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Unit I Introductory
   a. Modern & Contemporary History: main characteristics
   b. Emergence of Italy and Germany as unified nations
   c. European hegemony and inter-imperialistic rivalries, conflicts within Europe
   d. Alliance formation, social tension and socialist movements

Unit II The Emergence of USA after the Civil War
   a. The emergence of the USA after the Civil War
   b. Japan’s Emergence as a World Power: Modernization and economic progress under the Meiji restoration, Sino-Japanese War
   c. Nationalist movements in Asia: Rise of Kuomintang and the fall of the Manchus and its aftermath
   d. Ottoman Empire and the Arab World: Accession of Sultan Abdul Hamid and the Young Ottoman Movement, Young Turk revolution of 1905

Unit III The End of the Czarist Regime in Russia
   a. Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 and its consequences
   b. Revolutions of 1905
   c. Towards Bolshevik Revolution: February-March Revolution
   d. The October Revolution of 1917 and the socio-economic foundation of a socialist state

Unit IV The First World War and its Aftermath
   a. New grouping of European States
   b. Anglo-German Rivalry
   c. Causes, events and results of the war
   d. The war settlements: Economic and social consequences

Recommended Books
The history of any country or region or of the world is generally divided into specific periods and sub-periods. This is done on the basis of some specific criteria. One criterion which is common in traditional historical writings is to divide the history of a country in terms of the dynasties that ruled over it. In this sense, we have the history of India divided into the Mauryan period, the Manchu period, etc., and the history of England divided into the Tudor period, the Stuart period, etc. This kind of division is still common as the period of the rule of a dynasty provides a convenient chronological period of study. The division of history into periods is also based on another criterion of division like the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution which denote broad chronological periods in the history of some countries. But the criteria of division in this case are developments in certain aspects of cultural and economic life, rather than dynastic or political. Such divisions (unlike the divisions based on dynasties) indicate broad periods and not specific dates and years as developments in culture and economy cannot be traced back to any particular date nor do they end on a specific date. To give an example from Indian history, the period of the rise of Indian nationalism...
cannot be ascribed to any one particular event taking place on a particular date. Sometimes, division into periods is done on the basis of centuries. We have, for example, the history of England, let us said in the fifteen century, the sixteen century, and the seventeenth century and so on.

Another, more important kind division of history in to periods, or simply periodization, is done on the basis of demarcation of stages on the development of society. In this kind of periodization each period denotes not only a broad chronology but a distinct form of society, economy, political system and culture, and has a well-defined character of its own distinguishable from other periods. The broadest commonly accepted periodization of the history of most countries and of the world as whole is the division into ancient, medieval and modern periods. In terms of chronology, these periods vary from country to country as society in different countries and regions moved from one stage to another at different times. For example, in the history of Western Europe the ancient period came to a close by the early centuries of the Christian era and the medieval period began when a new form of social system characterized by feudalism began to take shape. Similarly, the medieval period in the history of Western Europe may be said to have ended by the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries and the modern period began with the decline of feudalism and the emergence of a new kind of social system, called capitalism. Comparable developments denoting the passing of one type of social system and the emergence of a new one in other counties or regions, say Asia and Africa, took place at different times. Therefore, the specific chronology of the ancient period, the medieval period and the modern period differs from country to country and region to region.

It should also be remembered that the ancient period or the medieval period in the history of all countries does not have the same characteristic features. There are variations even in many essential features of social and economic life, political system and culture. Thus medieval China or medieval India does not necessarily denote the same kind of society, economy, political system, etc., as that in medieval Europe. However, while periodizing the history of the world as whole are ignored for the sake of convenience, and new forms of society and economy, even though they might have emerged only in one region of world, are taken to mark the beginning of a new period.

1.2 Objective
After reading this lesson, you will be able to learn about:
The contemporary history
The main characteristics of contemporary history
The main deference between contemporary and modern history

1.3 Contemporary History

As mentioned above, the period of world history beginning from fifteen-seventeenth centuries is generally regarded as the modern period. The term modern applied to this period implies that it would cover the developments from its beginning right up to the present time in which we live. Until two or three decades ago, however, the historians generally were reluctant to write about the period in which they or even their contemporaries (some of whom would be much older than them) lived. Many histories of the world written and taught in the 1950s, 1960s and even in the 1970s would stop even earlier in 1918 or 1914 (the years, respectively, when the First World War ended and began. Some of the reasons for doing so were very sound. Many important sources which the historian requires to write the history of the period in which he is living would not be available to him. For example, many important official papers regarding the activities of the governments are open to the historians for study only after a lapse of 50 years (in the case of some countries, 30 years). Many people who are involved in the formulation of policies and in the activities of the government, such as Prime Minister, ministers and high officials maintain diaries of their activities and notes or write their memoirs. These diaries and memoirs (generally called private papers) are generally not published in the lifetime of their authors and even when they are published or made public care is taken to see that such portions as may show them or the government in a bad light are not published or made available to the historian. The official records and the private papers also often deal with matters of a sensitive nature or with persons still living and making them public may cause embarrassment to the governments or to the individuals. Some records of discussions between the leaders of different countries, if made public may embitter relations between them or between them and other countries. Sometimes, government release some documents to prove that their policies and actions were in the best interests of their countries or even of the world, and withhold others that may lead to a different conclusion. Because of the non-availability of all relevant sources of information, the historian, if he is to be true to his profession, would rather not venture to write the history of recent years.

There are other stronger, reasons why some historians are unwilling to
Write about the period in which they are living. The writing of history is a valid and useful intellectual activity only if it is practiced without bias. A historian who writes about the present is, in a sense, himself a participant and is emotionally involved in the events and developments that he is writing about. Therefore, it is said, this writing cannot be unbiased and objective.

The first reason regarding the historian’s reluctance to write about the present or contemporary history (we shall define what we mean by contemporary history later) carries less weight. There is such abundance that the absence of some official records and private papers may not really make much difference. In fact, reliable materials on the aspects of history which are of great importance to the historian, such as social and economic life, political institutions science and technology, various components of culture, are more readily available for contemporary history than for any other period of the past. And these materials are available for almost every part of the world. For earlier periods, even the facts with regard to the population of most parts of the world are not available with any degree of certainty. The question of bias is more relevant even though a reader of Indian newspapers of the recent years may say that the writing on ancient Indian history at least the popular writings, including those by some professional historians reflect more biases views on the history of the eighteenth century or even ancient Indian history than on the history of a more recent past. The danger of bias, however, is real and it need not be seen only or even mainly as narrow mindedness or prejudice. The historian’s view may be coloured by his philosophical outlook or his general approach to the problems of the world. While narrow mindedness of any kind has no place in the historian’s profession, no historian can be free from some philosophical outlook or other as he views the contemporary problems and issues from a certain standpoint. There is no getting away from this and the historian has to guard against the possibility of his outlook distorting his understanding of the problem he is studying. His philosophical outlook or general viewpoint may even be an aid to his study of history. The reader should study a historical work critically and try to find if the historian’s philosophical outlook or viewpoint has hampered his study of a historical event or development.

A more serious problem which arises while studying contemporary history is the one of historical perspective or, as one historian has put it, of “knowing what happened in the end”. A historian dealing with the events of an earlier period, say,
the Civil War in England or the Battle or Plassey, knows how those events ended and is also able to see the long-term consequences of those events. One cannot write with the same certainty about, say the end of the Cold War.

Since there was the possibility that one’s historical study and since not enough time had elapsed to provide sufficient historical perspective, some historians thought it was not sage to write even the history of the nineteenth century. And example from recent history will illustrate this problem. In 1928, as scholar wrote an article on capitalism for a new edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. In the article, he wrote, Capitalism is still accused responsibility for avoidable unemployment arising from periodic alternations of fiances and depressions in trade activity of booms and slumps. It is certain, however, that though there must always be some tidal movement of rise and fall, the former violence of these rhythms is now much abated. This article was published in the Encyclopaedia in 1929, the year which saw the beginning of the worst economic depression in history affecting almost parts of the world. The 1920s had been the years of economic growth and prosperity for many capitalist counties in the West. The scholar, who wrote the article, was, presumably pro-capitalist and his writing was falsified just at the time it was published. Similar examples can be quoted to show how some recent events have proved that the views of some socialist scholars regarding the growing strength of the world socialist system were false.

From the above, it is clear that much of contemporary history is provisional or ‘open-ended’. But not all contemporary history is so. For example, the statement that the system of imperialism built by the European powers since the nineteenth century or before collapsed about two decades after the Second World War is not going to be proved false in the same way as no new scientific researches are going to prove false the statement that the earth is not flat. The statement about the collapse of European imperialism describes a very important historical development in the contemporary world. There are many other significant historical developments in the contemporary world about which our knowledge would be much more than ‘provisional’. Our knowledge of contemporary history is crucial to our understanding of the world is which we live and its problems even if such knowledge is ‘provisional’.

But what is ‘contemporary history’? There are many different answers to this question. Literally, it might mean ‘only the history of what is already happening at the moment of writing or a record of events through which the
historian has lived’. But most historians consider it to be a specified period of history with its own specific characteristics in the same way as ancient history, medieval history or even modern history. Some historians consider recent modern history to be contemporary history. According to one historian writing in the early 1960s “…our era has such a well-defined character that it is possible to speak of contemporary history in a specific sense…Hence it is the crucial years from 1945 to the present day which can be regarded as especially the sphere of contemporary history.” Another historian, describing the period from 1917 to 1945 as the first stage of contemporary history, has stated, “Contemporary history begins with the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia. This revolution provided the impetus for a radical change in the fate mankind, its transition from the domination of the exploiter classes to the elimination of exploitation, to the establishment of social justice” Many Western historians considered the years between 1914 and 1945 as the domain of contemporary history, which is perhaps a reflection of the view that European developments were ventral to the history, which is perhaps a reflection of the view that European developments were central to the history of the world. In 1965, a French historian published a book entitled major controversies of Contemporary History. He studied 65 controversies converging the period 1914-45, by analyzing 11,000 published works and by personal interviews. Most of the controversies dealt with certain events of European history, a few concerned the U.S. policy vis-à-vis Europe and two related to Japan’s relations with Russia and the United States. No other part of the world figured in the book.

There is an increasing trend among historians the world over to treat the history of the twentieth century as the specific sphere of contemporary history. The history of the twentieth century is viewed as contemporary history not only because it is a convenient period in terms of chronology or as recent modern history but because it is regarded as having a ‘well-defined character’ which makes it a distinct period of history, distinct even from modern history. Contemporary history, or the history of the twentieth century, is also increasingly viewed as contemporary world history. This is because of the awakening of mankind “to a sense of world community in which all were inescapably involved.” For the Europeans, according to the editor of a voluminous work on the twentieth century, it was possible to take a short-sighted view of the history of the period preceding the twentieth century and to think that Europe played a leading role in world
history. Such a view, according to him, “is no longer even plausible, and any history of the 20th century has to take a view of the whole world in a way that was not true of earlier periods.” Geoffrey Barrowclough, in his book An Introduction to Contemporary History, has written. “One of the distinctive facts about contemporary history is that it is world history and that the forces shaping it cannot be understood unless we are prepared to adopt worldwide perspectives.” He considers the period designated by him, as “contemporary” to be different in “quality and content” from what is known as modern history. According to him, contemporary history has characteristics “which mark it off from the preceding period in much the same way as what we call medieval history is marked off from modern history.” While no fixed dates can be given, contemporary history, according to Barrowclough, “beings when the problems which are actual in the world today first take visible shape.” He puts this in the last decade of the nineteenth century. In this book, we have generally followed this view.

1.4 Contemporary history: Some Characteristic Features

The main characteristic feature of contemporary history, as indicated before, is that the world has become “integrated in a way it had never been before.” There are still many things that divide the world. There are countries that have highly developed economies and there are also the countries with extreme economic backwardness. There are ideological and political divisions such as capitalist, socialist and others. Much of contemporary history has been a history of confrontation and conflict. In spite of these divisions and conflicts, the common problems of mankind “have become the common concern of all.”

Contemporary history is characterized by tremendous changes in every aspect of social, economic and political life and in every area of human activity. Winston Churchill, Britain’s prime Minister in the 1940s and 1950s, mentions in one of his books the advice that an elder statesman gave him when he was entering politics. “My dear Winston,” the elder statesman told him, “the experiences of a long life have convinced me that nothing ever happens.” Churchill, commenting on this advice, wrote, “Since that moment, nothing has ever ceased happening. He also described this century as “this terrible Twentieth Century.” In many ways, the contemporary period, which is mainly the twentieth century, has been truly “terrible.” No other century has seen such mass destruction and such avoidable misery as this century. However, many other things have happened, besides the terrible ones, in this century. This period has seen the
collapse of imperialism and colonialism on a world-wide scale, the ending of the
degemony which Europe exercised over the world since the beginning of the
modern age, and the rise of what is commonly known as the third World –the
peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America- as a major force in world affairs. The
period also saw the emergence of the United States of America and the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics as world powers, or ‘super powers’ as they are
commonly called. Thus world politics has been completely transformed during the
past one hundred years.

There have been changes in the nature and functions of the State the world
over and new forms of States the World over and new forms of State have
emerged. In spite of many differences between different forms of States, the
powers of the State everywhere have increased and the State now plays many more
functions than it did in the past. There is much more active participation by the
people in the political affairs of their countries and in the making of history than
ever before. It may be recalled that in the year 1890 universal adult franchise was
unknown in almost every part of the world. Now it is a common feature of political
life in almost every part of the world.

There have been tremendous changes in economy and society the world
over. The Industrial Revolution, which began in England during the last decades of
the eighteenth century, had spread to a few countries of Europe and North America
by the end of the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century, industrialism has
become a world-wide phenomenon. The advances in science and technology have
been so far-reaching and fundamental that we often speak of them as
revolutionary. Their direct application in industry has further accelerated the rate
of changes in the economic life. In the process, however, the countries that do not
have the advantage of modern science and technology, have been left behind and
the gap between the economically developed countries and the others has
increased. All societies have undergone major transformations. There has been an
unprecedented increase in what is called “human expectations – a much higher
percentage of human race demanding much more and believing that it is possible
to provide it.” Ideological challenges such as those represented by the rise of
socialism in mid-nineteenth century because powerful forces in the twentieth
century influencing hundreds of millions of people in all parts of the world.

There has been what may be called a rowing secularization of political and
social life, of art and literature, and of ideas, although some parts of the world
continue to be plagued with sectarian conflicts and violence. There has generally been called “the growing impatient demand for greater satisfaction in man’s present life.” The art and literature of the contemporary world are distinguishable from the art and literature that grew were distinctly new and not merely a continuation of the traditional forms, much less their limitation. The art and literature in almost every part of the world have been influenced by the developments in other parts of the world much more than in any other period of human history.

The most significant characteristic of the contemporary history, which is increasingly becoming the dominant characteristic, is the awakening “to a sense of world community in which all were inescapably involved” as has already been mentioned. There has been a growing common concern over the common problem of mankind. The chief of these problems has been the common danger that the development of thermonuclear and other weapons of destruction posed to the very survival of human life. There are other problems, such as those of poverty and backwardness, of over-population and, more recently but one that is increasingly recognized, of environment.

1.5 Contemporary History and Modern History

If, as discussed above, contemporary history is distinct from modern history (and not merely the most recent part of it), it is useful to have an overview of modern history. It should be remembered that no historical period is totally new; every historical period carries within itself much of the preceding period. There are always many elements of continuity. It is also necessary to know the preceding period in order to adequately grasp the new in the following period.

The modern period of history may be said to have begun in the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries, if we take an overall view of the world. (This statement, of course, is not true for all regions and countries of the world.) These centuries marked the transition from the medieval period in some countries of Western Europe. The major historical developments in these centuries of transition were the Renaissance, the Reformation, the beginning of modern science, the discovery of new lands and new routes (particularly new sea-routes) leading to the colonization of the Americas and parts of Asia and Africa, and emergence of nation-states. All these developments were related to a fundamental change in the way the social and economic life of the people was organized. This change was the disintegration of the feudal system and its replacement by a new system, called capitalism. A large
part of the world was brought together as a result of these developments, often by brute force and, in the case of many parts of Africa, by enslavement. Another development which began to take place in the second half of the eighteenth century and which brought about even more fundamental changes was the Industrial Revolution. It began in England with the use of machines for producing goods. By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Industrial Revolution had spread too many counties of Europe, though in varying degrees, and to North America, particularly the USA. The countries to which the Industrial Revolution had spread had their social and economic life completely transformed. The centre of economic activity shifted from rural to new industrial production and related activities than in agricultural and an ever-growing share of a county’s wealth came from industry rather than from agriculture. Two new social classes emerged in society – the capitalists or the bourgeoisie, who were the owners of industries and controlled trade and commerce, and the industrial working class or the proletariat, who worked for a wage. This was a period of terrible misery for the working classes of the industrialized countries of Europe. The workers began to organize themselves into trade unions even though in many countries these were illegal. They workers began to organize themselves as a distinct political force under the influence of the ideas of socialism. Thus, arose the socialist movement which strove not only to promote the economic demands of the workers but also to mobilize them to overthrow the system of capitalism itself. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels played a leading role in giving a scientific shape to the ideas of socialism also reached the United States. In 1864, the International Working Men’s Association, popularly known as the First International, was formed. By the time it was formally abolished in 1876, socialist parties had been organized in many countries of Europe. Some of these had a large following. In 1871, the first revolution inspired by the ideas of socialism had taken place in Paris. This is known in history as the Paris Commune which, though it lasted for barely three months, was an event of great historical importance. In 1889, the Second International was formed and socialist parties of various countries were affiliated to it. In the meantime, laws were passed in many countries to safeguard workers against some of the worst effects of the Industrial Revolution and Capitalist exploitation. Simultaneously with these developments, there were significant changes in the political sphere. We have mentioned the formation of nation-states as one of the major developments that marked the period of transition from the medieval period
to the modern period. The formation of nation-states in Europe continued during the nineteenth century and, in the case of some countries, during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Nationalism arose as a major factor in the history of Europe.

Nations that were divided into a number of States, such as Germany, and others that were divided into a number of States some of which were under the rule of another country such as Italy, strove to unite themselves in to independent States. There was another major development regarding the political system in many countries of Europe. The political system in almost all countries of Europe was monarchical and autocratic. Only England, after a civil war in the seventeenth century, had succeeded in establishing the supremacy of Parliament. During the eighteenth and nineteenth century’s ideas of democracy and popular sovereignty gained ground. In 1789 took place the French revolution which proclaimed the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity, and rights of Man and Citizen. Earlier, the English colonists had issued the Declaration of Independence which declared that “all men are created equal and had certain inalienable rights” and that the people had right to overthrow and oppressive government. The colonists had succeeded in their war of independence and had set up a new independent republic, the United States of America.

Along with nationalism, democracy was a major force in the history of the nineteenth century Europe. A number of revolutions and movements took place in most countries of Europe to establish democratic political systems. Although almost all the countries of Europe continued to have a monarchical form of government, in many cases the monarchies were constitutional that is they were governed by a constitution and real power was exercised by parliament. Most countries, however, the franchise was not universal, and many men and all women were excluded from the right to vote.

1.6 Self Check Exercise

1 What is contemporary history?
2 The first International Working Men’s Association was formed in which year?
3 Define the Contemporary History and Modern History.
4 Who among the following was the King of France at the time of the outbreak of the French Revolution?
   (a)- Louis XIV
   (b)- Louis XVI
1.7 Summary

All these developments were confined to Europe and North America, but even in Europe there were some countries that remained unaffected. The rest of the world had neither an Industrial Revolution, except Japan during the last decades of the nineteenth century, nor the kind of social and political changes that have been mentioned above. The colonization of the Americans and parts of Asia and Africa which took place with the discovery of new lands and sea-routes has been mentioned earlier. A new wave of imperialism arose during the last three decades of the nineteenth century and before the end of the century almost every part of the world had come under direct or indirect subjugation of a few European powers (and of the United States). In the case of some counties, the actual occupation took much longer in the face of resistance put up by the people of the colonies. The imperialist conquest of some other countries, such as India, had been completed even earlier. The countries of the world which today constitute the Third World were subjected to economic exploitation by the imperialist countries even though they were not under direct imperialist rule. The people of the colonies resisted the imperialist rule form the very beginning. However, ever before the nineteenth century ended, powerful forces had begun to emerge in some countries under colonial domination, which sought to end the colonial rule, not for restoring the pre-colonial systems in their countries but for transforming them into independent modern nations, industrializing them and building their societies on the principle of equality. This world was very different from the world which came into being in the twentieth century, particularly during the times in which we live. It should, however, be remembered that some of the forces that were to build the world of the twentieth century, had already begun to emerge in the nineteenth century.

1.8 Glossary

Indicate: to show that something probably true or exists
demarcation: a border or line that separates two things
essential: completely necessary
subsequent: coming after or later
rather: quite; to some extent
misery: great unhappiness or suffering
arise: to begin to exist to appear
1.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. The history of what is already happening at the moment of writing or a record of events through which the historian has lived’. But most historians consider it to be a specified period of history with its own specific characteristics in the same way as ancient history, medieval history or even modern history. Some historians consider recent modern history to be contemporary history.

2. 1864

3. See at 1.5

4 (b)

1.10 Suggested Readings


1.11 Terminal Questions

1. Explain the differences between ‘Modern History’, ‘Contemporary History’ and ‘current History’.

2. Contemporary history is open ended. Discuss the concept of contemporary history in the light of this statement.

3. What are the problems faced by historians of the contemporary period? Explain with examples.

4. Why is the study of contemporary history important? Discuss.

5. Trace the main characteristics of Modern Europe and point out the salient features of Medieval Europe and Modern Europe.

6. Discuss the position of Church in the life of Europeans on the eve of modern age.

7. Trace the importance of the geographical discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in the history of Europe.
Chapter-2

Emergence of Italy and Germany as unified nations:

Structure:
2.1 Introduction
2.2 Objective
2.3 Unification of Italy
2.3.1 Italy after 1815
2.3.2 Italy after 1848
2.3.3 Contribution of Mazzini to the Rise of Nationalism in Italy
2.4 Common Features of Nationalism in Germany and Italy
2.4.1 Meaning of nationalism
2.4.2 German Nationalism
2.5 Reasons for the delay in the rise of nationalism in Germany
2.5.1 Causes for Ultimate Rise of nationalism in Germany
2.5.2 German Unification
2.6 Self Check Exercise
2.7 Summary
2.8 Glossary
2.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise
2.10 Suggested Readings
2.11 Terminal Question

2.1 Introduction:

The rise of nationalism in Italy bears a close resemblance with the growth of nationalism in Germany. Italy, like Germany, was also inspired by the tradition of a political unit which had existed in the distant past. This tradition in Italy was as old as the Roman Empire. Even after the disintegration of the Roman Empire the feeling of community persisted among the people for many centuries, before it was replaced by the growth of local patriotism in Italian cities. The other obstacles in the way of development of nationalism in Italy were: (1) the hostility of Papacy towards Italian units; (2) the rule in northern Italy of a foreign power in the south of a dynasty of a foreign origin; (3) the lack of wealth and industrial potentialities which helped the growth of nationalism in Germany; and (4) a weak middle class etc. Thus Italy, despite excellent natural boundaries, common historical traditions and language failed to achieve national unification on account of persistent
struggle between the Pope and Emperor; the multiplicity of sovereignties, seemingly insurmountable social differences between North and South an unwillingness of Rome, Milan, Venice, Florence and Naples to sacrifice their glorious past for the sake of the national unity.

2.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The Unification of Italy
Italy from 1815 to 1870
Contribution of Mazzini to Italy
Meaning and rise of Nationalism in Italy and Germany
The unification of Germany

2.3 Unification of Italy:
As a result of Napoleon’s rule of Italy, the Northern area was well-governed. The kingdom of Naples’s was under Murat who conceived the bold scheme of uniting all Italy under his rule. During 1814-15, he put his plan into practice and proclaimed the Union of Italy. He was defeated and shot but the ideal that he proclaimed did not die. The Napoleon regime had infused new life into Italy and given an impulse to union which had been strengthens on many a battlefield. As the restoration princes followed a policy a reaction, the democratic and nationalist ideas began to work among the people like leaven.

2.3.1 Italy after 1815: As in Germany, in Italy also the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars provided a strong impetus to nationalism. However, nationalism could not become strong enough to ensure the establishment of a national state. After fall of Napoleon, Italy once again come under the dominance of Austria. But as the Italians, who had been greatly inspired by the French revolutionary ideas could not tolerate any outside interference in their national life and therefore started struggle for independence as well as political freedom. In this cause the students, noblemen as well as the middle classes cooperated. However, the national movement in Italy was divided into two parts- the moderates and the revolutionaries. The Moderates represented the aristocracy and the main upper middle classes. They wanted to lead the Italian people towards national unity but did not want to give them any share in the control of the united Italian state. They also did not want to disturb the existing social order and favoured Italy’s unity on the basis of federal principle. In other words they wanted to bring about unity of Italy without depriving the Pope of the temporal power. A section of Moderates
favoured piedmont to take a lead in the movement for national unity because the king of piedmont was an Italian and was free from Austrian influence.

The Revolutionaries or Radicals mainly represented the main body of middle classes and the artisans. The revolutionaries under Mazzini wanted to bring about the union of Italy through a series of rebellions, simultaneously organized throughout the peninsula. They hoped that in the course of these rebellions the various state would merge themselves into a single whole. They envisaged a democratic republic on the French model. However, despite the divergence in the approach of the moderates and the republicans the two groups made a compromise and made a bid to achieve unity.

As the chief moving spirit behind the Italian nationalism was Mazzini, it shall be desirable to know about his ideas on nationalism in some details. Mazzini considered the progress of humanity as the ultimate objective. He held that the individuals could not hope to fulfil their duty of forwarding the progress of humanity in isolation because the ultimate end of that progress was not revealed to man who could not even know its immediate objective unless he discovered the points on which his private conscience was in agreement with the accepted beliefs of humanity. He argued that such a process could only be carried out in an association, which might take three forms the family, the nation and humanity. While the first was too small to provide an adequate field for human endeavours, and the third too vast to be embraced effectively, the nation gave or ought to give a common agreement to which appeal could easily be made, since between fellow nations there could exist an intimate communion of feeling and thought. Mazzini argued that the path to individual freedom led through cooperation on a national basis.

2.3.2 Italy after 1848: Once of the main difficulties which stood in the way of Italy’s unity after 1848 was her dominance by Austria. The states of Italy were so small and weak that they could not by themselves drive out Austria. No doubt efforts were made by leaders like Mazzini to combine the various states against the states against the Bourbon despots but these efforts proved futile. The prospects of uniting the seven Italian states against Austria also did not look quite bright. On the other hand France could not reconcile with the growing power of Austria in Italy and decided to checkmate the Austrain ambitions by restoring the Pope. This move of France also operated against the Italian interests and was therefore naturally unwelcome to Mazzini. However, despite this opposition France
succeeded in restoring the Papal States. Thereafter, France was naturally committed to maintain a force in support of the Papal authority and opposed all movements for Italian unity.

