy of France and Britain for Piedmont by joining their side. Piedmont played its role in the success of allies and she was invited to participate in the Congress of Paris in 1856 after the defeat of Russia. It was in this Congress Cavour appealed to the big powers like France and Britain about the need to give support to the unification of Italy. He eagerly looked forward to secure the support of France since the French Emperor Napoleon III was once a (*Carbonari*). The French Emperor was moved by the appeal for support to Piedmont in bringing about the unification of Italy. But it was not until an unsuccessful attempt made by Orsini (an Italian bandit) to kill him that Napoleon took decisive steps to help Piedmont.

Emperor Napoleon III sent a message to Cavour to meet him at Plombieres, and accordingly the two great leaders met secretly to discuss how France could be of assistance to Piedmont in the unification of Italy. The French Emperor agreed to militarily assist Piedmont if Austria attacked her. It was also agreed that France would get Nice and Savoy in return for French support. After this secret agreement with France, Cavour lost no time in provoking Austria to a war(1859) by creating border incidents. As anticipated, Austria declared war on

Piedmont and Cavour sought help from the French Emperor. With French military assistance the Piedmontese troops achieved success in the battles of Magenta and Solferino. These battles resulted in the liberation of Lombardy from Austrian rule and if the war had continued for some more time Venice too would have achieved freedom. But that was not to be because the French army was withdrawn at the orders of the French Emperor. Cavour was so much disappointed that he even thought of committing suicide. What compelled Napoleon to change his mind remains a mystery but he signed an armistice agreement with Austria by which he stopped his hostility. Austria was to give Lombardy to Piedmont and the terms of the armistice came to be ratified by the treaty of Zurich. When Austrians left Lombardy, the people of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Romagna rose in rebellion against the Austrian rulers and decided to merge their respective states with Piedmont. The French Emperor gave his consent to their desire and for which he received Nice and Savoy from Piedmont.

3.1.7. *Role of Garibaldi (1807-1862):*

One of the most romantic figures in the nineteenth century in Italy was Garibaldi. He is described as “the sword of Italian unification.” Garibaldi was a disciple of Mazzini. He was a native of Nice. He was a born patriot and subsequently joined the ‘Young Italy’ founded by his master. He helped his master in organizing many revolts. When his plot to overthrow the king of Piedmont failed in 1833, he was forced to go into exile. He spent the next twelve years in South America where he helped the Uruguayans to fight against the tyranny of the Brazilian

rulers. It was there that he married Anita "who shared his dangerous life in the saddle and in the battle field." He gathered number of loyal volunteers who were ready to sacrifice their lives for his sake. He returned to Italy in 1848 to help Mazzini to attack Rome and establish a republic here. But the mission ended in failure and he was forced to leave Italy. He lived on the island of Caprera. He returned in 1859 to help Piedmont in her war with Austria. Although Cavour did not like his methods he wanted to make use of him. When the Sicilians staged a revolt against their foreign ruler, Cavour secretly urged Garibaldi to undertake the task of helping the rebels. So, commended one of the most daring exploits of Garibaldi-the liberation of Sicily and Naples. He left for the island of Sicily with his followers called Red-shirts. When Garibaldi landed in Sicily with his Red Shirts(1150 men), the Sicilians eagerly welcomed him and joined him in overthrowing the Spanish-Bourbon monarchy. He overcame the feeble resistance offered by the troops of king Bomba. The Spanish rule ended there. Encouraged by his success, Garibaldi managed to cross the narrow straits of Messina under dangerous circumstances and liberate the people of Naples from the yoke of Spanish rule. From there Garibaldi began to march towards Rome to liberate the people from French-supported Pope. Frightened at the prospect of alienating the sympathies of the French Emperor, Cavour appealed to his king, Victor Emmanuel II to forestall Garibaldi's attack on Rome. At the head of an army the king invaded the Papal States and occupied Umbria and Marches. From there he proceeded to meet Garibaldi. Garibaldi could have become a dictator by his own right

over southern part of Italy but he proved to be a patriot *par excellence*. He surrendered all the territories he had conquered to King Victor Emmanuel II and refused all rewards and riches. He shed tears when his native place, Nice, was handed over to Emperor Napoleon III. He retired to lead a farm life in the Island of Caprera. In 1861, the Victor Emmanuelli was crowned as the king of Italy and a parliament was summoned to meet at Turin. Cavour died without seeing Rome and Venice being united with the rest of Italy.

18

3.1.8. Venice United with the Rest of Italy(1866):

On the eve of Austro-Prussian war in 1866, Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor of Prussia, promised Venice if the Italians opened a new front against Austria. Accordingly, the Italians fought the Austrians when the Austro-Prussian war broke out. However, they were defeated. But the Prussian troops inflicted a crushing defeat upon Austria at Sadowa and the peace of Prague was concluded. Austria was forced to part with Venice to the Italians. Only Rome held by the Pope remained to be liberated.

1

3.1.9. Rome Liberated in 1870:

When the Franco-Prussian war broke out in 1870, Emperor Napoleon III was forced to withdraw the French troops from Rome which were stationed there since 1849. That was due to the fact that Napoleon had to fight against Prussia and it was necessary to collect troops from everywhere. In the absence of French protection, the Pope who held Rome could hardly resist the merger of Rome with the rest of

Italy. Thus, all parts of Italy were liberated and united. Mazzini's dream that Italy should remain as Republic did not materialize. Italy chose constitutional monarchy. The Pope began to live in the Vatican after having lost his control over Rome.

3.1.10. Summary:

The unification of Italy completed in 1870 as a result of the Italian patriots, foreign help and the force of circumstances. Cavour was brilliant and ingenious opportunist rather than the framer of long term plans for a distant future. He effectively utilized the existing opportunities in the need of the hour. He was a masterly statesman and not a masterful superman. Further the statesmen of Italy and Germany adjusted their policies to take account of each new situations and exploited them to achieve their own ends.

3.1.11. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Critically examine the significance of the Unification of Italy.
2. Describe the Role of Mazzini, Cavour and Garibaldi in the Unification of Italy.
3. Examine the contribution of Mazzini and Garibaldi to the unification Italy.

3.1.12. Reference Books:

1. Clark, C.W., **Franz Joseph and Bismarck: The Diplomacy Of Austria before the War of 1866.**
2. Davies, **World History**

3. Evans, J., **The Foundations of a Modern State in the 19th Century Europe**

4. Hobsbawn, E., **Nation and Nationalism**

5. Lucas, Colin, **The French Revolution and the Making of Modern Political Culture, Vol.12.**

6. Oris, P., **Modern Italy**

7. Porter Andrew, **European Imperialism, 1860-1914**

8. Thomson, David, **Europe Since Napoleon**

9. Zimmern, **Italy for Italians**

Unit-3

Lesson-3.2.

UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

Objective of the Lesson:

How unification of Germany was happened in different phases
is the main objective of the lesson.

9

Structure of the Lesson:

3.2.1. Introduction

3.2.2. Rise of Nationalism

3.2.3. Zollverein (Customs Union)

3.2.4. The 1848 Revolution in France

3.2.5. ¹King William I and His Iron

Chancellor, Bismarck

3.2.6. Blood And Iron Policy

3.2.7. War with Denmark (1864)

3.2.8. Friction Over the Spoils of War

3.2.9. Austro-Prussian War (1866) and Results

3.2.10. Franco-Prussian Relations

3.2.11. Bismarck's Diplomacy

3.2.12. Events Leading to Franco-Prussian war

3.2.13. French defeat at Metz and Sedan

3.2.14. The Treaty of Frankfurt (1871)

3.2.15. Summary

3.2.16. Self Assessment Questions

3.2.17. Reference Books

3.2.1. Introduction:

1 Before the advent of Napoleon, Germany happened to be a confederation of more than two hundred petty and independent principalities each ruled by a prince. It was Napoleon who welded them as 39 states. It was his oppressive rule there which roused national sentiments to a high pitch. After his downfall the Congress of Vienna established a loose kind of confederation. It also provided for a Federal Diet which was to consist of the representatives of 39 German rulers. The Diet was to be presided over by the Austrian delegate. After making this arrangement, the Congress of Vienna hoped that they would not encounter troubles. The ruler of every German state was a sovereign in his own territory and therefore opposed every move of the liberals to

bring about the unification of Germany. A few German states like Hanover and Holstein were governed by foreign kings and they were least expected to support national movement.

3.2.2. *Rise of Nationalism:*

Under such circumstances the initiative to rouse national consciousness lay with the university students and teachers. The University of Jena took a leading part in spreading the national movement. The students and teachers held Wartburg festival which, among other things, was aimed at expressing their national sentiments. Metternich was alarmed at some of the events happening in Germany, particularly the murder of a Russian spy, Kotzebue. He summoned a meeting of the ministers of important German states at Carlsbad to take steps to suppress the national movement. It was here that resolutions were passed and they were announced in the form of decrees (1819). Austria began to exercise her magisterial powers through a commission of investigation. The commission was to investigate about plots and conspiracies hatched by disgruntled German patriots to overthrow the confederation.

3.2.3. *Zollverein (Customs Union):*

Before 1817 Prussia had a customs house in each district and they hampered free flow of goods from one corner of the state to other. In order to encourage free flow of goods, the Prussian government got an Act passed by which Tariff Reforms were introduced. The Tariff

Reforms converted Prussia in to a Free Trade area. To see that other German states also did likewise, Prussia levied heavy transit duties on tariff goods coming from them. The other states agreed to join the Customs Union of Prussia. With the exception of a few German states and Austria, almost all joined the Customs Union of Prussia. Thus, Prussia took upon herself a leading role in bringing about the economic union of German states in 1837. This economic union was called as Zollverein and it paved way for the political unity.

3.2.4. *The 1848 Revolution in France:*

The French Revolution of 1848 had its impact on Germany also. As Austria herself witnessed an uprising, the Germans took advantage of the chaotic situation and rose in rebellion against their rulers. The liberals in the country took lead in holding elections and the Frankfurt Assembly met. The Frankfurt Assembly began to draw up a new constitution for whole of Germany and offered the crown to the Prussian king, Frederick William IV. The Prussian king rejected the offer for he knew well that if he accepted it there would be a war between his state and the Austrian Empire. In the meanwhile, the Frankfurt Assembly failed to achieve its objective and the national movement was suppressed. The liberals in Germany were deeply disappointed, Austria regained its control over all the German States. However, the king of Prussia made an attempt through her minister, Radowitz, to bring about the union of German states under her leadership. But this attempt did not succeed since the Austrian Emperor was firm in his decision about not losing his control over all the German states. The

King of Prussia was forced to give up his attempt by the convention of Almutz in 1850. The old German Confederation was revived and Austria reigned supreme.

3.2.5. *King William I and his Iron Chancellor, Bismarck:*

The last stage in the unification of Germany began with the rise of Otto von Bismarck. The leadership in the unification movement passed from the German liberals to a highly conservative Prussian 'Junker' who always believed in strong monarchy. Bismarck's appointment as Chancellor by the new Prussian king came at a time when the Prussian Parliament, dominated by liberals, refused to grant money to enable the new king to introduce military reforms. The deadlock began when the king insisted on, in 1862, that he be allowed to reorganize the Prussian army whereas the liberals stood for constitutional reforms. Dejected at the attitude of the Parliament, the king decided to abdicate. However, he was dissuaded from doing so by his close advisers, von Roon (war minister) and Moltke (the Prussian General). At their request, the king finally summoned Bismarck, who was then in Paris, to return and handle the crisis.

Otto von Bismarck belonged to the landowning German aristocracy, the 'Junkers'. He was a staunch conservative and had no sympathy for parliamentary democracy. He was a firm believer in a strong and enlightened monarchy. He believed, like the king, that Prussia's greatness depended upon her military force. He possessed an iron will and tenacity of purpose which helped him in overcoming many

a crisis. Fortunately, Prussia discovered the right man to guide her destiny for the next twenty-eight years.

3.2.6. 'Blood and Iron' policy:

After being appointed as chancellor by the king, Bismarck addressed the members of the Prussian parliament about the need of the hour. He cautioned them saying that "Not by speeches and resolutions of the majorities are the great questions of the day to be decided, but by blood and iron." In a characteristic way the Prussian parliament decided to defy him but Bismarck dealt with it severely by arresting many of its opposition leaders. The Prussian government forcibly collected taxes to enable the government to undertake necessary reforms in reorganizing the Prussian armed forces. Bismarck was convinced that Prussia alone had the capacity to lead all other German states and if she has to achieve the unification, it has to be through means of war against the enemies of German unification. He realized that Austria was the principal enemy which was to be defeated in a war. Within four years of his coming to office, Bismarck made strenuous efforts along with von Roon and Moltke to keep the armed forces well-trained and well equipped. Prussian army began to possess a new weapon, the breech-loading needle gun. This was to enable the Prussian army remain invincible.

3.2.7. War with Denmark (1864) :

In 1863, the new Danish king declared a new Constitution by which he annexed German populated Schleswig into his own kingdom

and established closer ties with Holstein, a member of the German Confederation. By this act he violated the protocol signed at London in 1852. Prussia had always looked upon these two duchies as rightfully belonging to her. So Bismarck planned his strategy in such a way that Prussia should involve Austria in a war with Denmark, and after victory, pick up a quarrel with her over the sharing of the spoils. Immediately he called upon Austria as the leader of the German Confederation to join Prussia in sending a combined military expedition against Denmark. Austria and Prussia sent an ultimatum to the king of Denmark to withdraw his new constitution, and upon his refusal, sent a joint expedition in 1864. The combined forces of Austria and Prussia inflicted a crushing defeat upon Denmark and her ruler signed the treaty of Vienna in 1864. As per the terms of the treaty the king surrendered his control over these two German duchies to Austria and Prussia. Bismarck was convinced that his Prussian troops had proved their superiority and he can look forward to another promising performance by them if a war were to break out with Austria.

3.2.8. *Friction over the Spoils of war:*

The question arose as to who should have control over these two duchies. Austria proposed that the Duke of Augustenburg should take over their control. But Bismarck was not willing. There was about to be a war between Prussia and Austria but it was averted following the convention of Gastein. By this convention, it was agreed, pending final settlement of this issue, Austria should administer Holstein and Prussia should control Schleswig. Prussia should also get duchy of

Lauenburg. Thus Bismarck was able to eliminate the claim of the Duke of Augustenburg and succeeded in keeping up his pressure on Austria. Austria was not happy over this arrangement and secretly supported the cause of the concerned Duke. In the meanwhile, Bismarck was making diplomatic preparation to isolate Austria if a war broke out. Russia proved to be friendly because Bismarck supported Russia when she decided to suppress the Poles who rose in revolt in 1863. Then he turned his attention to secure the neutrality of France in the event of a war with Austria. So Bismarck offered to Emperor Napoleon III of France, who had then suffered setback on account of his Mexican adventure, prospects of a future compensation were he to remain neutral if Austro-Prussian war broke out. Napoleon was overjoyed, and even imagined that he could gain advantages if the war prolonged. So Napoleon assured Bismarck of France's neutrality. Bismarck turned his attention to Italy to secure her military cooperation. For this purpose, he promised the Italian ruler the state of Venetia was he to succeed in a war with Austria. He urged them to open a new front by attacking Austria from the south if the war began. He also knew that Britain would not take sides.

Austria was not happy with her precarious possession, the German dominated Holstein. So she supported the claim of Duke of Augustenburg and asked him to raise this issue in the German Diet. This was a clear violation of the Convention of Gastein. The Prussian troops occupied Holstein and Prussia proposed for the elimination of Austria from the German Confederation. At this Austria supported by other

German States declared war on Prussia, Bismarck convinced Prussians at the war defensive.

3.2.9. *Austro-Prussian War (1866) and Results:*

Being the leader of the German Confederation, Austria got the support of most of the German states to meet the challenge of Prussia. However, the Prussian troops led by Moltke were able to overcome all the resistance. In the meanwhile, the Italians opened another front and created panic in Austria. The war was over within seven weeks with Prussia achieving splendid victory over her enemy in the battle of Sadowa. Although there was clamor to march and capture Vienna, Bismarck discouraged this move. He offered lenient terms to Austria by the treaty of Prague. Austria recognized the dissolution of the German Confederation. Austria was excluded from the German political system. Venetia was ceded by Austria to Italy. A nominal war-indemnity was imposed on Austria. Prussia annexed the two duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, Hanover, Hesse Cassel, Nassau and free city of Frankfurt-on-the-Maine. All the German states lying north of the river Maine were to join the North-German-Confederation formed and led by Prussia. However, the southern states wished to remain independent and Bismarck gave his tacit consent. It was this generous attitude which made these southern states sign a military convention with the Northern-German Confederation. Bismarck's spectacular success silenced all the liberals at home.

3.2.10. *Franco-Prussian Relations:*

Emperor Napoleon III was rudely shaken by Prussia's victory over Sadowa. It caused great disappointment to him because he could not take advantage or secure compensation for remaining neutral during the course of Austro-Prussian war. He put up his claim frequently for compensation and Bismarck turned it down. Prussia's rise alarmed the French, and a French Marshal by name of Randon said, "It is France who has been defeated at Sadowa". There was national hysteria that France should somehow take revenge. Bismarck was also making preparation for a likely war with France as that would fulfill his main objective-the annexation of southern German states into North-German Confederation. These German states lay in between France and North-German Confederation, and in the event of war between France and Prussia they would have to opt for joining France or Prussia.

3.2.11. *Bismarck's Diplomacy:*

As before, Bismarck secured the neutrality of Russia. This time he promised that in the event of a war with France the Czar could repudiate a few clauses of the treaty of Paris concerning the Black Sea. Austria remained friendly with Prussia because the latter had offered generous terms in the treaty of Prague. Britain's neutrality was taken for granted. Thus France remained isolated.

3.2.12. *Events leading to Franco-Prussian War:*

The throne of Spain fell vacant and the Spanish statesmen offered it to Prince Leopold, a relative of the Prussian king. Bismarck forced the prince to accept it which he had rejected it earlier. The news

of his acceptance provoked France and she demanded the Prince's rejection. Not satisfied with this, France ordered her ambassador to see the Prussian king to get official confirmation and further, to secure an assurance that his relative would not again offer himself as candidate. The king granted an interview to the French ambassador and whatever transpired was communicated to Bismarck through telegram. Bismarck cleverly abridged the Ems telegram in such a way as to give the impression that the French ambassador was insulted by the Prussian king. The French Emperor felt deeply humiliated and the war became inevitable. It was at this juncture that Bismarck exposed the French Emperor's greed for other's territories. So the Southern German states were left with no option other than joining the North German Confederation.

3.2.13. *French Defeat at Metz and Sedan:*

The French Emperor was equally eager to fight Prussia since his prestige was sagging at home and press and the opposition were vehement in crying for revenge. France declared war and mobilized her troops to the border. Prussia had been making preparations for war earlier and its forces crossed the French borders and defeated the French at two important places, Sedan and Metz. At both the places the French armies surrounded. The Emperor himself was taken prisoner at Sedan. The Prussian army proceeded towards Paris to force a new treaty upon the newly formed Republic government.

3.2.14. *The Treaty of Frankfurt (1871):*

Paris put up a stiff resistance to the invaders but it was of no avail. She finally surrendered. France signed the humiliating Treaty of Frankfurt by which she ceded Alsace and a part of Lorraine to Prussia. She was also agreed to pay 200 million pounds as war indemnity in installments, and till its final settlement, agreed for Prussian –army- occupation of her soil. To add insult to the injury, Bismarck crowned King William I of Prussia as the emperor of united Germany in the famous Hall of Mirrors at Versailles in 1871. The Southern States of Germany also joined the German Confederation. Thus, Bismarck achieved the unification of Germany through his matchless diplomatic skill and premeditated wars.

3.2.15. *Summary:*

According to Hazen, “The Treaty of Frankfurt remained the open sore of Europe after 1871. France could never forget or forgive the deep humiliation of it. The enormous fine could, with the lapse of time, have been overlooked, but never the seizure of the two provinces by mere force and against the unanimous and passionate protest of the people of Alsace and Lorraine. Moreover, the eastern frontier of France was thus seriously weakened.”

However, the Franco-Prussian war had other consequences also. It led to the final completion of the unification of Italy. That was due to the fact that ⁵when the war started between France and Prussia, French troops were withdrawn from Rome and the Italian troops

entered the same. Russia took advantage of the war and repudiated the Back Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris. The Empire of Napoleon was overthrown in France and a Republic was set up in that country.

3.2.16. Self Assessment Questions:

4

1. Describe the role played by Bismarck in the unification of Germany.
2. Explain the unification Germany.

3.2.17. Reference Books:

1. Clark, C.W., **Franz Joseph and Bismarck : The Diplomacy Of Austria before the War of 1866.**
2. Davies, **World History**
3. Dawson, W.H., **Evolution of Modern Germany**
4. Evans, J., **The Foundations of a Modern State in the 19th Century Europe**
5. Hobsbawn, E., **Nation and Nationalism**
6. Lucas, Colin, **The French Revolution and the Making of Modern Political Culture, Vol.12.**
7. Porter Andrew, **European Imperialism, 1860-1914**
8. Thomson, David, **Europe Since Napoleon**

Unit-3

Lesson -3.3

MILITARISM AND IMPERIALISM

Objective of Lesson:

How militarism and imperialism developed during the 19th and early 20th centuries is the main objective of the Lesson.

Structure of the lesson:

3.3.1. Introduction

3.3.2. Why Imperialism and Militarism?

3.3.3. Methods of Expansion

3.3.4. Tightening of Grips

3.3.5. Decay of Imperial System

3.3.6. Imperialism of Some Countries

3.3.7. Imperialism of Russia

3.3.8. Imperialism of U.S.A.

3.3.9. Japanese Imperialism

3.3.10. British Imperialism

3.3.11. French Imperialism

3.3.12. Summary

3.3.13. Self Assessment Questions

3.3.14. Reference Books

3.3.1. ¹Introduction:

Militarism and imperialism got very popular from 19th century. Especially due to industrial revolution as well as increasing population of European powers and Japan had forced them to adopt militarism and imperialism to set up colonies for the fulfillment of their products sale and peoples' needs for acquiring new territories.

Even before the nineteenth century, the Europeans had expanded in various parts of the world. Spain and Portugal were foremost in this matter. They had not only trade in various parts of the world but also had established their colonies. Portugal acquired a foothold in India in the beginning of the sixteenth century and established her control over Goa and other places. She also had her colony in Brazil in South America, Spain had a big colonial empire in Central and South America. The Dutch set up their colonies in the Far East. The French set up their colonies in North America and also acquired some territory in India. In the struggle for supremacy, the French were defeated ⁵by the British in India. The French colonies in North America ⁵were conquered by Britain in the Seven Year's War. Britain lost the American colonies ²during the last quarter of the ²eighteenth century. Spain also ²lost her colonies in Central and South America during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. In 1882, Portugal lost Brazil.

3.3.2. Why Imperialism and Militarism?

¹Imperialism in the past did not spread peacefully. For acquiring every territory ¹there was a vigorous war ¹which was usually fought on

one pretext or the other between the powers which wished to bring territories under their influence. Every expansion was thus accompanied by bloodshed, miseries waste of manual and material resources. A problem therefore, which needs attention is as to why was a desire and what was the need for imperialism.

The prime reason was to adopt imperialism to possess colonies and dumping of the finished goods of the origin country. ¹ With most of the countries of the west having industrialized themselves, there was increased production. Goods in large quantities were produced which under no circumstances could be consumed at home. The alternative being was international market for dumping these goods. Thus need for expansion and following policy of imperialism became unavoidable.

Another reason for imperialism was that of providing employment to both skilled and unskilled labour of the mother country. Because of industrialization machine had replaced man. There was surplus man-power in every industrialized country. Since home market was not in a position to absorb man-power, therefore, only other alternative was to find employment somewhere else. The only other place could be the colonies.

Then another reason which prompted imperialism was that most of these countries were militarily weak. To worsen the situation the countries were divided in the small independent units; each unit or state fighting with the other. There was no sense of unity and that did not come even in the face of great and grave threat which foreign

powers posted to their independence. Once western powers came to know of this weakness, process and speed of expansion became rapid.

Availability of raw material and desire for exploitation of natural resources was a very important reason for imperialism. Natural resources in some of these countries were vast. But many of these nations were aware of the existence of these resources in Asian and African countries. These wanted to exploit these resources to their own advantage.

Another cause for the spread of imperialism was political stability at home and military strength. Every government realized that expansion meant honour, respect and prestige at home. If expansion programme was going on smoothly the chances of removal of political party from power became remote. Thus imperialism got closely linked with political stability.

International prestige was another reason which tempted western powers to follow imperialist policy. These powers wanted to excel each other in controlling and occupying more and more territories because more a power had colonies, more was its prestige and respect in the world.

Then came desire for the spread of Christianity. Almost all the western powers believed that christens were the most civilized people of the world and thus it was their religious duty to spread the message of Christ all over the world, particularly among Asian and African people, whom they considered as uncivilized and semi-cultured.

According to them this could be possible, when countries of this part of the world, were under their domination and supremacy.

Lastly imperialism became popular with countries because of the feelings of nationalism. It was a time when political leaders on the one hand and political philosophers and literary figures on the other spread the message of nationalism in the country. Nationalism in the international field demanded more and more colonies, so that no other nation excelled theirs. Therefore, feelings of nationalism resulted in a hot race for acquiring more and more territories and colonies.

3.3.3. Methods of Expansion:

First common method was use of force or threat for the use of military force. These powers were equipped with latest war equipments, which colonies or the territories which they wanted to acquire badly lacked. In order to have permanent occupation imperialist powers erected their ports and kept some armies and war equipments to punish those who challenged their authority.

Once on the soil of country, the imperialist power followed the policy of creating fictions among the natives. Usually native princes and Amirs or zamindars quarreled with each other and thus wasted their energies over trifles including prestige points, reputation etc. these foreign powers, exploited the situation. They sided with one against the other.

Still another method of their expansion has been that of creating a situation by which a ruler was forced to surrender some his territory to the imperial power. This could be possible by entering into

agreement at some point of time with the ruler and subsequently charging him of the violation of some terms and conditions and making him feel helpless before the treat of ⁵ the use of force or with the actual use of force, so that he willingly agreed to surrender some territories provided he was allowed to remain as puppet or nominal head of the state.

Still another method of expansion was exploitation of social and religious conditions. Imperial powers in the name of religion, caste etc. made the people and rulers fight with each other and meantime increased their hold and control over the country.

Control over the sources of supplies and essential commodities is another method used by the imperialist powers to have control over the colony. Colonies usually are not self-sufficient even in meeting basic needs of the people. These have limited supply of even essential commodities. Imperialist powers, in a bid to expand, follow pressure tactics. Communication and transportation system, through which supplies follow are brought under control. No supplies are allowed to pass, till colony agrees to accept terms and conditions of the imperialist power.

Then in many cases imperialist powers entrench themselves by financing the treacherous people. They are purchased and secrets obtained from them. Once secrets about military strength etc. are available, it becomes easy for the imperialist powers to carry out its expansionist designs.

Creation of sense of dependency was another method used for expansion. Once a foot was placed on the soil of the colony, the ruler was assured that he now need not at all worry either about any aggression either from any foreign power or from a prince from within. He was also assured that every internal rebellion will be ruthlessly crushed with their military strength. Such a ruler then became dependent on the imperialist power. He used to neglect armies or welfare of the people. He wasted his time, money and resources on merry making and drinking. At the appropriate time imperialist power occupied the territories of such a negligent ruler and became master of the colony.

In this way all imperialist powers used all sort of fair and unfair means to expand. In the process these powers divided the areas of influences in each part of the world. These powers allowed each other to expand in areas of their influence and in fact cooperated with each other in this regard. Often these powers solely relied on their militarism or military strength.

3.3.4. Tightening of Grips:

Once imperialist power was in a position to occupy a colony, it made every effort to see that she was not uprooted or dislodged from there. But to the good luck of colonies these powers quarreled with each other both at home as well in colonies. In fact whole balance of power was so arranged that no imperial power became very powerful and threatened the supremacy of any other imperial power. But on the

whole imperial powers were much success in tightening the grip, for which these used various methods.

Use of military force was of course one method which was used for tightening the grip. Every colony was made clear that if any attempt was made to challenge supremacy strong armed forces equipped with latest war equipments were not far away to crush every challenge to their authority.

Still another method used was that of ruling the people with the help of strong and irresponsible bureaucracy. The imperialist power will bring such trusted persons in the steel framework administration, including the natives, who cared more for ¹⁵ the interests of the mother country than that of the people of the colony. Only such laws passed and enforced were with suited to mother country.

Then another method of control is that of increasing the sphere of influence. Under this method the imperialist power does not take over the administration of the colony. It neither employs its own people in the administration, nor holds itself responsible for acts of omission and commission. Similarly it does not undertake the burden of defending the colony from foreign dependence. This method is just the reverse of the first method. In this system the imperialist power increases her influence in the colony. This is done by way of giving economic assistance, both of consumer and capital goods, helping in the task of industrialization or by way of supplying war equipments and material and similar other ways, so that the colony remains under the influence of the mother country.

Then another method which is employed is that of giving concessions to colony. Usually each colony is much in need of everything. Its economy is very poor. Process of capital formation is slow. The people therefore, need economic, technical and all other types of assistance so that the country can quickly develop. Imperial powers then come forward with all sort of concessions to the colony. The idea is that in this way the colony will remain in constant touch with the imperialist power.

Then comes the system of protectorate. Under this system an imperialist power comes forward and openly declares that in a particular area she has some interests and will not like that these should be challenged by any other power or country. Such a power then declares the colony as its protectorate. It in effect implies that any invasion on this colony will be treated as an invasion on the mother country and therefore, shall be repulsed with all might and strength.

3.3.5. DECAY OF IMPERIAL SYSTEM

Imperial system, as it operated in was based on simple exploitation of the people of the colony. It cared least for their interests, economic or political. The only aim of the system was to protect ¹⁵ the interests of the mother country. The result of the bad policies was that the system began to decay. There were several wars of independence, rebellions and revolutions in the colonies against the mother country. Powers were gradually forced to pack up from the colonies, though much against their wishes and with many bitter tastes and memories

behind. This old system of imperialism was and has now been replaced by what is today known as new imperialism.

3.3.6. Imperialism of some countries

In the world there were and still are some imperialist Powers. Their sole aim all along has been to exploit the colonies. Imperialism of some countries provides an interesting study.

3.3.7. Imperialism of Russia:

During the 18th and 19th centuries Russian imperialism was at its height. It alarmed many European countries as well. She wanted to expand towards west as well as in Turkey but her designs could not see the light of the day. But Russians continued to expand towards east and south. By 1860, the province of north Amur River had been wrested from China and Vladivostok (Ruler of the East) founded a Russian sea port on the Sea of Japan. Russian armies also pressed into Mongolia and soon overran Turkistan upto the borders of Afghanistan and Persia. But European nations could withstand the Russian encroachments much more successfully than the disorganized people Asia. This policy of expansion continued throughout Czarist regime and ¹⁶by the time First World War broke out Russia was a powerful empire. But in the mother country herself there were several problems. The rulers failed to understand the problems of the masses. There was a gap between the rulers and the ruled. Whole defense system was disorganized and army

was dissatisfied with the rulers. The result was that mighty ² Russia suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of tiny Japan in 1904. Not only this, but in 1917 Russia was the first country where Communism found its roots and communist philosophy was found acceptable by the masses. Soon after their coming to power in 1917, Russian leaders declared that they were opposed to the policy of expansion and imperialism in no way was their aim of national foreign policy.

3.3.8. Imperialism of U.S.A. :

Since United States of America had its own best market and field of investment, therefore, it did not compete with the European powers for Asian and African territories and this fact also tended to disguise its strength. It no part in the scramble for Africa protectorate between 1871 to 1914 and sought no conquest on the mainland of Asia. But urge for acquiring territories was no way less. She owns a quick war with Spain in 1898 and acquired Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines in the far Pacific. This victory gave America first ranking in the world. She also began to decisively intervene in the affairs of the Latin American republics, especially when unpaid debts of these republics were likely to provide an opportunity to European powers for intervention. But Americans preferred the doctrine of isolation within the western hemisphere. After 1898 the USA also began to expand her navy rapidly and by 1914 American naval fleet was third most powerful in the world. It was operating in Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. But even then till 1914 American felt secure in their isolation and were slow to realize that it could not endure for long. At the opening of the 20th

century the USA was already involved in the economic problems of Europe and caught up both in European and world affairs.

3.3.9. Japanese Imperialism:

Before ³ the close of the 19th century the Japanese embarked up on a policy of expansion that brought them swift gains. They won Formosa and the Pescadores Islands in 1895, the Southern half of Sakhalin and a dominant position in Korea in 1905. During the World War I, they captured German concession at Kiaochow, gained German island in the Pacific north of the Equator, pushed into Chinese Province of Shantung and into the Eastern Siberia. They also wished to bring China under their control. In 1915 the Japanese war office presented "Twenty-one demands " to the Government of Peking but the plan was miscarried. Protests from London and Washington persuaded the Japanese to withdraw the demands. Prestige of Japan in international world went very high by the victory which she won over Russia in 1905. Japan continued to follow her imperialist and expansionist policies between two World Wars, till she was defeated in World War II.

3.3.10. British Imperialism:

During this period British imperialism very widely spread. There was no part in the world in which Britishers did not keep their feet. In India, East India Company with the active support of the Government was in a position to create an empire. It was in a position

to practically throw France and Portugal out of the country. Both these powers had to satisfy themselves with small pockets. But the empire remained with the Britishers.

In China, the Britishers fought First and Second Opium Wars before they could break and smash old Chinese policy of isolation and give a setback to China's sense of superiority. It was during these wars that the Britishers got Hong Kong from China as well as right to sell opium. China also agreed to open four more ports for European trade. She also agreed to receive Christian missionaries.

It was also during the period that Ceylon, Malaya, Australia and New Zealand became part of 'British Empire'. In Australia, 1830 Edward Gibbon founded a Colonization Society and also was a success in persuading his government not to send criminals to Australia. Between 1842-52 gold mines were discovered in Australia, which made the country rich and prosperous. Britain gradually began to increase its hold and in 1900 Australian colonies were grouped in the Commonwealth of Australia under federal type of government. Even now Australia is member of Commonwealth of Nations.

The Britishers legally became the masters of New Zealand and in 1839 was signed the treaty of Wattangi by which the natives accepted British sovereignty. In 1841 New Zealand became a crown colony. In 1907 the colony became full-fledged dominion. She is still a member of the Commonwealth of Nations.

In 1815 Britishers got Cape colony from Holland, in South Africa. The colony served both as coal and military station which

connected the British trade with the east. The inhabitants of the colony were called Boers. The Britishers annexed Natal in 1884 but recognized the independence of Transvaal (1855) and Oranges Free State (1854). Cape colony was granted responsible government in 1878. In 1906 Transvaal and Orange Free State were also granted representative governments. In 1909 these colonies were grouped as a Union of South Africa. Today South Africa is a free nation.

In Central Africa, David Livingstone did good work. He made Africa happy ground for European imperialism. He explored area around Congo River. He along with Stanley explored African continent which resulted in mad rush for traders, explorers and even religious missionaries. Commercial possibilities of the continent were explored thereafter. Whole of this Dark Continent was then divided by European nations as the area under their influence. France, Belgium, Portugal and Germany all advanced their claims in some parts of Africa. In Africa there were territorial disputes, because each European power wanted to take of mineral and mental resources of the continent on the one hand and trade and commerce on the other. In 1884 Berlin Conference was convened to settle disputes. The Conference decided that henceforth there will be no territorial occupation of unoccupied territories. The Conference agreed to the abolition of slave trade and in Congo the principle of international trade was accepted.

The imperialist powers in Africa were however, not at all sympathetic towards the natives. These people who were much far away from the modernity of life were ruthlessly exploited. They were

used as cheap labour. Mineral, material and manual resources of the Dark Continent were exploited beyond all expectations. No attempt was made to either urbanize or industrialize any part of the continent. There was no regard for human rights and local customs. No efforts were made to either make the people politically conscious or make them a participant in the running of their own administration.

3.3.11. *French Imperialism:*

French wanted to be a bigger imperial power than England. Under Napoleon Bonaparte French empire spread in many parts of Europe and reached up to Egypt. But somehow France could not carve out as big an empire as England. In the East she tried to compete with England but French Trading Company in India had to suffer heavy losses and defeats in India. Ultimately she had to be satisfied only with few pockets in India. During Second Opium War, France jointed hands with England against China and got some trade concessions from that country. But France could not reap the fruit of these concessions because soon other nations too claimed and got concessions from China. After 1870 France annexed Indo-China. In Africa she had her stronghold, particularly in the Congo area.