In the meanwhile in Piedmont a state which had played a leading role during the struggle of 1848-49. Victor Emmanuel appointed Cavour as his Prime Minister, which set the ball rolling for the Italian unity. Cavour was a statesman with great diplomatic skill and was committed to make Italy a powerful nation, under the leadership of Sardinia-Piedmont. He therefore tried to increase the armed forces of Piedmont as well as to economically develop the state. At the same time he also realized that Piedmont could fight against Austria with the help of other powers only. Realising that even though Britain may be sympathetic towards Piedmont she was not likely to plunge into a war with Austria. The only country which could offer help to Piedmont was France because she had been conducting her international relations on the basis of practical and selfish considerations. Nonetheless he started working with a view to win the sympathy and support of other European powers.

First of all he extended support to England and France during the Crimean War in the hope that this alliance would promote Italy’s interest. He sent the Italian forces to the battle of Thernaya. When his soldiers complained of the excess of mud at the site of “war Cavour asserted out of this mud, Italy will be made”. At the end of the Crimean War, Cavour took part in the Convention of Paris in 1856 on terms of equality with other powers. He also utilized this occasion to vigorously attack Austria for misgovernment in central and southern Italy.

In 1858 Cavour was able to secure a promise of help from France in Piedmont’s struggle against Austria. In return for this France was to get Savoy and Nice. The kingdom of Sicily was to retain its separate entity and Pope was to be the matter of Rome.

After reaching an understanding with Napoleon II of France, Cavour started looking for a pretext for war with Austria. In 1859 rebellion broke out in Lombardy and Venice. Cavour with the help of France succeeded in pushing out the Austrians’ from Lombardy and merged it with Piedmont. After this success of Piedmont Napoleon III grew suspicious that ultimately Piedmont may lord over the entire Italy and pose a menace to the French border. He therefore made a hurried peace with the Austrian Empire, whereby Venetia was left with Austria and an
Italian federation under the presidency of the Pope was created. This was a serious setback for Cavour.

After the conclusion of peace by Napoleon II with Austria, Piedmont was also forced to conclude treaty of Zurich with Austria. Under the treaty the right of Piedmont to rule over Lombardy was accepted by Austria retained her mastery over Venetia. Nice and Savoy were handed over to France. All these developments convinced the Italians that they could hope to liberate their country only through a united action. The northern states of Italy requested their merger with Piedmont which was duly accomplished after plebiscite. As a result, with the exception of Venetia and Rome the entire northern and central Italy was united and a federal administration was established.

The next important stage in the unification of Italy set in with was the victory of Garibaldi over Sicily. In 1860 the inhabitants of Sicily revolted against their autocratic ruler. Garibaldi with the help of his soldiers invaded Palermo, the capital of Sicily and ousted the autocratic ruler with the support of the people. He also inflicted a defeat on the army of Naples at Milazzo. As a result the whole of Italy with the exception of fort of Mazzina came under his control.

Fearing that these victories of Garibaldi may impede the cause of Italy’s unification due to the possibility of Garibaldi coming to the rescue of the Pope, Cavour was able to secure approval of Napoleon II for invasion of Umbria and Marches by the Piedmont armies. Ultimately on 29 September the armies of Piedmont captured Ancona. Garibaldi agreed to hand over Naples and Sicily to the King of Piedmont and thus the unification of Italy was completed. Victor Emmanuel was made the king of Italy.

Not only Venetia and Rome was to be added to make the unification of Italy complete. For the attainment of the objective Victor Emmanuel II concluded a treaty with Bismarck whereby Italy agreed to invade Venetia, while Prussia was involved in a war against Austria. Obviously the purpose of the treaty was to divert the attention of Austria. Accordingly, in 1866 when the war between Austria and Prussia broke out the emperor of Italy also declared a war against Austria and invaded Tyrol, as well as Venetia. However, Prussia succeeded in scoring a victory over Austria. In terms of the treaty Bismarck handed over Venetia to Italy.

The Italian leadership had to wait for some time more before they could capture Rome. The opportunity was provided by the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 which rendered France weak and hence it could no
longer ensure the safety to Pope. Rome was captured by Emmanuel II in September 1870. A plebiscite was held to ascertain public opinion. In the plebiscite the people voted for unification with Italy with an overwhelming majority. Rome was made the capital of Italy and it emerged as a united and free nation.

2.3.3 Contribution of Mazzini to the Rise of Nationalism in Italy
Mazzini is often described as the prophet of 19th century nationalism and was one of the three great architects of Italian Unification (the other two being Garibaldi and Cavour). He developed a nationalist feeling from the very childhood and began to grasp a vision of united Italy. He impressed on the people that the whole of the Peninsula, though divided by artificial political barriers, was a living unity with a common heritage of traditions and historic memories. As a youth he joined Coronary’s revolutionary organization with a view to work for Italy’s unification. He actively participated in a revolt in 1830, which was inspired by the French Revolution of 1830, and was imprisoned. While in prison Mazzini realized that the country could not be liberated by following principles of Carbonari and it was vital to charge the Italian youth with sentiments of patriotism, sacrifice, moral character etc. to attain Italy’s national emancipation. In 1831 he founded the society known as Young Italy, with its branches all over Italy. This society propagated Republican and nationalist ideas through education and insurrection and tried to cultivate a spirit of self-sacrifice among the Italian youth it may be noted that Mazzini did not favour foreign help for emancipation of Italy

Mazzini organized a number of risings in different parts of Italy, especially Millan and Lombardy, and succeeded in expelling the Austrians. He also organized successful revolt against the people who took to flight and Mazzini set up a Republic with himself as its president. However, the Roman Republic did not last long because after some time Napoleon II sent an army which defeated Mazzini and destroyed the Roman Republic. Mazzini was forced to fly to America and ultimately died in foreign land in 1872.

The main contribution of Mazzini to the cause of Italian Unification was that he succeeded in impressing on the Italian people that liberation and unification of Italy was not an impossible dream but a practical ideal capable of realization. He converted a large number of Italian people to his way of thinking and fired them with a missionary spirit to die for the cause of Italian independence and unification. It is true that though most of the attempts made by Mazzini to attain
independence for Italy ended in failure, but this does not undermine his 
contributions to the cause of Italy’s independence. His services were in the realm 
of ideas and inspiration which he injected in the body and brain of the Italian 
youth. His chief contribution was that he gave a definite shape to the idea of Italian 
nationality and converted it into a popular cause. This greatly contributed to the 
struggle for Italian independence and unity. According to Lipson, “Mazzini 
deserves all the honour due to pioneer whose life was devoted to the pursuit of a 
great ideal. His propaganda broadened the political horizon of Italians and created 
a vigorous public opinion in favour of national independence. Mazzini, therefore, 
holds an imperishable place amongst the makers of modern Italy.”

2.4 Common Features of Nationalism in Germany and Italy

A look at the movements of national unity in Germany and Italy shows that 
they had many things in common. Both these movements culminated in the 
creation of new states rather than new nations. In both the countries the national 
unity was achieved under the leadership of a single powerful state-in Germany 
under Prussia and in Italy under Piedmont, while the rest of the states did not 
extend any willing cooperation to the movement. Again, in both the countries the 
display of high degree of diplomacy by the leadership was a contributory factor in 
this unification. Finally, in both the countries the unification was achieved through 
a series of successful wars. “In the modern times and with continuously waxing 
strength since the seventeenth century, nationalism has re-emerged first in Europe 
and then in other countries.”-Carlton J.H. Hayes

Nationalism in Europe mainly drew inspiration from two revolutionary 
developments-the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. While the 
former provided the political base the latter created the economic framework of the 
modern nation state. In this respect France and England provided the models of 
modern nations. In this Chapter we shall deal with the rise of Nationalism in 
Germany and Italy. However, before undertaking this survey it is desirable to 
understand the meaning of nationalism.

2.4.1 Meaning of Nationalism

The term ‘nationalism’ is very difficult to define because its meaning and 
implications have changed with the society and its social relations. Generally two 
distinct meanings have been assigned to this term. In the first instance nationalism 
is taken as a social concept which expresses the bond existing between the 
individuals of one nation. In the second sense, nationalism is considered as a
creative and a powerful force. While in the first sense nationalism means a ‘relationship’ in the second sense it means the ‘power’. But if we look at the things in their full perspective we find that there is no contradiction between these views. If there exists a national bond, the power automatically accompanies it. Hence the two constitute the subject of the same thing.

One of the difficulties in defining nationalism is posed by its elasticity. Since nationalism is not a static concept any definition of nationalism would only cover its characteristics at a particular point in a particular society. But as the society is dynamic and keeps on changing the concept of nationalism also keeps on changing. However, in the broad sense we can define nationalism as “the bond which people of a nation feel, or as the feeling on the part of the people of one nation that there is something which binds them together and which distinguishes them, therefore, from other. It is essentially irrelevant whether the binding factors are cultural, historic, economic or political.”

Though the task of giving acceptable definition of nationalism is difficult, scholars have offered definitions assigning different meanings to nationalism. According to Hans Kohn nationalism is difficult; scholars have offered definitions assigning different meanings to nationalism. According to Hans Kohn nationalism is “first and identification of himself with the ‘we-group’ to which he gives supreme loyalty”. Carlton J.H. Hayes looks at nationalism as “a fusion of patriotism with consciousness of nationality”. It combines “a common language and a community of historical traditions”. But the most workable definition of nationalism has been provided mind, feeling or sentiment of a group of people living in a well-defined geographical area, speaking a common language, possessing a literature in which the aspirations of the nation have been expressed, being attached to common traditions, and, in some cases, having a common religion. There are of course, exceptions to every part of the definition.”

2.4.2 German Nationalism

The rise of nationalism in Germany differs fundamentally from the rise of nationalism in England and France. While in the latter two countries the state preceded the state and greatly contributed to the creation of the modern German state. Further, the German movement for unity drew inspiration from French and English, who had reached a fairly high degree of consciousness about two centuries earlier. One of the major factors which inspired the Germans to unify their state was that they wanted to imitate the success achieved by the French and
the British in the world. Obviously the rise of nationalism in Germany was greatly delayed and it shall be desirable to analyse the reasons for this delay.

2.5 Reasons for the delay in the rise of nationalism in Germany:
The following factors were responsible for the delayed development of nationalism in Germany:

   Firstly, Germany did not possess any create geographical boundary, which not only exposed her to foreign invasions but also encouraged the centrifugal forces.

   Secondly, the hostile attitude of the Pope greatly hampered the growth of nationalism in Germany. The Pope was encouraged to adopt hostile attitude towards Germany because the German Kings under the impulse of romantic Imperialism pursued a policy of a drive to towards Italy. This was detested by Pope and he naturally extended support to those who were opposed to the establishment of a strong Central power in Germany.

   Thirdly, the depletion of German man-power due to constant migration of Germans into the Slav countries, during the medieval ages, also hampered the growth of nationalism in Germany.

   Fourthly, the passing of the Imperial Crown into the hands of the Habsburgs, which had intimate connections with Spain and Netherlands and also contributed to the delay in the growth of nationalism in Germany. The intimate connections of Habsburgs with Spain and Netherlands were greatly detested by France which turned a hereditary enemy of Germany and extended every possible encouragement to particularism within the empire and this hampered the growth of nationalism.

   Fifthly, the fundamental religious differences which cropped up between the Catholics and the Protestants in the wake of the Reformation also stood in the way of Germany’s unity As there was no strong political authority in Germany which could keep these hostile groups under control, the divisions within the country persisted.

Sixthly, the division of Germany into a number of small states, which were constantly at war with each other, not only resulted in destruction of life and wealth, but also stood in the way of the material prosperity of Germany. As a result the country faced stagnation in industry and commerce and the merchant class, which played a leading role in the building of Western nations, could not develop.
Further, the governments of the small states were also opposed to any move for unity because it entailed their extinction.

Finally, the dominance of the German culture by the French culture in the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries also greatly obstructed the growth of local nationalism in German states.

2.5.1 Causes for Ultimate Rise of nationalism in Germany:

Despite the above noted limitations, nationalism did develop in Germany during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The main factors which facilitated the development of nationalism in Germany are enumerated hereunder.

1. Impact of the French revolution: In the first instance the French revolution and the Napoleonic despotism which followed it, exercised a profound influence on the growth of nationalism in Germany. Napoleonic invasion of Germany brought home to the of indifference to politics, and the state must be large enough to defend itself. The policy of continental blockade applied by Napoleon against Germany gave a rude set back to the German commerce and the German merchants felt the importance of politics and started working for the establishment of a democratic liberal state. Simultaneously, a feeling of uniting the various states into a single national unity also gained strength. In short, it can be said that the Napoleonic invasion of Germany fostered an incipient national consciousness and convinced the German people of the advantages of a very strong German state. Further, Napoleon by abolishing the vestiges of the medieval rule and laying the foundations of a modern government also unconsciously paved the way for the growth of German nationalism.

2. Impact of Cultural and Religious Movements: The cultural and religious movements which had been in progress in Germany since the days of Luther also exercised profound influence of the growth of German nationalism. The middle classes started taking interest not only in politics but also took to the study of Philology, folk-lore, primitive German history and sages. Studies were undertaken by Herder, Jacob, Wilhelm Grimm and Savigny, in which they not only emphasized the common language, culture and race of the Germans but also advocated the concept of volk, which emphasized the highest freedom through the development of its inherent spiritual and idealistic power. In simple language the concept of volk highlighted the cultural community of the German people, which was even more important than the political unity.
3. **Impact of Historismus:** The doctrine of Historismus, which held that that the laws, customs and traditions are an expression of a nation’s individuality, also greatly influenced the growth of German nationalism. In this regard the contributions of Herder are most outstanding. Historismus emphasized the particularise elements and asserted that broadly no two historical events could be alike, and each nation had its own peculiar history. As such the various institutions existing in a state grew out of and served the needs of a nation. Ranke recreated the German history. As such the various institutions existing in a state grew out of and served the needs of a nation. Ranke recreated the German history a new. He traced the distinct German tradition from the Roman Empire, which suffered an eclipse during the middle ages. He asserted that as it possessed an individual character of its own, it could not only suffer a temporary eclipse but could not become extinct.

4. **Impact of Pietism:** Pietism, a sectarian movement of the second half of the seventeenth century, also helped in the growth of German nationalism. This movement posed a challenge to the religious orthodoxy and political absolutism. Since the movement was carried through German language and appealed to the lower classes, it had a very wide impact. It also highlighted the German culture as opposed to the classical or the French culture, which was the culture of the ruling class. It may be noted that though Pietism was in no sense a nationalistic movement and flourished much before the emergence of nationalistic feeling in Germany, yet it certainly prepared the ground for the later developments.

5. **Contributions of Fitch and Hegel:** Above all, the political writings of philosophers like Fitch and Hegel also exercise profound influence on the growth of German nationalism. Fitche attached great importance to state and described it as the highest embodiment of the spirit of reason and therefore the ultimate reality. Hegel played even more important role in the development of German nationalism and presented all that was important in German thought in a systematic manner. He asserted that “the history of the world was the history of the mind, evolving, by a dialectical process, towards a fuller consciousness of itself and a fuller freedom, in which the laws that determined it, should be solely the laws of its own making”. He asserted “that the laws and conventions which grew up at each stage of this progress from the family to the state embodied a new advance in the dialectical evolution of mind; and the state, the final stage in this process, presented the highest embodiment of mind upon earth”.

2.5.2 German Unification
The growing nationalism of Germany ultimately manifested in the unification of Germany. No doubt, at the Vienna settlement of 1815 the reactionary leaders sought to crush the national sentiments of the Germans, but due to the efforts of Prussia some sort of unity was achieved through the creation of Zollverein, a customs union. This not only resulted in enormous expansion in trade and strengthening of national feeling among the Germans but also considerably increased the power of the Emperor of Prussia. Encouraged by his constitution for the people of Germany. However, this move of Prussian Emperor was bitterly opposed by Austria which still wanted to retain the leadership of Germany and if it was not possible to split the Hapsburg Empire. Ultimately Fredrick William 4, the Prussian Emperor, was forced to sign the Treaty of Olmutz in 1850 and the initial attempts at the formation of confederation of German states were foiled. This convinced Prussia that progress towards unification could be made only through use of military power. Therefore, the Prussian Emperor (William 1) started improving his military power. In this task he was ably assisted by Otta Von Bismarck, his Minister President. Unmindful of the resistance offered by the popular House of the Prussian Diet, Bismarck embarked on an ambitious programme of militarization. He not only raised a large number of soldiers but also imparted them training in the use of new weapons. As a result the military strength of Prussia considerably increased. Bismarck openly declared that he would achieve the unification of Germany through the policy of iron and blood. He asserted that significant problems could not be solved by mere speeches and public opinion but only through bloodshed and the ratting of war weapons.

Another obstacle in the way on unification of Germany was posed by the problem of Schleswig and Holstein, the two duchies south of Zutland. While Holstein had entirely German population and was a member of the confederation, Schleswig had partly Danish population. As both Denmark and Germany wanted to capture these two duchies a conflict between the two became inevitable. In January 1848 the King of Denmark made a bid to incorporate the duchies in Denmark but Holstein revolted and made an appeal to Prussia and the confederation for help. A war ensued as a result of which Danes were driven out of the duchies. However, England and Russia were opposed to invasion of Denmark and forced the Prussians to withdraw to Schleswig. By the Treaty of London, concluded in 1852, it was decided that both the duchies should remain under Denmark but they were not to be merged into it. However, in 1863 the new King
of Denmark (Christian 9) established intimate relations with Holstein and made a bid to annex Schleswig. As this was contrary to the terms of the Treaty of London it met with resistance from the patriots, leaders and rulers of the duchies. Taking full advantage of the situation Bismarck assumed leadership of Germany.

As the Emperor of Austria was heading the German Confederation Bismarck thought it desirable to have a treaty with Austria. The two (Austria and Prussia) then asked the King of Denmark to dissolve the new constitution as it violated the Treaty of London. On the latter’s refusal Prussia and Austria declared war against him in 1864. After his defeat the King of Denmark was forced to sign the Treaty of Vienna as a result of which Schleswig and Holstein came under the sway of Prussia and Austria. However, Bismarck knew it fully well that Austria would not agree to the surrender of these duchies to Prussia and as he himself was not willing to agree to the handing over of these duchies to the Duke of Augustenburg, a conflict with Austria seemed inevitable. But as Bismarck was not as yet prepared for a war against Austria he reached an agreement with Austria whereby the duchy of Holstein was to go to Austria while the duchy of Schleswig was to go to Prussia. As a result of this settlement the hold of the Duke of Augustenburg over the duchies was ended for ever and road was left open for Prussia to conspire against Austria in the duchy of Holstein. Thus he prepared the ground for a war with Austria.

Bismarck in the meanwhile developed friendly relations with Russia. He also knew it fully well that England would not assist Austria. Therefore he started looking for an excuse to wage a war against Austria. He got this excuse when Austria insisted that the duchies should be governed by the Duke of Augustenburg. Bismarck asserted that as the problem concerned Austria as well as Prussia no such decision could be taken without their prior permission. Bismarck also insisted on the dissolution of the Parliament of Frankfurt and the election of a new one. This attitude of Bismarck was quite humiliating to Austria and it decided to declare war against Prussia.

In the war though the Austrian army succeeded in defeating Piedmont, it could not make any concrete gains. On the other hand taking full advantage of the pre-occupation of the Austrian army in Italy, Prussia invaded Austria in Bohemia and succeeded in establishing Prussian sway over hess, Cessel, Saxony, Hanover and Dresden. After this success the Prussian armies moved towards Bohemia and came face to face with the Austrian armies stationed at Koniggratz. A war ensued
in 1866 in which Austrian army, though numerically much stronger, was defeated by the Prussian army. The Emperor of Austria was compelled to sign the Treaty of Prague in August 1866. In terms of this treaty the Confederation of Germany was dissolved. As a result the Austrian influence was eliminated from Germany. The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were annexed to Prussia. Venetia was given to Victor Emmanuel. Austria was required to pay a war indemnity. In the north of the Mein River a North German Confederation consisting of 20 German states was formed and its headship was given to the Emperor of Prussia. Thus the Treaty of Prague destroyed the influence of Austria in Germany and recognized the military supremacy of Prussia.

France-Prussian War, 1870-71. The growing power of Prussia greatly roused the jealousy of France. Even Bismarck realized that the unification of Germany could not be achieved unless France was defeated. In view of the expected inevitability of a war with France he had treated Austria generously and also allowed the south German states like Baden, Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Hesse to form an independent federation. On the other hand Napoleon III of France was disillusioned by the victory of Prussia over Austria and felt that it was not Austria but France that was defeated at Sadowa. Further he was looking for some adventure after his failures in Russia, Mexico and Germany to recover his lost prestige. Accordingly in 1865 he demanded from Prussia the states of Mainz, Bavaria, Palatine, situated on the left bank of the Rhine. But Bismarck refused to part with the same. The efforts of Napoleon III to acquire Belgium and purchase duchy of Luxemburg from the King of Holland were also foiled by Bismarck. As a result his prestige greatly suffered and he decided to punish Prussia. Bismarck was well prepared for it and had already either won the sympathy of other powers in favour of Prussia or antagonised them with France. Thus he encouraged Russia to invade Turkey and nullify the terms regarding the black sea. He had already won over Austria by the liberal treatment after the war of Sadowa. Italy also agreed to side with Bismarck because it felt that the withdrawal of French forces from Rome would smoothen the cause of Italy’s unification. Bismarck won over the sympathy of England and South German states by projecting the image that Napoleon III’s ambitious policy of expansion (in the nature of demand of Belgium, Bavaria, Luxemburg, Palatine etc.) posed a threat to the arrangements existing in Europe.

After preparing the ground for a war with France, Bismarck provoked France to launch an offensive by carrying certain amendments in a telegram (about
the negotiations going on between the French Ambassador Benedetti and the Prussian Emperor) which was received differently by the French and the Prussians. While the Prussian people got the impression that the French ambassador had misbehaved with their Emperor, the French felt that the Emperor of Prussia had insulted their ambassador. The amended telegram was given wide publicity in the press. As a result the public opinion on both the sides was greatly excited. Ultimately, on 19 July 1870 France declared a war against Prussia. However, the Prussian forces proved too strong for the French. The French forces under Napoleon III were defeated at Sedan, and Napoleon was taken prisoner. This resulted in the demand for the abolition of monarchy and establishment of republican rule in France. The war against Prussia was continued by the French under their Foreign Minister (Jules Fabre) and Home Minister (Gambette). However, ultimately Germany succeeded in capturing Strasberg and Metz. After a prolonged fight of about four months ultimately France surrendered to the German forces. A treaty was concluded on 18 January 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. The treaty imposed a war indemnity of 20 crores on France. As long as France did not pay this indemnity the German armies were to stay in the main forts. France also agreed to the surrender of forts of Strausberg and Metz as well as the districts of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany.

The most important outcome of the Franco-Prussian war was the completion of unification of Germany and the establishment of the German Empire. Not only The King of Prussia was declared the Emperor of Germany even the states of South German Federation decided to merge themselves into the North German Confederation.

2.6 Self Check Exercise

1 The name of the famous book of Montesquieu was?
(a)- Social Contract
(b)- The Spirit of Law
(c)- Das Capital
(d)- Napoleon Code

2 Franco-Prussian war broke out in the year
(a)-1868 AD
(b)-1870 AD
(c)-1871 AD
(d)-1866 AD
3 Which treaty was concluded between France and Prussia after the battle of Sedan?
(a) The treaty of San Stefano
(b) The treaty of Frankfort
(c) The treaty of Paris
(d) The treaty of Campo Formio

4 Who was the real architecture of the unification of Germany?
(a) Metternich
(b) William I
(c) Bismarck
(d) Napoleon-III

5. “Young Italy“ was established by-
(a) Garibaldi
(b) Cavour
(c) Mazzini
(d) Napoleon-III

6. The unification of Italy was completed in-
(a) 1840-AD
(b) 1850-AD
(c) 1869-AD
(d) 1871-AD

7. Bismarck resigned the post of Chancellor in
(a) 1870
(b) 1875
(c) 1880
(d) 1890

8. Treaty of San Stefano was signed in
(a) 1878
(b) 1880
(c) 1881
(d) 1882

7 Summary
It is noteworthy that what could not be accomplished by the Liberals otherwise was achieved by Bismarck through a series of successful wars. In fact under the prevailing conditions the unification of Germany could be achieved only through
this method because the element of particularise was too strong in Germany and the states were not willing to make any surrender in this regard. Further, what Bismarck really succeeded in creating in 1871 was a German Empire and not a Nation-State. The feeling of nationalism developed only afterwards.

In view of his contributions to the cause of German unification scholars have showered great praise on Bismarck. Prof. Phillips says “Bismarck was the statesman of the school of Machiavelli sharing to full his contempt for those brain spun of fogs of fancy which are apt to obscure the path of practical politics.” J.A.R. Marriot says, “In the history of nineteenth century, Bismarck will always claim a foremost place.” Even after Bismarck had accomplished unification of Germany, he continued to play a leading role in furthering nationalism in Germany. He accorded pre-eminent position to national interests in his policies and tried to keep public opinion on his side. As a result of his efforts Germany emerged as one of the leading powers by the close of the century.

2.8 Glossary

embrace: to include
intimate: having a very close relationship
inspiration: a feeling, person
vigorous: done with vigor
desirable: wanted
binds: to tie or fasten with string
peculiar: unusual or strange
emancipation: to give people social or political freedom and rights

2.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. (b)
2. (b)
3. (b)
4. (c)
5. (c)
6. (d)
7. (d)
8. (a)

2.10 Suggested Readings
2.11 Terminal Question

1. Give an Account of the service of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini to the cause of Italian unity

2. Give an estimate of Bismarck’s achievements after 1870.

3. What were the aims of the foreign policy of Bismarck and how could he achieve them?

4. Write a note on the domestic policy of William Kaiser 11 from 1890 to 1914.

5. Write a detail note on the foreign policy of William Kaiser 11.

6. The unification of Italy and that of Germany constituted a contrast in respect of the ways they were affected and the impact they left on later international politics. Elucidate.

7. Discuss in details the attempts made by people by Germany for the unification of their country. Also account for their failure.

8. “Not by speeches and majority votes are the great questions of the day decided but by Blood and Iron”. Explain how Bismarck brought about the unification of Germany.

9. Isolation of France constituted the keystone of Bismarck’s foreign policy.

10. “Metternich was the greatest reactionary of his age”. Explain.
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3.1 Introduction

During the period form about the last decade of the nineteenth century to 1914 when the First World War broke out, the world was dominated by Europe. However, there were already signs that the beginning of the end of European hegemony had started. Outside Europe, two countries-like USA and Japan –had already emerged as major powers. Within the colonies, nationalist movements had begun to take shape. The rivalries among the European imperialist powers over colonial possessions and the conflicts among the European States over European affairs led to the First World War, which was disastrous for Europe. Within many countries of Europe, powerful movements had emerged which aimed at radical changes in the existing social, economic and political system. Even before the war was over, the biggest country of Europe, Russia had a successful revolution. The world which emerged after the First World War ended in 1918, was very different from what it had been in the preceding three decades.