In addition, Belgium, Holland, Spain and Germany all tried to create empires for themselves and were considerable success as well. But unfortunately, the policy of ruthless economic exploitation on the one hand and manual power on the other continued till in the 20th century, idea and philosophy of new imperialism received currency.

3.3.12. Summary:

People of the colonies were exploited by their ruled countries for centuries together. No effort was made for their welfare and this was very much resented by the people of the ruling as the time passed. Feelings of nationalism and patriotic feelings began to develop. The peoples of colonies everywhere began to feel that they were being exploited and for their plight not the foreigners, but they themselves were responsible. They began to realize that the foreigners had enslaved them only on account of the mistakes of their ancestors. They therefore, put up determined efforts and struggle to throw the foreign imperialist powers out of the country.

The foreigners too realized that a stage had come when the whole policy will have changed. Not only this, but policy of ruthless exploitation and more use of military force will not serve the purpose. The rulers realized that they could live on the soil only after satisfying the colony to considerable extent.

3.3.13. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Discuss the significance of Imperialism in the 19th century
2. Write an essay on the growth of Militarism and Imperialism is a culminating pont in the beginning of the 20th century.

3.3.14. Reference Books:

1. Buss Claud, **History of Asia**
2. Cipolla, C.M., **Fontana Economic History of Europe,**

Vol.III

3. Davies, **World History**
4. Fisher, H.A.L., **A History of Europe**
5. Raj Hans, **History of Modern World**
6. Hunter, W.W., **The Indian Empire**
7. Lyall, A.C., **The Rise of the British Dominion in India**
8. Raj, Hans, **History of Modern World: An Overview**
9. Rao, B.V., **World History**
10. Wells, H.G., **An Outline History of the World**
11. Woodruff, P., **The Men who Ruled India, vol.2.**

Unit-3

Lesson-3.4

SINO-JAPANESE WAR

Objective of the lesson:

Causes and course of the Sino-Japanese War in 1894-95 and its results is the main objective of the Lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

- 3.4.1. Introduction**
- 3.4.2. Fear of Russia**
- 3.4.3. Economic Reasons**
- 3.4.4. Unrest in Korea**
- 3.4.5. Opposition in Japan**
- 3.4.6. Treaty of 1885**
- 3.4.7. Interests of the Europeans**
- 3.4.8. Chinese Entry in the Conflict**
- 3.4.9. Immediate Cause of the War**
- 3.4.10. Course of the War**
- 3.4.11. The treaty of Shimonoseki(1895)**
- 3.4.12. Causes of the Defeat of China**
- 3.4.13. Summary**

3.4.14. Self Assessment Questions

3.4.15. Reference Books

3.4.1. Introduction:

Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 was a major and remarkable event in the history of relations of both the countries. The war demonstrated the political ambitions of Japan and established beyond doubt that she wanted to have place for her increasing population and industrial production. The main causes of war were as under:-

3.4.2. Fear of Russia:

Japan had a design and eye on Korea. She had tried to establish that Korea was an independent country. She also wanted that no other country should have an eye on Korea because she was sure that it was easy to deal with weak China rather than with any powerful country. But Japan feared that Russia was trying to bring Korea under her sphere of influence. She was giving military aid to Korea and had demanded the port of Lazar off as compensation. Such a demand, if accepted was to provide Russia with ice free naval base ice which was threat to Japan.

China was not objecting to this demand because this could check Japanese activities in Korea. But Japan considered it a serious threat to her security on the one hand and her intentions in Korea on the other. She felt that if Russia once advanced and could establish herself in Korea, the country will permanently slip out of Japan.

3.4.3. Economic Reasons:

Economic reasons very heavily weighted with Japan while trying to bring Korea under her sphere of influence. Firstly Korea was surplus in rice but had banned export of this commodity. On the other hand Japan needed food for her increasing population. The only way out, in the eyes of leadership in Japan was, that Korea should be brought under their sphere of influence. Secondly Japan was already dealing with 40 per cent of Korea's import through her ships. This had a favourable impact on her economy. Japan thought that if she was to maintain this control it was essential that she should have political influence in Korea. For this also she wanted to have a war in Korea.

3.4.4. Unrest in Korea:

Then another reason was unrest in Korea which was continuing in that country for quite some time. Korea had failed to keep her house in order. Japan felt that if this condition of uncertainty and disorder was to continue in Korea that was bound to adversely affect the morale of her people and create a situation of uncertainty and disorder in Japan. She therefore, wanted to interfere in Korea in a bid to bring order in that country.

3.4.5. Opposition in Japan:

The things were not smooth in Japan as well. Opposition to Prime Minister Count Ito was increasing day by day. He wanted to divert the attention of his people to some other direction. In his opinion, if the

attention of the people was focused in Korea that was excellent. Not only this, but he even wanted that the energies of the people in Korea should be wasted even at the cost of the war.

3.4.6. Treaty of 1885:

By the Treaty of 1885 both China and Japan had recognized the sovereignty of Korea. Both the countries had agreed to withdraw their armies and not to send them without giving prior written notice to each other. But this had created dissatisfaction in both the countries. Both were feeling that they had surrendered their rights in Korea. Both the countries wanted to abrogate the treaty and it was not possible without the use of force in Korea.

3.4.7. Interests of the Europeans:

As the time was passing, more and more European nations were taking interest in Korea. Britain wanted to ensure that Russia does not get port of Lazar off, Similarly Russia tried to get the cooperation and support of the U.S.A. The things were moving so fast that Japan wanted to have his control and influence over Korea as quickly as possibly she could.

3.4.8. Chinese Entry in the Conflict:

It was now quite clear that Japan was very much interested in occupying Korea. China had already lost her dependencies one after the order and was not prepared to give up her legitimate claims over Korea. She had fully well realized that policy of passiveness had not paid to her and her policy of giving maximum freedom to Korea had resulted in

encouraging Japan and many other European countries. She was therefore, quite prepared to accept all responsibilities of war. Then another reason was that China well realized that in case she followed a weak policy at this stage, her prestige will considerably go low, for which she was not prepared. In China another problem was that of the prestige of ablest statesman of the day Li-Hung-Chang. There was a growing feeling in China that Li was giving maximum concessions to Japan at the cost of national prestige. In case a little concession was given to Japan in Korea, that was bound to end or lower prestige of Li Party in the royal court for which Li-Hung-Chang was not at all prepared. In the circumstances both China and Japan were prepared for a show down over Korea and only wanted an opportunity.

3.4.9. Immediate Cause of War:

Immediate cause of war was provided by Tonghak Rebellion in Korea. The Tonghaks were religious people and their teachings combined good principles of Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism. Subsequently they indulged in politics as well and suggested that corrupt officials should be slaughtered and official life should be purified. They did not like increasing influence of foreigners in Korea. The government of Korea did not like these people and banned their entry. They made futile efforts to lift the ban and this resulted in rebellions at many places. Some risings were so serious that it became impossible for the government of China to control them. Korea made a request to China to provide armed assistance to suppress the rebellion.

The Chinese armies were sent to Korea and as per terms of the Treaty, Japan was also informed of this. On hearing this Japan immediately sent her armies to Korea. Before Japanese armies reached the Koreans were in a position to restore peace. The Koreans, therefore, requested both the countries to take back their armies. Both the countries however, could not reach an agreement for the withdrawal. Japan insisted that Korea should introduce some reforms before armies could be withdrawn. China was not prepared to accept this. Japan declared war on August 1, 1894.

3.4.10. Course of the War:

Japan had well- organized armies which were well- equipped with western techniques and war methods. As compared with Chinese armies, Japanese armies were less in number but were fighting for a national cause. Chinese armies soon found themselves in disadvantageous position. The advancing Japanese armies first of all occupied sea shore and thereafter defeated Chinese ship fleet at Yulu. Then the armies advanced towards Korea and thereafter took Manchuria, defeating the forces which opposed them. The Japanese forces were now in a position to invade China proper without any difficulty. Forced by the circumstances Li-Hung –Chang was sent to Japan to conclude a peace treaty with that country. The war came to an end with the Treaty of Shimonoseki.

3.4.11. The Treaty of Shimonoseki (1895):

Sino-Japanese war came to a close with the Treaty of Shimonoseki which was concluded on April 17, 1895. The terms of the Treaty were as under:-

1. China agreed that Korea was a free sovereign state.
2. China agreed to give to Japan Port Arthur, Formosa and the territories of Pescadores and Liaotung Peninsula in Southern Manchuria. Subsequently however, Russia and Germany protested against Japan's getting Liaotung peninsula and the provisions in this regard were nullified.
3. China agreed to pay a heavy war indemnity of 200 million taels to Japan. In case this amount was not paid Japan had a right to occupy Weihaiwei port.
4. China agreed to extend 'most favoured nation' treatment to Japan in all such matters, which were applicable to European nations.
5. China also extended extra-territorial rights to Japan in her territory.
6. The ports of Shasi, Chungking, Soochow and Hungchow were declared treaty ports for Japan.
8. Japan got right to carry on trade and commerce in all trade ports in China.
7. It was agreed that Japan could ship machines freely to China after paying customs duty.
9. Japan was given a right to manufacture some commodities in China and such commodities were exempted from all taxes.

3.4.12. Causes of the Defeat of China:

China was a powerful nation as compared with Japan. Both in size, population and numerical strength of China, Japan has no comparison with China but whole world was surprised when China surrendered to Japan. Some of the causes for the defeat of China were as under.

1. Japanese armies had better leadership, war techniques and equipments with China. She tried to get her armies trained on western lines, which advantage China did not enjoy due to her apathy towards western nations.
2. The Japanese always considered that the Sino-Japanese war was a national war and in its defeat or victory national prestige was involved. But in so far as China was concerned, the situation was altogether different. Chinese considered that war was Li-Party affair and they did not pay much attention to war. Accordingly they considered that defeat or victory was not that of the nation but of only one party in the royal court. This proved disastrous.

3.4.13. Summary :

The war was of course, brought to end but it became clear that Japan was ambitious to occupy as much territory of China, as possibly she could. It also became clear that Japan was not a dwarf to be ignored but a power to be reckoned with. The Japanese proved more than a match to the Chinese in modern methods of warfare and the use of

weaponry. China was easily defeated she had to give up her claims to Korea and pay a vast sum of money as war indemnity. China also gave a few islands on her sea coast, the most noteworthy being Formosa. The war increased national and international prestige of Japan and the nation found her place in the family of powerful nations.

3.4.14. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Discuss the causes of Sino-Japanese War and why was China was defeated?
2. "the Chinese war of 184-95 was (not) a war of mere adventure or spoliation it was a revolt movement desired and pushed forward by the whole nation, both as a political demonstration of power and as an economic necessity". (E.H. Norman) Examine and Discuss.
3. Write an essay on Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95.
4. Explain the impact of Sino-Japanese war of 1894-95 on China

3.4.15. Reference Books:

1. Allen George, **A Short Economic History of Japan**
2. Beckmann, George M., **Modernization of China and Japan**
3. Fairbank, John, et al., **East Asia: Modern Transformation**
4. Myers, Ramon Hand, **The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945**
5. Pepper, Nathaniel, **The Far East : A Modern History**

Unit-4

LESSON-4.1.

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Objective of the Lesson:

Importance of modern inventions and Industrial Revolution is the main objective of the lesson

Structure of the Lesson:

- 4.1.1. Introduction**
- 4.1.2. Origin of Industrial Revolution**
- 4.3.3. Features of Industrial Revolution**
- 4.1.4. Iron and Steel Industry**
- 4.1.5. Coal and Mining Industry**
- 4.1.6. The Invention of Steam Engine by Newcomen and James Watt**
- 4.1.7. Factory System in Britain**
- 4.1.8. Revolution in Transport**
- 4.1.9. Mc Adam Improved the Road Construction**
- 4.1.10. Revolution in Communication System**
- 4.1.11. Significance of Industrial Revolution**
- 4.1.12. Spread of Industrial Revolution**
- 4.1.13. Japan and the Industrial Revolution**
- 4.1.14. Effects of Industrial Revolution**
- 4.1.15. Summary**
- 4.1.16. Self Assessment Questions**

4.1.17. Reference Books

4.1.1. Introduction:

The mass production of consumer goods with the help of newly invented machines ushered in a new era in the history of mankind. It was during the 18th century that Britain and Europe witnessed this kind of transformation. This transformation in the method of production—from man-made to machine-made is called the Industrial Revolution. The industrial revolution had many phases in the last two hundred years.

4.1.2. Origin of Industrial Revolution:

The Industrial Revolution had many phases in the last two hundred years. It originated in Britain due to many factors. It may be remembered that Britain was principally an agricultural country before the advent of industrial revolution. However, she also made rapid strides of progress in trade and commerce. Napoleon had once declared contemptuously that Britain was “a nation of shopkeepers.” Many factors were responsible for the advent of Industrial Revolution. Among them the most important are the availability of raw materials, scarcity of labour, a fully developed banking system, and the birth of a new entrepreneurial class. Fortunately, Britain had a large number of semi-skilled workers who were always available to take up extra work. Again Britain had large amount of coal and iron and they were available at a cheap cost. The Royal society of London encouraged scientific discoveries and thereby created a favourable climate for the onset of industrial revolution. New inventions and new methods of production went hand. Over a span of a hundred years Britain's countryside witnessed the rise of factories.

4.1.3. Features of Industrial Revolution:

The Industrial Revolution proved to be silent revolution. It was marked by a gradual change. First of all, it was confined to the textile industry. John Kay invented the ‘Flying Shuttle’ in 1733. Operated by hand, it increased the speed of the weaving of cloth. This invention was followed by another called ‘The Spinning Jenny’ by James Hargreaves in 1767. Hargreaves's Jenny spun eight threads at one and the same time. He kept his invention a secret for some time thinking that this would create retrenchment of workers. In 1769, Richard Arkwright invented a spinning frame called a ‘water frame’ because it used water power in the place of manpower. As water frame was too big to run at the home of the worker, factories were built. In the meanwhile, Samuel Crompton invented his ‘Spinning Mule’ in 1779 combining the good qualities of the ‘spinning Jenny’ and the ‘Water frame’.

The 'Spinning Mule' spun hundreds of threads at a time and produced either fine or coarse thread. Since the method of weaving was not improving in tune with the manufacture of threads, the inventors began to pay attention to this problem. In 1785, Reverend Edmund Cartwright invented the 'Power loom' which wove cloth quickly. This machine was driven by a big water-wheel. The next invention was that of Eli Whitney's 'Cotton gin', a machine which was used to separate the seeds from the cotton. So during the span of a half-a-century the textile manufacturing industry in Britain changed from hand-made to machine-made. During the next half a century colorful cloth was produced when the new methods of bleaching, dyeing and printing were discovered. In 1846 the 'sewing machine' was invented to stitch clothes by an American named Elias Howe.

4.1.4. Iron and Steel Industry:

The other industry which was affected by the Industrial Revolution was the iron and steel industry. For making machines iron was used. Since a long time people were in the habit of smelting the iron ore in brick furnaces by using the charcoal as fuel. The iron produced by this process was brittle. So it had to be reheated and impurities removed. Finally coke was used to produce iron. The blacksmiths hammered it into different shapes according to their convenience. But the whole process was very laborious and costly. Henry Bessemer discovered a faster and cheaper method of producing steel in 1856. Subsequently, iron and steel were used in making all the machines. Textile and metal industries were started in many towns in Britain like Sheffield, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and London. The factory system came to stay in Britain.

4.1.5. Coal and Mining Industry:

It may be remembered that wood was used in place of coal as fuel. When coal or coke was used for producing stronger iron, coal mining became necessary. Coal was available at a far cheaper rate and people began to make use of it instead of wood. Fortunately, Britain had large coal reserves, and so coal-mining became one of the largest industries.

4.1.6. The Invention of Steam Engine by Newcomen and James

Watt:

The British mine owners were faced with the problem of water seeping into the mines. They employed labourers at great cost to pump this water out. A British engineer named, Thomas Newcomen made the first steam engine and used it to pump the water out

of the mine. But this consumed too much fuel. After a few years, a young Scottish inventor by the name James Watt redesigned the steam engine so as to make it produce more power and consume less fuel. His new invention was patented in 1769 as it proved to be a great success not in mining industry but also in others. So water power was replaced by steam power in many industries such as the textile and steel.

4.1.7. Factory System in Britain:

The invention of numerous machines including that of the steam engine and their utilization by wealthy capitalists revolutionized the organization of industries. Only rich men could buy machines and house them in a large building which became a mill or a factory. Many workers were required to run the machines for which they were paid meager wages. People who were without jobs in the villages began to drift towards these factories located in small towns. The workers started living in huts near the factory where they were employed. So the factory system replaced the old medieval guilds. In the course of time these small towns where the factories were located became big cities with population bursting at their seams.

4.1.8. Revolution in Transport:

While the factory system produced goods for mass consumption at a rapid rate, it was also found necessary to transport these goods by a faster means to the far of distribution centers of the country. An American by the name of Robert Fulton invented a steam boat called 'Clermont' in 1807. The Clermont covered the distance of 150 miles from New York to Albany on the Hudson River in 32 hours. A few years later a number of steam boats appeared carrying cargoes on the rivers and the coast line. In 1838, a transoceanic steam boat *Sirius* crossed the Atlantic in 18 days.

An English engineer, George Stephenson designed the first railway line and invented a locomotive called 'Rocket'. It completed its 40 miles journey from Manchester to Liverpool in an hour and half in 1830. Between 1830 and 1870 Britain had a network of Railway lines measuring 15000 miles.

4.1.9. McAdam Improved the Road Construction:

France led other countries in the construction of roads and canals. In the U.S.A. canals were dug to link important rivers and lakes. River transport there assumed great importance. In Britain, an engineer by the name Mc Adam showed how smooth and hard-

surfaced roads can be built on which vehicles can move without jolts. When these macadamized roads—roads built as per his method—were completed the stage-coaches carrying large numbers of passengers moved fast. They covered fourteen miles an hour.

4.1.10. Revolution in Communication System:

Along with quicker means of transport, the means of communication also improved conspicuously. Samuel Morse, an American, invented telegraph to send messages in 1844. Messages were sent by means of telegraph wires. In 1876, Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone. The new instrument carried human voice on wire from one end to the other. In 1866, Cyrus W. Field laid the Trans-Atlantic undersea cable connecting the U.S.A. with European continent. Marconi invented the wireless in 1899, which made it possible to send signals to any part of the world. Based on his theory, radio broadcasting and television were introduced.