3.2 Objective

After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:

The Europeans hegemony and inter imperialist rivalries
The conflicts among the European States
The rise of two big powers USA and Japan

3.3 Europe’s Hegemony and Inter-Imperialist rivalries
During the period from the 1870s, when the new phase of imperialist expansion began, to 1914, almost all parts of Asia and Africa and some areas in other parts of the world had come under the control of one European imperialist country or other. In Asia, India, Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Burma (now Myanmar) were under British rule, the countries comprising Indo China were under French rule and Indonesia was under Dutch rule. China was not directly ruled by any imperialist country but had been divided into spheres of influence of various countries. She had been reduced to the status of an international colony. Her dismemberment was prevented by the Boxer Rebellion which broke out in 1899-1900. The Rebellion was suppressed by a joint Anglo-German-Russian-French-Japanese-American force which occupied Beijing but it prevented the partition of China. In 1907 Iran was divided into three parts—one part was within the sphere of influence of Britain, the second within that of Russia and the third open to both Russia and Britain. Britain exercised some degree of control over Afghanistan. Central Asia had come under the rule of the Russian empire. The only country in Asia which was independent was Japan. She had defeated China in 1895 and occupied Korea.

Africa, with the exception of Ethiopia and Liberia, was divided among the European powers. In 1876, Leopold II, King of Belgium, had taken possession of Congo, more or less as his private property; it was handed over to the Belgian government in 1908. Britain Empire in Africa included Egypt and Sudan, Rhodesia, Uganda, British East Africa, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast (Ghana), Nigeria, and South Africa. The French had taken possession of Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, the Sahara, French Congo, French, Guinea, Senegal, Dahomey and Madagascar; Germany had acquired German East Africa, South-West Africa, Cameroons and Togoland. The Italian conquests included Libya and Somaliland. Portugal held Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea and Spain had acquired Rio de Oro and Spanish Guinea. Italy’s ambition to conquer Ethiopia had been thwarted when her troops were defeated by the Ethiopian army at the famous battle of Adowa in 1896.

The British Empire was the biggest in the world, both in terms of the number of people over whom it ruled and the area under her rule. Britain at this time had a population of about 45 million but the population of her colonial possessions extending over an area of 23 million square kilometres was about 400
million. France with a population of about 39 million ruled over an empire of over 10 million square kilometres inhabited by over 50 million people.

Europe dominated the world not only politically but also economically. Three countries of Europe—Britain, Germany and France—controlled about 45 percent of the world market for manufactured goods.

The process of the imperialist conquest of Asia and Africa was accompanied by intense rivalries and conflicts among the European imperialist powers. The competing claims over colonies often created conditions of war. However, generally, most of these conflicts were resolved in the conference rooms of Europe and wars were avoided. The European powers settled their rival claims—which country would acquire which territory—on the basis of quid pro qua of something for something, by giving away something in exchange for receiving something. For example, in 1904, after a long period of conflicting claims, which Hs brought them almost to the point of a war, Britain and France entered into a secret agreement whereby Britain was given a free hand in Egypt and in exchange Morocco was to be given to France. When Germany came to know about it, she demanded that France relinquish her claim to Morocco. A serious of international crises followed, brings Europe to the brink of war. The Moroccan issue was finally settled in 1911 when France agreed to give a portion of French Congo to Germany and Germany informed France that she could do what she liked in Morocco. In creating these crises and in resolving them, the people of French Congo or Morocco, whose territories were being bargained, had no say.

In spite of the ‘Gentlemen’s agreements’ which resolved most disputes over colonies, there was growing militarization of the European States. Every country feared and suspected the other and tried to increase its military and naval strength and the size of every country’s navy and army went on increasing. Most European countries introduced conscription that is, making military training compulsory for everyone. Europe was being gradually converted into an armed camp. Each country of course, claimed that the increase in her armed strength was for purely defence purposes but others was for war. Britain opposed Germany building a strong navy saying that it was a luxury for her as she had a strong army. Kaiser William Fleet is not built against any one and not against England, but according to our need. I want to make myself safe, against France and Russia and England too. And I am all for the white man against the black. Britain was determined to maintain her naval superiority, which she had enjoyed for about
three centuries, to protect her empire and commerce and to give herself a feeling of safety. The feverish manner in which the armed strength of various European States was increasing and the preparations for war made, led to the steady growth of feeling that war was inevitable. War was considered a part of the natural order of things and was even extolled as a virtue. Preparations for war were accompanied by propaganda for war, and some philosophers and politicians viewed war as one of the divine elements of the universe and a condition for progress.

When we speak of the economic and military might of Europe, it should be remembered that this was not true for all countries of Europe. When the war broke out in 1914, there were about twenty-five States in Europe, big and small. The most industrialized of these were Britain, Germany and France while most of the rest—Spain and Portugal in the Liberran Peninsula, the Balkan States such as Albania, Serbia and Bulgaria, and Greece and countries of Eastern Europe—were still primarily pre-industrial countries even though some of them had acquired colonial possessions. Russia, the most populous country in Europe and with a big empire, was also primarily an agricultural country, industrialization there had just begun and that too mainly through investment by other countries. Nor were the States based on the principle of nationality. The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and Finland were part of the Russian empire. Poland as a State did not exist; one part of it was under Russian occupation, of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the third part lay in Germany. Czechoslovakia was a part of the Austro-Hungarian empire as were many areas of the Slave people (comprising parts of present Yugoslavia). Ireland had been a British colony for centuries. The political systems in these countries also varied a few were republics, though not all republics were democratic; some were constitutional monarchies, the powers of the monarchs varying from country to country, and the rest were autocracies.

The conflicts among the European countries were not confined to the question for colonies. There were tensions and antagonisms between them over European affairs of the twenty-five European States. Five may be said to have been powerful. These were Britain, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary and the most powerful. Britain had a parliamentary form of government though monarchy had been retained. Even after the various Reform Acts passed during the nineteenth century, the House of Commons, the House of British Parliament which comprised elected members (the other being the House of Lords which comprised
hereditary members) was not truly democratic. All men still did not have the right to vote and women had no voting rights at all. One of the major problems that Britain faced was the demand for Home Rule by the Irish. A powerful movement for independence had been growing in Ireland though many people in Northern Ireland, mostly settlers from England and Scotland, were opposed to it. Germany was the strongest power, both in terms of her economic and armed might, on the continent of Europe and was Britain’s main rival. She too had a parliamentary form of government though the position of the German emperor was much stronger than that of the British monarch. The territory of Germany included a part of Poland and Alsace-Lorraine which she had taken from France after a war in 1870-71. France, the third most industrialized State of Europe, had been a republic since 1871. She looked forward to the day when she would avenge her humiliating defeat at the hands of Germany and recover Alsace-Lorraine by a war of revanchist (revenge). Austria-Hungary, the Hapsburg Empire as it was called, was a dual monarchy. The two important countries comprising the empire were Austria and Hungary, and Francis Joseph was simultaneously the emperor of Austria and king of Hungary. Politically, Austria-Hungary was the most troubled State in Europe. Her territories, besides Austria and Hungary, included Czechoslovakia, Slav areas (later to constitute Yugoslavia) and parts of Poland, Rumania and even Italy. In all these territories, there was a resurgence of nationalism, creating deep discontent and division. The nationalism of the Slav people in Austria-Hungary was also fanned by Russia and Serbia and created strong antagonism between these two countries and Austria-Hungary. Russia was the biggest country in Europe and she had established a vast empire which included the Baltic States Finland and part of Poland in Europe and northern and Central Asia. She was a backward agricultural country, with some industries concentrated in a few big cities, and had an outdated political system. She was under the autocratic rule of the Czars, as the Russian emperors were called, and until 1905 she did not have even the semblance of a parliament. After the 1905 Revolution a parliament, called the Duma, was created but it had little power. Discontent was rife in the Russian empire, among the non-Russian nationalities because of the oppressive social, economic and political system. Another country of Europe which pretended to be powerful was Italy. She had vast colonial ambitious but, expect for its northern part, she was industrially backward.
Some of the tensions in Europe were connected with the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Throughout the nineteenth century, there were wars between the Ottoman Russian empires. Russian attempts to extend her control over the Ottoman territories in Europe were thwarted by other European countries, notably Britain, Germany, and Austria-Hungary. By the early twentieth century, the Ottoman rule over the Balkans had all but ended. Serbia, Bulgaria and Albania had emerged as independent States. However, the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire did not solve the problem of nationalities in Europe. Serbia had emerged as a champion of the Slav people, many of whom inhabited the Austro-Hungarian empire. She depended on Russia’s support in her ambition to create Greater Serbia which would include the Ottoman provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina that were under Austria-Hungary and the southern areas of Austria-Hungary which were inhabited by the Slav people –the Croats the Slovenes and the Serbs. She encouraged discontent in these areas and organized conspiracies against Austria-Hungary. This region became the source of increasing tensions in Europe and finally provided the incident which brought about the First World War. In 1908, Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina which had been placed under her administrative control. Serbia wanted Russia to go to war with Austria-Hungary on this issue but Germany’s threat of supporting Austria-Hungary in the event of a war restrained Russia. There was further intensification of bitterness in Serbia against Austria-Hungary as a result of the Balkan Wars in 1912-13. Some of the Balkan States, including Serbia had united, with Russian support, to conquer Macedonia from the Ottomans. However, after the Ottomans had been defeated, Austria-Hungary, with the support of Britain and Germany, succeeded in making Albania an independent State rather than a part of Serbia which Serbia had hoped.

During all this period, treaties and secret agreements were signed, and threats of war issued and withdrawn, indicating alignments and realignments. There was no parliament friend sand no country could rely on the support of another country. This confusion who was whose ally and enemy- persisted till the very outbreak of the war and was an additional source of tension. For example, Russia had threatened to go to war on the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In fact, she had earlier reached a secret understanding with Austria-Hungary promising her that she would not interfere in her plans to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina in exchange for her support in Russia’s ambition to have the straits leading to the Mediterranean opened to her. However, in spite of these
uncertainties, two rival alliances had emerged by the first decade of the twentieth century. Already in 1882, the Triple alliance comprising Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy had been formed, although or many years after 1882, Germany and Austria remained friends and by 1890 it was clear that Italy’s loyalty to the Alliance would be uncertain. Russia and France had signed secret agreements in 1894 which had brought them together against the Triple Alliance, Particularly against Germany and Austria-Hungary in 1904, Britain and France, who had long been enemies and had often reached the brink of war in their rivalries over colonies, entered into what is known as the Entente Cordiale, a sort of friendly agreement rather than a formal alliance. The secret clause of the friendly agreement included France giving up her claims on Egypt in return for freedom to do what she liked with Morocco. The next stage in the process was an agreement in 1907 between Britain and Russia-the two had a long history of rivalries and hostility. The purpose of this friendly agreement was to divide Iran, as already mentioned. With this was formed the Triple Entente comprising Britain, France and Russia. It was an Entente (understanding) and not a formal alliance. The formation of the alliance (or understanding), in spite of doubts about the loyalty of allies and friends in case the war broke out, brought the war nearer and added to the mistrust and fear of each country against the others. The alliances also made it inevitable that, when the war broke out, it would not be a local war confined to one or two countries and that it would almost certainly assume wider proportions.

3.4 USA and Japan

Two countries which emerged as major powers during this period were the United States of America (USA) and Japan.

The USA

During about a hundred years after the thirteen English colonies on the east coast of North American had won their independence from England and emerged as the United States of America, that country had attained its present’s territorial proportions. The westward territorial expression of the United States took place at the cost of the American Indian tribes which inhabited those areas. The American Indians resistance finally ended in a massacre at a place called Wounded Knee in South Dakota. The USA also purchased vast territories of Louisiana and Alaska from France and Russia, respectively, and sized Taxes and California form Mexico after a war with that country. Between 1861 and 1865, there was civil war when
the southern states of the USA which were primarily agricultural with plantations worked by slave labour seceded from the union. As a result of the defeat of the southern States in the civil war, the Union was preserved and slavery was abolished.

Within about three decades after the end of the Civil War, the USA had become the foremost industrial power in the world. By the end of the nineteenth century, she was producing about one-third of the total production of iron and steel in the world. In almost every branch of industry, she outstripped every other country in the world. There were over 300,000 km of railroads in the country, which exceeded the combined railroads in entire Europe. She produced and consumed more oil and natural gas than the rest of the world put together. For a long time, the amazing growth of the US economy went unnoticed. One reason for this was that the US herself provided a huge market for her products. The US population had risen from about four million in 1790 to about 92 million in 1910. About twenty-five million European had migrated to the US during the nineteenth century. There had also been a general lack of interest in the European and world affairs.

By 1890s, the USA had emerged as a new imperialist power. In 1889, a US senator said, “Today, we are raising more than we can consume. Today we are making more than we can use. Therefore, we must find new markets for our produce, new occupation for our capital, new work for our labour.” Another senator had warned that the US must not fall out of the line of March. Like many Europeans at that time, the Americans also had begun talking about of the duty of the civilized nations to uplift the less fortunate ones and the domination by strong nations of the weak ones being in accordance with the laws of nature. The US expansion in the Pacific had started even earlier. The Hawaiian Islands were referred to as being a part of the American System in 1881 though they were annexed only in 1898. In the 1880s a war-like situation had developed as a result of the US, German and British rivalries over the Samoan islands. For some time, the three but in 1899, Germany and the US divided the Islands between themselves, with Britain being provided elsewhere. In 1893, the USA declared her hegemony over the American continent. During a territorial dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana (present Guyana), she forced Britain to agree to refer the dispute to arbitration and declared, “Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines
its interposition”. In 1998, the US went to war with Spain over Cuba which, along with Puerto Rico, was the only Spanish colony in the Americas, it was claimed to have been a splendid little war except for those who had fought in it. The US also attacked the Philippines, a Spanish colony in the Pacific. Spain was defeated and ceded Puerto Rico and the island of Guam in the pacific to the US. The Filipinos were considered unfit to rule themselves and the US president, claiming that he had received divine guidance, decided to annex the Philippines. Cuba forbidden to make treaties with any other country and the US claimed the right to intervene in Cuba to preserve her independence, life and property. Though nominally independent, she became a US appendage. When in the 1890s the European powers made preparations for the partition of China, the US felt that she would be left out. When therefore, declared what is known as the open Door policy, which meant that no country should be discriminated against in China by other countries, including in areas which they claimed as their spheres of influence. When the Boxer Rebellion broke out, the US troops joined the troops of European countries in suppressing it and in occupying Beijing. By the early years of the twentieth century, the US had become fully aware of her being a world power. There was also a streak of racism in the US attitude to other peoples. According to the US president Theodore Roosevelt, the ‘civilized’ nations were predominantly white and the uncivilized ones predominantly non-white. He himself summarized his foreign policy in these words: “Speak softly and carry a big stick.” He was concerned about the Russian designs in China and, therefore, was quite happy when the Japanese attacked the Russian fleet in 1904. Later, he mediated to end the Russo-Japanese war and persuaded Russia to recognize Japan’s territorial gains which included control of Korea and southern Manchuria, and a part of the Sakhalin Island which had earlier belonged to Russia. He also entered into a secret agreement with Japan which gave the US the right to trade freely in that region. The US appeasement of Japan’s colonial ambitions was to prove costly to the US later as Japan became the main rival to the US in the pacific. Latin America had begun to be seen as the USA’s special sphere of interest, which was open to intervention only by the US. In 1904, Roosevelt declared that the united states had the right not only to oppose European intervention in the American continent but to intervene herself in the internal affairs of her neighbours to maintain order. This is known as a new corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. For over thirty years, the US kept with her the control of the customs revenues of the Dominican Republic. In
1906 the US troops landed in Cuba to preserve order and remained there for three years.

The completion of the Panama Canal is considered the “most celebrated accomplishment” of Roosevelt. A French company had completed about 40 per cent construction of the Panama Canal in Colombia. The US bought from the French company its holdings but the Colombian government refused to agree to the terms which the US had offered to her regarding the payment to be made to her for giving the right to construct the Canal in Colombians “bandits” and “blackmailers”. A revolution was organized in Panama with money supplied by an American industrialist, the US troops landed in Panama to preserve order (actually to prevent Colombia from suppressing the revolution) and, after three days, Panama was recognized as an independent nation. The new government of Panama signed an agreement with the US on the Panama Canal on terms that were which the US had earlier offered to Colombia and which the latter had rejected. The Canal was opened in 1914. In the meantime, in 1906, Roosevelt had been given the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in ending the Russo-Japanese War.

The policy of US intervention in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries continued during the presidencies of Wilson. Taft’s policy of promoting American investments in the Latin American countries and elsewhere and establishing indirect control through investment did not preclude the use of gunboats and armed intervention if the need arose. The US policy towards Mexico had been deposed by a popular leader Francisco Madero. In 1913 he was deposed, with US approval, by another director, and murdered. This dictator was deposed after some time and the US, unsuccessfully, continued to intervene in the affairs of Mexico.

The industrial expansion, which had made the USA a leading industrial power and was soon to make her a world power was accompanied by corruption intense exploitation and the use of ruthless means, and disregard for the interest of the people. The owner of one of the largest railroad companies is credited with the frank statement: The public be damned. By adopting ruthless methods a few individuals controlling a few corporations had concentrated enormous economic power in their hands. Often this concentration took place in violation of the law and by bribery. The holder of huge industrial empire, when told that what he was doing was against the law declared “what do I care about the law? Hain’t I got the power?” The need to control the increasing concentration of economic power in a
few hands became a major issue in the politics of the USA from the 1890s. It led to a movement called ‘progressivism.’

What has been said earlier about the conditions of the common people, particularly the industrial workers, in Europe was also true for the USA. The working and living conditions of the workers were miserable and unemployment was a common feature of their life in spite of the enormous growth of the economy. Workers were never very far from the prospect of poverty, losing their jobs or facing a cut in their wages. Child labour was rampant and children working at night in the textile mills were kept awake by throwing cold water on their faces. Female children in some industries worked sixteen hours a day. About 20 per cent of the workers employed in manufacturing industries were women, who were paid much lower wages than men. Little attention was paid to prevent industrial accidents, which were a common occurrence.

The workers of the USA began to organize themselves and there was a wave of strikes from the 1880s. Most of these were ruthlessly suppressed by the state police and troops, which were used to terrorise the workers. The industrialist also used guards hired for the purpose of breaking strikes and terrorizing workers. One agency which provided the services of its guards for this purpose was the Pinkerton Detective Agency and it continued to provide these services for many decades. Killing of trade union leaders were not uncommon. A national workers organization which emerged in their period, was the American Federation of Labour (AFL). On its call, strikes and demonstration were held on 1 May 1886 all over the country to press the demand for an eight–hour working day. In the Haymarket Square in Chicago on that day, the police fired at the demonstrators who were protesting against the police atrocities on the striking workers of the city. Four workers were killed. Someone had earlier thrown a bomb at the police, which had killed seven policemen. Eight persons were arrested on the charge of inciting the person who had thrown the bomb and in what is considered to be one of the most injudicious trials in Americans history seven of the accused were sentenced to death. The second international’s decision to give a call to workers to observe I may to demand eight-hour working day has been mentioned earlier. The choice of that day was connected with the incidents that earlier took place at Haymarket Square in Chicago on 1 May 1886.

Many Americans raised their voice against the gross inequalities in society the exploitation of could labour and of woman workers the growing concentration
of wealth in a few hands, and corrupt industrialists, bankers, politicians and officials. A powerful literature of protest was also strong opposition to the imperialist policies being followed by the US government. Some of the earliest socialist groups outside Europe were formed in the US. In 1901, the Socialist Party of America was formed. Its most prominent leader was Eugene V. Debs, who later polled about one million votes in the 1912 election for the presidency. Another important labour organization was the Industrial Workers of the world (IWW). When the First World War broke out, the US in the words of President Wilson, decided to remain “impartial in thought as well as deed”. In April 1917 the USA decided to enter the war to end wars and to make the world safe for democracy. It has been mentioned earlier that when the war broke out, the socialist Party and the IWW, however, stuck to their opposition to the war. The US government had made laws according to which any public expression of opposition to the war was sedition and sabotage. Many Americans were prosecuted for their opposition to the war Eugene Debs was sentenced to ten years imprisonment.

There were other tensions and conflicts within the US some of which have persisted till our own times. Vast sections of the American population suffered from various other disadvantages besides the ones created by the concentration of wealth in a few hands. Industrial progress did not mean increased prosperity of the people. In the course of a little over hundred years, the American Indian tribes which inhabited North America were deprived of their lands and their way of life was totally disrupted. By 1890, the process of their total subordination was nearly complete and they had to accept what the whites left to them. One of the major issues in the history of the USA since the nineteenth century has been the struggle of the black people for freedom and equality. For about 80 years after the USA emerged as an independent nation with a republican form of government, slavery continued in that country. In 1860, in a total population of about 31 million there were four million slaves owned by about 225,000 people in the southern States of the USA. In 1865 after the Civil War, slavery was abolished. For about ten years afterwards, efforts were made to enforce the rights of the black people the former slaves in the former slave owning southern States. In 1868, “citizenship” rights were given to all persons born or naturalized in the United States and these rights could not be abridged. In 1870, the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution was passed which made it a law that the right of the citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Earlier, even
in the northern States, which did not have slavery most black people were denied this right on one ground or the other. Now even in the southern States the black people who were now free but very poor were not only given the right to vote but this right was enforced. This period which lasted till the 1870s is known as the Reconstruction Period. In many respect this was the first time that the US had a truly democratic system. It came to an end when power was handed back to the former slave-owners in the southern States, troops of the Federal government were withdrawn from the southern States and a period of denial of political and legal rights to the black people and the practice of racial discrimination and oppression against them started. By the early years of the twentieth century the black people and the practice of racial discrimination and oppression against them started. By the early years of the twentieth century the black people were stripped off their legal and political rights and segregation between whites and black was rigidly enforced blacks and whites could not travel in the same train compartments they could not go to the same parks and beaches they could not eat the same restaurants, they could not go to the same schools, theatres and even hospitals. Segregation was combined with violence and it is estimated that about 200 blacks were lynched by white mobs every year during the last decade of the nineteenth century. Racism also became an instrument for perpetuating economic inequalities in society. The black people were the most economically depressed section of American society. But most of the whites were also poor and were ruthlessly exploited. By arousing racial feelings, common people black and white, were prevented from unitedly fighting against exploitation. The black people suffered from discriminatory practices throughout the century in the southern States of course it was much worse and much more brutal than in the northern States. By the early twentieth century, a powerful movement of protest against racial discrimination began to emerge. The most significant figure in this movement for about half a century was W.E.B. Du Bois. In 1909 the national Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAAP) was formed. Many who were opposed to racism also supported the struggle of the black people. However, it took over half a century before significant progress began to be made in ending racial discrimination and the inhuman system of racial segregation. It has been mentioned earlier that even in those European countries that had a democratic right to vote. The same situation exercised in the started in the mid-nineteenth century and it became an important
issue in the early twentieth century. However, it was only in 1920 that American women were granted the right to vote by the US Constitution.

3.5 Self Check Exercise

1. In which year Triple alliance formed?
2. Triple Alliance was concluded among:
   (a) Germany-Austria-Italy
   (b) Germany-Italy-France
   (c) Italy-England-France
   (d) Germany-Austria-Japan
3. Triple Entente comprising the countries of
4. Who’s word is “Speak softly and carry a big stick.”
5. Panama Canal was opened in which year?

3.6 Summary

The inter-imperialist rivalries, the growing chauvinism and antagonism and conflicts with Europe, the formation of opposing alliance systems, and the growing militarization and feverish preparation for war these were some of the features that characterized the history of Europe since the last decade of the nineteenth century. There had been a number of crises which had been at least temporary resolved. The tensions in Europe, however, had created a situation which war had begun to be considered inevitable. Every State was ready with its war plans and strategies. It had also become increasingly clear that once the war broke out, it would not be possible localize it and that it would become a general war and every country would get drawn into it. Two countries which emerged as major powers during this period were the United States of America (USA) and Japan.

3.7 Glossary

Exceeded: to be more than a particular number or amount
Annex: to take control of another country or region by force
Preserve: to keep something safe or in good condition to officially to show that he/she is guilty
Racial: connected with peoples race
Perpetuate: to cause something to continue for a long time
Racism: unfair ways to treating people of different races

3.8 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. 1882
2. (a)
3. Britain, France and Russia
4. Theodore Roosevelt
5. 1914

3.9 Suggested Readings

3.10 Terminal Question
1. Explain the basic reason for the conflicts between European nations from the late nineteenth century to the early years of the twentieth century.
2. Describe the policy of the second international on the questions of colonies, militarism and war.
3. What were the causes of the tensions within the countries of Europe in the period up to 1914? Discuss.
4. Throw a light on the emerging powers of USA and Japan.
Chapter 4
Social tension and socialist movements
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4.1 Introduction

Besides the conflicts between States, there were serious tensions and problems within States. The problem of nationalities, which has been mentioned, was not the only source of internal tension, the changes that had come about since the rise of capitalism and during about a hundred years after the beginning of the Industrial Revolution had made Europe’s hegemony over the world possible. However, the social system in all countries of Europe was marked by gross inequalities. In the countries where industrialization had not taken place on any significant scale, the peasantry which constituted the bulk of the population, continued to live in the old way in conditions of misery and oppression. The countries that were industrialized and had become mighty economic powers had social systems that were based on undisguised exploitation of the workers. In spite of the growth of industries which produced an increasing quantity of goods, vast masses of people lived in unhealthy conditions in slums and led lives of semi-starvation, with the ever-present danger of being thrown out of employment. In Britain, during her war against the Boers (Dutch settlers) in South Africa in 1899-1902, the need for recruiting additional men to the army was urgently felt. A large number of people who came to the army recruiting centres were rejected, for they were diseased and too weak, having lived lives of poverty in unhealthy surroundings, to serve as soldiers. Efforts were made to mitigate some of the Industrial Revolution but the situation of the downtrodden had not significantly improved even after the end of the nineteenth century. A British historian of the
twentieth century Europe has remarked, “The poor who thronged the overcrowded slums of the big towns and industrial districts were a lower order of humanity and treated as such, valued only as the necessary pool of labour, always in surplus, on which the social as well as the economic system depended.”

4.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
- The Social tension and socialist movements
- How industrial revolution marked by gross inequality in European society
- How economic powers and social systems exploited the workers

4.3 Socialist Movement
The rise of the trade union movement and of the ideas and movement of socialism has been mentioned earlier. The socialist view that capitalism was a system based on exploitation and must be ended, was gaining increasing popularity with the workers of Europe since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. There was a spate of strikes in pre-First World War Europe. In almost every country of Europe, socialist parties had been formed and steadily growing. By 1914, the people who voted for the various socialist parties in Europe also steadily increased. In 1914, the socialist parties of Germany, France and Italy were the single largest parties in the parliaments of their respective countries.

The formation of the Second International in 1889 has been referred to earlier. One of the decisions taken at the Congress at which the Second International was formed was “to organize, for 1st May, a great international demonstration organized in such a way” that on the same day “the workers in all the lands and cities will simultaneously demand from the powers-that-be a limitation of the working day to eight hours”. Since then, the May Day is observed throughout the world as the working-class day and a day of solidarity of the workers throughout the world.

There were many differences within the socialist movement and parties of each country on the meaning of socialism and the methods of achieving it. Some socialist held the view that capitalism could be ended only by overthrowing the ruling class through a revolutionary struggle while others held that capitalism could be transformed gradually through the growing influence of the working class without a revolution. These differences were also reflected in the policies of the Second International and continue of divide the socialist movement to this day.

4.4 Japan
It has been mentioned earlier that Japan was the only Asian country to have escaped imperialist control. For centuries military generals called shoguns, exercised real power in Japan while the Japanese emperor was a mere figurehead. For over two hundred years, Japan had been almost totally secluded from the rest of the world. In many respects, the Japanese social system was comparable to the social system of feudal Europe. Around the middle of the nineteenth century, Japan was rudely awakened to the modern world by the threat to her independence. Within a few decades she not only succeeded in warding off the danger of foreign domination but also underwent a process of modernizing certain aspects of her society that enabled her to emerge as a world power. In 1853, Commodore Perry went with a US fleet and delivered an ultimatum to Japan. It was stated that positive necessity requires that we should protect our commercial interests in this remote part of the world and in doing so, to resort to measures however strong, to counteract the schemes of power less scrupulous than ourselves. Eight months later, when he returned with a bigger fleet, the Japanese government signed a treaty with the US under which two ports were opened to US ships and some amount of trade was permitted. Similar treaties were then signed by several European countries. In 1863 and 1864, the US and European fleet displayed their military superiority by firing on two Japanese cities. In 1868 the rule of the shogun was ended and a new set of rules and advisers came to the fore. They ruled in the name of the emperor, whose authority, in theory was restored. This event is known as the Meiji Restoration after the title Meiji which the new emperor took.

Within less than four decades of the Meiji Restoration, Japan’s economy and political situations were transformed. The Japanese government made heavy investments in industries the money for which was raised by heavy taxation and exploitation of the peasantry. Subsequently, the industries were sold to capitalists. Afterwards, government support in starting industries was no longer needed as the Japanese capitalists were able to start industries on their own. The process of industrialization was accompanied by impoverishment of the number of them migrated to the cities where they provided cheap labour for the industries. By the early years of the twentieth century, Japanese goods particularly textiles, could successfully compete in the international market with European goods. The demand for Japanese manufactures within Japan was limited due to the extreme poverty of most Japanese.
In 1889, Japan was given a new constitution. The Emperor enjoyed a special position as head of the executive and ministers were appointed by him and were responsible to him. He was believed to be “heaven-descended” divine and sacred; he is pre-eminent above his subjects. He must be reverenced and is inviolable.” The constitution provided for a parliament called the Diet. Less than 3 per cent of the population had the right to vote. The Diet enjoyed little power; the ministers were not responsible to it, and even in financial matters, its powers were limited. The military enjoyed vast powers in the new political system and, in course of time, came to completely dominate it. The army and the navy appointed army and naval and the Diet had absolutely no control over them. The educational system which was built up, made a mass of the population literate within a very short time. It enabled the Japanese of master the technical skills necessary for industrialization. The educational system was also used to promote emperor worship and an attitude of extreme nationalism and chauvinism. The civil liberties and open political struggles were lacking in Japan. The Stat was controlled by an oligarchy and the repressive apparatus of the State, notably the police, enjoyed wide powers to control the press and prevent the holding of public meetings and demonstrations. Political dissent was not tolerated. In spite of severe restriction, however, the first socialist group in Asia formed in Japan.

By the 1890s, Japan had started pursuing her colonial ambitions. These ambitions were primarily directed at China and aimed at establishing Japanese supremacy in East Asia. Later, the object of Japanese ambitions was to be entire Asia and the Pacific region. Having built up her armed strength, she went to war with China and defeated her in 1895. She annexed Formosa, which was a part of China, and forced China to recognize Korea, which came under Chinese suzerainty, as an independent State. IN 1905, Korea was made a protectorate of Japan and in 1910 was annexed by her. In 1899, Japan’s status as a great power was recognized by the US and European countries when they gave up the rights and concessions that they had obtained as a result of the treaties which Japan had been forced to sign with them after 1854. In 1902, the Anglo-Japanese Treaty or Alliance was signed, and Japan became the first Asian country to enjoy the status of full equality with other with other colonial powers. The British objective in signing the treaty was to deter Russian designs in China. The Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), which ended in the defeat of Russia, has already been mentioned. Southern Manchuria was recognized as a Japanese sphere of influence. Japan also
obtained half of the Sakhalin Island and acquired control of the Liaotung peninsula. During the First World War, Japan sought to establish her protectorate over china. Though she did not succeed in achieving this aim, she was able to extend her influence there.

The rise of Japan as a great power, ever though she was following imperialist policies in Asia, provided an impetus to the growth of nationalism in many Asian non-white country could defeat a major European power. It helped the peoples of Asia the regain their pride.

The emergence of the USA and Japan as great powers was an indication that the supremacy of Europe would not last long. The First War hastened the process.

We have referred to certain development in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the context of European, American and Japanese imperialism. From the time when the imperialist countries established their direct or indirect control, they were faced with stiff resistance by the people. In course of time, the early forms of resistance gave way to the rise of nationalist movements, which aimed at the overthrow of direct or indirect foreign control, asserted their right to equality with other nations and expressed their determination to build up the economies of their countries on modern lines and their political and social systems on the principles of democracy and social justice. These nationalist movements often had to fight against the outdated political systems in their countries as well as those elements that stood in the way of their progress.

You are already familiar with the rise of Indian nationalism and its specific features. It was one o the first nationalist movements to emerge in the colonies. Movements of national liberation had begun to emerge in other parts of Asia by the early years of the twentieth century, notably in Indio China Indonesia, the Philippines and Iran after a series of revolts, the Shah of Iran had been forced to agree to transform Iran into a constitutional monarchy with a parliament called mafias. Soon after, however, with foreign particularly Russian, support, the Shah re-established his despotic rule and the mafias was abolished. In China, the national awakening of the people was expressed in the emergence of a number of revolutionary organizations which came together by forming the Chinese Revolutionary League. The President of this League was Dr Sun Yat-sen, who played the leading role in the national awakening of the Chinese people and uniting the various revolutionary groups together. The League was guided by three
principles enunciated by Dr Sun Yat-sen. These principles were: Nationalism, Democracy, and Livelihood (the last one is sometimes referred to as Socialism). In specific terms, these principles meant the ending of the rule of the Manchu dynasty which had been ruling China since the middle of the seventeenth century, establishment of a democratic republic and equitable distribution of land. In 1911, revolution swept southern China and on 1 January 1912, China was proclaimed a republic with its headquarters at Nanjing. Dr Sun Yet-Sen was made President of the Republic. In the meantime, in northern China some steps had been taken to make China a constitutional monarchy with General Yuan Shih-Kai as Prime Minister. To avoid a conflict between the government in control of northern China from Beijing (Peking) and the republic proclaimed at Nanjing a compromise was reached. The Manchu ruler abdicated and thus the imperial government in China came to an end. Yuan Shih-Kai was recognized as the President and he was entrusted with the task of calling the parliament. Yuan Shih-Kai was supported by foreign powers. In 1913, he called the parliament but soon dismissed it. He had dreams of declaring himself emperor. In the meantime, Dr Sun-Yat-sen had formed the Kuomintang (Kuomintang) or the National Party and had given a call for a second revolution. Yuan was able to suppress the Kuomintang, which was banned and Dr Sun sent in to exile. In 1916, Yuan died and China came under the rule of warlords, who controlled different parts of the country and received financial support from foreign powers. When the First World War ended, the national and revolutionary movement in China entered a new phase.

The Ottoman Empire, as has already been mentioned, had lost most of its territories in Europe by the early years of the twentieth century. Most of her possessions in North Africa had also been taken over by European colonial powers. In the countries of West Asia, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine and Arabia also nationalist feelings had been on the rise. Within Turkey, there were powerful stirring against the tyranny of the Sultan and for making Turkey a modern democratic and secular State. The movement was led by a group of intellectuals, reformers and army officers, called the Young Turks. Threatened by a rebellion, the Sultan, in 1908, agreed to restore the constitution, which had been first introduced in 1876. Some Young Turks were in favour of giving equal rights to the Arabs of the Ottoman Empire while others were bent on maintaining Turkish supremacy and even extending it. Ultimately, Turkey due to the failure of the liberal Young Turks, was drawn into the First World War on the side of Germany.
and Austria-Hungary, and the British succeeded in pursuing her imperialist ambitions in the Arab world by making use of the anti-Ottoman Arab nationalist feelings.

The European partition of Africa had been more or less completed by the end of the nineteenth century, except for some parts of North Africa, which were acquired by the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century. The actual occupation of African territories, however, took the European colonial powers much longer because of the resistance and revolts that they had to face. Some of these revolts took the colonial powers a long time to suppress. There was, for example the Maji-Maji revolt in Revolt in German East Africa in 1905-07. Unlike in many countries of Asia, modern nationalist movements in most parts of Africa emerged only after the First World War. When they arose, they had a long tradition of resistance and revolt behind them.

In Latin America, twenty independence States had emerged with the collapse of the Spanish and Portuguese empires. Till the end of the nineteenth century, most of them had backward economies, based mainly on agriculture. Most of them were also ruled by corrupt oligarchies, and strong government did not emerge, which could tries. The rich resources of these countries instead of being used for development and welfare of the people, were bartered away to European companies and, later increasingly, to US corporations. With foreign investments in mines, plantations, railways, shipping, electricity, that is, in almost all sectors of economy, Latin America had become what has been called and informal empire. The increasing control and domination exercised by the USA over Latin America has already been mentioned.

Most Latin American countries had social systems which were marked by gross inequalities. In some countries, slavery had been abolished as a result of the French Revolution. In some others, however, it persisted even after it had been abolished in the USA. In Brazil, for example slavery was abolished only in 1888. However, in spite of the long persistence of slavery in some of the Latin American countries, the kind of racism, racial discrimination and segregation which marked the life in the USA even in the twentieth century, was absent in Latin America.

Except for later Asian immigrants, the population of Latin American countries comprised people of European descent, blacks who were descendants of slaves who had been brought from Africa, and American Indians and their admixtures. More than half of the population of Latin America was of mixed
blood. However, in most countries which had a large American Indian population such as Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, and Venezuela—all power was concentrated in the hands of white ruling cliques. Large estates were owned by mainly absents landlords while the American Indians were forced to live in conditions of extreme poverty. Only in Mexico—another country with a large American Indian population did united popular movements grow with American Indian participation on a massive scale to put an end to social inequalities, to bring about equitable distribution of land, and build a state system based on the support of the common people. Mexico, however, underwent a long period of political turmoil, including intervention by the USA, before the aims of the Mexican Revolution could be realized. Argentina made some progress in building up her economy and democratic institutions. The city of Buenos Aires was regarded as the Paris of Latin America.

By the time the First World War broke out, there were democratic stirring in many parts of Latin America. Even though, Latin American countries had been independent for about a century, they lingered on the margin of international life with no independent role to play. With little industrialization, they were reduced to the position of suppliers of raw materials. Some of them were transformed into single crop economies for the benefit of their powerful neighbour this made them further dependent. The contrast between North America and Latin America was too glaring to be missed by the people of Latin America. There was a rise in the aspirations of the Latin American people and a growing sense of hostility to the USA, the Colossus of the North.

4.5 Self Check Exercise

1. Anglo-French Entente was concluded in
   (a)-1904
   (b)-1914
   (c)-1894
   (d)-1905

2. Algeciras Conference was called in
   (a)-1904
   (b)-1906
   (c)-1907
   (d)-1905

3. The second International was formed in which year?
4. The May Day is observed as a
giving.
5. Give the name of Japan’s Parliament.

4.6 Summary
Efforts were made to mitigate some of the Industrial Revolution but the situation
of the downtrodden had not significantly improved even after the end of the
nineteenth century. A British historian of the twentieth century Europe has
remarked, “The poor who thronged the overcrowded slums of the big towns and
industrial districts were a lower order of humanity and treated as such, valued only
as the necessary pool of labour, always in surplus, on which the social as well as
the economic system depended.”

4.7 Glossary
immigrants: a person who has come to a another country
increase: to become or to make something larger in number or amount
pursue: to follow somebody/something in order to catch him/her/it
dissent: disagreement with official
apparatus: a set of tools, instruments or equipment used for doing a job
oligarchy: a small group of people having control of a country or organization
executive: concerned with managing, making plans

4.8 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. (A)
2. (B)
3. 1889
4. Working –class day
5. Diet
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4.10 Terminal Question
1 What do you know the Social tension and socialist movements
2 How industrial revolution marked by gross inequality in European society?
3 How economic powers and social systems exploited the workers?
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5.1 Introduction:  
Soon after the success in its war of independence, the colonies became States. They were united and governed as per the provisions of the articles of Confederation. A Constitutional convention was set up in 1787 to draft a new constitution for the U.S.A. It was headed by George Washington. Most leading revolutionaries and lawyers were associated with the drafted of the new constitution. It was completed in 1789 and came into force that year. The Americans chose to remain under a republican form of government headed by an elected President for a fixed term. Washington’s nomination became the obvious choice and he chosen as the first president of the U.S.A. during the early years of the Republican he paid attention to achieve a more perfect union of the states. The financial stability of the new Republic also became his main concern. The Jay treaty was signed with Britain even though about by Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, who introduced various economic reforms. The two-party system in America developed, with Hamilton favouring a strong federal union on the one side and Thomas Jefferson championing the cause of Anti Federalism. The parties founded by them came to be known as the Federalist Party.
has adopted many principles of the Federalist Party, and the Democratic Party of the Anti-Federalist party respectively. c

5.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The expansion of U.S Territory
Causes of the Civil War
Attitude of European Nations towards the Civil War
Consequences of the civil war

5.3 Expansion of U.S Territory:
Under President Jefferson, the U.S.A. doubt the area of its then existing territory with the purchase of Louisiana territory from Napoleonic France. The entire territory along the sides of the Mississippi cost the U.S.A. a sum of 15,000,000. A large number of her citizens began to migrate far as the Rocky Mountains with the purpose of setting.

5.3.1 The War of 1812 and its Results:
When France and Britain were engaged in a conflict, the U.S.A. maintained her strict neutrality. Despite her observance of neutrality, her commercial interests with Europe suffered because of naval blockades. Failing to get Britain respect her right on the seas, America fought a war with Britain, called the War of 1812. Neither party gained any final victory nor subsequently did both agree to end their hostilities. The war had its telling effect on the U.S.A. The war infused a new sense of national unity and self-confidence. The Americans no longer depended upon Europe for improving their economy. The American government launched various schemes of its own to strengthen its economy. A protective tariff was introduced by an enactment of American Congress with a view to protecting the “Infant industries”. The country was on its way toward rapid industrialization. The westward movement accelerated fast, and eleven more states were admitted into the Union. With improved means of transport and communication, America was poised to achieve new heights of prosperity. During the time of President Madison, Western Florida was annexed. In 1819, Spain Sold Florida to the U.S.A. The west began to play an important role in the country.

1. Monroe Doctrine: In the foreign policy area, the U.S.A. Took the first step to stem the further tide of Europe interference and colonization of the American continents by enunciating what is called the Monroe doctrine. Embodies in a message sent to congress President Monroe (1857-25) warned European powers
that their further interference in Spanish colonies and attempt at colonization could be considered as unfriendly acts towards the U.S.A. His declaration implied the supremacy of the U.S.A. over the whole American subcontinent. Further his warning had salutary effect on effect on European powers. A popular candidate of the west, Andrew Jackson, was chosen as President in 1892. He was a man of the masses and a “people’s President.” The Jackson and democracy represented the fulfilment of some of the aspirations of common man.

2. Controversial issues which divided the nation: During the ensuing years what troubled the politicians and statesmen most was the spread of slavery. Whether the new states which desired to join the Union be slave-free or slave was the question which raised heated controversy between the North and the South. Unfortunately, the Northern and the Southern states could not see eye to eye on many matters. Two crucial issues which divided the country and plunged it into civil war were the new traffic proposal before the Congress and the question of slavery.

3. The North-South difference: One many as well note these two controversial issues affected the North and South. The northern states were comparatively prosperous than the southern states due to rapid industrial progress and trade. The new tariff proposal helped them in accelerating their progress. However, this development was adversely effecting the Southern states were generally backward. They depended on agriculture. They imported many agricultural tools and other necessary products from abroad. If the new tariff bill became the law, the imported products would cost more. Secondly, the northerners shunned slavery and treated its existence as a blot on the fair name of their country. They were vehement in their argument that the newly formed states which desired to join the Union should be slave-free. The southerners did not like any of these arguments to them the constituted vital segment of their economy. Without slave-labour, agriculture, in the south would suffer. The argument that slavery should not be permitted constitution a great threat to south. These controversial issues became highly politicized to such an extent that a civil war became inevitable. The Republican Party was founded by the northerners who hated slavery, and its extension to other territories.

5.3.2 Causes of the Civil War: From the days of yore, the northern and southern states of America were struggling against each other. In 1784 differences cropped
up between the federal and the democratic classes and the economic crisis of the 19th century fanned them. This difference ultimately took the shape of civil War.

(a) Economic Disparity: From the very beginning economic disparity was present between the North and the South America. Northern America being industrialized helped the rise of big factories. As these factories were run with the help of machines, slaves did not have much importance for them. On the other hand, the economic life of the southern America was based on agriculture and there was dearth of agricultural equipments, the people of south relying upon the labour of the slaves. In fact, the slaves were the basis of their success; that was why they did not want to abolish this system. Thus the economic interests of the northern and the southern states differed from each other. There were two powerful political parties in America. One party was in favour of sovereignty of each state while the other wanted a strong central government. The number of immigrants in the north was quite large in comparison to the South as economic opportunities were very bright in the north. Abraham Lincoln wanted to eliminate these differences and to strengthen the Federal system in America.

(b) Slave System:

By the end of the 18th century the people of America began to look to the slave trade with disdain and the slave system was abolished in North America by an Act of 1787. But in the south it was being abolished gradually by changing the hearts of the people in place of making use of force. But in the mean time with the advancement of industry the slaves trade became a vested interest and now nobody wanted to abolish it. Gradually, the slave system became a very intractable problem in American politics.

In the declaration of independence by George III it was stated that Slave Trade was a sin but later on this provision was removed from the declaration. By an Act of 1787 though the slave system was abolished in the northern part of America, it was permitted that fugitive slaves could be arrested. Perhaps the constitution makers of America agreed to the circumstance of the time. It was admitted in the constitution that in the election of the legislature the Negro salves would be allowed to take part but their number would not exceed three-fifths. After this the slave trade continued for thirty years more according to Missouri Pact and by 1850 the number of the slaves reached states. Later on this Pact was completely rejected by the South.
Thus the north and the south were not unanimous on the issue of slavery. North America considered it to be a bolt on the fair society of America whereas it was an unavoidable evil for the South which could not be abolished. Neither of the tow was prepared to compromise on this issue. Some thinkers were of the opinion that America wanted to extend her territory in the west in the name of salve trade.

(c) Election of Abraham Lincoln

Abraham Lincoln occupies a significant place in the history of America. In the 1860 presidential election, Abraham Lincoln of the Republican Party was chosen President. The new President was an advocate of the abolition of slavery and soon after his election; the southern states seceded from the union. They formed a confederacy of their own to fight the union, and the nation plunged into a civil war.

With the success of Lincoln in the election, it became a certainty that the slave system would not survive in America for a long time. Although Lincoln and his Republican party had not much stressed the point of slave system, however, the victory of Lincoln had given rise to the worry that the new government would abolish American institutions and civilization. It led the Southern State to separate from the Union.

(d) Atmosphere of Terror due to Political Propaganda

Those opposing Slave System had created a terror in the southern states that the historic labour system of the south would be abolished by the north. The propaganda mounted by the leaders of the north created doubt, terror, hatred and resentment in the people of the South. The leaders of the South were endeavouring their best for the expansion of slave system; hence Abraham Lincoln had talks with Stephen Douglas. Lincoln emphasized that slave system was immoral and unjust but Douglas could not be convinced and he emphasized that the issue of slavery fell within the provincial constitution. Hence feelings of terror spread which made the outbreak of Civil War imminent.

(e) Separation of Southern States

The southern states of America did not take kindly to the success of Abraham Lincoln. Many southern had already decided that they would not remain in the Union under the President of Republican party. Carolina was the first state to oppose. She declared her separation from the Union on 20 December 1860. She declared that the laws of the individual independence which were passed by the thirteen northern states were not in accordance with the constitution. Beside, the
anti-slave movement of northern states had made their property, i.e., salves insecure. On 4th March 1861 when Lincoln took as President, seven states of the South had separated from the Union. These states formed a southern confederacy and elected David Jefferson as their President. They made a separate constitution of their own in which every state was authorities to separate herself from the Union. Although the situation was quite grave, yet Lincoln wanted to avoid the blast. After his election, unity and integrity would be maintained at all costs. Thus, a civil war broke out between the army of Lincoln and that of the rebellious states.

**Beginning of the Civil War**

When on April 12, 1861 south Caroline began a war against the Union by throwing a bomb on the fort of summer, it became imperative for Lincoln that he should safeguarded the disintegrated Union with armed intervention. On 15 April, 1861, he posted an army of 75 thousand citizens for the enforcement of the law of Union and ordered for posting the army against southern confederacy. The capital of the State was transferred of Rich mount. It was about 130 km away from Washington. The Civil war between North and South America continued from 12 April 1861 to 26 May 1865. The northern states had named it ‘Great Revolt’, whereas the southern states called it ‘War of the State’. But it is popularly known as Civil War America.

Both the parties had equal resources and had underestimated the power of the other. They were expecting an easy victory over each other but it lasted for doubt four years. The people of the south were fed up with war. The position of North was quite strong from the very beginning and it had earned a great wealth from its industries. Their resources of transportation and communication were also considerable; hence they faced the enemy very successfully.

Although the leaders of the south organized their army in a fine way and introduced compulsory military service, yet owing to their weak economic position they could not get success against the North. In spite of all the disparities between the North and South, the war continued for about four years.

**5.3.3 Attitude of European Nations towards the Civil War:**

At the time of the beginning of the Civil War, the administrative class was in favour of confederacy, but the public opinion in these countries was divided on this issue. Most of the people considered it a struggle between slavery and independence and expressed their sympathy towards the North. The states of the South expected the cooperation of English but the England supported the North.
The states of South though if they got recognition and support of foreign countries, it would help them in war. They wanted to prepare England and France for arbitration. The states of the North knew that it would be easy to defeat them in case, no support was provided to them from outside, hence they saw to it that recognition and support should not be provided to southern states. England and France exercised great influence in the Civil War. Both of them had fought against Russia in the Crimean War and it was decided in a treaty on the issue pertaining to U.S.A. the proposal of England would be accepted. Therefore Russia also supported Northern American and thus rendered the condition of the South very precarious.

**End of the Slave System, 1863:**

Although Abraham Lincoln was supporter of the independence of the slaves, yet he did not want to declare it at the time of the beginning of Civil War because it might have harmful consequences. He also knew that it was not possible to continue the slave system in some parts of the country and to discontinue it in other parts. During war it was proved that the slave system would be abolished after the victory of the North in the Civil War. Hence they supported the armies of the Union whole-heartedy. Although Lincoln had declared that he had taken part in the Civil War for the safety of the Union and for the emancipation of slaves yet on 1st January 1863 he declared the independence of all the slaves residing in the countries fighting against the Union. Consequently, the slave trade was abolished forever and the slaves began to be recruited in the Confederate Army. They were also being assured that they would be set free their recruitment in the army.

After the declaration of emancipation of the slaves the result of the war began to turn in favour of the North. The death of commander Jackson of South America proved to be the last nail in the coffin of the South and ultimately they surrendered before the army of the Union on 26th May 1865.

Assassination of Lincoln: On 4 March 1865 Abraham Lincoln started his second term as President. At the time of his opening speech, he assures the people that he would do all the best for his countrymen but his dream could not be fulfilled as he was assassinated on 14th April 1865.

**5.3.4 Consequences of the civil war**

The Civil War added a new chapter in the history of America. It not only shed the blood of the brothers but also enhanced the social, political and economic values.
Loss of Lives and Property: This Civil War was the biggest war ever fought in America. About six lakh people were killed in the war from both the sides and the number of the disabled was also very large. The Union government spent about 30 lakh dollars daily and the total expenditure accrued on this war was about 10 crore dollars.

Establishment of Powerful Political System: The Civil War solved the pending issue of the rights of Provincial and Federal states and it strengthened the political and administrative center’s of America. The southern states which passed the Black laws were forced to withdraw them. By the 14th and 15th amendments of the constitution the right of franchise was granted to the slaves, and they were granted all the rights of the citizens. Now the real shape of United States was granted to America. Really, the eradication of slave system, organization of central powers and parity of nations were its chief achievements.

Industrial Expansion: The old economic system of America was abolished as the results of the Civil war, and industrialization had taken its place. The agriculture-economic systems of the South were abolished and the industrial development of the North also could not escape its influence. Besides, the arms and ammunition factories, the industries like cotton manufacturing etc. also took to modernization. The industrial revolution helped in the rise of towns, transportations and rail industry. At this time a neo-economic age was ushered in America. In this age America headed towards industrial prosperity and capitalism.

Change in Social Values: During war both North and the South were at daggers drawn with each other but after the end of the war they established very cordial mutual relations which gave birth to the rise of new social values. Although capitalists and rich classes flourished in the society, yet due attention was paid to ameliorating the position of the labourers and to education them. Special attention was paid to the interests of the soldiers and American Red Cross society was given a new form.

This American Civil Was paved the way for social and political reconstruction. Some nationalist writers described this Civil War as a splendid war and they considered this war indirectly useful for America. It might be painful but it was a blessing in disguise.

Further Expansion of U.S.A

A few thousands American drifted towards Texas, than a port of Mexico, and settled there. The Texans opposed the dictates of Mexican government and
thereafter the former revolted and declared their independence in 1836. Texas applied for admission into the Union but had to wait for a number of years. In 1845 she got the admission and become a state of the U.S.A. The annexation of Texas into the U.S.A. directly led to a war with Mexico. After winning this war, the U.S.A. received a vast area lying towards the west of Rio Grande River. This included the territory of California. In an earlier development Britain, which disputed the claims of the U.S.A. in the Oregon territory submitted herself to a peaceful settlement in 1846. The Gasden purchase was made by which some territory near the southwest coast become a part of the U.S.A. So by the middle of the 19th century, the U.S.A. had grown from the original thirteen states to nearly 48 states, and spread from the sea-board of the Atlantic in the East to the Pacific seacoast in the west. In 1867 fishing in the Bering Sea by the Americans necessitated the purchase of Alaska from Russia at a cost of 7,200,000.

American interests in Cuba development during the last decade of the nineteenth century. The Spanish tyranny over the Cubans evoked great sympathy among the American public. Relations between Spain and the U.S.A. became strained, and an American ship Maine, was blown up under mysterious circumstance in the harbour of Havana. Acting on the wishes of American Congress, President McKinley declared war on Spain in 1898. After the defeat of Spain, her government signed the treaty of Paris by which her colonial rule in Cuba ended. Furthermore, she surrendered Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines to the U.S.A. As compensation to her territorial loss, Spain received from the U.S.A. a sum of twenty million dollars. It may be remembered that during the course of the war, the U.S.A. also occupied the Hawaii islands. Alaska and Hawaii become the last two states to join the U.S.A. had grown of the Atlantic in the East to the Pacific seacoast in the U.S.A. So the American national flag has fifty stars, each star representing a state. During the early years of the present century, the U.S.A. built the Panama Canal and extended its control over its zone. It was not until she jointed World War I on the side of the Allies, that her enormous strength becomes evident to the world.