4.1.11. Significance of Industrial Revolution:

Let us examine the significance of Industrial Revolution. It may be remembered that man since prehistoric age has been trying to make his life comfortable by devising better tools and implements. He made use of animals for his work. He tried to improve his life through means of knowledge. He understood the working of the forces of nature. However, it is only in the last two centuries that he has been able to invent complex machines and find out new sources of power. Power-driven machines began to produce large amount of goods to satisfy the needs of the community. Mass production increased not only the wealth of the country like in Britain where Industrial Revolution began but also improved the standard of living of the people. Through improved means of transport and communication, man has been able to build a new society and civilization. Thus, progress of science and technology made it possible for man to build a civilized world.

4.1.12. Spread of Industrial Revolution:

The Industrial Revolution began to spread from the place of its origin – Britain to the European continent. France too was affected by it but the Napoleonic wars put a stop to this temporarily. After the defeat of Napoleon, the Industrial Revolution continued. The defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo gave a new impetus to Britain to rise as a great industrial and commercial giant. By the middle of the 19th century, Germany also made rapid strides of industrial progress. On the eve of the First World War, Germany rose to great heights of power after having made tremendous industrial progress. The other countries of Europe also

felt the impact, and in due course of time, they too achieved industrial progress. The U.S.A. achieved industrial progress by leaps and bounds soon after the Civil War. At the end of the 19th century she emerged as a great power. India, as the colony of the British, also began to make industrial progress especially from the time of Lord Dalhousie. He introduced Railways and Telegraphs. British capital was encouraged and the British industrialists invested money here. The textile industry made remarkable progress. Jamshedji Tata opened a steel factory to make India self-sufficient in steel. The other industries were started in the private sector.

4.1.13. Japan and the Industrial Revolution:

One of the Asiatic countries which made marvelous industrial progress during the last decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century was Japan. After Commodore Perry's visit she realized that it would be of no avail resisting the advent of western civilization. Japan realized that the key to the West's superiority lay in its scientific and technological progress. So, she began to increasingly copy western methods and models and in the end became a highly advanced country. No doubt that she is now competing with such highly industrialized countries as the U.S.A. and West Germany.

4.1.14. Effects of Industrial Revolution:

In the West the Industrial Revolution produced good and bad effects. Firstly, it transformed the life of the people in the towns and cities. Factories produced consumer goods on a large scale. They were made available at cheap prices. Factories provided employment to many. The general standard of living of the people improved. In the long run, however, these good effects faded and the ugly aspects became manifest.

The capitalists and entrepreneurs invested their capital built factories, and purchased raw materials. They employed cheap labour. They purchased machines which produced goods on a large scale. They earned huge profits and enjoyed a better standard of living. While the capitalists or in other words the middle class enjoyed life, the conditions of the labour class turned from bad to worse. Men, women and children who were employed in factories got meager wages. They had to work for longer hours and could not complain for fear of being dismissed. They lived in squalor. A great novelist of that time was Charles Dickens who described the pitiable conditions of the poor in Britain. In villages, cottage industries suffered a serious setback on account of the competition with machine-made goods. Many of them became unemployed and they went to the overcrowded cities in search of employment.

Man's social life was affected in many ways. In a family the husband and his wife both had to work to make both their ends meet. Sometimes even their children were employed. All of them received low wages. Women no longer depended upon men folk for money. Many a time the absence of parents at home had its impact on the children. They became delinquents. As machines were not properly fenced, there was danger to the life a labourer. Unhygienic surroundings left them in poor health. Slum areas in cities where the labour class resided became an eyesore. Then there was the alarming increase in growth of population. While the rich became richer the poor became poorer.

The exploitation of the labour class by the rich middle class (sometimes known as the bourgeoisie) continued unabated the middle class easily influenced the government in order to safeguard their vested interests. The capitalist middle class enjoyed the levers of power because they elected the members of the Parliament, bribed the government officials and did a lot of lobbying for favourable legislation. Unfortunately, the labour class did not have access to power despite their numerical superiority.

Workers' life was not only affected by the working conditions imposed on them by the capitalist class but also by the policies of the government. Therefore, the workers demanded certain political rights such as the right to franchise. They also demanded that their trade unions be recognized so that they could fight for their rights, the most important being collective bargaining. The conflict between the capitalists and the workers led to strikes and lockouts. It was in these circumstances that socialism took its birth. Socialism advocated the bridging of the gulf between the rich and the poor by improving the conditions of the workers. However, it was not until Karl Marx, the German philosopher, coined the word, socialism that attained great popularity with the working class. Karl Marx introduced the doctrines of "Scientific socialism". With Frederick Engels he wrote the Communist Manifesto wherein he gave a clarion call to the workers of the world to unite for they had "nothing to lose but their chains." Subsequently Karl Marx wrote Das Capital in which he talked about the class war, exploitation of workers by the capitalist class, labour theory of value and advocated the establishment of the socialist state. He appealed to the workers to remain united everywhere, take over the charge of the government by force, confiscate the property of the rich and establish the socialist state which would be run by the proletariat (workers). It was on these lines that Lenin organized the October revolution in Russia (1917) and established a Communist or socialist State. She became the first socialist or communist state in the world.

4.1.15. Summary:

About the nature of industrial Revolution, some modern historians believe that it was not at all a sudden upsurge as it did not come all of a sudden. It took almost half a decade before machine age came in many countries of the world. On the other hand many other historians feel that it was really a Revolution because it fundamentally and basically changed the economy and with that social and political life of the people. For them it was revolution in the real sense of term.

4.1.16. Self Assessment Questions:

1. What factories were responsible for the outbreak of Industrial Revolution in England?

Trace the development in the cotton textile industry.

2. Describe the effects of the Industrial Revolution in Europe.

3. Describe significance of Industrial Revolution in iron and steel and coal-mining industry.

4.1.17. Reference Books:

1. Ashley, W.J., *The Economic Organization of England*
2. Ashton, T.S., *The Industrial Revolution (1760-1830)*
3. Buer, M.C., *Health, Wealth and Population in the Early Days of the Industrial Revolution*
4. Cipolla, C.M., *Fontana Economic History of Europe*, Vo.III
5. Clapham, Sir John H., *An Economic History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I
6. Fay, C.R., *Great Britain from Adam Smith to the Present Day*
7. Henderson, W.O., *The Industrial Revolution on the Continent*
8. Lipson, E., *The Economic History of England*, Vol. II.
9. Knowles, L.C.A., *The Industrial and Commercial Revolution In Great Britain*
10. Mantoux. P., *The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century*

Unit-4

Lesson- 4.2.

BIG BUSSINESS IN USA

Objective of the lesson:

Description about the industrial expansion and growth of big business is the prime objective of the lesson.

Structure of the lesson:

- 4.2.1. Introduction**
- 4.2.2. Coal and Steel**
- 4.2.3. Oil Industry**
- 4.2.4. Electricity**
- 4.2.5. Other Industries**
- 4.2.6. Anti-trust Legislation**
- 4.2.7. The Rise of Investment Banking**
- 4.2.8. House of Morgan**
- 4.2.9. The Evolution of Corporation**
- 4.2.10. Summary**
- 4.2.11. Self Assessment Questions**
- 4.2.12. Reference Books**

4.2.1. Introduction:

By the close of the 1890's the United States had become the world's leading industrial nation. The expansion of industry was such a varied and complex process that no brief description can do it justice. Yet the industrial output for 1900 was small indeed in compared with that of the 20th century. The value of manufactured in goods produced in 1900 was about 13

billion dollars. By 1929 this figure had increased more than five times as over as 68 billion dollars. Certain forms of mining and manufacturing, however, were of peculiar importance. The two most essential needs of the new economy were coal and steel. In fact, the most reliable way to measure industrial progress in general to watch the increase in the production of these two basic commodities by the domination of a few corporations. By 1900 a startling change had taken place. The very years that witnessed the filling in of the West and the passing of the frontier also saw a revolution in the business and economic life of America. From a country which was not well developed industrially, the US had grown into a land of big business-business which no longer local but nation-wide in scope. Improved forms of communication and railroads which spanned the continent bound together. In the quantity and value of its products it had become the leading manufacturing country of the world. Its population was shifting rapidly to the cities, centers alike of wealth and grinding poverty. Unprecedented quantities of capital had been pooled into single enterprises. Similar way big business also developed by the end of 19th century.

4.2.2. Coal and steel:

The principal coal-mining region was a section of northeastern Pennsylvania where there were beds of the hard coal known as anthracite. Anthracite was not discovered in any other part of the United States, but there were plentiful supplies of soft bituminous coal down the Appalachian plateau and in a number of Middle and Far Western states. The anthracite fields soon passed under the control of half a dozen railroad corporations, but the soft-coal fields continued to be owned by thousands of small operators. During the last forty years of the nineteenth century the annual production of anthracite increased from 10,000,000 to 60,000,000 tons, and that of bituminous coal from 6,000,000 to nearly 200,000,000 tons.

In 1860 the production of pig iron amounted to 800,000 tons, while that of steel was negligible. By 1900 the United States was producing nearly 14,000,000 tons of pig iron, of which 11,000,000 were made into steel. This was larger than the combined production of two other leading industrial nations in the world, the Great Britain and Germany.

Pennsylvania, which had both coal and iron fields and transportation facilities, had become the chief center of iron production before the Civil War. Later in the century vast iron fields were developed around Lake Superior, especially the Mesabi Range in Minnesota. But since there was no coal in the region, the ore was transported by water through the Soo Canal

and across in the Great Lakes to the Pennsylvania blast furnaces. Pittsburg and other Pennsylvania cities thus retained their predominance in heavy industry, although centers of steel-production developed also in Ohio and other Midwestern states and, on a smaller scale, in parts of the South and the Far West.

The dominant figure in the growth of the American steel industry was Andrew Carnegie. Brought to America from Scotland at the age of thirteen, he worked first in a cotton mill and then for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and became an iron-manufacturer at Pittsburg in 1864. By 1900 the Carnegie Steel Company was making a quarter of all steel in US, and was the owner of coal fields, coke ovens, limestone deposits, iron mines, ore ships, and railroads. Carnegie's success was due primarily to his efficient business methods and driving energy and to his capacity for forming partnerships with men of almost equal ability, such as Henry C. Frick and Charles Schwab. Like most other corporation executives of this period, he enforced a harsh labor policy of long hours and low wages, and was uncompromisingly hostile to trade unions. On the other hand, he did not engage in stock-watering or other financial malpractices, and he felt obligated to use part of his wealth for useful objectives. After he retired in 1901, he contributed large sums to founding public libraries, improving education, and promoting world peace.

4.2.3. Oil Industry:

After coal and iron, the most important product was oil, although this did not become indispensable until internal combustion engines came into general use in the 20th century. The organizer of the oil business was John D. Rockefeller, who was comparable to Carnegie both as an industrial builder and in the scale of his philanthropies. Establishing the initial trust, he provided the first outstanding example of the tendency towards monopoly.

The first commercial oil well was drilled in western Pennsylvania in 1859 by E.L. Drake, the chief use of oil at this time being for lighting. Mineral oil quickly began to take the place of tallow and whale oil, and a large number of small operators went into the business. The violently competitive conditions caused a great deal of waste, prevented any stability of prices, profits, and wages, and made long-range planning impossible. Rockefeller, then a young merchant at Cleveland, Ohio, became interested in oil in 1862. He left the drilling to other people and set out to win control of refining, through which he could hope to dictate terms to the whole industry and thereby to stabilize production and ensure regular and substantial profits for himself and his

associates. Thus his method of making a fortune was to impose order and economy upon a chaotic, wasteful, and uncertain business.

Rockefeller adopted the most efficient methods of production made a regular habit of saving part of his profits, and, by forming alliances with the ablest men in the industry, was able to establish a kind of monopoly of brains. Operators who were willing to accept his terms were assured of large profits, but those who insisted on remaining independent were crushed by means of ruthless price-cutting. His most remarkable performance was to compel the railroads not merely to give him rebates on the oil which he shipped but also to pay him drawbacks on shipments of oil by rival companies. The refiners who were driven into bankruptcy and the oil drillers who were forced to accept whatever prices Rockefeller chose to offer them portrayed him as a monster of cold-blooded avarice, although his competitive methods were actually not more unethical than those of many other businessmen of the time.

In 1870 Rockefeller and his associates formed the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, which soon acquired a monopoly of refining in the Cleveland area. He then formed alliances with refiners in other parts of the country, and by the end of the decade his group controlled 90 per cent of the oil business in the United States. One of their problems was to find some legal device for tying together the forty different corporations which they represented. A pooling agreement was too easily violated. The problem was temporarily solved in 1882 when the stock of the different corporations was turned over to a group of nine trustees. In this manner Rockefeller created the original "trust," a word which was afterwards loosely applied to any large combination with monopolistic powers. Ten years later the State of Ohio, under whose laws the trust had been organized, ordered its dissolution. In 1889, however, New Jersey had altered its corporation laws in such a way as to legalize the formation of a holding company- a company, in other words, which owned a majority of the stock in a number of subsidiary corporations and was set up for the sole purpose of maintaining unified control. In 1899 the various properties of the Rockefeller group were legally combined through the creation of a giant holding company, the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

Meanwhile, the expanding market for oil in its various forms was rapidly increasing the wealth of the group. They began to acquire ownership of railroads, iron and copper mines, public utilities, and numerous other industries, representing an enormous concentration of economic power.

4.2.4. Electricity:

The growing use of electricity for light, power, and communication was another notable feature of the period. This had been made possible by the researches of a number of pure scientists, especially Michael Faraday in England and Joseph Henry in the United States. That electricity could be used to provide light had been demonstrated early in the century, but for a long time the materials used for filaments in bulbs were not sufficiently cheap or durable to make general use possible. The problem was then taken up by Thomas Alva Edison, a self-educated man who had little basic scientific knowledge but had a genius for invention. Edison devised a satisfactory filament in 1879, and in 1882 the Edison Electric Company opened a power plant in New York City to supply current for electric lights. In the same year Frank J. Sprague worked out a practical method for using electrical power to provide transportation, and in 1887 he directed the building of the first electrical streetcar service at Richmond, Virginia. The use of electricity for communication, which had already produced the telegraph, was further exemplified in 1876 with the invention of the telephone by Alexander Graham Bell, a Scotch immigrant scientist who had specialized in the study of deafness. Bell's original telephone was afterwards improved by numerous other inventors, the most notable of whom was a Yugoslav immigrant, Michael Pupin. By 1900, 1,355,000 telephones were in use in the United States.

In this public utilities competition meant a wasteful and inconvenient duplication of equipment, and there was therefore strong economic justification for the monopolistic tendencies which quickly developed. The manufacture of much of the essential equipment was controlled partly by Edison Electric, which was expanded into General Electric in 1892, and partly by Westinghouse Electric, which developed the patents taken out by another gifted Yugoslav inventor, Nikola Tesla. The telegraph after 1886 was divided between two companies, Western Union and Postal Telegraph, while most of the nation's telephones were the property of a network of Bell companies which were tied together by a single vast holding company, American Telephone and Telegraph. This eventually became the largest corporation in the US.

4.2.5. Other Industries:

Technological advance was producing equally revolutionary effects in many other human activities. One group of inventors, for example, devised a series of mechanical implements which transformed farming methods. Others speeded up business procedure with

appliances like typewriter (1867), the adding machine (1888), and the cash register (1897). The making of cloths was mechanized by the sewing machine, which had been invented in 1846 but was not generally adopted for factory use until Civil War period. Food habits were changed by development of artificial refrigeration and canning. After the Civil War between the states, the number of patents issued to inventions showed a marked increase. Inventions mushroomed even faster during the 20th century. From 1900 to 1930 the Patent Office issued 1,119,000 patents-nearly three times as many as in the 30-year period from 1860 (36,000) to 1890 (440,000).

Some industries continued to be highly competitive. The manufacturing of textiles and clothing, for example, was performed by numerous small or medium corporations. But the tendency towards concentration was by no means restricted to the processing of mineral products and to railroads and public utilities. Entrepreneurs almost as forceful and ambitious as Rockefeller were putting an end to competition in many different fields. Many of the new mechanical appliances were made exclusively by single corporations. The McCormick Harvester Company of Chicago, for example, acquired almost a monopoly of mechanical farm equipment. Even in some of the industries producing goods directly for consumers, where consolidation often had less economic justification, there was the same tendency. James B. Duke's American Tobacco Company, founded in 1890, and Henry O. Havemeyer's American Sugar Refining Company, founded in 1891, were examples of almost complete monopoly, while meat-packing was dominated by a small group of Chicago businessmen headed by Philip D. Armour, Gustavus Swift, and Nelson Morris. Among other consumer goods notoriously controlled by trusts were salt, whisky, matches, crackers, wire, and nails. Thus the American people could enjoy the benefits of technology only by paying tribute to the overlords of the new industrial economy.

4.2.6. Anti-trust Legislation:

Throughout the 1880's public opinion was becoming increasingly alarmed by the growth of monopoly, its most bitter opponents being the small businessmen who could not compete with the big corporations. In popular parlance any large combination was known as a trust, although actually businessmen secured control of the market in a variety of ways. In addition to forming trusts, they combined different corporations through holding companies or by means of complete mergers. Sometimes one corporation secured so large a share of the market that it

could dictate terms to its rivals, and in some of the new industries competition was impossible because one corporation had an exclusive ownership of essential patent rights. As the American people watched the proliferation of millionaires, they became convinced that something must be done to maintain effective competition and thereby bring about lower prices.

During the 1880's a number of state governments passed laws prohibiting trusts and other forms of combination; but such legislation was ineffective as long as other states refused to fall into line. Some of them, however, notably New Jersey, Delaware, and West Virginia, placed very few restrictions upon the issuance of corporation charters. A group of businessmen organizing a combination had only to establish legal head-quarters in New Jersey and secure a New Jersey charter, after which their corporation could own property and do business in all the other states. It became obvious, therefore, that only the Federal government could prevent the growth of trusts.

As with the Interstate Commerce Act, few Congressmen regarded legislation as either desirable or practicable, but public opinion demanded some kind of action. In 1890 Congress passed the Sherman Anti-trust Act by an almost unanimous vote. This brief and loosely worded measure was a remarkably crude attempt to cope with a very delicate and complex problem. Giving statutory definition to a traditional common-law doctrine, the act declared that "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states, or with foreign nations" was illegal. "Every person who shall attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolize, any part of trade or commerce among the several states or with foreign nations" was declared guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 and/or imprisonment of not more than one year.