5.4 Self Check Exercise

1. President Wilson belonged to
   (a)- France
   (b)-America
   (c)- German
(d)- Austria
2. Fourteen Points were put before Germany by
(a)- Loyald George
(b)- Orlando
(c)- Wilson
(d)- Clemencean
3. Civil War was fought between
4. End of slave system in America

5.5 Summary
The two-party system in America developed, with Hamilton favouring a strong federal union on the one side and Thomas Jefferson championing the cause of Anti Federalism. The parties founded by them came to be known as the Federalist Party has adopted many principles of the Federalist Party, and the Democratic Party of the Anti-Federalist party respectively.

5.6 Glossary
leading: best or most important
obvious: easily seen or understood
accelerate: to go faster
plunge: to jump
blot: a spot of something
quite: not very
oppose: to disagree with somebody’s beliefs
intractable: not easily governed

5.7 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. (b)
2. (c)
3. North and South America
4. 1863

5.8 Suggested Readings

5.9 Terminal Question

1. Describe the emergence of the United States of America as an imperialist power. Give examples.
2. Describe the main features of President’s Wilson fourteen points. How far were they implemented?
3. Examine the issue involved in the American Civil War. Was it a contest between two separate nations?
4. Describe the brief history of the Civil War of America and throw light on its consequences.
5. What were the factors responsible for the American War of Independence?
6. President Franklin Roosevelt’s new Deal “Had the wit to start the political economy in a fresh, more promising direction”. Do you agree?
7. Discuss the reasons for inequalities in the US society between the two world wars. Which section of the US population was the worst affected and why?
Chapter-6
Japan’s Emergence as a World Power: Modernizations and economic progress under the Meiji restoration, Sino-Japanese War
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6.1 Introduction

Japan is an island state consisting of a group of islands with an area of 147,000 sq. miles. Like Great Britain, Japan’s history was to a large extent conditioned by her geographical location. The feudal character of her society and the belief in the divinity of the Emperor (who was considered as the descendant of Sun god) also exercised profound influence on the history of the country.

For a long time, Japan pursued a policy of isolation. She first came in contact with the Western world through Christian missionaries, who came to Japan in the sixteenth century. Her first commercial contact with the West was in the nature of permission to the Dutch for facility to carry on trade with Japan, even though the commerce at this stage was strictly regulated. It was only in the mid-nineteenth century that the foreign powers succeeded in gaining a foothold in Japan and secured trade concessions. The contact with the West resulted in adoption of European oleander in 1873, and the introduction of Western legal and judicial system. Japan also adopted the educational system of Britain and institutions of Europe. As a result, Japan got Westernized within a short span of a quarter century and emerged as a strong power.

By the close of the nineteenth century Japan embarked on imperialist policy and thus got embroiled in the rivalry of the rivalry of the powers. Japanese
nationalism received further fillip following her victory over Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05. Thereafter Japan started competing for territories with other Western countries. In 1910 Japan had become a dominant power in the Far East. During the War Japan took advantage of the pre-occupations of other Great powers and occupied Manchuria, Shantung, Inner Mongolia and Fukien. After the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, the Japanese soldiers occupied the whole of Siberia in cooperation with the American forces. At the end of war Japan succeeded in retaining some of her gains with the support of Britain, France and Italy.

6.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:

- The Meiji restoration
- The Era of the Enlightenment
- Social and Cultural Changes
- Temporary Balance of Power in Asia
- How Japan becomes a Military Dictatorship

6.3 The Meiji restoration, Sino-Japanese War

Japan’s policy of restricted international intercourse, carefully maintained since the early seventeenth century by the Tokugawa Shoguns, was bound to give way when Western nations expanded their trading activities in the Far East. Before the middle of the nineteenth century several attempts, all unsuccessful, had been made by European powers to open Japan to trade. That the United State government finally took the initiative in forcing the issue was due partly to the fact that the British were busily engaged in China. It was also an indication that America’s Far Eastern commerce had clipper ships had passed through Japanese waterway en route to China, and with the rise of steam navigation the need for stations where ships could be refuelled had provisioned become more imperative.

Commodore Perry and Townsend Harris

When commodore Perry’s “black ships” steamed into Tokyo Bay in July 1853, Perry was under instructions from Washington to secure from the Japanese government the promise of protection for shipwrecked United States seamen, permission for merchant ships to obtain repairs and fuel, and the right to trade. Perry’s gunboats were sufficiently impressive to induce the Shogun to give a favourable reply when the commodore returned to Edo early the following year. However, the significance of the change in Japan’s position was
not apparent until United State consul-general, Townsend Harris, after many vicissitudes negotiated a commercial treaty with the Shogun in 1858. Harris, had no gunboats to back his arguments, but he skilfully used the object lesson of European aggression in china, to convince the Japanese that they would be better off to yield peaceably to American demands. The Harris Treaty provided for the opening of several ports to traders and for the establishment of diplomatic intercourse, placed limitations on the Japanese tariff, and recognized the principle of extraterritoriality. Following the United States lead, other Western powers secured treaties granting them similar privileges, and it seemed that the pattern that was unfolding in China might be duplicated in Japan. But, as events turned out, Japan's reaction to the Western impact produced results almost the opposite of contemporary development in China. The reason for this contrast is that the Japanese after recovering from their initial shock, turned enthusiastically to the task of assimilating Western culture and techniques for the purpose of strengthening their state and winning equal recognition among other nations.

The Abolition of Shogunate

The first important effect of the opening of Japan was that it led to the abolition of the Shogunate, making possible a reorganization of the government along modern lines. The “Outer daimyo”-especially the heads of four great domains: Choshu, Satsuma, Hizen, and Tosa has long been awaiting an opportunity. Before singing the treaties the Shogun had taken the unprecedented step of going to Kyoto to consult the emperor. The domain lords subsequently demanded that the emperor should be restored to his rightful position as ruler, denounced the Shogun for his weakness in submitting to the foreigners, and raised the cry that the ‘barbarians’ must be expelled. The anti foreignism of great daimyo was broken by direct action on the part of the “barbarians.” In 1863, after an Englishman had been slain by people of the Satsuma daimyo, British vessels bombarded the domain capital. Duly impressed, the Satsuma leaders immediately voiced the desire to acquire a navy like that of Britain. The feudal lords of Choshu were similarly chastened and reoriented their thinking in 1864 when British, French, Dutch and United States men-of-war unleashed a joint action upon Shimonoseki. In a remarkably short time the key men of the great feudal estates dropped their attitude of uncompromising hostility to the foreigners, meanwhile becoming more determined than ever to end the outmoded dual system of government.
The Meiji Restoration

In 1867 the Shogun was prevailed upon to surrender his prerogative to the emperor. He had expected to be retained as generalissimo, and when he was ordered to lay down his military command also, he resisted. However, the principle daimyo, acting in concert and in the name of emperor, quickly defeated the ex-Shogun’s forces and relegated the Tokugawa family not to obscurity but to private station. Upon abolition of the Shogunate, which had existed for almost 700 years, the imperial residence was moved from Kyoto to Edo, renamed Tokyo (“Eastern Capital”), and the old castle of the Shogun was converted into an imperial palace. This series of events constituted what is known as the Meiji Restoration.

It is so happened that Emperor Mutsuhito, a lead of fifteen at the time of the Restoration, proved to be an extremely capable person who helped materially in the task of reorganizing Japanese institutions. The years of his reign, known as the Meiji or “Enlightened” era (1868-1912), witnessed the emergence of Japan as a modern and powerful state. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to attribute Japan’s transformation to the initiative of the emperor, as in previous periods of the country’s history, effective leadership was supplied by less exalted figures, which used the throne as a symbol to promote a sentiment of national solidarity and to give the sanction of authority to their programme. Quite understandably, the leaders in the political field were recruited chiefly from the ranks of feudal society, although they included some members of the old court nobility. In spite of their aristocratic backgrounds, the leaders were quick to perceive the necessity of breaking with the past if genuine progress along Western lined was to be achieved. Some of the daimyo voluntarily liquidated feudal institutions within their own jurisdiction, urging others to follow their example, and in 1871 the emperor formally abolished the whole feudal system. The hereditary fiefs reverted to the state and by authority of the emperor were divided into prefectures for administrative purpose; the peasants were made, in theory, free landowners, paying taxed instead of feudal rents. The daimyo and their Samurai retainers were granted pensions (later converted into lump-sum payments) amounting to less than the revenues they had formerly claimed.

The sweeping political, social, economic, and intellectual changed which took place in Japan during the Meiji era were sufficient to constitute a revolution. However, they were not the result of a mass movement or of any tumultuous upheaval from the bottom of society. The revolution was one directed and
carefully controlled from above. The fact that the Tokugawa regime had already unified the country and through its discipline had instilled habits of obedience in the population facilitated the work of the Restoration leaders. The majority of the population played only a passive role in the transformation, even though they were profoundly affected by it.

6.3.1 The Era of the Enlightenment

The ambitious changed and readjustments entailed by the Meiji Restoration were facilitated by a spirit of optimism that animated Japanese intellectuals during this period of transition. Optimism was indeed the prevailing mood among contemporary Western peoples, who had embraced the doctrine of progress and believed that its validity was demonstrated by their own material success and their expanding influence throughout the world. Champions of change in Japan were inclined to accept the West’s appraisal of itself almost unreservedly because it lacked Western legal and educational systems, industry, technology, and science. Yet, strangely, while readily conceding Western superiority, Japanese spokesmen did not betray as inferiority complex. On the contrary, they expressed confidence that an enlightened Japan could catch up with the West and earn an honourable position among the nations of the world. A strong feeling of nationalism motivated the proponents of changes as it did the conservatives who opposed change. In contrast to contemporary China, where the government floundered helplessly and reformers were driven to rebellion or despair, progressive minded Japanese could witness with satisfaction an array of improvements instituted by their government. To promote the cause of national progress, a group of ten men, chiefly of samurai extraction but broadly educated, founded an Enlightenment society which met regularly for discussions, held public lectures and published a journal. Although after two years (1873-1876) the Journal of the Enlightenment suspended publication in the face of stringent censorship laws, its essays turned a searching spotlight on important political, economic, philosophical, moral, and scientific issues, ranging from the abolition of torture in the penal code to the protection of women’s rights (stopping short of a declaration of the equality of the sexes). Even during the euphoric early years of the new regime some dissenting voices were raised. One critic, decrying an attitude of servility to the government, asserted that the Japanese had become too docile a people. What they needed to borrow from the West, he said, was not its institutions and techniques but its individualism.

The Last Gasp of Feudalism
Although many members of the Samurai class found a good place for themselves, the abolition feudalism exacted a real sacrifice of the Samurai as a whole. The daimyo received a fairly generous financial settlement and were assigned ranks in a newly created order of nobility. But the Samurai found themselves deprived of their incomes while, at the same time, the government forbade them to wear any longer the traditional two swords and ordered them to merge into the ranks of the commonalty. Smouldering discontent among the Samurai broke out into open revolt in 1877, presenting the government with a test of strength which it met with complete success. The newly organized conscript army, composed of peasants with modern weapons, quickly defeated the proud Samurai, and the rebellion of 1877 proved to be “the last gasp of a fast dying feudal society.”

The Constitution of 1889

In carrying out their carefully channelled revolution, Japan’s leaders made a painstaking study of the institutions of all the major Western nations and copied, with adaptations, what seemed to be the best features of each. In the political sphere, they reached the conclusion that the principles of constitutional monarchy should be introduced. A bold but somewhat ambiguous statement of policy, known as the Emperor’s Charter Oath (1868), had hinted at the establishment of a deliberative assembly; but when plans for the drafting of a constitution were announced, it was made clear that any concessions would be in the nature of a gift from the throne rather than in recognition of inherent popular rights. A hand-picked commission drafted a constitution which, promulgated by the emperor in 1889, was patterned somewhat after the model of the German Imperial Constitution of 1871. It provided for a bicameral parliament or Diet, with a House of peers (including some representatives of the wealthy taxpayers) and a House of Representatives chosen by an electorate of the properly owners. The Diet was assigned the normal legislative powers; expect that its control over finance was limited, and the constitution including a bill of rights. In spite of some liberal features, the conservative character of the new government was unmistakable. So high was the properly qualification for voting that only about one per cent of the population was enfranchised. The position of the emperor was declared to be inviolable; he retained supreme command of the army and navy, directed foreign affairs, and could veto bills passed by the Diet. Notably lacking was the principle of parliamentary control over the executive; ministers were responsible not to the
Diet but to the emperor. Furthermore, although there was a Cabinet of Ministers, as well as a Privy Council, both these bodies were created before the Constitution went into effect. A peculiarity of the Japanese Cabinet (aside from the fact that it was not responsible to the Diet) was that the Army and Navy ministers could consult with the emperor directly, without the mediation of the premier.

The Persistence of Ancient Traditions:

While the Japanese constitution incorporated several important features and much of the nomenclature of Western political institutions, the government remained close to Japanese traditions in its spirit functioning. These traditions (which had more in common with Confucianism than with Western Political concepts) include such fundamental ideas as that men are by nature unequal and the inferior person should be subject to the superior, that society is more important than the individual, that government by man is better than government by law, and that the patriarchal family is the ideal pattern for the state. Political reforms were considered only a means to an end, which was not necessarily to produce the greatest happiness of the greatest number but to promote the efficiency, strength, and prestige of the state. The men who, in consultation with the emperor, introduce the constitution of 1889 had no notion of relinquishing their command at the instigation of parliamentary cliques or under the pressure of public opinion. The guiding personalities were a fairly large group numbering perhaps a hundred men, chiefly ex-daimyo and ex-samurai, who together composed a sort of oligarchy. Young men at the time of the Restoration retained their influence throughout the Meiji period and beyond, and eventually were referred to as the “elder statesmen” (Gennro). Acting quietly behind the scenes, they frequently made important decisions of policy. Fortunately, for Japan, these “elder statesmen” were as a whole realistic in outlook, moderate in judgment, and high-minded.

Political parties

In spite of the absence of democratic traditions and in spite of the authoritarian character of the Restoration government, the granting of a constitution led, almost from the outset, to a desire for further political reforms. Members of the Diet at least had the right to criticize the ministers, and voices were raised in favour of the extension of parliamentary control over the ministry. Political parties were organized, leading to a struggle in the Diet between the defenders of bureaucratic government and the advocates of the cabinet system. The germination of political parties actually antedated the constitution. The “Liberal
“party, which appeared in 1881, was primarily an outgrowth of an “association for
the study of political science” founded several years earlier by Itagaki, a Samurai
of the Tosa domain. In 1882 Count Okuma of Hizen launched his “Progressive”
party. These two “radical” aristocratic were doubtless motivated partly by
resentment against the fact that their own affiliated had secured relatively few
posts in the bureaucracy, most of which were filled by Choshu or Satsuma men.
Nevertheless, the introduction of political parties helped to strengthen the
movement for the establishment of representative government.

After the constitution went into effect, the character and the activities of
political parties in Japan were peculiar and not entirely healthy. Emphasizing
personalities rather than specific programmes, parties came and went, fusing into
one another, or changing their names in a bewildering fashion. Their effectiveness
was lessened by their lack of a broad popular base, by the government’s censorship
of press and speech, and by the fact that when party spokesmen became too
troublesome they could usually be quietened by offering them patronage or
admitting them to the lower ranks of the bureaucracy. But, with all their faults, the
parties provided opportunities for acquiring political experience and also forced
the bureaucrats to explain and defend their political to the public. The campaign to
achieved party government that is, to make the Cabinet responsible to the Diet-
gained considerable headway on the eve of World War I and was resumed
vigorously during the 1920s.

**Militarism and the Abolition of Foreign Privileges**

Experiments with constitutional government were only one aspect of
Japan’s political transformation. A modern and efficient military establishment
was a prime objective that was rapidly attained, with a navy modelled after Great
British’s and an army copied from that of Germany, largely because the superiority
of the latter had been strikingly demonstrated in the Franco-Prussian War. The
principal of universal military service, introduced in , was not a Japanese invention
(although conscript peasant armies had been known to both China and Japan in
ancient times and had played a part in Japan’s feudal wars of the sixteenth
century), but was based upon the example of modern European states. The
administrative system was revised, and new judiciary and legal codes were
adopted which compared favourably with those of Western countries and enabled
the Japanese to claim successfully that they were not behind the West in the
administration of justice. In 1894 Great Britain voluntarily surrendered
extraterritorial rights in Japan, and by 1899 all the other powers had taken the same step. The abrogation of external control over the customs duties require a longer period of negotiation, but tariff autonomy was achieved in 1911. Henceforth Japan was entirely free from the humiliation of unequal treaties.

**The Growth of Capitalism**

The economic changes of the Meiji era were perhaps even more significant than the political. In Tokugawa feudal days Japan was far from being a purely agrarian nation, and before the restoration of 1867 an urban economy, mercantile and capitalistic, had come into being. When new regime undertook to strengthen the state and secure the benefits of Westernization, it launched an ambitious programme for the development of industry and a modern system of communications. Because private capital was not available in sufficient quantities to do the job quickly and because of the fear that extensive borrowing from foreign investors would endanger Japan’s economic independence, the government assumed the initiative in constructing railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, books, shipyards, and even manufacturing plants, while it also aided private industry by loans and subsidies. There was no tradition of laissez faire in Japan to stand in the way of government participation in the economic sphere, and public officials were anxious to move ahead as rapidly as possible. However, many enterprises which had been fostered by the state were eventually transferred to private hands, although the state retained control of railways and communications for strategic and security reasons. Hence, in Japan, economic progress led to the growth of the capitalist class, but one which did not correspond exactly with similar classes in the western industrial nations. The members of the new capitalist class, like the prominent political figures were drawn largely from the old aristocracy, while not excluding men of bourgeois origin- money- lenders and rice merchants of the Tokugawa era. Daimyo now found a profitable field of investment for the funds they had received upon surrendering their feudal privileges, and the more nimble- witted of the Samurai also participated in industrial development.

**Mitsui and Mitsubishi**

The history of the famous house of Mitsui, which grew to be the largest combination of mercantile, financial and industrial interests in Japan, illustrates the remarkable success of a Samurai family that was shrewd enough to anticipate future developments. In early Tokugawa time the Mitsui, defying the prejudices of
their class, had abandoned fighting in favour of the more solid rewards of commerce. They opened a store in Kyoto and its management apparently anticipated the techniques of modern scientific salesmanship, displaying advertising posters and on rainy days giving away to customer’s paper umbrellas printed with the Mitsui trademark. Before the close of the seventeenth century, the family had established a banking house in Edo. The Mitsui heartily welcomed the opening of Japan to foreign trade, and so confident were they of the success of the Restoration that they lent large sums of money to the emperor and his entourage while the new government was in the process of formation. The Mitsui family also formed a connection with the great Choshu domain whose members filled important government posts, and thus were enabled to participate in various aspects of the economic programme. The Mitsubishi group of interests, which was the greatest rival of the Mitsui and like them, developed under Samurai leadership, effected a similar connection with the Satsuma group. In spite of the rapid industrialization of Japan, capitalists were relatively few, and they were generally affiliated with clan bureaucrats who dominated the government.

**Peculiarities of Japanese Capitalism:**

Industrial developments in Japan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century’s differed in several respects from the typical pattern of economic change in the West. In the first place, they were so rapid that in one generation the country was producing a surplus of manufactured goods, and foreign markets had become essential to the national economy. Second, the Industrial Revolution was transported to Japan after it had already reached an advanced state in the Western nations, and consequently characteristics of the early and late Industrial Revolutions were intermingled. The employment of women in industry at low wages, the lack of organization among the labourers or of legal safeguards to protect them, and the working conditions in factories and mines were parallel to the early stages of the Industrial Revolutions in the West. On the other hand, the projection of the government into the business sphere and the appearance of finance capitalism were phenomena that were only beginning to manifest themselves in Western Europe and the United States. To a considerable extent in Japan, finance capitalism preceded industrial capitalism, because there had not been time for financial reserves to accumulate from the saving effected by a gradual mechanization of industry. The wealth of the aristocracy and of merchant and banking houses—essentially unproductive classes—was drawn upon to
position to dominate the productive enterprises of mining, manufacturing, and distribution as these grew to maturity.

**The Japanese Trusts**

Another peculiarity of Japan’s industrial development was the fact that, while total production increased rapidly and some large plants were built for heavy industries, the majority of the factories remained small. Even in the 1930s, when Japan’s industrial labourers numbered 6 million, almost three-fourths of them worked in small establishments employing fewer than a hundred, workers and about one-half of them toiled in plants employing not more than five. The small factories, however, were usually not independent but were controlled by the great financial houses, which resembled trusts in their structure and obtained monopolies of whole fields of production. Workers in the cotton and silk textile mills, for example, might be likened to workers under the domestic system in early modern Europe, even though they tended machines instead of using hand tools. The supplying of raw materials and the distribution and sale of finished products—especially in the export trades—were handled by a few centralized organizations from which a network of controls extended over hundreds of tiny workshops scattered throughout the country. Naturally, this system placed the worker at a great disadvantage, and his bargaining position was further weakened by the prevalence of an oversupply of cheap labour. In spite of the growth of huge cities, the larger part of population remained on the land, which was insufficient in resources to support the peasant families. Hence these families were glad to supplement this meagre income by letting some of their members, especially daughters, work in the shops for such wages as they could get. Between the depressed classes farmers and labourers and the wealthy capitalists, the gulf was as great as that which had separated the upper and lower strata of the old feudal hierarchy.

**6.4 Social and Cultural Changes**

Extensive social and cultural changes also accompanied the transformation of Japan’s economic and political institutions. Some of these changes were brought about deliberately by government action; others were unintended or even unwelcome. To carry out a programme of Westernization on a system of public education was clearly necessary. A ministry of Education was established in 1871, careful studies were made of the procedures so Western countries, and schools were built rapidly at state expense. Japan was the first Asian nation to introduce
compulsory education and did it so successfully that illiteracy almost disappeared even among the poorest classes of society. There was also notable progress in instructional facilities at the higher level, providing boys with opportunities for technical and profession as well as academic training and offering separate and more limited instruction for girls. The programme was extremely ambitious and the curricula of the middle and higher schools were exacting. The study of Chinese classic and professional, as well academic training and offering separate and more limited instruction for girls. The programme was extremely ambitious and the curricula of the middle and higher schools were exacting. The study of Chinese classics and Confucian philosophy was retained, and to these were added besides Japanese language literature and history Western scientific and technical subjects as well as foreign languages. Notably lacking however the encouragement of original thought was. The system was devised to serve the ends of the government and aimed at producing a nation of loyal efficient and disciplined conformists. To that end all students were required to take so called moral classes, which stressed patriotism. Western science and technology were appropriated without the liberal and humanistic traditions which had engendered them; and investigation of the social science was almost entirely neglected. Thus, the emphasis was not upon the fullest development of the individual but upon enabling him to fit into a firmly fixed pattern of society without questioning it. The Minister of Education on exercised strict surveillance over teachers and texts, making the schools a powerful agency for indoctrination.

**Literary Production**

The creation of a wide reading public stimulated literary production, some of which was intended for mess circulation. Although Japanese writers were greatly influenced by contemporary Western literature, as a reflected in their tendency towards realism they were by no means mere imitators and produced literary work of great merit. Journalism became a flourishing occupation and some newspapers of high calibre appeared. The Japanese press, however, laboured under disadvantages, the most serious being the arbitrary and often erratic government censorship. Editors who dared to criticize officials, or who were merely unlucky enough to publish news which officials desired to keep from the public, were likely to be fined and imprisoned or to have their offices closed. It is significant that a considerable number of journalists, in spite of the risks involved, persisted in giving expression to independence and critical opinion.
New Social Problems

In passing successfully through the difficulty years of the Restoration period, the Japanese gave abundant evidence of vitality, courage, and versatility. In many fields they had come abreast of the Western nations, while they had also retained their own distinctive cultural heritage. At the same time, the accomplishments were not an unmixed good, and social problems and arisen which could not be easily solved. The most dubious aspect of Japan’s conditions, in spite of its mounting industrial strength, was in the economic sphere. Scientific knowledge, improved sanitation and medical facilities, and especially the impact of the Industrial Revolution induced a terrific increase in a population that had remained almost stationary for over a century. Between 1887 and 1913, the population grew from about 30 million to more than 50 million, and from this time on the rate of growth was still more rapid. There was hardly enough arable land in Japan to produce food for such large numbers, even under the most efficiency, methods of cultivation. While a brisk foreign trade could correct the deficiency, not only was a sufficient volume of trade difficult to maintain but also the profits from manufacturing and commerce were concentrated in the hands of a small group. The standard of living of the farmers- the great majority of the population-remained almost at a standstill while the total national income was rising. With the abolition of feudalism, the peasants had become free landed proprietors, but their economic condition was not greatly improved thereby. Taxation bore far too heavily upon them; they had to compete in a cash market dominated by large landlords and industrialists and their individual holdings were often insufficient to support a family. Many farmers had to supplement their small plots by renting additional holdings. Tenant farming in place of independent proprietorship became a striking characteristic of Japanese agriculture. The urban labourers were even worse off than the poor farmer; and Japan lacked a strong middle class to redress the balance of society. The revolutions of the Meiji era, unlike their counterparts in the Western world, were not essentially middle-class movements and had not broken the ascendancy of leaders whose ideals and outlook had been shaped in a feudal atmosphere.

Factors leading to the Authoritarian Trend

The fundamental attitudes and loyalties of the old Japan passed into the new, even though they were in a somewhat different guise and were associated with more effective implements. It was not difficult for the creed of unswerving
loyalty to a feudal superior to be converted into an intense patriotism, for which the emperor served as a symbol of national unity and object of common devotion. Ancient legends and the Shinto cults were refurbished to stimulate patriotic sentiments and to inspire confidence in Japan's unique destiny. As already suggested an efficient and in many ways progressive educational system was utilized for this same end. The army also became an educational agency of a very potent kind. It was made up largely of literate but unsophisticated peasants, who found membership in the military establishment more rewarding financially and more gratifying to the ego than a life of grubbing on a tinny farm. The provincialism, prejudices, and legitimate resentments of the peasant rendered him susceptible to indoctrination by fanatics who preached the superiority of Japan over other nations, the infallibility of the divine emperor, and the subordination of civilians to the military. However, the influences promoting an authoritarian or militaristic regime were never unopposed. Continuous and broadening contacts with the outside world and a gradual reaction to the disturbing consequences of rapid economic change introduced a train of liberal thought, which threatened to collide with the forces of conservatism.

**Moderates and Extremists**

Japan’s external relations during the Meiji era were directly related to, and appreciably affected by, internal developments. It is not strange that Japan, in the process of becoming a modern state, adopted a policy of imperialism, in view of its agility in assimilating the techniques of Western nations and also in view of the stresses created by the industrialization of the country. As time went on however, difference of opinion appeared among Japanese statesmen, business and financial leaders, and intellectuals as to the proper course to pursue in advancing the interests of the state. Some conservative bureaucrats, generally unsympathetic to parliamentary institutions, favoured an aggressive foreign policy. Others were primarily interested in building up Japan’s economic and financial strength, securing foreign markets by peaceful penetration, and creating a prosperous and stable society at home. While not genuinely democratic, they at least accepted the implications of constitutional government and were anxious to win an honourable position for their country within the family of nations. Fortunately for Japan, the moderate expansionists were fairly successful during this period in holding the militant faction in check, although not without making some concessions to them.