If any hopeful citizens expected that John D. Rockefeller would now be sent to jail, they were quickly disillusioned. Prior to the year 1901 neither the Department of Justice nor the law courts showed any honest desire to comply with the Sherman Act. Strict and literal enforcement of its terms would, in fact, have impeded technological progress; it would have been absurd to fine or imprison anybody who established a monopoly without distinguishing between those businessmen who formed combinations solely in order to raise prices and those who dominated an industry through the efficiency of their methods of production. Between 1891 and 1901 the Federal law officers brought eighteen suits under the Sherman Act and won ten of them, while

private persons brought twenty-two suits and were successful in three. But none of the victories were won against big business. In the E. C. Knight Company case of 1895 Attorney General Olney showed that the sugar trust controlled 98 per cent of the sugar refined in the United States, but according to the Supreme Court he failed to prove that it had sought "to put a restraint upon trade or commerce," and on this ground the trust was acquitted. The manufacturing business in which it was engaged, declared the Court, "had no direct relation with commerce between the states." But while the Sherman Act was not enforced against the big corporations, it was perverted in several cases into a weapon for attacking trade unions.

The tendency towards combination, in fact, actually became accelerated after the Sherman Act, and did not reach its climax until the turn of the century. In 1904 John Moody calculated that during the period since the Civil War 5,300 separate firms had been combined into 318 large corporations, and that 236 of these combinations had taken place during the period 1898-1903. By 1904, 38 percent of all manufacturing was done by those firms, 1 percent of the total, which had an annual output of more than \$1,000,000.

4.2.7. The Rise of Investment Banking:

Perhaps the most significant feature of the combinations of the 1890's was the growing influence of the investment bankers. Historians sometimes distinguish between three different phases in the development of capitalism, both in Europe and in America; the dominance of mercantile capitalism had been replaced in the early nineteenth century by that of industrial capitalism, and this was now changing into finance capitalism. The influence of the bankers came about through their control of the investment market. A corporation in need of capital would ask a banking house to undertake the function of selling its securities. But if the bankers were to retain the confidence of the customers to whom they sold such securities, they needed some assurance that the corporation was soundly organized and likely to make a profit. As a result of their function of protecting stockholders interests, the bankers gradually began to assume supervisory power over corporation management.

The chief banking house of the Civil War period, Jay Cooke and Company of Philadelphia, became insolvent in 1873. Financial supremacy then passed to New York, where the leading firm was Drexel, Morgan and Company, reorganized in 1895 under the name of J.P. Morgan and Company. Other important houses were August Belmont and Kuhn, Loeb of New York and Lee, Higginson and Kidder, Peabody of Boston. But there was relatively little

competition between, and by the 1890's J.P. Morgan was recognized as their leader and, indeed, as the dominant figure in the entire national economy.

4.2.8. The House of Morgan:

Endowed not only with great financial ability but with an extraordinarily personality, Morgan set out to impose order and stability in one industry after another. His main objective was to ensure a regular flow of dividends to stockholders, in order that they might continue to buy securities and contribute their savings for further expansion. This made it necessary to ensure efficient management and to put an end to the buccaneering of men like Jay Gould, who had made millions by buying control of different corporations, arranging mergers, watering the stock, and then selling out. By promoting higher standards of financial integrity, Morgan performed a very necessary function. At the same time he disliked competition, on the ground that it led to outbreaks of cutthroat price-cutting which were bad for all the businessmen involved, and believed in a policy of "community of interest" by which corporations should make agreements with each about price and the division of the market. Thus while Morgan's policies meant more protection for stockholders, they also resulted in higher prices for the consuming public.

Drexel, Morgan and Company was at first occupied chiefly with the sale of American securities in Europe. Since much European capital was invested in railroads, the firm assumed responsibility for reorganizing roads that were no longer paying dividends, scaling down their capitalization and squeezing out the water, installing more efficient management, placing its own representatives on the boards of directors, and promoting combinations. Before the end of the century more than a third of the total railroad mileage of the country had been "Morganized." In the 1890's Morgan extended his activities into a large number of other industries, and was the moving spirit in many of the combinations formed around the turn of the century.

The biggest of the Morgan promotions was United States Steel in 1901, which was made possible by the retirement of Andrew Carnegie. Morgan took the lead in combining the Carnegie Company with ten other steel companies into a single vast corporation capitalized at the then unprecedented figure of \$1,018,000,000 plus a bonded debt of \$303,450,000. This was scarcely an example of Morgan financing at its best, since the combined assets of the merged companies were valued at only \$682,000,000 and the remainder of the capitalization therefore represented water, while the House of Morgan itself received the tidy sum of \$75,000,000 for its

services. But the investors who bought the stock of United States Steel had no cause to regret their purchases, which usually earned high dividends. United States Steel controlled more than half the entire steel business and was strong enough to fix prices and determine policies for the whole industry. In accordance with Morgan's "community of interest" doctrine, its directors cultivated friendly relations with their competitors, and used their power to maintain high price schedules, which sometimes remained unchanged for a dozen years at a time.

The only financial empire which could compete with the House of Morgan was Standard Oil. But in 1907 the two groups established interlocking directorates in some of the corporations they controlled and became partners in a number of different financial operations. In 1912 the Pujo Committee of the House of Representatives investigated the situation and came to the conclusion that, through the banks, trust companies, and insurance companies under their management, the Morgan-Rockefeller combination had control of financial resources amounting to more than \$6,000,000,000, and that members of the group held directorships in 112 corporations with a total capitalization of \$22,245,000,000. Many people interpreted these findings as a proof that the House of Morgan had created a monopoly of money and thereby acquired dictatorial powers over American industry. Such fears were exaggerated, since the House of Morgan was a part of the economic system and not a controlling influence over it. Nor should it be forgotten that it had acquired its pre-eminence chiefly because its methods had won the confidence of investors. But such a concentration of money and credit under the control of a few men was certainly a startling to the democratic ideals in which Americans professed to believe.

4.2.9. The Evolution of the Corporation:

The rise of the investment bankers was accompanied by important changes in the management and control of the big corporations. Many of the new industries had been built up by independent entrepreneurs who owned a large proportion of the stocks in the corporations they organized and personally supervised their activities. But after these men died or retired, they did not usually pass on their managerial functions to their heirs, who often preferred to devote themselves to sport, pleasure, politics, or philanthropy. As corporations grew larger, moreover, there was a tendency for ownership to become diffused among large numbers of stockholders, none of whom held a big enough percentage to exercise control. Thus ownership and management began to become divorced from each other, as had happened in the New

England textile industry even before the Civil War. Although a corporation was still legally the property of the stockholders, they often ceased to have any effective control over its policies; ownership now meant only the right to receive whatever dividends management chose to distribute. In practice, as we have seen, the function of representing stockholders interests, including the power to appoint and supervise the managers, was exercised by the investment banking houses. But the actual work of administration was left to salaried executives who understood the business and had usually worked their way up within it.

4.2.10. Summary:

In this new era of absentee ownership there was less room for personal initiative and willingness to take risks. Bankers were likely to prefer conservation policies and refuse to gamble on enterprises which offered no assurance of steady profits. It was significant that the chief new industry developed in the twentieth century, the automobile industry, was built up with virtually no financial assistance from Wall Street. The qualities needed to rise to the top in a banker-controlled corporation, moreover, were somewhat different from those that had brought success in the age of Rockefeller and Carnegie. Skill in handling personal contacts and winning other people's approval, and a reputation for caution and sobriety, tended to count for more than brilliance and personal drive. The managers of the big corporations, in fact, began to develop some of the characteristics traditionally associated with government bureaucracies. Thus American industry after the turn of the century was becoming less individualistic and more institutionalized; having passed through its phase of youthful exuberance, it was settling down to a more sober middle age.

4.2.11. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Examine the growth of American Big Business.
2. Discuss the rise of corporations in the name of Big Business in U.S.A.
3. Describe the several kinds of business that are well-adapted to proprietorship or partnership, and several which are best adapted to the corporate form.

4.2.12. Reference Books:

1. Bruchey, S., **The Roots of American Economic Growth**
2. David, Henry, et al. (eds.), **The Economic History of the United States**
3. Faulkner, U., **Economic History of the United States of America**
4. Howard R. Anderson, et al., (eds.) **The Making of Modern America**
5. Parkes, H. B., **The United States of America: A History**

Unit-4

Lesson-4.3.

OPEN DOOR POLICY OF U.S.A. IN CHINA

Objective of the Lesson:

America's 'Open Door' policy and its practical operation and results are the main objective of the lesson.

Structure of the Lesson:

4.3.1. Introduction

4.3.2. Secretary of State Hay Proclaims "Open Door" Policy

4.3.3. Implications of the Doctrine

4.3.4. What was the Impact on China of this Policy?

4.3.5. Had the Policy Moral Flavour?

4.3.6. The Chinese Rise against Foreigners in the Boxer

Rebellion

4.3.7. Open Door Policy in Operation

4.3.8. Summary

4.3.9. Self Assessment Questions

4.3.10. Reference Books

4.3.1. Introduction:

After the Treaty of Shimonoseki (1895), concluded between China and Japan, many European nations had got many concessions from China. United States of America, which was then engaged in a war with Spain, could not pay any attention towards China. U.S.A. was of course, not very much interested in acquiring territories in China, but gradually she realized that

without territorial acquisitions, it will not be possible for her to retain and enjoy economic interests.

While American interests in its new possessions had more to do with trade than gaining wealth from natural resources or large-scale American settlement. Puerto Rico and Cuba (where US retained a naval base at Guantanamo Bay even after recognizing the Island's independence) were gateways to Latin America, strategic outputs from which American naval and commercial power could be projected throughout the Western hemisphere. The Philippines, Guam, and Hawaii lay across shipping routes to markets of Japan and China.

In 1899, soon after the end of Spanish-American war (1895), Secretary of State, John Hay announced the Open Door Policy, demanding the European powers that had recently divided China into 'commercial spheres of influence' grant equal access to American exports. The Open Door referred to free movement of goods and money, not people. Even as the USA banned the immigration of Chinese into the country, it insisted on access to the markets and investment opportunities of Asia. The USA soon found, however, that other countries were determined to get this trade for themselves. They were even trying to bring about the partition of China for their own benefit.

Possession of the Philippines also affected United States relations with Japan. Further United States found itself in Japan's backyard, and the nearest route from United States west coast to Manila, capital of the Philippines, was by way of Yokohama, Japan. It was apparent that USA would have difficulty in defending the Philippines if America involved in any Far Eastern conflict. According to U.S., President, Theodore Roosevelt, "The Philippines Islands from our heel of Achilles". Japan, just beginning to take her place as a world power, considered the Western Pacific her own sphere of influence, and resented U.S. presence there.

4.3.2. Secretary of State Hay Proclaims the "Open Door" ¹Policy:

American ships had been carrying on trade with China ever since the early days of the republic, and more recently with Japan. When United States obtained a foothold in the Philippines and coaling stations in the Pacific at the close of the 1800's, United States had great hopes that this trade would be increased. Unfortunately for United States hopes, however, conditions in China were in a state of confusion. After a war between Japan and China revealed how weak China really was, powerful European country forced China to lease some of her

important ports to them. They also acquired "spheres of interest" over areas in China, where they built railroads and enriched themselves by exploiting the natural resources.

Fearing that leased territories and spheres of interest threatened United States commercial rights, at that time, the Secretary of State, John Hay sent communications to the European powers and to Japan in 1899 through their ambassadors at respective countries. The ambassadors were asked to seek clarifications on the points mentioned below from the government of the country in which they were posted. Accordingly the doctrine is also known as 'Hey Doctrine or Doctrine of Open Door Policy'. The Points amplified were:-

1. The governments having sphere of interest and leased territories in China, should assure that they will not interfere with any treaty port or any vested interests there in.
2. That a government having a sphere of influence will make no discrimination of harbor dues or rail road charges against any other country.
3. China's treaty tariff and collection of customs dues should be guaranteed by all the countries having their status in that country.
4. All concessions which the European countries, have already obtained from China, for carrying on their trade, will not be violated, no matter whether these ports were still under the influence of China or any other power. The old tariff and custom rates will be honoured.
5. When the ships of one nation enter a port under the sphere of influence of another country, the controlling country shall not charge more than what she pays to China.

Each nation agreed somewhat reluctantly to the principles set forth in Hay's notes, but only on condition that the powers would also agree. In 1900 Hay boldly announced that all the nations had given a final and positive acceptance of what he had called the Open Door policy in China.

4.3.3. Implications of the Doctrine:

There appears to be nothing novel in this doctrine but in actual practice what U.S.A. wanted was that special interest acquired by western nations should be nullified, if U.S.A. did not get the same concessions which these nations had already got. This doctrine was bound to attract Britain which then had maximum trade in China and due to shrinking of sphere of influence her trade was bound to suffer at one stage or the other. Similarly all European countries were broadly agreeable to these terms because these could get vaster areas for their

trade and tariff. But this was not acceptable to Russia because the clauses dealing with railway charges and rail-road tariff were not acceptable to her and were to her great disadvantage. In this way U.S.A. had created a particular and peculiar situation for the western imperialist powers.

In the beginning of the 19th century China was closed nation. She suffered from superiority complex. European nations then tried to pierce into China. These were always prepared to risk a war to get into China, on one pretext or the other. As the century rolled on, China laid exposed before the nations of the world. Now the problem was how to close this country to other nations. This during this period, the whole situation had altogether changed. In the beginning China wanted to close doors but now European powers wished to close doors of China on other nations. The implications of this doctrine in plain and simple language were that U.S.A. wanted that European powers should open doors to her in the territories under their sphere of influence and also in their leased territories.

4.3.4. *What was the Impact on China of this Policy?*

This policy was in no way going to profitably benefit to China. What U.S.A. wanted was that the European powers should cooperate with each other and there should be no international rivalry so far as they were concerned. In other words, what U.S.A. suggested to European powers was that they should at least cooperate with each other in exploiting China- a policy which they were following during the middle of the century.

4.3.5. *Had the Policy Moral Flavour?*

Some of the historians make us believe that the 'Open Door' policy had high moral flavor. But this does not appear to be true. There was not much of moral in the policy. The whole doctrine revolved round the principle that commercial interests of U.S.A. in China should not be jeopardized. These were no high hidden ideals concealed in the policy. There appear to be convincing reasons to believe that U.S.A. was either opposing the exploitation of China by European nations or in any way pleading her independence or integrity. USA was not even bitterly opposed to the increasing of sphere of influence of western powers in China, as long as this did not adversely affect her trade and commercial interests. All that U.S.A. wanted was that markets in China should not be exploited by European powers by ignoring her. She wanted to make it clear that she was also an equal claimant in the race and should be recognized as such.

by these powers which had staked their claims there. Accordingly, there was not much moral flavor in the whole doctrine.

4.3.6. *The Chinese Rise against Foreigners in the Boxer Rebellion:*

Meanwhile, a tide of resentment against European selfishness was rising in China itself. A patriotic society, known as the "Boxers," began to agitate the "foreign devils," and their uprising soon developed into organized rebellion. In 199 bands of Boxers, joined by Chinese government forces, attacked and murdered missionaries and other residents. They gained control of the territory around the capital city, Peking and out of communication with the outside world. Foreigners in Peking took refuge in the British embassy. The leading nations, including the US, combined forces and sent an expedition to relieve the city. It arrived just in time to save the besieged diplomats and missionaries.

China now faced a reckoning with the angry foreign powers. Secretary Hay, however, did not want the foreign nations to grab still more of China's territory. He preferred a solution which would "preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity... and safeguard for the world the principle of equality and imperial trade with all parts of the Chinese Empire." In the end, his ideas were followed. Although spared further loss of territory, China was compelled to pay 333 million dollars to the various nations for their losses. The US was to receive some 24 million dollars, but less than half of this sum was needed to meet the claims of American citizens for losses suffered in the Boxer Rebellion. Later the US canceled the rest of the debt, and this amount was used by the Chinese government to provide scholarships for Chinese students who wished to study in China or the USA. For the time, at least China escaped being divided and the policy of equal trade privileges and the Open Door for all nations had won a victory.

4.3.7. *Open Door Policy in Operation:*

In theory 'Open Door' policy was accepted by all the European nations except Russia. But what actually happened was that after the proclamation of doctrine, USA began to take more and more interests in China. This was in spirit, opposed to the doctrine which did not accept in principle increase in the sphere of influence in China. But for some time China got a nation which was interesting in preserving her integrity from the aggressive designs of European

nations. In this way immediate dis-membership of that country was checked. One however, finds that the countries, which accepted this doctrine, did not sincerely implement that. These went on demanding more and more rights and concessions from Chins. Not only this, but no steps were taken for conferring commercial befits over China. In addition to this, her international exploitation by mutual cooperation of European powers continues unabated. Thus the doctrine did not materially benefit China.

In actually none of the other powers, not even Britain was willing to accept the Open Door doctrine. Although China was never carved up into colonies, this was due mainly to the inability of the imperialist powers to come to terms with catch other, and eventually to the outbreak of, World War I, rather than to the influence of the USA. The USA was probably not strong enough to maintain Chinese independence singlehanded, and certainly not sufficiently interested in the Far East to expand much energy in attempt to do. In other words, the Open Door doctrine was merely a pious aspiration not backed by sufficient force.

4.3.8. Summary:

The Open Door policy of USA had nothing novel in it but if implemented in true sense and sprit, it would have benefited China on the one hand and European powers on the other. Though European powers continued to benefit themselves, interests of China continued to be ignored. But the only advantage to China was that due to cooperation of USA. European powers could not get many concessions from China, though these powers very much desired to have them.

4.3.9. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Discuss the genesis and the impact of 'Open Door' Doctrine.
2. 'The Open Door Policy did not mean a cessation of imperialistic demand on China'. Discuss.
3. Analyze the aims of the policy of 'Open Door'.

Reference Books:

1. Allen George, **A Short Economic History of Japan**
2. Beckmann, George M., **Modernization of China and Japan**

3. Fairbank, John, et al., **East Asia: Modern Transformation**
4. Myers, Ramon Hand, **The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895- 1945**
5. Peffer, Nathaniel, **The Far East : A Modern History**
6. Parkes, H. B., **The United States of America: A History**
7. Pratt, W., **A History of the United States Foreign Policy**

Unit-5.

Lesson- 5.1.

RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

Objective of the lesson:

Causes and course of the Russo-Japanese War and its results are the main objective of the lesson.

9

Structure of the lesson:

- 5.1.1. Introduction
- 5.1.2. Causes of Russo-Japanese war
- 5.1.3. Occupation of Sakhalin Island
- 5.1.4. Triple Intervention of 1895
- 5.1.5. Russian Interests in Japan
- 5.1.6. Japanese Designs over Korea
- 5.1.7. Dispute over Manchuria
- 5.1.8. Anglo-Japanese Alliance
- 5.1.9. Rise of Nationalism
- 5.1.10. Japan's Desire for Expansion
- 5.1.11. Outbreak of War
- 5.1.12. Events of war
- 5.1.13. Towards Peace
- 5.1.14. Treaty of Portsmouth
- 5.1.15. Effects of the Treaty
- 5.1.16. Summary
- 5.1.17. Self Assessment question

5.1.18. Reference Books.

5.1.1. INTRODUCTION:

¹ Russo-Japanese War was one of the most important events of not only in the history of Japan but also whole world. It resulted in the emergence of Japan, as the most powerful nation in Asia. This war changed the very complex of international politics.

5.1.2. *Causes of Russo-Japanese War:*

No single cause can be attributed to Russo-Japanese War. In fact seeds of this war were sown as early as in 1875, though actual war broke out in 1904. Some of the important causes for the war might be discussed as under:

5.1.3. *Occupation of Sakhalin Island:*

In 1875, when nationalism was still growing in Japan, Russia in a very high-handed manner occupied Sakhalin Island, which reasonably belonged to Japan. Since Japan was not prepared for war at that stage she had no alternative but to accept the high-handedness of Russia. This however was not forgotten by Japan who wanted to take a chance for its recovery at the appropriate time.

5.1.4. *Triple Intervention of 1895:*

In 1895, in the Sino-Japanese War, Japan had defeated China and had got Port Arthur and Liaotung areas from her. But these territories had to be returned to China because of Triple intervention of Russia, Germany and France. At that time Japan was not in a position to take a chance with the Western powers and she returned these territories to China but she did not forget that Russia primarily responsible for putting pressure on Japan. She thus wanted to have an appropriate opportunity to take revenge of his humiliation.

5.1.5. *Russian Interests in Japan:*

Russia was championing the cause of China and posing herself as the friend of that country. In Chinese Court her influence was rapidly increasing. In 1898 Russia was in a position to get many concessions from China in Port Arthur and Liaotung. Since Japan had been forced by Russia to return these territories to China and now she herself was using them, this was an eye-sore for Japan. This became still more so because nationalism was awakening in that country very rapidly.

5.1.6. Japan's Designs over Korea:

During the war of 1894-95 between China and Japan, the latter had occupied Korea. She was arbitrarily introducing reforms there. Japanese capital was being invested there and economic gains were already there for Japanese nationals. Though after the war sovereignty of Korea was accepted but economically she remained under the influence of Japan. The reforms being introduced by Japan were disliked by the Queen with the result that she was killed. This created a very unfavorable atmosphere for Japan in Korea. But the political parties favoured reforms and influence of Japan was so deep that on 11th February, 1896 the king and the prince took shelter in Russian Embassy in disguise. The king began to run government from there (Russian Embassy). All this was disliked by Japanese who did not wish that in any way Russia should stand on his way of expansion in Korea. But due to murder of queen Japanese influence had very much decreased in Korea whereas that of Russia much increased. Since there was relaxation in administration, therefore, disorder prevailed in the country. The increase of Russian influence in Korea caused to strain relations between USSR and Japan. In 1896 however, there was an agreement between the countries by which both agreed to withdraw their forces and agreed that responsibility of maintaining order should be left to Koreans. Both the countries also agreed to jointly invest capital in Korea in its development.

But both the countries were not serious in implementing this agreement. After some time Russia sent her people to have some control over military and economic institution of the country. She also began to misbehave with the people of Korea. This created resentment against Russians in Korea. At the same time it provided an opportunity to Japanese to come to the fore front. This again started the relations between the two countries. In 1898, both the countries however, signed a new convention by which Russia and Japan agreed to the sovereignty of Korea. Russia also promised not to obstruct the development of commercial and industrial relations between Japan and Korea. But both the countries were again not serious in implementing the decisions and were keen to increase their sphere of influence there.

When the relations between the two countries were deteriorating Japan made an attempt for a compromise with Russia. Japan suggested Russia that she might increase her influence in Manchuria, whereas might leave Korea for Japan. Russia was quite prepared to accept economic interests of Japan in Korea but not political and military. But this position was not acceptable to Japan and thus compromise attempt failed. On January 12, 1904 Japan again came forward with the suggestion that if Russia accepted her complete influence over Korea. She was willing to withdraw her interests from Manchuria. But Russia

again did not take the offer seriously. Since Japan considered Korea essential for her security and was not at all willing to withdraw from Korea, this became a major reason of conflict between the two countries.

5.1.7. Dispute over Manchuria:

Both Russia and Japan had their interests in Manchuria. Russia was keen to maintain her hold in the Far East and Manchuria was considered to be a good field. After the Sino- Japanese war of 1894-95, Russia could get concession from China to construct 1,000 miles long railway line in Manchuria. On the pretext of constructing railway lines, thousands of Russians came to Manchuria when Boxer Rising broke out, Russians helped China and thus got her goodwill. In the name of protecting her railway lines, Russia also began to send her armies to Manchuria. In fact, she was very much interested in annexing Manchuria to herself. She also began to exert influence over China for getting more and concessions. When these pressures very much increased, China approached world powers for assistance. But Russia kept them quiet, promising that she had no intentions to encroach upon Manchuria. But Russia went on sending her armies there.

Like Russia, Japan too had interests in Manchuria, Japan wanted to use Manchuria's natural resources for the benefit of her increasing population. She also felt that increasing influence of Russia was threat to the very security of Japan. Japan always felt that Russia was standing in the way of her expansion in Manchuria, Japan also wanted to have a compromise with Russia by offering her free hand in Manchuria provided, she agreed to accept Japan's supremacy over Korea. In this way interests of both the countries clashed over Manchuria as well. Both wanted to have an opportunity to settle their dispute.

5.1.8. Anglo-Japanese Alliance:

In 1902 England and Japan concluded an alliance known as 'Anglo-Japanese Alliance'. This was intended against Russia because England felt that Russia was emerging as a very strong power in the Pacific, which England was not prepared to tolerate. Japan's alliance with a European power created a sense of self-confidence in the country. This alliance has been concluded in the face of opposition from a powerful section of Japanese people who wanted to make a compromise with Russia. As a result of this alliance Japan was not very hesitant or reluctant to face Russia. This Alliance came at a time when Russia was without any solid friend.

5.1.9. Rise of Nationalism:

After Restoration in Japan there was rise of nationalism in the country. Japan had taught lesson from China and was not at all prepared to meet that fate. In order to come out as a powerful nation, Japan had modernized her army. She was modernizing his every institution. This modernization was creating a sense of self-confidence in Japan. The feelings of nationalism were very wide spread. Japanese could not tolerate any power which stood on their expansion. When therefore, Japan found that Russia was standing on their way and was not reaching a compromise, Japan got herself ready for a war.

5.1.10. Japan's Desire for Expansion:

Still another reason for the war was that Japan wanted to expand. For her, China was the only country where she could expand and settle her people and dump her produced commodities. Korea and Manchuria were the safest places for her expansion, but when Japan saw that she was not being permitted to expand, she became impatient.

5.1.11. Outbreak of War:

After conclusion of Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Russia felt isolated and promised to withdraw gradually from Manchuria but she was never serious about this. On the other hand, she got promise from China that in future no other country except Russia will get Manchuria for economic enterprises. She got a Railway service opened from Moscow and Port Arthur. In 1903 viceroyalty for Far East was created. Russian troops crossed Yalu valley and occupied a port near the mouth of Korea. She also tried to construct highways and telegraph lines. This alarmed Japan and Russia was fully aware of it. Russia was however, confident that in spite of Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Japan will not venture to wage a war with Russia.

When Japan became confident that Russia was not prepared to thrive at a compromise she decided of waging a war. In February 1904, Japan decided to break off her diplomatic relations with Russia.

5.1.12. Events of war:

After breaking away diplomatic relations on the night of February 8-9, 1904 Japan sent her armies to Korea and also torpedoed the Russian fleet off Port Arthur. As war proceeded Russia looked forward for help from France and Germany which did not come forward and Russia was to deal single handed against Anglo-Japanese Alliance. On February 8-9 Japanese troops landed in Korea at Chemuplo and Genson. On May 1, some

Japanese armies landed in South Manchurian near Russian leased territory. On May 26, Japanese cut the Russian lines at Nanshan and forced Russians to withdraw to Port Arthur. In August of the same year a battle was fought at Mukden between Russians under general Kuropakin. From August 23 to September 3 was fourth the battle of Liaoyang in which Russians were defeated but not completely routed. From October 9 to 17 Russians took the offensive but without many results. They could not break either Japanese lines of defense or communication. In early 1905 Japanese took the offensive, forced the Russians to retire to Tieling, north of Mukden. Thereafter Russians were defeated one after the other and her Baltic fleet was destroyed in the Sea of Japan by Admiral Togo at the Battle of Tsushima which sealed the fate of Russia. It has been said about this naval battle that such a decisive battle was not fought on the seas after the Battle of Trafalgar.

5.1.13. Towards Peace:

As the war dragged on both the countries thought in terms of having peace. Japanese had won naval battles but they knew that on the land she had now comparison with Russia. As Japanese armies were moving further, the danger of their defeat was coming to sight. Japan's economy was also under heavy strains. In so far as Russia was concerned Clyde and Beets say, "In the military sense, Russia's position showed some improvement as the war dragged on, but her funds were exhausted and French bankers were not disposed to extend further credits. In addition revolutionary movements within Russia threatened the entire war effort." It was under these circumstances at Japan made first formal proposal on May 31, 1905 to President Theodore Roosevelt of USA to initiate discussions for peace. On June 6, 1905 Tsar was approached and both the parties accepted the invitation. The war came to an end with the Treaty of Portsmouth

5.1.14. Treaty of Portsmouth:

'Treaty of Portsmouth was concluded on 1905'. About it Clyde and Beers say that the Treaty has been "described to become one of the most consequential agreements in the modern history of Far East....Most important of all, the war had convinced both powers of the futility of working at cross purposes. Indeed, the Treaty of Portsmouth opened the door to a period of Russo-Japanese collaboration in Manchuria." The main provisions of the Treaty were as under:-

1. The Russians agreed to recognize Japan's paramount political, military and economic interests in Korea.

2. Russia agreed to transfer to Japan the lease of Liaotung Peninsula and the railway connecting Port Arthur and Mukden as far North as Changchun, beyond Mukden.
3. Russia ceded to Japan the Southern half of the island of Sakhalin together with special fishing rights.
4. Both the powers agree to completely and simultaneously evacuate Manchuria within 18 months of the signing of the Treaty. But they will keep their armies to protect their railways there.
5. For Manchuria Russia declared that she will not have any territorial advantages or preferential or exclusive concessions in impairment of Chinese sovereignty or inconsistent with the principle of equal opportunity.
6. Both the powers agreed that they will not obstruct any general measures common to all countries which China might take for the development of commerce and industry in Manchuria.

5.1.15. Effects of the Treaty:

The treaty of Portsmouth had its effect on the world as a whole as well. One of the major effects was that the balance of power in Europe and Asia was disturbed. Russia went in the background and the problem of abridging the gap arose. Similarly Japan emerged as powerful nation and problem of making room for her arose. This Treaty also strained the relations of Japan with United States of America because in U.S.A. investors felt that their investments in Asia will be reduced and considerably checked by rising Japan. Japan had to face European powers in China as well, where she became a partner in exploitation of that country and thus clash of interest with western powers arose. The war had its effects on China as well. It was after war that Reforms Movement started in the country and nationalism, which had brought glory to Japan, began to be loved there. Chinese students in large number went to Japan to study and learn from there. All this resulted in the Reforms Movement of 1911 in China.

5.1.16. Summary:

The Russo-Japanese War was ended with the utter failure of Russia the Giant. Russia was forced to humble itself before dwarf Japan and it has been said that dwarf proved to be a giant killer. The war was memorable in the sense that for the first time a European power was defeated by an Asian power. It strengthened the position of Japan not only in Asia but throughout the world. For Russia it created problems both at home and abroad.

5.1.17. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Elucidate the impact of Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05 on Japan.
2. Analyze ⁵ the Causes of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 and its results.
3. "The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 arose directly out of the competing imperialism of Russia and Japan in Korea and Manchuria." Explain and discuss.

5.1.18. Reference Books:

1. ¹⁰ Allen George, **A Short Economic History of Japan**
2. Beckmann, George M., **Modernization of China and Japan**
3. ⁶ Fairbank, John, et al ., **East Asia: Modern Transformation**
4. Myers, Ramon Hand, **The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895- 1945**
5. ⁶ Pepper, Nathaniel, **The Far East : A Modern History**

Unit-5

Lesson-5.2.

THE EASTERN QUESTION AND BALKAN NATIONALISM

Objective of the lesson:

The problem of Eastern Question and nationalism in Balkan states is the main objective of the lesson.

9

Structure of the Lesson:

5.2.1. Introduction

5.2.2. Meaning of the Eastern Question

5.2.3. Balkan Nationalism on the Rise

5.2.4. Greek War of Independence

5.2.5. Causes of War

5.2.6. the course of the War

5.2.7. Provisions of Treaty of Adrianople

5.2.8. The Crimean war

5.2.9. The Treaty of Paris (1856)

5.2.10. "Pan Slavism" and Russo-Turkish War(1877-78)

5.2.11. Congress of Berlin (1878)

5.2.12. Political Turmoil

5.2.13. Young Turk Revolution (1908)

5.2.14. Break Up

5.2.15. The Italo-Turkish War (1911-12)

5.2.16. The First Balkan War (1912-13)

5.2.17. Treaty of London

5.2.18. The Second Balkan War (1913)

5.2.19. The Treaty of Bucharest

5.2.20. Summary

5.2.21. Self Assessment Questions

5.2.22. Reference Books

³5.2.1. Introduction:

In 1453, the Ottoman Turks captured Constantinople and began to extend their sway over the southwestern part of Europe and the northern coast of the Africa continent during the next two centuries. They reached the acme of power during the middle of the seventeenth century. They had conquered all the lands which lay between them and Austria. They attacked Hungary, and after its conquest, laid siege to Vienna during the middle of the sixteenth century under the leadership of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent. It was the Holy Roman Emperor who got help from the king of Poland and defeated the Turks. He drove them out of Vienna. The Turks continued to threaten the Roman Empire till the last quarter of the seventeenth century. It was late in the seventeenth century that they suffered from a series of defeats which caused the beginning of their decline. At the same time due to several reasons, particularly religious, Turkey was not treated as a part of Europe till 1815. She was considered as a part of Asia. After 1815, however, conditions in Turkey so much deteriorated that several Christian powers felt tempted to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey.

²¹
³ Unfortunately, the Balkan Peninsula, which once formed a part of the Eastern Roman Empire, remained as an integral part of the Turkish Empire. The Sultans of Turkey subjected the

Christian population of this region to an undiluted despotism and misrule. When a fresh wave of nationalism and liberalism swept over the western part of Europe in the early nineteenth century, the Christian subjects of the Balkan Peninsula also longed to be free from the tyranny of the Turkish Sultans.

5.2.2. Meaning of the “Easter Question”:

¹ Eastern problem is one of the most serious questions of modern Europe. Before 1815, the Sultan of Turkey was an incompetent person and his administration was corrupt. He could not give good administration to his people. The Christian states of Turkey were agitating for self-rule. These wanted to have independence and national feelings had developed among themselves. The Congress of Vienna in 1815 failed to realize the aspirations of the Christian subjects living in the Turkish Empire and the peacemakers decided not to disturb her territorial sovereignty. It was in one of the meetings of later Congresses that Czar Nicholas described the Turkish Empire as the “sick man of Europe”. Ever since the days of Peter the Great, Russia had been eager to bring about the downfall of the Turkish Empire and expand her own empire. Especially Russia aim was to establish his domination in the Balkan and Mediterranean States. It was not until the early decades of the twentieth century that she found opportunities to take steps in this direction. However, there were other European powers, especially Britain and France, who were equally eager to thwart Russian attempts to bring about the liquidation of the Turkish Empire mainly to maintain the delicate balance of power in Europe. Britain was concerned about the threat Russia was likely to pose if she conquered Turkey, and further expanded her dominions towards South Asia. So three aspects dominate what is popularly called the “Eastern Question,” namely the decline of the Ottoman Empire, the rise of Christian nations in the Balkans against the Turkish master, and the conflicting ambitions of big powers and their intrigues.

5.2.3. Balkan Nationalism on the Rise:

The inhabitants of a small country, Montenegro, were the first to rise in revolt against their Turkish master and in 1799 succeeded in liberating themselves after driving out the Turks from their country. The next to revolt against the Turkish Sultan were the Serbs who were supported by the Russians. They succeeded in securing self-rule but lost that status in 1812

because the Sultan reasserted his control. It was not until 1830 that the Serbs regained their independence.

5.2.4. Greek War of Independence:

Turkey had hold over Greek, where the people were Christian but they had not been given any religious freedom. This was obviously resented by Christian subjects. The Sultan was not prepared to treat them better because he considered them atheists. The result of this policy was that the people of the Greece revolted against the Sultan. In 1821, Greece declared it a war of independence. The war continued for a years in which many European nations got involved. Russia favoured Greece because she wanted to increase her influence in Turkey in the pretext of helping Greece. On this pretext she could interfere in Turkish affairs. But Austria and England did not allow increase of Russian influence in Turkey. Though the Sultan went on treating his Christian subjects ruthlessly, yet they continued their struggle against Turkey.

5.2.5. Causes of War:

Of course religious policy of Turkey was one cause responsible for outbreak of war, but there were several other causes responsible for the outbreak of war as well. The Greek were very much inspired by Greece Revolution and nationalist feeling which were witnessed during those days. Society of Friends did a tremendous work in awakening the people of the country but the Sultan treated the members of the society in an unbecoming manner, which still more aggravated the situation. In 1813, the people of Serbia successfully revolted against their masters. This also very much inspired the Greek who invigorated their struggle against their Turkish masters. The Greeks were inspired and got encouraged by the promise of help given to them by Russia. It was at this stage that the people of Egypt under Mehmet Ali revolted against Turkey. Since Turkey got involved in Egypt, the Greek took advantage of the situation and declared war. Turkey was thus not only got involved in Egypt but was also faced with her own internal problems.