**Japan as an Imperial Power**
Japanese expansion in Eastern Asia would almost inevitably be at the expense of the decadent Chinese Empire. In 1876, the Japanese government took direct steps to end the isolation of Korea, a “hermit nation” which had been more tightly sealed against outside influences than Japan under the Tokugawa Shogunate. Copying a page from the Western book, the Japanese negotiated a treaty with the Seoul government which accorded them extraterritoriality and other rights, as well as opening Korea to commercial intercourse. The treaty also recognized Korea as an independent state, in total disregard of the fact that the Peking government considered the peninsula a tributary dependency of the Manchu Empire. Actually the Manchu officials had neglected to enforce their claims, and their belated attempt to recover their position by counter-intrigue against the Japanese provoked a clash with Japan. Korea, at this time, was an ideal breeding ground for war. In spite of brilliant episodes in its past, the kingdom had degenerated into one of the most back-ward regions of Asia. The administration was corrupt and predatory, the peasants ignorant and wretched, and conditions in general thoroughly belied the country’s poetic name – Chosen (“Land of the Morning Calm”). Japan’s interest in Korea was both economic and strategic, the latter because Russia and acquired the Maritime Province on the Pacific coast directly north of the Korean border and had already attempted to intervene in Korea’s troubled affairs. After a local rebellion had furnished the excuse for both China and Japan to rush troops into Korea, the Sino-Japanese War was precipitated.

**War with China and Russia**

It could be – and has been – argued that, beginning with its swift victory over China in 1895, Japan’s policy in Asia was one of territorial aggression. In the treaty of Shimonoseki, Japan required from China not only recognition of Korean independence and the payment of an indemnity, but also the cession of Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and the southern projection of Manchuria—the Liaotung Peninsula. Japan joined in the scramble for concessions in China, acquiring a sphere of interest in Fukien province opposite Formosa. When harasses by the advance of Russian imperialism in Korea, Japan attacked Russia in 1904 and, after defeating its forces on land and sea, annexed the southern half of Sakhalin Island and obtained economic concessions in Manchuria. These facts, however, are only part of the story, which in its entirely indicates that the Japanese were adept in mastering the object lessons of European diplomacy and power politics. Following
the Sino-Japanese War, under pressure from Russia, France, and Germany, Japan had been forced to relinquish its claim to the Liaotung Peninsula, on the ground that occupation of this region by a foreign power would threaten the safety of the Peking government. Almost immediately afterwards Russia, by a treaty of alliance with China, secured control of the very region it had denied to Japan and converted practically all Manchuria into a Russian sphere of interest. Several attempts on the part of the Japanese government to reach an accommodation with Russia in regard to Korea and Manchuria were frustrated by the recklessness and duplicity of the Tsar’s agents. Nevertheless, some influential Japanese considered war with Russia too dangerous an undertaking, and the government would probably not have dared to attack Russia except for the fact that the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 assured Japan of the friendly backing of the world’s greatest naval power. The British welcomed Japan’s accession to a position of strength as a means of checking Russian expansion in the Far East. During the Russo-Japanese War, sentiment in both Great Britain and the United States was prevailingly in favour of Japan, largely, because of the devious and bullying tactics that the Russians had been pursuing. Present Theodore Roosevelt’s sympathy for Japan helped in terminating the hostilities, and the peace treaty was negotiated at Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

6.5 Temporary Balance of Power in Asia

Japan’s victory over Russia for the peculiar to restore the balance of power in the Far East. Russia, shaken by the Revolution of 1905, and Japan its financial reserves drained by the war, quickly agreed on apportioning their respective spheres in Manchuria—publicly affirming, of course, that they had no intention of violating China’s territorial integrity. But the balance of power proved to be unstable. The outbreak of the European war in 1914, necessitating a “retreat of the West” from Asia, provided Japan with a golden opportunity to consolidate and extend its position.

In 1918 Japan was in a strong position in the Far East. She had a powerful navy, a great deal of influence in China, and had benefitted economically from the First World War, while the states of Europe were pre-occupied with fighting each other. Japan took advantage of this situation both by providing the Allies with shipping and other goods, and by stepping in to supply orders, especially in Asia, which the Europeans could not fulfil. During the war years her exports of cotton cloth almost trebled, while her merchant fleet doubled in tonnage. Politically the
course seemed set for democracy when in 1925 all adult males were given the vote. Hopes were soon dashed as at the beginning of the 1930 the army assumed control of the government.

6.6 Japan becomes a Military Dictatorship

During the 1920s problems development, as they did in Italy and Germany, which democratically elected governments seemed incapable of solving:

From the beginning democracy was not popular with many influential groups in Japanese society, such as the army and the conservatives who were strongly entrenched in the upper house of Parliament and in the Privy Council. They seized every opportunity to discredit the government, criticizing for example Baron Shidehara Kijuro for his conciliatory approach to China, which he thought was the best way to strengthen Japan’s economic hold over that country. The army was itching to interfere in China, which was torn by civil war, and considered Shidehara’s policy to be soft. They were strong enough to bring the government down in 1927 and reverse his policy. Many politicians were corrupt and regularly accepted bribes from big business; sometimes fighting broke out in the lower house as charges and counter-charges of corrupting were flung about. The system was not one to inspire confidence and parliamentary prestige suffered accordingly. Neither (1) nor (2) made military dictatorship inevitable, but when economic problems were added to the political ones the situation became serious.

The great trading boom of the war years lasted only until the middle of 1921 when Europe began to revive and recover lost markets. Unemployment and industrial unrest developed and at the same time farmers were hit by the rapidly falling price of rice because of a series of bumper harvests. When farmers and industrial workers tried to organize themselves into a political party they were ruthlessly suppressed by the police. Thus the workers, as well as the army and the rightists, gradually became hostile to a parliament which posed as democratic but allowed the leftist to be suppressed and accepted bribes from big business.

The world economic crisis beginning in 1929, affected Japan severely her exports shrank disastrously and other countries introduced or raised tariffs against her to safeguard their own industries. One of the worst affected trades was the export of raw silk which went mostly to the USA. The period after the Wall Street Crash was no time for luxuries, and the Americans drastically reduced their imports of raw silk, so that by 1932 the price had fallen to less than one-fifth of the 1923 figure. This was a further blow to Japanese farmers, since about half of them
relied for their livelihood on the production of raw silk as well as rice. There was desperate poverty, especially in the north, for which peasants and factory workers blamed the government and big business. Most of the army recruits were peasants; consequently, the rank-and-file as well as the officer class were disgusted with what they took to be weak parliamentary government. Many officers, attracted by fascism, were as early as 1927 planning to seize power and introduce a strong nationalist government.

Matters were brought to a head in 1931 by the situation in Manchuria where the Chinese were trying to squeeze out Japanese trade and business, which would have been a severe blow to a Japanese economy already hard hit by the depression. To preserve their economic advantages Japanese army units invaded and occupied Manchuria without permission from their government. When Prime Minister Inukai criticized extremist action he was assassinated by a group of army officers his successor felt he had to support the army actions. For the next 13 years the army more or less ran the country, introducing similar measures to those adopted in Germany and Italy: ruthless suppression of Marxists, assassination of foreign policy which aimed at capturing in Asia as markets for Japanese exports. This led to an attack on China (1937) and participation in the Second World War in the Pacific.

6.7 Self Check Exercise

1. What was the chief achievement of Meiji Restoration.
   (a)-Abolition of Feudal system in Japan
   (b)- End of the Shogun reign
   (c)- Opposition of Shogun by nobles
   (d)-All of the above

2. The treaty of Shimonoseki was concluded in
   (a)- 1890
   (b)-1891
   (c)- 1895
   (d)-1896

3. Anglo-Japanese treaty was signed in
   (a)-1901
   (b)-1902
   (c)- 1903
   (d)-1904
4. First Opium war broke out in
   (a)- 1839
   (b)-1840
   (c)- 1842
   (d)-1843
5. The leaders of the Chinese Revolution of 1911 was
   (a)- Sun Yat Sen
   (b)- Yuan Shi Kai
   (c)- Lo Chuwan Wang
   (d)- Lee Hudco
6. Which dynasty came to an end as a result of the Chinese Revolution.
   (a)- Sen Dynasty
   (b)-Wang dynasty
   (c)- Manchu Dynasty
   (d)- Yuan Dynasty

6.8 Summary

For a long time, Japan pursued a policy of isolation. She first came in contact with the Western world through Christian missionaries, who came to Japan in the sixteenth century. Her first commercial contact with the West was in the nature of permission to the Dutch for facility to carry on trade with Japan, even though the commerce at this stage was strictly regulated. It was only in the mid-nineteenth century that the foreign powers succeeded in gaining a foothold in Japan and secured trade concessions. By the close of the nineteenth century Japan embarked on imperialist policy and thus got embroiled in the rivalry of the rivalry of the powers. Japanese nationalism received further fillip following her victory over Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05. Thereafter Japan started competing for territories with other Western countries. In 1910 Japan had become a dominant power in the Far East. During the War Japan took advantage of the preoccupations of other Great powers and occupied Manchuria, Shantung, Inner Mongolia and Fukien. After the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, the Japanese soldiers occupied the whole of Siberia in cooperation with the American forces. At the end of war Japan succeeded in retaining some of her gains with the support of Britain, France and Italy.

6.9 Glossary

Shogun: a hereditary commander-in-chief in feudal Japan
Imperative: very important
Rivalry: competition between people, groups
Pressure: the burden of physical or mental distress
Brisk: quick or using a lot of energy

6.10 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1 (d)
2 (c)
3 (b)
4 (a)
5 (a)
6 (c)

6.11 Suggested Readings

6.12 Terminal Questions
1 How did Japan develop between 1868 and 1894? Did the restoration of Meiji mark a sharp break with the past?
2 Trace the growth of militarism in Japan in the inter-war years. What international reaction did it provoke.
3 Trace the distinct phases of the Sino-Japanese War. Assess its political, economic and cultural impact on China, both ‘occupied’ and ‘free’.

4 Throw light on the foreign policy of Japan from 1919 to 1945.

5 Write an essay on Japanese imperialism and her plunge into world war.

6 What is meant by Meiji Restoration? What were its consequences on the future development of Japan?
Chapter-7
Nationalist movements in Asia: Kuomintang and the fall of the Manchu’s and its aftermath.
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7.1 Introduction
In 1912, the Western world received the startling news of a successful revolution in the largest and perhaps most conservative of Asiatic empires: China. The Manchu dynasty, which had ruled China since 1644, was ousted from power, and the empire was converted into a republic, bearing, at least outwardly, the earmarks of a European parliamentary system.

The reformers now renewed their activities, and a national assembly was convened at Peking in 1910. It soon was dismissed, and the year 1911 witnessed troop mutinies, movements for local autonomy, and violent reactions to the Manchus abdicated in February 1912, after almost 270 years of power.

7.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The Course of Revolution in China
The Economic Progress in Manchuria and in Japan
Toward a New Order in Eastern Asia

7.3 The Course of Revolution in China
In 1912, the Western world received the startling news of a successful revolution in the largest and perhaps most conservative of Asiatic empires: China. The Manchu dynasty, which had ruled China since 1644, was ousted from power,
and the empire was converted into a republic, bearing, at least outwardly, the earmarks of a European parliamentary system.

China long had been in a state of “backwardness,” whereas the West had been advancing towards world supremacy. China’s government under the emperors had been corrupt, her social development retarded. Education had been confined to the few and had been out of tune with the requirements of a modern age. Famines, pestilence, and floods had wreaked havoc. Foreign “barbarians” had been exploiting China’s natural resources.

Between 1898 and 1900 there had occurred two unsuccessful movements to remedy the abuses of the Manchu regime and curtail the activities of foreigners. In 1898 a group of patriotic intellectuals influenced the young Emperor Kwang Hsu to launch a sweeping reform program. But because of their very radicands the reforms were foredoomed to failure. China was too backward to be modernized overnight by edicts, and turmoil and reaction followed the sudden attempt at widespread reform. Then, during the period of reaction, the authorities, inspired by the Dowager Empress Tsu His, turned the popular dislike of “foreignism” into a concerted move to oust the “barbarians.” The resulting Boxer Rebellion brought on an international punitive expedition.

As the twentieth century wore on and the Chinese became aware of the remarkable transformation wrought by the Westernization of Japan, an increasing number of Chinese students went abroad to study. At first, thousands of students went to Japan, which was relatively close and had a language similar to Chinese. But eventually many student preferred to seek education elsewhere. Some of them came to he United States, particularly after Washington arranged generous scholarship funds.

Their foreign contacts and observations inspired these young people with a fervent national spirit. China’s defeat by Japan in the war of 1894-1895 and the aggression of the foreigners helped to disseminate this spirit among the business classes and the professionals. The Machus had never entirely lost their foreign aspect in the eyes of the Chinese intelligentsia, and from the late 1890’s a powerful secret agitation worked for the overthrow of the conquerors.

Sensing this widespread discontent and spurred by the example of Japan, who in 1940-1905 astonished the world by her stand against Russia, the Manchu Government inaugurated another reform program (1905). A plan of constitutional reform was outlined, and provision was made for the calling of a national
assembly. Before much progress in this direction was registered, the throne fell (1908) to Pu Yi, a boy not yet three years old. The regent was a conservative politician who attempted to halt the reform movement. The reformers now renewed their activities, and a national assembly was convened at Peking in 1910. It soon was a conservative politician who attempted to halt the reform movement.

The reformers now renewed their activities, and a national assembly was convened at Peking in 1910. It soon was dismissed, and the year 1911 witnessed troop mutinies, movements for local autonomy, and violent reactions to the Manchus abdicating in February 1912, after almost 270 years of power.

MEANWHILE, ON JANUARY 1, 1912, A REVOLUTIONARY ASSEMBLY AT NANKING HAD ELECTED DR. DUN YAT-SEN PRESIDENT OF A PROVISIONAL REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT. DR. SUN WAS A PATRIOTIC AND CAPABLE SCHOLAR WHO HAD BEEN FORCED TO SPEND A CONSIDERABLE PORTION OF HIS LIFE IN EXILE. AS ONE OF THE FOUNDERS OF THE KUOMINTANG, OR NATIONALIST PARTY, HE HAD SPENT MOST OF THE PERIOD SINCE 1895 ORGANIZING YOUNG CHINA INTO AN ENERGETIC ASSOCIATION BENT ON ACHIEVING POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGE. SUN BELIEVED THAT HIS COUNTY, WITH ITS MASSIVE PART IN HUMAN AFFAIRS. HE WANTED TO AROUSE THE CHINESE PEOPLE FROM THE NATIONAL LETHARGY INTO WHICH THEY HAD FALLEN UNDER MANCHU CONTROL, AND TO ALLOW NO NEW OPPRESSION TO TAKE THE OLD. IN 1924, HE SUMMED UP HIS IDEAS IN A SERIES OF LECTURES ENTITLED THE THREE PRINCIPLES OF THE PEOPLED (SAN MIN CHU1). THESE PRINCIPLES, FOR WHICH THE NEW CHINA WAS TO STRIVE, WERE NATIONALISM, DEMOCRACY, AND LIVELIHOOD (ECONOMIC EQUALITY).

At the time his election Sun agreed that, for the sake of unifying the county, he soon would retire in favour of Yuan Shih-kai, well known as China’s ablest military organizer, who had come into control of northern China. This arrangement was completed in February 1912, and Yuan thus became the first president of a united Chinese Republic. Friction soon developed between the northerners led by Yuan and the southerners under Sun when it became apparent that Yuan had dictatorial ambitions.

The Kuomintang deputies in the parliament that convened in 1913 persistently voted against Yuan and his policies. The mutual ill will increased steadily, and eventually an attempt was made to oust Yuan. This “second revolution “failed and Yuan commence a dictatorial rule that lasted until his death in J7une 1916. Following Yuan’s death, the county was split over the question of
participation in the First World War and the further granting of foreign concessions. The central authorities found it virtually impossible to collect taxes, and hence China’s mineral and industrial resources were being given outright to foreigners in return for loans that promptly were squandered.

Late in 1917 the Kuomintang set up a southern government at Canton in opposition to a northern government at Peking. The confusion was increased by the activities of a dozen military governors, who did most of the tax collecting and who used their armies to further private ambition. The Canton Government claimed to be the legitimate representative of the people but Peking obtained both recognition and funds from foreign powers seeking further privileges.

A. The Twenty-One Demands

Japan declared war on Germany in August 1914 and soon thereafter captured the area about Kiaochow, which Germany in 1898 had leased from China. To carry out this project, Japan had violated China’s neutrality by landing troops on her territory more than a hundred miles from the German leasehold. When, after the fall of the German strongholds, the Chinese asked the Japanese to retire, the latter presented to President Yuan a list of twenty-one demands (1915). These demands were calculated to make China a Japanese protectorate. The preoccupation of Europe with the war afforded Japan, in the words of one of her publicists, “the opportunity of a thousand years” with respect to China.

In answer to inquires from abroad, the Tokyo Foreign Office denied that any demands impairing China’s sovereignty had been formulated and published an expurgated list that contained only an outline of eleven of the points. When the Chinese Government revealed a full list of the demands, Japan announced that the omitted demands had been only “wishes.” No such distinction, however, had been made to China.

The United States and other powers protested that they would not recognize any Sino-Japanese arrangement that violated their own treaty rights, but in May 1915, after a threat of war by Japan, China signed two treaties. The documents embodied a modified version of the original demands and contained clauses, granting economic concessions, which provided for their enforcement on the date of signature. Since the Chinese Parliament never ratified them, the treaties consistently were regarded as invalid by the Kuomintang.

B. China, the War, and the Washington Conference
From the outset of the European conflict, China had feared that Japan would take advantage of the situation to establish her control in China. The Peking Government therefore thrice attempted to join the Allies, but each time the Japanese prevented such action. Japan had no desire to see China recruit an army, mobilize her resources, and participate in a peace conference. Only in 1917 did Japan reverse her policy. The military position of the Allied Powers in 1917 was critical; hence, they made special efforts to secure additional help, from the United States and from the Far East.

In 1917, then, a secret treaty was signed between Japan and Great Britain. The former promised to dispatch some war vessels to the Mediterranean, and the latter agreed to support the claim of Japan to Shantung and the German Pacific islands north of the equator at the peace conference. France agreed to similar pledges in return for Japan’s promise to encourage China’s participation in the war. Russia and Italy followed suit. Upon the conclusion of these bargains, Japan urged China to break off relations with Germany. The United States, after her entry into the war, likewise suggested to China that relations with Germany be severed. Peking, moreover, was annoyed at the unrestricted submarine warfare and the drowning of several hundred coolies through the sinking of a French ship that was transporting them to France to work in war-material factories. In August 1917 Peking and Canton declared war on Germany and Austria-Hungary.

China’s participation had little effect on the outcome of the war. After the struggle, however, China was entitled to representation at the Paris Conference. Sino-Japanese difficulties developed as soon as Japan presented her claims to all former German rights in Shantung. To this the Chinese delegation strenuously objected. President Wilson for a time upheld the Chinese view, but Lloyd George and Clemenceau insisted that they were bound by the secret treaties to back Japan. Eventually the Japanese had their way, acquiring Shantung and mandatory rights over all former German colonies north of the equator. Thereupon China withheld her signature from the Versailles Treaty and became a member of the League of Nations by adhering to the Treaty of St. Germaine with Austria.

When news of these events reached China, it was greeted with violent demonstration; and the demonstrations soon were followed by China’s most powerful weapon the economic boycott. The resulting decline in her foreign trade seriously worried Japan, and she started negotiation for the return of Shantung to China. The latter rejected the offers that were made and appealed to the world for
financial and diplomatic help. Foreign loans, however, seemed out of the question, for China had no credit standing. At this point (1921) President Harding of the United States invited eight powers to attend a conference in Washington on the limitation of naval armaments and the settlement of international problems in the Pacific and Far East. It was hoped that the conference, too, might forestall any united Anglo-Japanese action injurious to the interests of the United States.

The conference in 1922 concluded seven treaties. Two of these dealt with naval disarmament; the remaining five, with Pacific and Far Eastern questions. Two additional treaties, one dealing with Shantung and the other with the island of Yap, were signed outside the conference, but by powers represented there.

It was difficult to evaluate the work of the Washington Conference. Regarding China, the principle of the Open Door once more was subscribed to by the great powers, no new disabilities were imposed, and a certain amount of lost autonomy was restored to the republic. Shantung was reacquired, and China was given a breathing spell during which, if she had the capacity, she might rebuild her weak national structure. The signing of the Sino-Japanese conventions was followed by the adoption in Japan of a so-called friendship policy towards China, which lasted until the spring of 1927. Moderate Japanese leadership attempted to harmonize the interests of China and Japan without force. However, when the moderates were replaced in power at Tokyo by expansionists, aggressive imperialistic methods appeared once more. The naval arrangements concluded at the conference temporarily lessened a growing naval rivalry among the United States, Great Britain, and Japan.

C. Education and Nationalism in China, 1919-1931

The internal history of China from 1919 to 1927 was conspicuous chiefly for administrative confusion in every province. Scores of generals ravaged country and town and lay waste much of the natural wealth of the republic. There were catastrophic floods and famines, fanatical antiforeigner outbursts, and political quarrels between republicans and Communists. Out of the turmoil, however, there emerged two definite phenomena: progress in education and an organized nationalist movement.

Under the old regime, education had been reserved for a small minority. After the revolution numerous efforts were made to increase literacy. A movement was launched to substitute in literature the colloquial language of the country for the ancient literary forms. In order to popularize the vernacular as a literary
medium it was utilized in the composition of a variety of works of high literary merit.

Another expression of the educational reform spirit was a Mass Education Movement aimed at familiarizing the people with 1000 of the most commonly used Chinese ideographs. Easy and inexpensive readers were devised, and the lessons were so arranged that the information could be mastered by spending one hour a day on them for four months. Within a few years, millions of persons learned to read.

The advances in education were accompanied by the emergence of students as an important factor in the agitation for liberation from foreign restrictions and the shackles of tradition. In 1919, for instances, the most serious attacks on the Versailles Treaty and on the officials who proposed to endorse it were led by students. The spirit displayed by the emancipated young people was encouraging, but it required mature leadership. Some direction was given to the student’s movements by the Kuomintang.

The Kuomintang Government at Canton opposed most of the moves undertaken by the government at Peking, which continued to function under the guidance of interested foreigners. Led by Dr. Sun, the Nationalists worked for several years to bring the north under the sway of the Kuomintang and unify the country, through the use of force and propaganda. Support for this endeavour was forthcoming from Soviet Russia, which meanwhile had surrendered most of the privileges acquired in China in tsarist days. An able diplomat, Michael Borodin, was dispatched to China to win the confidence of sun and his associates—a mission he fulfilled with eminent success. Simultaneously, Moscow had an ambassador at Peking.

In 1924 a Kuomintang Congress at Canton extended party membership to all Chinese Communists who were ready to accept the Kuomintang principals. Soon thereafter Peking signed an agreement with Moscow whereby the Russians gave up extraterritorial rights in China and agreed that the Chinese Eastern Railway in Manchuria, a Sino-Russian enterprise conceived in 1896, should remain under the joint control of the two states until China could redeem it “with Chinese capital.” In 1924, also, sun established a military academy and Soviet military officers were invited to train the Nationalist forces.

With the approach of 1925 there development a rift in Kuomintang ranks. The right-wing members of the party were out of sympathy with the aims of the
Communist left wing and wanted to end the close relationship with the Soviet Union. Dr. Sun was able to hold the two camps together, but after his death in March 1925 he breach widened. In 1927 Chiang Kai-shek, who had succeeded Sun as leader of the Nationalists, broke off relations with the Russians Communists and discriminated against the Communist members of the Kuomintang.

Just prior to the break with the U.S.S.R., the Nationalists, led by Chiang, had succeeded in extending their control over nearly all China. The fruits of the victory, however, were spoiled by the fierce struggle that had developed among factions in the Kuomintang.

The Communists tried to discredit Chiang by committing excesses, the most serious instance being the Nanking Affair of March 1927. After the capture of the city by the Nationalists, left-wing elements attacked the foreign residents. The powers demanded restitution, and Japan sent soldiers to protect her extensive interests. In the end, he actions of the Communities reacted to the advantage of Chiang, whose support came increasingly from the commercial and industrial groups.

Chiang was born in 1888 and obtained a military education at the Tokyo Military College. During 1911 and 1912 he commanded revolutionary soldiers and from 1913 to 1920 was secretary to Dr. Sun. By 1924 he had become director of the National Military Academy and soon thereafter succeeded, Chiang was able in 1928 to establish a Nationalist Government at Nanking. The northern government was abolished and Nanking became the new national capital.

In October 1928, the Kuomintang promulgated an Organic Law for the National Government of China. The law was to be executed under the supervision of the party’s executive committee, which thus virtually became the government of the republic. The highest administrative unit was to be a State Council, and the committee elected Chiang to be chairman of the first such council, an office equivalent to that of the president of China. The Nationalist Government promptly secured recognition from most of the Western states and Japan.

Chiang faced a difficult task as chief executive of China. He invited United States and German experts to assist in the reorganization of the country and strove to weld the Chinese nation into a powerful state. However, the continuing need to lead troops in battle interfered with Chiang’s plans. The constant disorder and the ravages of floods and famines had enabled the Chinese Communists greatly to increase their numbers, and now they massed all their strength against the Nanking
regime in an attempt to replace it by a soviet system. Chiang waged almost uninterrupted warfare against the Communists and against rival military leaders, who hoped in the confusion to acquire control of individual Chinese provinces.

Besides its domestic difficulties, the Nationalist Government in 1929 had a quarrel with the Soviet Union. The dispute grew out of Bolshevik propagandist activities in northern China and an attempt by the governor of Manchuria, Chang Hsueh-liang, to gain control of the Chinese Eastern Railway and to oust the subjects of the U.S.S.R. from the territory under his jurisdiction. Soviet consular offices in anchurian cities were raided, and hundreds of Soviet officials and employees of the Chinese Eastern Railway were arrested. The U.S.S.R. retaliated by arresting Chinese merchants who happened to be in the Soviet Union. Diplomatic relations were served, troop movements were begun, and some minor battles occurred.

At the height of the crisis, forty-two cosignatories of the Kellogg Pact, which included the U.S.S.R. and China, reminded the disputants of their obligation to settle the dispute by peaceful means. Eventually (1929) the parties concerned did reach agreement, and the status quo ante was re-established. A conference to settle all other cause of dispute was in the planning stage when a Sino-Japanese conflict occurred over Manchuria in 1931.

3.4 Economic in Manchuria and in Japan

China was a tempting field for Western and Japanese investments and business enterprises, and billions of dollars were poured into the land. Among the most promising economic sections of China was Manchuria. Situated in the northeast, this region, with an area in 1931 of 380,000 square miles, a population of 29,000,000 and 4000 miles of railways came to assume a tremendous importance in international affairs. The land grew numerous crops in abundance, and there were substantial subsoil resources. In 1928, Manchuria was responsible for almost one-third of the commodity exports of China and about one-fifth of the imports.