5.2.6. The Course of the War:

The Greek declared themselves independent in 1821, under prince of Moldavia, but Turkish army defeated and exiled the prince. Thereafter in 1822, the Greek revolted in

Morea and killed the Muslims. As a revenge Sultan killed Christians in Macedonia. The Sultan at this time signed a treaty with Egypt and defeated the Greek at several places in 1826. In 1827, Turkey captured Greece capital Athens and it became clear that the Christians would be defeated.

When war was progressing the situation in Europe was radically and speedily changing. As already said Russia was quite keen to increase her influence in Turkey and convinced a meeting in her own capital in 1825, to find out a solution of helping Christian Greece against Muslim Turkey. But England and Austria understood the real designs of Russia and kept away from the meeting. England declared that since Greece was a rebel as such she needed no help.

In 1827, however, died of Russian Emperor and new Czar of Russia Nicholas I came to the throne. He openly declared that he would help Greece without caring of the help and cooperation of any other European power. England, Austria and France were not prepared to accept the situation that Russia should thus have an upper hand in Turkey but at the same time they were not prepared to displease Greece Christian subjects. They therefore, suggested the Sultan of Turkey that it should not wage a war against Greece and that some truce should be made. Meantime England and France defeated at Navarino, Ibrahim Pasha, which irritated the Sultan. Russian army also entered Turkey. The situation was precarious for Turkey and she was forced to sign in 1829, which Greece a treaty known as the Treaty of Adrianople.

5.2.7. Provisions of Treaty of Adrianople:

By this treaty Russia was given full control over Moldavia and Wallachia. She also got trade facilities in Balkan and Turkey. Greece was freed from Turkish rule and prince Otto of Bavaria was made first ruler of Greece. Turkey was now to have nothing with Greece, the independent Greece decided to have constitutional monarchy. Independence of Romania was also recognized, which consisted of Moldavia and Wallachia. She was however, to pay annual sum to Turkey.

Obviously this treaty very much enhanced the prestige of Russia. Her influence in Turkey in particular and Europe in general very much increased. Her hold over new born state of Rumania was complete. She got the good wishes and sympathies of Greece and European Christian subjects. She also got trade facilities from Turkey, which she actually and badly needed. The prestige and position of Turkey very much came down. She lost Greece and

Rumania. She was forced to give trade facilities to Russia. Turkish Christian states now very much got inspired by this war. These also now demanded independence from Turkish rule. Thus series of revolts broke out against Turkey. Greece developed her own new culture and their past glory was revived. Not only this, but her trade flourished immensely. The war ended with a serious loss to Turkey and positive gain to Russia.

5.2.8. The Crimean war (1854-56):

¹ Crimean war is an important event in so far as the next phase of the Eastern question that began in the 1850s. Several factors contributed for this. The Sultan was incompetent and was harshly treating his Christian subjects. This had annoyed Christian rulers and alienated the sympathies of Christian subjects from him. In fact Christian subjects of the Sultan were uniting to give a rough resistance and rise in revolt against the Sultan. Syria and Greece had already become independent. Napoleon III of France wanted to have friendship with England to check evil designs of Russia and also to check her growing influence in Turkey. He also wanted that in the near East French glory of the past should be revived. He was keen to have French stay in the near East.

French felt that main cause of the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte was Russia, and now France wanted to take revenge of this. The decay of the Ottoman empire attracted the attention of Czar Nicholas who was eager to kill 'the sick man of Europe,' and acquire places of strategic importance such as the control of the Black Sea and the straits and also the vast territories of Turkey. In 1844, the Russian Czar proposed to British statesmen to divide the Ottoman Empire among them but he got no ready response. Britain was eager to maintain the balance of power in Europe and she did not want to see Russia growing stronger at the expense of Turkey. Therefore, the Russian Czar decided to go it alone and staked his claims for the protection of Christian subjects in the Holy Land then under the control of the Sultan. Russian troops occupied the Danubian principalities and provoked the European powers. The result was the Crimean war which broke out in 1854. Britain, France, and Sardinia went to the assistance of Turkey. Both Austria and Prussia decided to remain neutral. The principal battles were fought on the Crimean peninsula. They were Alma, Balaklava and Inkermann. But Russian armies were besieged in the fort of Sebastopol and Crimea was invaded. The unbearable Crimean winter of 1854-55 took a heavy toll and the rate of British casualties increased due to neglect of wounded soldier. It was in these circumstances that Florence Nightingale rendered yeoman's

service and reduced the casualty rate from 44 per cent to 2 per cent. On 8th September 1855, Russia decided to surrender and accepted defeat. Meantime Czar Nicholas I of Russia died and with the intervention of Austria, a treaty was concluded at Paris in 1856 to end the war.

5.2.9. *The Treaty of Paris (1856):*

The treaty of 1856 forced the Russians to give up their claim of protecting the Christian subjects in the Holy Land. In its place the Sultan was forced to give his promise to treat his Christian subjects with sympathy and introduce reforms. The Black Sea was neutralized. So Russia was prevented from having any influence in that area. The allies hoped that they had brought a lasting peace. But subsequent events proved how hollow this treaty had been as none of the concerned powers bothered much about carrying out their obligations.

5.2.10. *“Pan-Slavism” and Russo-Turkish War (1877-78):*

The Sultan again commenced his tyranny on the Christian subjects and Russia did not give up her ambition of the conquest of Turkish territory. She began to encourage a national movement among the Balkans called as “Pan-Slavism”, to bring about the overthrow of the Turkish rule. As the Sultan did not introduce any of his promised reforms, and in addition famine conditions prevailed in two Balkan provinces, Bosnia and Herzegovina, there was bound to be trouble. The Christian inhabitants revolted in 1875 and they were supported by Serbia and Montenegro. Then the trouble spread to Bulgaria whose inhabitants also revolted against the Sultan. The Sultan sent troops to quell these revolts and the Turks carried out their large scale massacre of the Christian subjects. Russia intervened on behalf of these Balkan countries. The Russo-Turkish War (1877-78) ended in the defeat of the Sultan who sued for peace. The treaty of SanStefano by the Sultan resulted in the tilt in the balance of power in favour of Russia. According to this treaty, the Sultan recognized the independence of three Balkan nations viz., Montenegro, Serbia and Rumania. A few state of Bulgaria emerged which was to be under the protection of Russia. Russia got additional territories from Turkey. This treaty caused great alarm and jealousy among other major powers, such as Britain, Austria, France and Germany.

5.2.11. *Congress of Berlin(1878):*

Disraeli the British Prime Minister threatened war with Russia if the demand for the revision of this treaty by a Congress was not accepted. Bismarck the iron Chancellor of the German Empire played the host and convened a Congress of concerned powers related to this dispute at Berlin in 1878. Russia meekly submitted to this revision as she was not prepared for another European war. As per the revised peace terms (a) Russia surrendered to Turkey some territory she had taken, (B) the size of Bulgaria was reduced and granted autonomy, and (C) to maintain parity with Russia, Britain got the island of Cyprus and Austria received the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. So Bismarck took the credit of averting a likely European war by bringing about an amicable settlement among the disputed parties. However, the nationalistic conflicts in the Balkan region continued despite many initiatives to bring peace there.

5.2.12. Political Turmoil:

Neither Russia nor the newly born Balkan nations were happy. These nations encouraged revolts against the Sultan on the part of others in order to extend their territories. Sometimes they frequently fought among themselves to expand their boundaries. Another factor that kept this region in a perpetual state of tension was the hatred of Serbia towards Austria-Hungary for administering the Slav-populated Bosnia Herzegovina. Serbia coveted for these territories very boldly for they were populated by Serbs. Russia was encouraging Serbia in her grand design of conquest of this area.

5.2.13. Young Turk Revolution (1908):

Disgusted with the corrupt and inefficient rule of the Sultan, a group of soldiers and intellectuals who called themselves "Young Turks" succeeded in seizing power in 1908. The Sultan was forced to grant a series of reforms to his own subjects and further agreed to rule the empire according to a constitution. Some of these reforms included parliamentary democracy, freedom of the press and speech and limited powers to the monarch. These developments caused deep concern among the subject nationalities in the Balkans. But when they heard that the Young Turks were bent upon "Turkification" of all the subjects of the Ottoman Empire, they became restless. The word "Turkification" meant the adoption of Turkey language and culture by all the inhabitants in the Ottoman Empire. The Christian subjects as well as the Arabs were not prepared to accept this plan and therefore got ready to oppose it tooth and nail.

5.2.14. Break up:

³ The first Balkan country to break away from the Turkish hold at this time was Bulgaria. She took advantage of the chaotic situation prevailing in the Ottoman capital following the 1908 Revolution and declared her independence. Her ruler assumed the title of a king. Austria-Hungary suddenly annexed the two Balkan principalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina which provoked Serbia. Russia felt humiliated because Austria duped her in the bargain with the result that the straits were not allowed to be open for Russian warships. At the same time she was not prepared to support Serbia if there was a war between the latter and Austria-Hungary. In the meanwhile, Austria tried to appease Turkey by offering cash-compensation for annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina. As none of the European powers were ready to support Turkey against Austria, the former accepted this offer.

5.2.15. The Italo- Turkish war (1911-12):

In 1911, Italy regarded the moment ripe and declared war on Turkey. She coveted Tripoli and Cyrenaica, both belonging to Turkey. While the war continued, ⁴ Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria formed the Balkan League to protect themselves from the future Turkish onslaughts. Turkey was alarmed at the prospect of a bigger war she had to wage. So she sued for peace in 1912 and signed the treaty of Lausanne. ⁴ As a result of this treaty, Italy received Tripoli.

5.2.16. The First Balkan War (1912-13):

While the Balkan league was preparing itself for a war with Turkey, it was Montenegro which declared war on Turkey. She asked ² the members of the Balkan league to join her. The members of the Balkan league joined her in October 1912 with the result the Turks were defeated in all the engagements. Finally, she sued for peace, and on May 30th, 1913 signed the treaty of London.

5.2.17. Treaty of London:

By this treaty Crete was taken away from Turkey and given to Greece. Similarly Macedonia and Island of Aegean was also taken from Turkey and brought under the control of Balkan states. A separate independent state of Albania was created. After signing this treaty, ⁵ Turkey lost almost all her possessions in Europe which she had ruled for more than five centuries. She was able to retain Constantinople and a small strip of territory along the coast. Bulgaria got much of the Turkish territory and not satisfied by it caused another war.

5.2.18. The Second Balkan War (1913):

⁴ Bulgaria's relations with Rumania, her northern neighbor, got strained because the latter demanded a small strip of territory. When Bulgaria refused to grant this demand, Rumania declared war on Bulgaria. Turkey joined Rumania and subsequently Serbia, Greece and Montenegro also joined the fray. All these powers defeated Bulgaria and she agreed to sign a treaty.

5.2.19. The Treaty of Bucharest:

The treaty of Bucharest was signed by Bulgaria at the capital of Rumania in 1913. ⁴ According to the treaty, Turkey got back the city and fort of Adrianople. Serbia and Greece got large chunks of Bulgarian territories. Rumania which started the war received the territories ⁴ which she had earlier demanded from Bulgaria. The Bulgarians were thus humiliated and their bitterness towards the victors increased.

5.2.20. Summary:

⁴ The major powers in Europe watched these developments in the Balkans with their fingers crossed. ⁴ Many peace initiatives failed and bitter hostilities continued unabated. Serbia was backed by Russia regarding the claims over Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Austria-Hungary was not prepared to cede them at any cost. Thus Serbia's desire of annexing the two principalities to herself dashed to the ground. As subsequent events proved, this situation led to the outbreak of the World War I.

Ottoman Empire disintegrated ungracefully but unfortunately no European nation could get anything positive out of this fall. Mutual differences and quarrels made them fight with each other and their resources continued to deplete.

5.2.21. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Critically examine the Significance of the Eastern Question.
2. Explain the rise of nationalism in the Balkan states.
3. Explain the causes for the Nationalistic movements of Balkan States

5.2.22. Reference Books:

1. Clark, C.W., and Franz, Joseph, **Bismarck : The Diplomacy of Austria before the War of 1866.**
2. Davies, **World History**
3. Dawson, W.H., **Evolution of Modern Germany**
4. Evans, J., **The Foundations of a Modern State in the 19th Century Europe**
5. Hobsbawn, E., **Nation and Nationalism**
6. Jelvich, Charles, **Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1840-1920**
7. Lucas, Colin, **The French Revolution and the Making of Modern Political Culture, Vol.12.**
8. Porter Andrew, **European Imperialism, 1860-1914**
9. Thomson, David, **Europe Since Napoleon**

Unit -5

Lesson - 5.3.

LIBERAL REFORMS IN RUSSIA

Objective of the Lesson:

How in Russia liberalism started under Czarist regime and revoked by tyrannical rulers of Russia is the main objective of this lesson.

9

Structure of the lesson:

5.3.1. Introduction

5.3.2. Russia Under Alexander I (1801-25)

5.3.3. Russia Under Nicholas I (1825-55)

5.3.4. Alexander II (1855-81)

5.3.5. Abolition of Serfdom

5.3.6. Judicial Reforms

5.3.7. Local assembly or Zemstvos

5.3.8. Alexander III and Russia (1881-94)

5.3.9. Russia under Nicholas II (1894-1917)

5.3.10. Industrialization in Russia

5.3.11. Nihilism in Russia

5.3.12. Liberal Experiments in Russia.

5.3.13. Down with Autocracy

5.3.14. Declaration of Concessions

5.3.15. First Duma

5.3.16. Second Duma

5.3.17. Summary

5.3.18. Self Assessment Questions

5.3.19. Reference Books

5.3.1. Introduction:

1 Although Russia had risen into prominence on account of the achievements of Czars like Peter the Great, and Catherine the Great, she was still a backward country as compared with other progressive States of Europe. She remained in that condition right up to the middle of the 19th century. It was only after that she abolished serfdom and started industrialization of the country, which brought liberal and revolutionary ideas in its wake. However, this does not mean that Russia did not play a prominent part in the foreign affairs of Europe. The fact remains that she was counted to be a great Power and her every move on the chess-board of international affairs was watched with interest, fear and anxiety.

5.3.2. Russia Under Alexander I(1801-25):

As the 19th century dawn, Alexander I ascended the throne of Russia, who succeeded Czar Paul. He continued to rule up to 1825. He was educated by a Swiss tutor and on account of his influence; the Czar came to have liberal ideas which dominated his mind upto 1820 when he came completely under the influence of Metternich. Alexander was an idealist and a visionary. The Holy Alliance was the outcome of his mysticism, idealism, and despotism. His ideals were lofty and he sincerely believed that his mission was to apply the principle of the divine faith to the affairs of the states. He would like to play the roles of fathers to their subjects whom he considered as children. No wonder, he prevailed upon Louis VIII of France to give liberal charter in 1814 after his restoration. He himself gave a liberal constitution to the Polish territory under his control. A similar constitution was given to Finland which was secured by Russia at the Congress of Vienna.

After the defeat of Napoleon in the battle of Waterloo Alexander I became as a dominating personality in the Congress of Vienna (1814-15). He had a huge army under his

control and consequently was able to get his point of view accepted from the other powers. No wonder, alexander was able to secure a lot for his country at the Congress of Vienna.

After the Congress of Vienna, the liberal ideas of Alexander began to change gradually. In 1818, he was willing to join hand with Austria and Prussia to guarantee the territorial *status quo* in Europe. In 1820, he was completely changed. At the Congress of Troppau in 1820, he made a public declaration of his conversion to Metternich and asked the latter to use him in any way he pleased to suppress the liberal forces in Europe. He was prepared to lead his troops to crush the revolts in Naples, Piedmont and Spain. Metternich cooled his enthusiasm as he was afraid of the strong military force of Russia. Alexander remained a reactionary for the rest of his life. He went under the influence of Metternich. He was curious mixture of opposites. Whereas at times he was liberal, at other times he was a reactionary. The result of all this was that he could not satisfy the people. He did not introduce any measures for the betterment of his people, who remained ignorant and the poor.

5.3.3. Russia under Nicholas I(1825-55):

Alexander I was succeeded by Nicolas I, who remained in power for about 30 years. He was a complete and strong reactionary and opposed to all liberal activities and movements. The liberals of the country therefore, were sore and vehemently opposed to him. They therefore, rose in revolt against him in 1825, and demanded a constitution. They also wanted many reforms. But Nicholas I was in a position to crush all revolts and the liberal movement in the country failed.

Throughout his reign Nicholas I remained reactionary. He was incarnation of absolutism and autocracy. On question of his authority and power he was not prepared to have any compromise. He ruthlessly suppressed all liberal forces and crushed every effort and demand about freedom of thought and expression. In 1826, he set up third section of Imperial Chancery for deducting all those who wanted political and social changes. The chief of the police was made head of this chancery and given unlimited powers. He was empowered to arrest, imprison and deport anyone who in their opinion was liberal. There were no restrictions on his authority.

He declared that Russia must be saved from the infection of liberalism which had spread in other parts of Europe. He put several restrictions on travel of Russians to European countries. All foreign publications were allowed only after careful censor and scrutiny and those which had

any liberal ideas were not allowed their entry. The students were not encouraged to join universities and young Russian students were not permitted to go to foreign universities for study.

Strict press censorship was imposed in the country and censorship provisions were strictly enforced. Those who possessed such literature which was likely to preach liberalism were exiled from the country and sent to Siberia. The courts could punish anyone and provisions for appeal against the orders of the king were non-existent. About him Lipson has said, "Throughout European he was indomitable foe of democracy, just as the Spanish monarchy in 16th century was the sworn enemy of the Reformation. Each employed similar instruments, the one the Inquisition and the other the Third Section, and they made their realms intellectual quarantines in order to isolate them from the disintegrating influence of European thought." But in spite of all the suppressions and repressions the people extended unquestionable loyalty to the monarch and that was the main cause of their sufferings.

But unquestionable and unqualified support was main cause of strength of the monarch that proved to be the main source of weakness as well. It was because structure thus created was bound to collapse sooner or later on the coming of political awakening and consciousness. This awakening was delayed in Russia until 1855, when the Crimean War had the same effect upon her people which the destruction of the Spanish Armada had upon Spain, shattering their faith in the existing regime and in their own invincibility.

5.3.4. Alexander II (1855-81):

Alexander II ascended the throne of Russia in 1855 in the midst of the Crimean war. It was he who had to negotiate and sign the humiliating Treaty of Paris of 1856. So far as the Black Sea was concerned, the Russian influence was completely liquidated for the next 14 years.

5.3.5. Abolition of Serfdom:

As a measure of reforms in 1861 Alexander II decided to abolish serfdom. In the country overwhelming majority consisted of the serfs. 9/10 of the cultivable land belonged to the royal family and the nobles and serfs were attached to the soil. No serf could leave that until he was permitted by this landlord to do so. The serfs did manual labour for the landlord and rendered all

obedience to him. Whatsoever they earned, a part of that was always to be given to the landlord, no matter whether such an earning was at home or abroad. In fact for all practical purposes they were treated as slaves. Their health was bad and they were ill- treated by their masters.

As a first step in this direction Alexandra II decided that all serfs who worked on royal lands will be liberated. All legal rights of the lords over the serfs were abolished and they were permitted to do whatsoever they liked to do. They were entitled to be the owners of $\frac{1}{2}$ of the land which they cultivated. The cost of the land was to be paid by the serfs in easy installments spread over 49 years. The land was to be given to the village community..

This was great humanitarian act of the monarchs, but was opposed by lords. This freed large number of persons who subsequently became available for work in the factories and helped in the process of industrialization. More areas were cultivated and in this way agricultural production increased. The state got more taxes, conditions of the workers improved and export trade received encouragement.

But at the same time it was found that the land pieces allotted to serfs were too small for living a comfortable life. Taxation burden very much increased. They were harassed by the tax collectors and other government officials.

But in spite of all this the effect of the abolition of serfdom all over the country was good. Discontentment which the peasants were having for the very long time and which could burst out in the form of revolution was now controlled.

5.3.6. Judicial Reforms:

Rotten and outdated judicial system which provided all facilities to the privileged classes without any responsibility was main cause of discontentment for many. It was therefore, most urgent that something should be done to reform the system, if the people were to be satisfied. The courts were modeled on western lines. Civil and criminal cases which hitherto were tried by administrative officials were now transferred to these courts. The justices of peace were to be elected by the people. The Senate was declared to be the highest court of appeal. All criminal cases were to be tried by jury and trials were to be held in public, but political offenders could be punished without trial. Steps were also taken towards codification of laws.

5.3.7. Local Assembly or Zemstvos:

It was provided that each district of 34 provinces was to have Zemstvos which consisted of representatives of peasants and others. It was to look after such aspects of local life as public works, health and poor relief. These assemblies proved good training ground for the people and helped in decentralization of authority.

The monarch perhaps would have introduced more reforms but in 1863 Polish revolt took place. It was of course crushed but the effect was not good for the liberals in Russia. The king became enemy of liberalism and followed a policy of Russification of minorities within the Russian empire. This alienated their sympathies and they were now on the outlook of an opportunity when they could rise in revolt. More the monarch suppressed the aspirations of the minorities, more revolutionary they became.

The king did not stop his reaction only with the minorities but he followed his policy in this regard with his own people as well. Powers of Zemstvos were curtailed and strict press censorship was introduced. All political offenders were also exiled. In this way the people got dissatisfied with the ruler and wanted to revolt against the regime at the earliest.

5.3.8. Alexander III and Russia (1881-94):

Alexander II was succeeded by his son Alexander III. He was rough in body and devoid of all polished manners. Like his father he was sworn enemy of liberalism. He was in favour of strong aristocracy. According to him it was will of god that aristocracy should be preserved for the good of the people. He put one of his close associate Plehve as in charge of police Department and ensured that there was no laxity in executing his orders. He put his another friend and associate as the controller of orthodox of church of Russia. He ensured that the preaching of church were such that these did not go against the ideas of Alexander.

Accordingly now legislatures were breeding places of selfish and ambitious persons and that freedom of press encouraged for the spread of falsehood. He also believed that secular education was not only immoral but also dangerous. According to him limited monarchy was a vain fancy and trial by jury an invitation to the art of litigation. Since the people are not saint therefore, representative or parliamentary system of Government was the worst.

Therefore, all those persons who were suspected to be liberals or doubted as associates in the murder of Alexandra II were exiled. Village administration was put under the control of people to be appointed by the Government. The powers of Zemstvos were drastically cut down. This composition was so changed that henceforth nobles and officials got much more representation than the others. Professional classes were altogether excluded and the Governors were directed to use their power to veto extensively.

In the country Church Schools were favoured and seculars discarded. School curriculum was controlled by the state and censorship was imposed on all kinds of publications. Restrictions were imposed on all kinds of meetings and associations. Not only this, but even private correspondence was not allowed to pass uncensored.

The police was given powers to arbitrarily arrest any person and impose any punishment on him. He also followed a policy of Russification. It was provided that in Russian empire only Russian language could be spoken. In addition, the teachings of old Orthodox Church was to be accepted and preached. The minority were to be given no rights but on other hand crushed. These were called upon to obey the king unhesitant and give up their own language, religion and customs. All schools of the minorities were completely Russianized and everything in educational institutions was to be taught in Russian Language. They were excluded from all public offices. The Jews were not allowed to buy any land and all of them were asked to migrate to the western provinces. They were massacred at wholesale rate.

In this way by following the policy of aristocracy and anti-liberalism the monarch became unpopular. The people got disgusted because the king had undone liberal work which had been started or completed by his predecessors. Not only this, but people got afraid of the way in which police administration carried out its work. The minorities were absolutely dissatisfied due to the policy of Russification followed by emperor. He not only followed that policy but pursued that vigorously. The Jews were obviously dissatisfied because of the policy of massacre followed by the monarch. In fact by his policy he created a situation by which no section of the society was happy except the rich nobles, who were hated by the masses.

5.3.9. *Russia under Nicholas II (1894-1917):*

The new Czar was weak and believed in fatalism. His wife had full control over him and she decided all state policies. The monarch was obstinate by nature and Rasputin with Czar's wife began to manage the state.

Both the king and the Queen were reactionaries. They believed that real authority should never be reduced and also the King should have full control over state affairs. Pobedonostsev was continued on his job and Plehve was appointed as the Minister of Interior. He was given dictatorial powers. The old policy of Russification, persecution and execution was followed. The old policy against the Jews was continued and Russian language was imposed on all language minorities living in Russian empire.

5.3.10. *Industrialization in Russia:*

It was in this atmosphere of autocratic rule and persecution that process of industrialization started in the country. Gold and Iron mines were exploited and new factories were set up. Shipping industry began to grow and production of pig iron and coal increased many fold. Railway construction was pushed forward. But in spite of this process of industrialization the country continued to have agricultural economy. During this period however big business developed and protection was given to infant industries by providing these protective tariffs. Russian currency was stabilized. Russian labour was made more efficient and Government started controlling working hours and conditions both in the factories as well as mines. All this helped in the growth of imperialism on the one hand and aristocracy and autocratic tendencies on the other.

Industrialization however, helped labour to unite. They demanded more rights and liberal legislative measures. Industrialization thus paved the way for liberalism. The sympathies of landlords were lost because on their account industrialization was progressing. But, in spite of all this Russia continued her policy of industrialization.

But unfortunately in 1904-05 Russia was defeated by tiny Japan much to the surprise of the world and was forced to leave both Manchuria and Korea. Differences with Japan could be made up only in 1917. It was in that year Russia entered a new phase of her history. But before

proceeding further it is proper to study two important aspect of Russian history which went a long way in the outburst of Revolution of 1917. These are Nihilism and Liberal experiment.

5.3.11. *Nihilism in Russia:*

Russian rulers had been following reactionary policies and as such the liberals lost every hope of getting their demands met. This created feelings of bitterness and disappointment in their minds. The liberals began to feel that their ideas and philosophy could never grow and develop in the country. It was in this atmosphere that some intellectuals of the country became very critical of the Government and they organized themselves into a movement called Nihilism. They believed in the philosophy of absolute individualism. They wanted that every human institution should be treated on the basis of customs and reasons. They were not the people who believed that there should be no bowing before any authority. This movement included those people who were disgusted with Russian political, social and religious life. They believed that everything in the existing order should be destroyed. They were not concerned with any constructive programme and believed in terrorism.

They were of the view that territories alone could make autocracy bow. These people were self-sacrificed and prepared to sacrifice their everything for creating terror. They believed that Russia could be freed from autocracy only with violence.

They conducted secret propaganda among the villagers and peasants and made them realize their miserable conditions under the peasant conditions. They formed many secret organizations.

Obviously their propaganda could not be tolerated and police began to have their hot pursuit. They began to leave the country and spread themselves in various parts of the world. It was abroad that some of them in touch with Bakunin, who had been exiled to Siberia and was then settled in London.

After 1870, some of the Nihilists followed a programme of sending some young Russian educated men and women to country side and also to the factories. Their aim was to awaken the people from their lethargy and indifference towards state affairs. They wanted to establish a government of the working classes and worked there as self-sacrificing missionaries. They found employment in the factories and about 300 of them managed to enter factories who activity propagated their philosophy.

They were however, not much success in their aim because police had arbitrary powers and these were extensively used against them. Many of them were imprisoned and sent to Siberia. The Nihilists therefore, felt that violence was the only course for achieving their object. They were of the view that in Russia no progress was possible without getting rid of reactionary and dishonest officials.

They followed violent means and many high officials were murdered by them. The police in turn executed many of them. The method of summary trials was followed and by simple executive decrees thousands of them were exiled to Siberia. They ultimately decided to kill the Czar Alexander II and made several attempts on his life. Each time he however, had providential escape. It was felt by some Czar officials that terrorism will not serve the purpose and what was Alexander II was killed and all proposals to liberalize the laws were shelved, reaction started throughout Soviet Union. Reactionary policies were followed both by Alexander II and Nicholas II.

5.3.12. *Liberal Experiment in Russia:*

When Industrial Revolution came in England and other Europe countries, Russia practically remained unaffected. It remained an agricultural nation. No attention was paid to the factories. The conditions of workers remained as bad as these were. No working hours were fixed for them and industrial production did not increase.

But as the time passed and need for more armaments and Industrial goods was felt efforts were made to have more industries. In this way industrial process started. Industries now began to be encouraged. The result of this was that the bankers, industrialists and others got united. They decided to put checks on unrestricted powers of the rulers so that they could have some free hand. In 1902, these people started a paper named "Liberation". These people were under the influence of the Liberals of Europe and wanted to preach liberal philosophy in Russia.

It was this time that the anarchist philosophy began to get some popularity in the country. In addition, more or less at this time Russia was defeated by tiny Japan which exposed the weakness of Russian armies. There was a demand that the policies of the government should be changed. Nicholas II was obliged to appoint Prince Mirski as Minister of Home Affairs in September 1904, who made it clear that Russian people were not fit a constitutional

government. He was however, of the opinion that Zemstvos can be given some additional powers. The press was given greater freedom of expression.

In order to ascertain the wishes of the people representatives from Zemstvos were called to St. Petersburg in November 1904, to discuss the need of the country. Professional organizations and learned people were also provided an opportunity to express their views. They demanded:

- There should be freedom of conscience, speech and publications.
- Public meetings and associations should be unrestricted.
- Justice should be administered by judges and not by administrative officers.
- There should be no punishment without trials.
- Local bodies should be given more powers.
- A Parliament for the whole country should be set up.
- A Constituent Assembly for giving a Constitution to the country should be set up.

5.3.13. Down with Autocracy:

The people were demanding much but Czar was not prepared any important or significant concessions. The people were quite clear about this. But at this very time much went against Czarist regime. Russia was defeated by Japan and many soldiers escaped to several countries. The people of Russia felt humiliated and revolutionary activities received support of the people. Due to war many essential commodities went out of the market. The traders did not cooperate with the government and began to sell their commodities in the black market. Shortage of supplies defamed the government. The students and the people paraded in the streets and shouted the slogans "Down with Autocracy".

When Czar saw that situation was getting out of control he agreed to give some insignificant concessions to the people. He was however, not prepared to accept demand for a national assembly. He was also not prepared to part with any of the real powers vested with him. The result was that on 22nd January, 1905, Slaughter of Bloody Sunday took place.

It was on this day that the workers wanted to present a Charter of demands to the Emperor and for the purpose went to St. Petersburg. There they were attacked by regular armies and hundreds of them killed. Subsequently the people became violent and they too began to attack the houses of the nobles and the rich. There were mutinies both in the army and the navy. An atmosphere of violence started throughout the country.

5.3.14. Declaration of Concessions:

In order to satisfy the people the Czar Nicholas II issued a manifesto in August 1905, that state Council of Duma will be called not later than January 1906. It will consist of elected representatives of Russia. But this did not satisfy the people because Duma had no representative character. In that professional and working classes were given no representation. It had also been provided that it will be a consultative body and its meetings were not to be held in public. Right to vote was given to only few persons. The revolutionary parties therefore, continued with their agitation and they used the weapon of strike. Railways went on strike and Russia was cut from the outside world. Merchants could not send or receive their goods. Gas and electric companies stopped working. Law courts were closed and newspapers stopped printing.

Forced by the circumstances, on 30th October, 1905, Czar Nicholas II issued another manifesto in which he announced freedom of speech, conscience and association. Franchise was made liberal and it was also declared that every law will be approved by Duma before its being enforced. But revolutionaries were not satisfied with this as well and wanted that an assembly consisting of elected representatives of the people should be convened. Such elections should be held on adult franchise basis. The Czar was not prepared for this. The revolutionaries therefore, continued with their activities. Strikes and mutinies continued. A sort of civil war between the revolutionaries and reactionaries broke out. The government used all vigour and strength to suppress the revolutionaries. There was strict enforcement of press censorship on the one hand and martial law on the other. Hundreds of the revolutionaries were exiled to Siberia. The king was therefore, forced to call Duma but he wanted that its powers should be curtailed to the extent possible. He therefore, decided to have a Council of Empire, an Upper House of Legislature, of which Lower House was Duma. The Council included officials and the rich nobles. It was not a representative body. It was however, provided that all bills must be approved by this Council, before their being sent to the Czar for his approval.

5.3.15. First Duma:

In April 1906, elections to the Duma were held and a party called Cadets came to power. It was opened by Nicholas II on 10th May, 1906. It wanted to have liberalism in Russia and thorough going reforms in the country on western model. It also demanded amnesty for all political prisoners and change in the composition of Council of Empire. It wanted that the ministers should be responsible to it than to the Czar. Martial law should be lifted and all lands which belonged to the government or the church should be distributed among the peasants or given on long leases.

The reactionaries were determined to make the Duma unsuccessful by making its working difficult. It did not care for many hurdles and openly criticized the shortcomings of the government. The ministers did not show regard to elected representatives of the people. But main point of dispute between Czar and Duma was about the responsibility of ministers. Whereas the king wanted to have full control over the ministers, the Duma wanted that the ministers should be responsible to it. It was in this atmosphere that the radicals among the peasants, wanted that all land should be distributed among them. This created law and order problem. Taking advantage of the situation on 22nd July 1906, Czar decided to dissolve Duma on the plea that it had engaged itself not in any constructive activity and that it had failed to solve any national problem.

5.3.16. Second Duma:

After dissolution several members of the Duma left for Finland from where they issued a manifesto. In that they pleaded that dissolution was illegal. All the taxes which had been levied without its approval should not be paid. The government should neither be provided soldiers nor money. But their manifesto did not attract much attention.

The king announced the calling of Second Duma, which met on 5th March, 1907. But it had no smooth beginning. From the very start differences between the ministry and the Duma started and these went on increasing. A stage came when the king ordered the arrest of 16 members of the Duma on account of their revolutionary activities. The members of the Duma felt that was interference in their legitimate and legal rights and activities. On 16th June 1907, Czar ordered dissolution of Duma.

In order to convene next Duma a manifesto was issued by Czar. In that members of the Duma were to be selected from selected land owners. The manifesto made it clear that the government was determined to have aristocratic control over the people. Reaction started and all type of atrocities began to be committed on the people.

5.3.17. Summary:

Third Duma was called in 1907. It was not an elected body or in any way a representative body. This Duma was only a consultative body and as such its views did not very much count. As expected, it was against all liberal demands. In this way liberal experiment in the country failed and in 1914, Russia got involved in First World War. Since 19th century to upto the Russian Revolution of 1917 there were several movements and demonstrations took place in Russia for demanding of liberal reforms. But the autocratic rulers of Russia were not responded properly to lose their absolute powers even though neighbouring European nations adopting democracy in their countries through introducing liberal reforms. Finally their negligence of liberal reforms targeted to abdicate their throne also by rose of Revolution of 1917.

5.3.18. Self Assessment Questions:

1. Write about the Liberal Reforms in Russia.
2. Elucidate the range of liberal reforms in Russia.
3. Explain pitfalls of liberal reforms during the Czarist regime of Russia.

5.3.19. Reference Books:

1. Davies, **World History**
2. Evans, J., **The Foundations of a Modern State in the 19th Century Europe**
3. Florinsky, M.T., **The End of the Russian Empire**

4. Hobsbawn, E., **Nation and Nationalism**

5. Lucas, Colin, **The French Revolution and the Making of Modern Political Culture, Vol.12.**

6. Porter Andrew, **European Imperialism, 1860-1914**

7. Thomson, David, **Europe Since Napoleon**

ORIGINALITY REPORT

41 %

SIMILARITY INDEX

41 %

INTERNET SOURCES

2 %

PUBLICATIONS

1 %

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

article1000.com

Internet Source

35 %

2

vsip.info

Internet Source

2 %

3

docslib.org

Internet Source

1 %

4

tnou.ac.in

Internet Source

<1 %

5

archive.org

Internet Source

<1 %

6

akuprakasam.ac.in

Internet Source

<1 %

7

www.historydiscussion.net

Internet Source

<1 %

8

iasexamportal.com

Internet Source

<1 %

9

www.pbidde.org

Internet Source

<1 %

10

histttmstella.blogspot.com

Internet Source

<1 %

11

nagarjunauniversity.ac.in

Internet Source

<1 %

12

anucde.info

Internet Source

<1 %

13

en.wikipedia.org

Internet Source

<1 %

14

docplayer.net

Internet Source

<1 %

15

doczz.net

Internet Source

<1 %

16

J.M. Bourne. "Who's Who in World War I",
Routledge, 2002

Publication

<1 %

17

ddceutkal.ac.in

Internet Source

<1 %

18

hostnezt.com

Internet Source

<1 %

19

kipdf.com

Internet Source

<1 %

20

vdocuments.site

Internet Source

<1 %

21

J.A.R. Marriott. "A History of Europe - From
1815 to 1939", Routledge, 2025

Publication

<1 %

22

Lawrence Sondhaus. "Naval Warfare, 1815–
1914", Routledge, 2012

Publication

<1 %

23

brhectorshistoryworld.blogspot.com

Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes On
Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 14 words