The Kuomintang Government regarded Manchuria as a vital outpost of Chinese culture. Between 1923 and 1929, 4,000,000 Chinese were reported to have entered Manchuria to take advantage of the fertile land and the relative freedom from domestic turmoil. Many of the immigrants returned southward after they had accumulated savings, but perhaps half of them became permanent settlers.
Nanking encouraged this latest of “people’s wanderings” and was anxious to restrict the encroachments of foreigners in the area.

Most of the world’s industrial powers, however, had interests in Manchuria. The U.S.S.R. and Japan felt that they had special rights. The Soviet Government was half-owner of the Chinese Eastern Railway, which offered the most direct route from the west to the Siberian port of Vladivostok. The Bolsheviks, moreover, exercised considerable authority in Outer Mongolia, a wild region just west of Manchuria. The Japanese had control of the South Manchuria was almost a monopoly of Japanese firms. Large as were her financial holdings in Manchuria, Japan advanced additional reasons for desiring recognition of her paramount interests in the territory. For an understanding of these it is necessary to survey the economic position of the empire.

In the mid-nineteenth century Japan was medieval country, cherishing feudal traditions and anxious to avoid contact with the West. Before the close of the century Japan had been “opened” by importunate Westerners seeking new trade outlets, and the Nipponese soon were imitating the intruders methods and adopting their business views. With the coming of modern industry to the islands, the same pressing needs developed that earlier had induced the Western powers to seek overseas expansion. Industrialized Japan the Western powers to seek overseas expansion. Industrialized Japan wanted sources of cheap raw materials, markets for surplus manufactures, fields for investment of accumulated capital, food for workers, and outlets for surplus population.

During the First World War, economic conditions in Japan took an unusually favourable turn. The Allies bought enormous quantities of war materials; new trades contacts were established in Asia, Africa, and the Americas; and Japanese ships were chartered to handle a considerable portion of the world’s ocean commerce. However, after the war there came a gradual slump. The former belligerents reengaged in the manufacture of peacetime goods and competed once more for foreign markets. Since foreign trade by this time had come to be the backbone of Japanese prosperity, normally accounting for one-third of the total commerce, any appreciable decline in exports was sure to have a serious effect on the economic condition of the country.

For some years after the armistice, Japan’s export figures remained at a relatively high level because the United States, in her new found prosperity, became a heavy purchaser of silk. Then silk substitutes were developed (rayon, for
instance) and the world depression appeared. There was then a decline in the demand for silk and other products of Japanese manufacture.

In 1930 the area of the Japanese Empire, including Korea (Chosen), was 265,000 square miles, or about that of Texas. Its population was estimated at 92,000,000. In Japan proper (area 148,700 square miles: population, 65,000,000), more than 40 per cent of the people derived a meagre existence directly from the soil, only one-sixth of which could be cultivated. The unemployed numbered 1,000,000, and the national debt stood at $3,000,000,000. Hence Manchuria, with its plentiful resources, undeveloped opportunities, geographic nearness, and strategic location, tempted Japan. The work which was begun in 1915 with the presentation of the Twenty-one Demands, it seemed to her statesmen, must now be completed. The year 1931 appeared favourable for this undertaking.

D. China, Manchukuo, Japan

Conditions in China in 1931 were turbulent. The right-and leftwing members of the Kuomintang exchanged accusations of self-interest and treachery, and sent military forces against each other. Famines and floods deprived millions of food and shelter. Communist propaganda was rife, and local chieftains revived their bandit activities.

Elsewhere in the World, faced with the great depression, governments were preoccupied with equally numerous problems. With Westerners distracted, Japan, Pressed by many of the same problems, felt the moment ripe for the realization of long-held expansionist dreams in Manchuria. There seemed little likelihood that the Western powers would interpose forcefully even if they disapproved to Tokyo’s plans. For a variety of reasons, the Japanese army took the lead in the Manchurian venture.

In Japan the army and navy departments were virtually independent of the civil authorities. Their leaders might approach the emperor directly, without regard for cabinet procedure. The army long had been suspicious of the civil government. It saw little good in the custom of ministerial responsibility, which dated from 1918, or in the universal manhood suffrage that had been proclaimed in 1925. The military professed to be interested in the well-being of the farming and labouring classes, from which came most of their recruits, and they believed that the country’s difficulties easily might cultural and industry colony. The army, moreover, worked hand in hand with an influential group of bankers and industrialists who had financial stakes in Manchuria.
During the years 1930 to 1932, the military wrested much political control from the civil government. A section of big business feared possible Western economic retaliation against Japanese aggression, sonal poverty to side with the army. Numerous Fascist societies appeared, political murder became frequent, and there was a popular demand for the achievement of economic security through the use of force.

Unfortunately for China, there occurred in 1931 two incidents that provided the Japanese military with a pretext for entering Manchuria with armed forces. First, the honor of the army was violated by the murder in Inner Mongolia of a Japanese captain; and then a short stretch of the South Manchuria Railway line was damaged by explosives. The Japanese troops who guarded the railway accused Chinese soldiers of the deed. Without prior notification to the Tokyo foreign office, the Japanese military machine was set in motion, and a wide area of Manchuria was occupied.

The Chinese withdrew before the advancing Japanese, and the Nanking Government appealed to the world for help. The diplomats at Tokyo supported the military by pointing out that the governor of Manchuria had violated an old Sino Japanese treaty by building a railroad paralleling the south Manchuria railway. Japan had said nothing about this while the line was being built, but now complained that the road constituted a military and economic threat to Japanese interest.

While china appealed her case to the League, the Japanese rapidly extended the area of occupation. In September 1931 Japan had been in direct control of 1400 square miles of territory. By January 1932 the area of control include 200,000 square miles of land. Efforts were made to encourage local separatism. Local Chinese officials were replaced by friends of Japan. In February 1932 some Manchurian leaders at Mukden (which was in Japanese hands) issued a declaration of independence. The new state was named Manchukuo. The newly institute Government was patently under Japanese tutelage.

Japan’s activities, as was to be expected, exerted a unifying influence upon Chinese politics. In December 1931 a reconciliation was effected between the Nanking authorizes and a rival government that had been set up in Canton by left-wing members of the Kuomintang. Anti-Japanese outbreaks became frequent occurrences, and Chinese residents in foreign lands sent home money to bolster the nation’s defence against the invaders. The Chinese people once more resorted to
their most powerful weapon; a nationwide economic boycott caused havoc to
Japanese industry. In January, 1932 the Japanese residents of Shanghai, the chief
foreign-Japanese movement by naval force. The navy welcomed this opportunity
to follow the army in the pursuit of glory. War vessels and marines were
dispatched to Shangri as a means of forcing the Chinese to buy Japanese goods.
Economic warfare was to be combated with the local Chinese garrison, and the
Battle of Shanghai was precipitated. The resistance of the Chinese to the invaders
was labelled aggression by Tokyo. The rainy season put to the battle, and in May
1932 negotiations were completed for the withdrawal of the Japanese forces and
the ending of the boycott. Meanwhile, in December 1931, the League Council had
appointed an international commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Lytton, to
investigate the Sino-Japanese situation and recommend possible solutions. While
the commission was at work, Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson announced that
the United States henceforth would refuse to recognize the legality of any
situation or treaty resulting from action taken in violation of the Kellogg Pact. This
Stimson Doctrine, as it came to be known, failed to elicit endorsements from the
European powers.

In September 1932, shortly before the report of the Lytton Commission
was made public, Japan affronted the League by recognizing the State of
Manchukuo. The motive presumably was to confront the League with a fait
accompli, and the procedure called forth a sharp rebuke from the president of the
Council, who happened to be the Irish Eamon de Valera. Recognition was
accorded through a Japan-Manchukuo Protocol, wherein the former Chinese
domain, in return for an endorsement of Its “independent” status, promised Japan a
long series of Favour, including the right to station troops at any desired point in
Manchukuo. (The Japanese yen dropped during these months to less than half of
its par value.)
The Lytton Report expressed doubt whether a government-in-spared boycott was a
“legitimate weapon of defence against military aggression by a stronger country,”
it suggested that China set up an autonomous government in Manchuria that would
acknowledge Chinese suzerainty, and it proposed widespread internal Chinese
reforms. The League Council referred the report to the Assembly, which referred it
to another committee.

During 1933 Japan suffered diplomatic defeats at Geneva and won military
victories in China, pushing south of the Great Wall under the pretext of preventing
further Chinese “raids” into manchoukuo territory. Since Japan paid no heed to the pleas of various League committees, China finally accepted an armistice. Under this agreement the Japanese were to return north of the Great Wall, and China consented to the creation of a demilitarized zone south of the wall, to be administered by Chinese officials friendly to Japan.

Meanwhile (March 1933) Japan had informed the League of her intention to withdrew from membership. Two years later, when Japan officially ceased to be a member of the League, Manchoukuo had been legally recognized by only her protector and El Salvador.

The U.S.S.R. offered to sell its half-interest in the Chinese Eastern Railway to Manchukuo, which had appropriated the half-interest of China. Negotiations among representatives of Moscow, Tokyo, and Hsinking were concluded in 1935, transferring all Russian rights to Manchoukuo in return for 50,000,000. Japan guaranteed the payments, “in view of the close relation existing between Japan and Manchoukuo.

Renewed friction meanwhile had developed between Japan and other states over the assignment of a Manchoukuo oil-sales monopoly to firm under Japanese control. The United Stated, British, and Netherlands Governments protested this action as a violation of the Open Door policy guaranteed in the puppet government of Manchoukuo. Tokyo replied by saying (1) that the Open Door had not been violated, (2) that the Manchoukuo Government’s promise could not be invoked since the government was not recognized by the complaining powers: and (3) that Japan could do nothing about the matter anyway since Manchoukuo was an independent state. The West an independent state, The Western nationals thereupon prepared to with draw from the oil business in Manchukuo.

7.5 Toward a “New Order” in Eastern Asia

Japan specifically enunciated the doctrine of a “new order” in eastern Asia in 1938. The trend in this direction had been foreshadowed in a declaration of 1934 by the Tokyo Foreign Office. Having broken with the West by withdrawing from the League, having declared herself to be “the principal protector” to stability in the Far East, and desirous of accommodating her rapidly increasing population, Nippon announced that she would continue to foster Sino-Japanese “Friendship” and oppose “any attempt on the part of China to avail herself of the influence of any other country in order to resist Japan. Then Tokyo promoted “friendship” with her neighbour by encouraging separatists in northern China to set up an
autonomous state under Japanese tutelage (1935) and by disarming the customs guards along the Great Wall so that Japanese goods readily might be smuggled into China (1936).

The increasing aggression of Japan on the Asiatic mainland for a time led to more serious difficulty with the Soviet Union than with any other third power. During the winter of 1936-1936 there were several border incidents along the Soviet-Manchoukuo, and the Manchjoukuo and Outer Mongolian, frontiers. Outer Mongolia, or the Mongolian People Republic, declared its independence of China after the First World War and had gradually come under the influence of the Soviet Union. U.S.S.R. deviser guided the policies foreign trade was with the Soviet Union. A commission appointed to demarcate a boundary between Manchoukuo and Outer Mongolia soon abandoned its efforts, and in 1936 the U.S.S.R. and Outer Mongolia signed a pact for mutual assistance in cases of attack.

Meanwhile, several clashes occurred along the Manchoukuo Siberian border. In 1937 Japanese artillery shelled Soviet gunboats in the Amur River, and one year later a Soviet-Japanese battle was waged over the border heights of Changkufeng. The ontier agreement of 1886 and now produced by the Soviets, failed to impress the Niaposese, and a Japanese force unsuccessfully attacked Changkufeng. The two governments then agreed to appoint a commission to demarcate the correct boundary. Establishment of the border commission was delayed, and in 1939 fighting was renewed. There were further disputes-some involving fishing rights-and, although the Mongolian-Manchukuo border eventually was defined, the Siberian-Manchoukuo frontier remained vague.

In China itself, meanwhile (1936), certain nationalistic leaders had warned the Nanking Government to resist further Japanese aggression last there be a civil war. For in that year Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was the only outstanding military leader who sill hesitated to adopt a strong anti-Japanese policy-properly because he felt that China must wait until she was more thoroughly unified and better prepared for war before risking an all out conflict with Nippon. Chiang disregarded the warning continued to order the suppression of anti-Japanese demonstrations, and preceded to Shensi in the north. There General Chang Hsueh-liang, bitter foe of Japan, supposedly was acting under orders of Nanking; but he was lukewarm in his campaign against the Chinese Communists. The Commander-in Chief wanted more energetic action against the Reds. Suddenly (December 1936) Chiang Kai-shek was seized by some of Chang Hsueh-liang’s generals and
held prisoner for two weeks. A growing number of northern soldiers had become reluctant to fight their own countrymen, even though these were Reds, while the Japanese were penetrating further and farther into China. Chang Hsueh-liang made his superior’s release conditional upon the latter’s promise to readmit the Communists into the Kuomintang and thus make possible a united Chinese front in a war against Japan. Chiang refused to make any commitments until released, and eventually he returned to Nanking with Chang Hsueh-liang in the role of voluntary prisoner. There the offending general received a full pardon. Then, prolonged negotiations between the national and Communist leaders took place. The Communists agreed to modify their social program and fight under Chiang Kai-shek in return for a promise of political reform and a war of resistance against Japan.

Meanwhile, in Japan, following an electoral victory by the Liberal Party, there was occurred a military rebellion. Early one morning in February 1936 a group of young officers led about a thousand soldiers from their barracks to the centre of Tokyo. While the troops seized a number of buildings, designated officers murdered several of the nation’s outstanding liberal statesmen. The rebels held their position for three days, disregarding even the Emperor’s command to surrender. Then they yielded, and some of the officers were condemned to death. The population remained relatively calm in the face of the army’s seeming inability to control its younger officers-who were determined to set up a dictatorship.

The conflict between the civil and military branches of the government was manifested continuously in the difficulties of the Japanese cabinet throughout 1936. It was aired in public when several parliamentary deputies bitterly attacked the army and its policies. The military, evidently unable to reply convincingly, precipitated additional cabinet crises until a new election was ordered for April 1937. The moderate elements won an overwhelming victory – which was promptly disregarded by the advocates of force. In Jul the advance into China was begun in earnest.

The Nanking Government now announced its readiness to fight “to the death.” The fighting spread and Japan declared a blockade of Chinese shipping. Thousands of civilians and refugees were killed by Japanese bombs in areas far removed from the fronts, and the Japanese army advanced steadily against the stubborn opposition of the Chinese soldiers. There were rays of hope for China in
September 1937 when the Communist armies in the north finally prepared to march against the Japanese invaders and when the League of Nations referred a Chinese appeal to its Far Eastern Advisory Committee. This committee, on which the United States was represented, unanimously condemned Japan’s tactics and urged a meeting of the signatories of the Nine-Power Treaties of 1922. Fifty League members endorsed the committee’s findings, expressed moral support for China, and called a parley of the interested parties to meet in Brussels. The Brussels Conference sat for three weeks, condemned Japan, and then adjourned indefinitely.

In the meantime, the Chinese Government had moved to the inland city of Chungking, because of the Japanese advance on Nanking. As the mechanized Japanese forces pushed on, Chinese sympathizers in many Western countries organized boycotts against Japanese goods, but these boycotts had no influence. In December 1937 Japanese soldiers poured into Nanking, celebrating their victory with a reign of terror.

On the day preceding the fall of China’s ex-capital, Japanese planes sank the United States gunboat Panay and some Standard Oil Company ships in the Yangtze Kiang. Several Americans were killed and many wounded, and the survivors reached safety under the greatest difficulty. The Japanese Government at once apologized, promised to punish those responsible for the crime, and indicated that there would be no future attacks. Washington was not satisfied, and Japan presented a second apology. The attack was called “entirely unintentional,” assurance was given of full indemnity, and it was pointed out that the responsible officers had been disciplined severely. The United States accepted this explanation, and the incident was closed.

In 1938 Japanese military victories in China continued, with occasional setbacks. Despite their defeats and staggering losses of people and territory, the Chinese continued to resist the invasion of the Japanese. Foreign sympathy China appeared to have in abundance, but little foreign aid. Supplies did reach the Chinese, chiefly from the Soviet Union and through Indo-China, but not in the desired quantities.

The domestic situation in Japan was not improved during 1938. There were frequent clashes between the government and the parliament, for many members of the latter, like the public at large, wanted to know the ultimate purpose of the
costly campaign in China. There also were frequent reorganizations of the cabinet, but always in the interest of a more vigorous prosecution of the undeclared war.

During her advance in China, Japan frequently performed acts which aroused the protests of the Western powers, acts that did much damage to foreign property and trading interests. To these charges the Japanese replied by declaring their purpose to extent to all China the status “enjoyed” by Manchukuo.

Throughout 1939 the Japanese continued the struggle in China, extending their occupation, further impairing their own diplomatic relations with the West, bombing more open cities, striving to set up a puppet government for China corresponding to that in Manchukuo, and failing in their efforts to break down the morale and the resistance of the Chinese. As the Japanese stripped, insulted, and slapped British subjects in the presence of Chinese (to impress the latter with the new importance of Japan) and advanced challengingly close to Hong Kong, the British enlarged their credit advances to China and warned Tokyo of the future consequences of its acts. As United States property was being destroyed through Japanese air attacks in various parts of China, Washington gave the required six months’ notice of its intention to terminate the United States and Japanese Treaty of Amity and Commerce that had provided Japan with its much needed United States market and supplies. In Japan itself, prices rose steadily, consumers’ goods began to run short, and casualty lists mounted; nevertheless, the military leaders ordered a further tightening of the people’s belts and persisted in their conviction that the new order in Asia was close at hand.

The countryside was affected even more adversely. As a consequence of the trade recession the price of a Koku of rice fell from 55 yen in 1920 to 22.5 yen in 1921. In the posts- World War I period, Japan found herself without political friends. While Soviet Union, Germany and China grudged Japan because she had deprived them of their territories, the victorious Allies also grew distrustful of Japan. They exerted pressure on Japan to sign the nine-power treaty in 1892.

This treaty signed by Britain, USA, France, Belgium, China, Japan, Italy, Holland and Portugal bound the signatories to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of China. All these powers agreed to refrain from securing special privileges of any king in China and also to help China to develop a strong and stable government. This treaty also recognized equal trade rights of all countries in China. By another treaty Japan was made to restore Shantung to China in return for a huge amount of compensation. However, Japan
was permitted to retain control over Shing Tao Railways. In short the Washington Conference of 1922 checked the growing naval power of Japan and made her surrender some of the gains of the First World War. However, Japan reconciled with these setbacks and tried to develop co-operation with USA and China because it wanted to exploit their markets. To reconcile China, Japan even restored Kiao-Chow to her and closed down all Japanese post offices in China. In 1928 Japan signed the Kellogg Briand Pact which outlawed war. Two years later Japan signed the London Naval Agreement to lighten the burden of armaments. All this did not find approval with the nationalists, particularly the military officers, and they stepped up propaganda against the government and advocated an aggressive policy which ultimately culminated in the Manchurian adventure.

At the domestic front the rapid industrialization of Japan during the first two decades of the present century caused great dislocation in the lives of the Japanese and a large number of them were forced to shift to urban areas, where adequate facilities were not available. The post-war trade recession in certain industries further added to the miseries of the worker. These were large-scale strikes, lock-outs and demonstrations in 1921. In view of the growing unemployment, the workers had to give a tough fight to maintain their levels of employment.

7.6 Self Check Exercise
1 Boxer Revolt was fought in which country?
2 The end of Manchu dynasty in China.
3 Who put 21 demands before China?

7.8 Summary
Conclusion:

In the post-WW 1 period, Japan found herself without political friends. While Soviet Union, Germany and China grudged Japan because she had deprived them of their territories, the victorious Allies also grew distrustful of Japan. They exerted pressure on Japan to sign the nine-power treaty in 1892.

This treaty signed by Britain, USA, France, Belgium, China, Japan, Italy, Holland and Portugal bound the signatories to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of China. All these powers agreed to refrain from securing special privileges of any king in China and also to help China to develop a strong and stable government. This treaty also recognized equal trade rights of all countries in China. By another treaty Japan was made to restore
Shantung to China in return for a huge amount of compensation. However, Japan was permitted to retain control over Shing Tao Railways. In short the Washington Conference of 1992 checked the growing naval power of Japan and made her surrender some of the gains of the First World War. However, Japan reconciled with these setbacks and tried to develop co-operation with USA and China because it wanted to exploit their markets. To reconciliate China, Japan even restored Kiao-Chow to her and closed down all Japanese post offices in China. In 1928 Japan signed the Kellogg Briand Pact which outlawed war. Two years later Japan signed the London Naval Agreement to lighten the burden of armaments. All this did not find approval with the nationalists, particularly the military officers, and they stepped up propaganda against the government and advocated an aggressive policy which ultimately culminated in the Manchurian adventure.

At the domestic front the rapid industrialization of Japan during the first two decades of the present century caused great dislocation in the lives of the Japanese and a large number of them were forced to shift to urban areas, where adequate facilities were not available. The post-war trade recession in certain industries further added to the miseries of the worker. These were large-scale strikes, lock-outs and demonstrations in 1921. In view of the growing unemployment, the workers had to give a tough fight to maintain their levels of employment.

7.9 Glossary
punitive: intended as a punishment
apparent: clear, easy to see
privileges: a special right
agreed: to say yes to something
endeavour: to try hard
apologize: to offer an excuse for some fault

7.10 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1 China
2 1911
3 Japan

7.11 Suggested Readings


### 7.12 Terminal Question

1. Write a note on Opium war and through light on their significance.
2. Trace the causes and effects of second opium war or Anglo-Chinese war of 1858.
3. Trace the causes of Chinese revolution of 1911 and through light on its failure.
4. Trace the distinct phases of the Sino-Japanese War. Assess its political, economic and cultural impact on China, both ‘occupied’ and ‘free’.
5. Divide into spheres of influence by foreign powers, China in the 19th century presented a sorry spectacle. How did China react to it?
6. Describe the growth of the Nationalist movement in China up to 1914. Discuss the consequences of the revolution of 1911.
7. What were the reasons of the fall of Manchus?
Chapter 8

Ottoman Empire and the Arab World: Accession of Sultan Abdul Hamid and the Young Ottoman Movement, Young Turk revolution of 1905

The European Powers and the Ottoman Empire (1815-1814)
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8.1 Introduction

In 1453, the Ottoman Turks captured Constantinople and began to extend their sway over the south-western part of Europe and the northern coast of the African continent during the next two centuries. They reached the same of power during the middle of the seventeenth century. They had conquered, lands which lay between them and Austria. They attacked Hungary, and after its conquests, 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 held 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.
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 the tyranny of the Turkish Sultan.

8.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:

The meaning of the “Eastern Question”
Sultan Abdul Hamid II
The Empire and the Great Powers
The Crimean War (1854-56) and the Treaty of Paris (1856)
Young Turk Revolution (1908)

8.3 Meaning of the “Eastern Question”

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 the 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. 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 dominated 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.

8.3.1 The Empire in 1878

In spite of territorial losses to which it was subjected in 1878, the Ottoman Empire was still, at this latter date, a truly imperial domain. In Europe it stretched across the Balkan peninsula from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, including Albania, Macedonia, and Thrace and of course, the ancient capital of Constantinople. In
Asia, it reached from the Egean Sea to the Persian Gulf and from the Black to the Red Sea. Between Europe and Asia it owned most of the Egean islands, including Crete and in outright possessions the Ottoman Empire still preserved a nominal suzerainty over Bosnian, Herzegovina and Novibazar (now administered by the Habsburg Empire) over Bulgaria (now under a Prince of its own), over Cyprus (now governed by Great Britain), and over Egypt (since 1866 under a practically independent ruler.

Yet this Empire extending into three continents was no longer the menacing great power which it had been back in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For more than a hundred years it had been declining in strength and prestige until it was quietly outranked by at least six Europe states France, Italy, Russia, and Austria-Hungary and fear of what it might do to Europe was lost in the prospects of what Europe could do to it.

In an age when mechanical industry was profoundly affecting most other European countries, increasing the size and taxable wealth of their populations, promoting the consolidation and democratizing of their governments, and enabling them to strengthen their armaments, the Ottoman Empire remained exceptionally backward in economics and politics and material force. Relative to its territorial extent or to populations of most other European Powers, the population of the Ottoman Empire was spare and practically stationary hardly exceeding twenty-five million between 1879 and 1914 and depending almost wholly on primitive agriculture. It was utterly unable to furnish the increment of financial resources requisite to keep the country in step with the political and military progress of industrial nations.

Then, too, in an age when most of the great powers of Europe were national states, commanding the enthusiastic loyalty of their dominant peoples the Ottoman Empire still harboured the anomalous religion-military imperialism of a much earlier period. Its Emperor the Sultan—was not merely a secular autocrat like the Russian Tsar. He was also both a Turkish overlord and the Caliph a king or honorary chief, for all orthodox Moslems throughout the world. Moreover, the Ottoman Turks, who constituted a compact and fairly homogeneous population in Anatolia and who supplied the sultan with the majority of his officials and, what was of prime importance, with the backbone of his army, were only a minority of the inhabitants of the Empire and they were slow to develop the nationalism which became characteristic of Europe in the nineteenth century. Such a backward and
external in attempting to survive alongside the industrial nationalist Europe of the
nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

8.3.2 Sultan Abdul Hamid II

The Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909) began his reign by making a
pretence of “modernizing” the Ottoman Empire; he promulgated a liberal
constitution of the current Western type. But so vociferous was the oppositions of
ardent Moslems of any such novel substitute for the venerable traditions of the
Empire, and so temperamentally despotic was the Sultan himself, that the
constitutions of 1876 was promptly suspended and for more than thirty years it
remained a dead letter. Then, too, for more seriously, Abdul Hamid early in his
reign failed to put down insurrections of Bosnians and Bulgarians within the
Empire and to halt Russian aggression from without; and the resulting Russo-
Turkish War of 1877-1878 only brought into lurid light the strength and the many-
 sides character of the forces operating against the Ottoman Empire.

8.3.3 The Empire and the Great Powers

First was the vaulting desire of European great powers to profit politically
and financially, from the weakness of the Ottoman Empire. Russia took territory
from the Empire in 1878, and the only way be which the Sultan could keep Russia
from taking more was to invoke the outside aid of Great Britain and Austria-
Hungary and to pay a price to each: Cyprus to the former, Bosnia-Herzegovina and
Novi-Bazar to the latter. Furthermore, the Sultan had to agree, by the peace treaty
of 1878, to collaborate with the great powers on a programme of “reforms”, whose
execution would be almost certain to arouse the hostility of his own Turkish
subjects and yet the failure of whose execution would afford foreigners a chronic
excuse for interference. Besides, the public finance of the Ottoman Empire, already
in confusion, were so completely disordered by the Russo-Turkish War that in
1881 the Sultan was obliged to place them under the direction of a commission of
foreign bankers. This in turn mortgaged heavily, the income of the Turkish
treasury and added greatly to the taxation and unrest within the country. It also put
foreign capitalists, particularly those of Britain, France, and Germany in a strategic
position to obtain profitable concessions for them and so clinch the stronghold of
their several governments on the Empire.

8.3.4 The Empire and Subject People

A second disrupting force was nationalism among the Balkan peoples of
the Ottoman Empire. This has already eventuated in the establishment of a national
Greek state in 1832, and in 1878 in the enforced recognition by the Sultan of the complete independence of Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro, the full autonomy of Bulgaria, and the partial autonomy of Eastern Rumania. None of these states was satisfied with the settlement of 1878, and what each had gained only heightened it ambition to precede an increasingly inflammatory propaganda of publications, armed hands, and secret societies.

Such nationalist incitement could not be confined to the Christian Balkan peoples. It proved contagious, and was presently communicated to Armenians, to Albanians, and even to Arabs. Nor were the Turks wholly immune. Some of their intellectuals, attending the universities in France or Germany or otherwise coming into contact with Western civilization, were thereby infected with nationalism but most Turks caught it while attempting to suppress subject’s people feverish with it. The more the Greeks and Serbs and Armenians insisted that they were equal or superior to the Turks, the more the Turks sought to put them in their proper inferior place. The more violent the former grew, the more vindictive became the latter. Massacres, which had been infrequent and sporadic while the Ottoman Empire embraced Moslems and Christians, because commonplace when the Empire comprised a variety of self-conscious and self-seeking nationalities.

The Sultan Abdul Hamid II, with no little skill, managed to stave off the seemingly inevitable dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. He played off one great power against another and one Balkan state against another. At first he relied mainly upon Great Britain to check Russian aggression. Eventually he came to regard Germany as the most dependable prop; it seemed to be comparatively disinterested, at least politically and territorially, and it was strong enough to serve as a counterpoise to either Russia or Britain. So the Sultan employed German army officers to reorganize his army and German financial experts to advise him on matters affecting the treasury. He welcomed the somewhat theatrical visits of the German Emperor William II to Constantinople in 1889. He granted to German bankers important economic concessions, including the construction of a railway across Asiatic Turkey from the Bosphorus to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf (1899).

In internal affairs Abdul Hamid employed espionage and terrorism to uphold his absolute power. And when Christian peoples grew too restive and threatened revolt, he permitted fanatic Moslem tribesmen, Kurdish or Albanian, to fall upon them and engage in massacre.
8.3.5 Disintegration of the Empire

Yet the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire proceeded apace. In 1882 Great Britain, already in occupation of Cyprus, effected a military occupation of Egypt and established a virtual protectorate over that nominal dependency of the Ottoman Empire. In 1885 the Bulgarians in Eastern Rumelia drove out their Turkish governor and secured the incorporation to their partially autonomous province with the fully autonomous principality of Bulgaria, which thereby was almost doubled in size and likewise in potential menace to the Empire.

In 1896 the Greeks in Crete revolted, and the next year on their behalf the kingdom of Greece went to war with the Ottoman Empire. This time, the Sultan’s army put up a stiff fight: it overwhelmed the Greek army on the mainland and advanced on Athens. Whereupon the “Protecting Powers” of Greece – Russia, Britain, France, and Italy – intervened and ended the Graeco-Turkish War. Greece had to pay a war indemnity and consent to a “rectification” of its northern frontier advantageous to the Ottoman Empire. Yet though Greece was not permitted to annex Crete, the Ottoman Empire practically lost it; it was to enjoy autonomy under the protection of the four great powers, and these named a son of the Greek King its governor.

The Armenians, too, rebelled in 1894. The rebellion was ruthlessly suppressed, and Kurds and other furious Moslems slaughtered at least 100,000, and perhaps 200,000, Christian Armenians. The great powers expostulated with the Sultan, but obtained only one of his facile promises that “reforms” would be instituted.

In the first years of the twentieth century, domestic criticism of the Sultan’s government affected Moslems as well as Christians, Asiatic provinces as well European, and created a widespread revolutionary unrest. In part it was a sign of the nationalistic spirit which was beginning to take possession of the Turks. In part it was a reaction against a government which permitted foreigners to exploit the country and put intolerable financial burdens on its own subjects, and yet which could not preserve order at home or prevent the loss of territory and prestige abroad. In part, also, it was an outcome of the closer contacts which railway construction—one of the most notable achievements of Abdul Hamid’s reign—enabled the peoples of the Ottoman Empire to develop with one another and with Western Europe. Whereas the total railway mileage of the Empire in 1885 was only 1,250, most of it being in the European provinces, it amounted in 1908 to
4,400, of which almost three-fourths were in Asia, serving to carry Western ideas as well as commodities to Ankara and Bagdad, Damascus and Mecca. In 1908, began a series of domestic revolutions and foreign wars which proved to be the death throes of the Ottoman Empire.

8.4 Greece

Meanwhile, we may note the development of those nationalistic Balkan states which won full or partial independence from the Ottoman Empire in the course of the nineteenth century. The first of these was Greece, which formally began its national cares in 1832, and which in the 1860’s, obtained a new King and a new democratic constitution. Under George I (1883-1913), despite many political and financial difficulties, the country made noteworthy progress, intellectually and materially.

The kingdom of Greece, as it existed from 1832 to 1913, embraced but a minority of the Greek nationality. The majority were still under Ottoman rule – in Macedonia, Thrace, at Constantinople, in Smyrna and other towns along the seacoast of Asia Minor, in the Egean islands and Crete. In 1897, as we know, Greece made an effort to wrest Crete from the Empire. The effort failed in its immediate purpose, but it brought to the fore an outstanding Greek leader, Eleutherios Venizelos, a Cretan by birth, had headed the revolutionary movement of the island’s autonomous government which issued from the war of 1897. By 1910 his popularity was so great in the kingdom of Greece that King George I, against his own personal wishes, was impelled to invite Venizelos to the mainland and to entrust him with the premiership of Greece. Venizelos reformed the Greek government, effected a reorganization of its army and navy, and negotiated with Serbia and Bulgaria a Balkan League against the Ottoman Empire. He thus prepared Greece, internally and externally, just as Cavour had prepared Sardinia, or Bismarck had prepared Prussia, for wars of national unification.

8.4.1 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 lose that status in 1812 because the Sultan reasserted his control. It was not until 1830 that the Serbs regained their independence.
8.4.2 The Crimean War (1854-56) and the Treaty of Paris (1856)

The next phase of the Eastern question began in the 1850’s. 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 themselves but he got no ready response. Britain was eager to maintain the balance of power in Europe and she did not want to see Russian 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. The principal battles were fought on the Crimean peninsula. They were Alma, Balaclava and Inkermann. The unbearable Crimean winter of 1854-55 took a heavy toll and the rate of British casualties increased due to neglect of wounded soldiers. 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. Finally, Russia was beaten in 1856 and she sued for peace. 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.

“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
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 (1877-78) war ended in the defeat of the Sultan who sued for peace. The signing of the treaty of San Stefano 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, Montenegro, Serbia and Rumania. A new 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 jealously among other major powers, such as Britain, Austria, France and Germany.

**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 deducted 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.

**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 extend 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 and Herzegovina. Serbia coveted these territories very boldly for they were populated by Serbs. Russia was encouraging Serbia in her grand design of conquest of this area.

**8.5 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 Turki 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.

8.6 Self Check Exercise

1. The treaty of Paris was signed in the year of-
   (a) 1870 AD
   (b) 1866 AD
   (c) 1856 AD
   (d) 1852 AD

2. The rise of the Young Turks Caused the downfall of
   (a) Muhammad-I
   (b) Muhammad-II
   (c) Abdul Hamid
   (d) Salim

3. Who was called the father of Turkey?
   (a) Abdul Hamid
   (b) Kamal Pasha
   (c) abdul Samad
   (d) Muhammad-I

4. What is Eastern Question?

5. What do you know the Crimean War?

8.7 Summary

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.

8.8 Glossary
increase: to become larger in number or amount
pursuing: to follow somebody/something in order to catch him/her/it
dissent: disagreement with official
oligarchy: a small group of people having control of a country
executive: concerned with managing, making plans, decisions, etc.

8.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. (c)
2. (c)
3. (b)
4. See at (8.3)
5. See at (8.4.2)

8.10 Suggested Readings

8.11 Terminal Questions
1. Throw a light on Sultan Abdul Hamid.
2. Write a brief history of the rise of Nationalism in Turkey and throw light on the causes and results of the Young Turk Revolution.
3. Describe the life and works of Kamal Pasha. What services did Kamal Pasha render to the progress of Turkey?
4 Trace the growth of Arab Nationalism after the First World War. How far was it a reaction to oil imperialism?
5 Turkish renaissance guided by Kamal Pasha revolutionised the Turkish life at many levels. Amplify.
6 Discuss the consequences of the First World War on the Ottoman Empire and on the development within Turkey.
9.1 Introduction:
The beginning of the 20th century was an age of imperialism. Every country of the world was trying to expand its territory. Russia and Japan both were heading towards imperialism; therefore, collision between the two was inevitable. The following reasons can be held as contributing to the outbreak of this war between Russia and Japan in 1904-1905.

9.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The Imperialistic Designs of Russia
Clash between Japan and Russia
The events of war
The consequences of Russo-Japanese war and the defeat of Russia

9.3 The Imperialistic Designs of Russia
All the developing nations of Europe were making efforts for their progress. She had development. Russia was interested in expanding its territory. She had already extended her influence in Asia and Europe. Japan was aware of
this progress of Russia and felt that the day was not far when the interests of both
countries would clash due to the imperialistic policies of each other.

**Lack of sea coast**

Russia is a cold country. The northern and western sea coasts of Russia
could not be used for navigation throughout the year. They were frozen due to
excessive cold. Therefore, Russia was in need of a sea coast which could be used
for navigation throughout the year. She fought in the Crimean War and also took
part in the Balkan wars in order to achieve a sea coast that could be used the year
round.

**Failure or Russia in Europe**

The defeat of Russia in the Crimean War proved disastrous for her. It
destroyed any hope of Russia to extend her territory. Russia also failed to gain
success even in the Balkan Peninsula. It proved that Russia would not be able to
expand territory in Europe. Therefore, it decided to advance its steps toward the
Pacific Ocean. Ports of Siberia and Northern Asia were already under her
command. But the sea coasts of these regions were also not navigable round the
year. Therefore, the greedy eyes of Russia were fixed over Manchuria, Liaotung
and Korea. Japan was also interested in capturing these coasts. In case Russia had
occupied them the interest of Japan might have been harmed. Therefore a war
between the two seemed to be inevitable.

**The Question of Railway Line**

Russia had extended her Railway line up to Manchuria. She had posted
some of her forces and police for its protection. Russia had also established her
control over Liaotung. The port of Port Arthur was also fortified by Russia. It
created a danger for Japan and she began to oppose the activities of Russia,
therefore a war between the two looming on the horizon.

**9.3.1 Clash between Japan and Russia**

Japan after waging a war against Chine in 1894-95 had captured Liaotung
according to the treaty of Shimonoseki signed between the two countries. But
Japan could not take any advantage of her victory. She was compelled by France,
Germany and Russia to give up her control over Liaotung and Russia established
her sway over Liaotung. It was not liked by Japan but she had to swallow the bitter
pill as she had no other alternative except to accept their proposals. But Japan
always remained on the lookout for an opportunity to get back the island of
Liaotung from Russia.
**Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902**

Japan had to give up her control over Liaotung due to the pressure of France, Germany and Russia but Japan took it very seriously. She felt an urgent need of a powerful friend who could help her in peril. Therefore, she concluded a treaty with England in 1902 and strengthened her position. Some scholars are of the opinion that the Anglo-Japanese treaty was the chief reason of the outbreak of Russo-Japanese war as it created a climate of confidence in Japan and strengthened her position.

**The Problem of Manchuria**

Manchuria was an apple of discord between Japan and Russia. Both wanted to establish their sway over it. Russia was dominating Manchuria but after the formation of Anglo-Japanese alliance, she concluded a treaty with China and promised to vacate Manchuria and Korea in 1902. She also admitted the Chinese domination over Manchuria, But later on desired possession over Manchuria. This demand of the Russians was against the terms of the treaty of 1902, concluded between Russia and China. China refused to grant Russia any concession for trading. This strained the relation between Russia and Japan.

**The Problem or Korea**

Both Russia and Japan were interested in capturing Korea. Russians were increasing their influence in northern Korea. They were busy felling timber on the bank of Yalu River. Japan opposed this action of Russia as it was against the terms of the treaty. On this small issue the Russians and Japanese soldiers opened fire on one another which resulted in the death of some Russian soldiers. Russia felt much offended at this and sent her troops in Korea to punish the Japanese. Japan protested against in but Russia paid no attention to her. Thus Japan was compelled to declare war against Russia on 5TH February 1904. Russia was not fully prepared for the war due to lack of means of communication and disintegration of her army but Japan was prepared to wage the war. Her fleet was very powerful and she had organized her forces in fighting trim.

**9.3.2 The events of war**

The Russo-Japanese war was fought both on sea and land. At the outset of this was Admiral Tojo of Japan destroyed the fleet of Russia in Port Arthur and captured it. Japan made it a military camp to face the Russian armies in Manchuria. Japan having achieved several victories advanced toward Liaotung after crossing Korea. Russians were also defeated in Liaotung and Shaho. A
terrible battle was fought at Mukden between Russia and Japan in which a great number of soldiers were killed. Ultimately the Japanese achieved victory over the Russians and established their control over Korea. Russian fleet was passing through the Baltic Sea. Admiral Tojo attacked it and gained victory. By this time both the countries were worn out by the constant war and concluded a treaty which was proposed by the intervention of the President of America.

**9.3.3 Treaty of Portsmouth**

The following terms and conditions were accepted by both the countries after a prolonged war:

1. The influence of Japan over Korea was accepted.
2. Russia promised to vacate Manchuria.
3. Japan got Liaotung, Port Arthur and southern part of Sakhalin Island.

**9.4 The consequences of Russo-Japanese war**

The Result of War proved to be quite significant and they made a great Impact upon Japan, China and Russia. It was a decisive battle. Its consequences were very significant.

**Influence of Russia**

The power and prestige of Russia was badly affected by her defeat in the war. It put a halt to her ambition in the eastern countries of Asia. The hollowness of the Russian Czar was no more a secret and the countries of Europe began to criticize him. Owing to the exposure of the weakness of the Czar, his position became very precarious and the end of Czarism loomed on the horizon.

**Influence of Japan**

Japan had defeated Russia in the war. It increased her international prestige and though a small nation, began to be counted among the big nation of Europe. She reached the zenith of her glory and power and her influence was established in the Far East. The victory of Japan also encouraged her to participate in the imperialistic race of the European countries and she succeeded in this direction.

**Influence over China**

China also could not help being affected by this war. The people of China realized that in case they wanted to be free from the yoke of the European countries, they would have to arm themselves in all earnest. Therefore, China resorted to western war technology. Many Chinese visited western countries to make themselves acquainted with their ways and means. Several Japanese instructors were appointed in China to train the Chinese soldiers in the western
style. This gave birth to the national awakening in China. They introduced several reforms in their political and social structure and gave up the habit of opium taking to some extent.

**Influence over Europe**

The position of Russia worsened after the Russo-Japanese war. She concluded a treaty in 1907 with England in order to overcome her miseries. Austria annexed Bosnia which otherwise would have checked Austria.

**Other Influences**

Even the Indian Freedom Movement was influence by this war and accelerated to achieve its goal. Mr. Swaine, a prominent historian has remarked:

“Russia’s ambitions were checked in the East. China was given a wave of regeneration and Japan showed a spirit of unparalleled growth.”

Ketelbey has also written:

“This war checked definitely the Far Eastern ambitions of Russian Empire and recalled the Czar once again to the Balkan and near Eastern affairs. At home it precipitated the internal revolution in Russia that had been brewing for a long time.”

H. A. L. Fisher has also remarked about the influence of this war:

“The victory of Japan became the eye opener to the Eastern nations, Especially to China and India, to rise, organize and overthrow the Western Yoke.”

Marriot writes about the importance of this treaty:

“The Russo-Japanese war was an event of resounding significance and its reactions were far reaching. In Asia the victory of Japan imposed a definite check upon the advance of Russia and placed Japan herself in a position of unquestioned pre-eminence; it also exercised a powerful effect upon the domestic policies of China. China hurriedly began to Europeanise her institutions on the Japanese model, established a parliamentary government in 1911 and in 1912 overthrew the Manchu dynasty and embarked upon the hazardous experiment of a Republic. It was felt throughout the whole continent of Asia and indeed, wherever coloured races were in contact with Whites. Even more significant were the reactions of Russo-Japanese war upon Europe-primarily of course upon Russia herself. The Russian autocracy had long ago appreciated the fact that for them it was a race between some dramatic success achieved in foreign wars, and an internal movement which beginning with reform might easily develop into revolution.”
Lipson also remarks: “The Russo-Japanese war (1904) affected profoundly the whole course of international policies-destroying for the time being the ‘Balance of Power’ on which had rested the European system. Hitherto the policy of the German Emperor had been cautious and restrained but in the future he was to display greater self-assertion and to stimulate the war-like ardour of the German nation. The Triple Alliance was converted into an instrument of aggression, and the next ten years, a period never free from international complications witnessed a succession of crises which on more than one occasion brought Europe to the brink of war... when the vast autocratic Empire (Russia) was worsted by a young Asiatic state (Japan) where people fifty years before (in Japan) fought with bows And arrows, the effect on the European situation was far reaching. Russia suffered immense losses of men; and she also lost valuable territory-the fortress of Port Arthur, the two naval fleets, but more disastrous than the material results of the war was the deadly blow to her prestige.....Another result of the Russo-Japanese war was to draw England and France closer together. The British government welcomed an opportunity to renounce her ‘splendid isolation’ which had hitherto been the keynote of its policy.”

9.4.1 Causes of the defeat of Russia

The following reasons contributed to the defeat of Russia in Russo-Japanese war in 1904-05:

1. The rise and progress of Russia was causing disturbance in the European countries. They considered it to be fatal to their interests and wished her downfall. This is why Russia could not get any help from European nations at the time of this war.

2. A civil war between the Czar and his people was in progress which barred the public support and made the defeat of Russia inevitable.

3. Russia could not get support from China due to the Manchurian issue.

4. Russia could not send her troops to Japan through the Eastern Siberian Railway due to Baikal Lake.

5. In comparison to Russians, the Japanese were more enthusiastic, patriotic and gallant and had a great spirit of sacrifice. Hence Russia failed before Japan.

6. The treaty of 1902 strengthened the power and prestige of Japan. She was sure of getting support from her friends.
7. The internal conditions of Russia were very deplorable. Corruption was rampant everywhere. Russian armies were having no discipline nor were they equipped with sophisticated arms. Therefore, defeat was essential.

9.5 Self Check Exercise
1. Anglo-Japanese treaty was signed on dated.
2. The main cause of the war between Russia and Japan.
3. The treaty of Portsmouth was signed between

9.6 Summary
Thus, we see that there is a great significance of Russo-Japanese war in the history of Europe. Lord Cecil has said that it was a decisive battle of the World History and it gave birth to rise of imperialistic Japan and she began to be reckoned among the powerful nations of the world.

9.9 Glossary
collision: a crash; an occasion when things or people collide
zenith: the highest point that the sun or moon reaches in the sky
acquainted: knowing something
precipitate: to cause to happen suddenly

9.8 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. 1902
2. The Korean problem
3. Russia and Japan

9.9 Suggested Readings
9.10 Terminal Question

1. How do you account for the defeat of Russia in Russo-Japanese war? What was the result of the defeat?

2. What were the causes of Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5?

3. What were the main features of the treaty of Portsmouth of 1905?

4. What were the results of Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5?

5. Write an essay on Japanese imperialism and her plunge into world war.
Chapter-10
Revolutions of 1905

Structure:
10.1 Introduction
10.2 Objective
10.3 The Eleven Points drawn up by the representatives of the Zemstvos
10.4 Self Check Exercise
10.5 Summary
10.6 Glossary
110.7 Answers to Self Check Exercise
10.8 Suggested Readings
10.9 Terminal Question

10.1 Introduction

The turning-point in the history of Russia came with the Japanese War (1904). The war was unpopular with the nation, and the incapacity with which it was carried on completed the disillusion of the Russian people, and opened their eyes to the gross defects of the bureaucratic regime. The Government was utterly discredited, and its weakness in the face of overwhelming public criticism speedily became transparent. Plehve, the Minister of the Interior, was assassinated in July 1904. His administration had been most reactionary: the year before his death, no less than 4867 persons are said to have been imprisoned or exiled without any regular trial. Plehve was succeeded by Prince Mirsky, a more enlightened and humane statesman, who invited the reformers to submit their grievances. They hastened to avail themselves of so unique an opportunity. The ‘Eleven Points’, drawn up by the representatives of the Zemstvos meeting in conference at Petrograd (November 1904), received the enthusiastic support of the professional classes.

10.2 Objective

After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The Revolutions of 1905
The Eleven Points drawn up by the representatives of the Zemstvos

10.3 The Eleven Points drawn up by the representatives of the Zemstvos

The ‘Eleven Points’, drawn up by the representatives of the Zemstvos meeting in conference at Petrograd (November 1904), received the enthusiastic support of the professional classes. They demanded:
1 Inviolability of person and domicile, so that no one should be troubled by the police without a warrant from an independent magistrate, and no one punished without a regular trial.
2 Freedom of conscience, of speech, and of the press, together with the right of holding public meetings and forming associations.
3 Greater freedom and increased activity of the local Government, rural and municipal.
4 An Assembly of freely elected representatives, who should participate in legislation and control the administration in all its branches.
5 The immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly to prepare a Constitution on those lines.”

In addition they sought the abolition of the so-called ‘temporary’ ordinances, which in reality were more permanent than the laws which they affected to interpret, an amnesty for political prisoners, and freedom of public instruction. These demands were backed up by a serried of banquets and demonstrations. Public excitement was growing, and the atmosphere seemed charged with electricity. A spark only was needed to produce a conflagration; this was supplied on January 22, 1905—a day marked in the Russian calendar as Red Sunday.

Hitherto the Reform Movement had been confined mainly to the educated classes, but now it was joined by the industrial proletariat. Father Gapon, a young priest, had organized in Petrograd a trade-union of factory workers, corresponding to that initiated by Zubatoff at Moscow, and enjoying in the same way police protection. On January 15, a strike was declared on account of the dismissal of two workmen, and the strikers demanded an eight hours’ day, better wages, improved sanitary arrangements, and arbitration boards. The Social Democrats now intervened, and movement, which originated in a purely industrial dispute, rapidly acquired a political complexion. Gapon, recognizing that his control over the workmen was rapidly weakening, and carried away, it is said, by the prevailing excitement, fell in with the programme of the revolutionaries and attempted to recover his waning influence by appealing in person to the Emperor. On Sunday, January 22, a great procession of strikers, with their wives and children, was organized for the purpose of presenting a petition as well as the industrial grievances of the Russian people. The demonstration was peaceful, but the troops fired upon the dense crowds which filled the suburbs. Gapon himself escaped unhurt, and his subsequent career is shrouded in some mystery. But though the
demonstration had failed achieve its immediate purpose; public feeling in Russia was stirred to its depths. It was moreover, a tangible sign of the political awakening of the working-classes, whose entrance into Reform Movement gave it a board democratic basis and enlarged its prospects of success. The next few weeks witnessed an epidemic of strikes in various parts of Russia, and innumerable assassinations, culminating in the murder of the hated Grand Duke Sergius, the Emperor’s uncle. Disorder was rampant throughout the Empire, and to calm the public agitation the Emperor yielded to the demand for a National Assembly. On March 3, 1905, he announced his intention “to convene the worthiest persons possessing the confidence of the people, and elected by them to participate in the drafting and discussing of legislative proposals.” At the same time memorials were invited as to the “improvement of the State organization and the amelioration of the national welfare.” As a result of this invitation the professional classes spontaneously organized unions comprising, among others, doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, clerks, and railway employees’ these soon combined to form a huge Union of Unions. In all cases the programme was almost exactly identical; everywhere the cry was raised for genuine parliamentary institutions, and the elementary rights of citizenship. The current of progressive opinion was strengthened at this juncture by the news of the battle of Tsushima (May 27), when the Baltic fleet, which had been sent to the Far East to wrest from Japan the command of the Pacific, was destroyed by the great Japanese admiral, Togo. A deputation of the Zemstvos urged the Emperor not to delay the summons of national representatives: “At this terrible hour of the nation’s trial, great is your responsibility before God and Russia.”

After a lapse of two months there appeared on August 19 the ‘Bulyghin Constitution,’ as it was termed. It was received with widespread dissatisfaction. Instead of a parliamentary assembly with full legislative powers, it set up an Imperial Duma, which was to be merely consultative; it established a very narrow franchise which excluded factory operatives, country doctors, country schoolmasters, and other rural residents without property; and it also left the fundamental principles of Government unchanged, preserving intact the Autocratic Power and refusing to admit the principle of ministerial responsibility. The result was a general political strike. Under the inspiration of Khrustalev, a lawyer of great capacity, the workmen had formed a central organization, known as the Council of Labour Delegates, which rapidly assumed the authority and
significance of a ‘working men’s Government.’ It even extended its control over the unions of the professional classes, and at the end of October it proclaimed a general strike. Newspapers suspended publication; the supply of electric light was cut off; employers were bidden to close down their factories under penalty of wrecking; magistrates and doctors, among other professions, participated in the strike; while the railway men on their part were already out owing to the report that the representatives of their union had been arrested. The whole social system of the Empire came to a standstill, and no alternative remained to the Government but to give way. Completely cowed by this remarkable manifestation of the strength of the progressive movement, the Government issued the Manifesto of October 30.

The October Manifesto marked an epoch in the history of the Reform Movement. In unmistakable terms it promised the elementary rights of citizenship—inviolability of person, freedom of conscience, liberty of speech, and the right of association and public meetings. The Duma was endowed with legislative functions, and no law was to be valid without its approval. There was also promised an extension of the franchise—a promise carried into effect by the decree of December 24, which enfranchised the professional and working-classes. But these concessions cut at the very root of the power hitherto wielded by the police and local officials. They therefore made a determined effort to gain back the ground they had lost by the massacre of their opponents. A union of Reactionaries was formed under the name of “Genuine Russians”; and, though they had no following in the community at large, they proved dangerous from their close cooperation with the police, who organized a series of outbreaks with the aid of the “casual criminal class.” This reactionary outburst “was vented chiefly on the peaceable Jewish population inhabiting the towns of the south-west and southern provinces. These poor people were pillaged and maltreated for several days to such an extent that in Western Europe their sufferings awakened a general feeling of commiseration, and the Russian word pogrom (devastation), by which the disorders were commonly designated, became for Englishmen a familiar term …… It is difficult to imagine how the Conservative or the Reactionary cause would be advanced by stirring up the hatred of the Russian lower classes against their Jewish fellow-citizens.” The most probable explanation of these atrocities appears to be that “an anti-revolutionary demonstration was required for party purposes.” The complicity of the authorities was notorious, the police having it in their power to check the pogroms without difficulty whenever they thought fit.
The first Russian Parliament, known as “the Duma of the national indignation,” met on May 10, 1906. It contained over four hundred members, of whom only seven were Reactionaries. The most important group was that of the Constitutional Democrats, or “Cadets,” as they soon came to be called; they represented the Liberal Party and numbered 153. Their chief rivals were the Octobrists, or Conservatives, who supported the Constitution as defined by the October Manifesto. They were recruited mainly from the landowning classes, but in the first Duma they gained very few seats owing to the brutal severity with which the Government had recently repressed agrarian disorders. The Labour group comprised 107 members; the Autonomists, who represented the minor nationalities like the Poles and wanted self-government, accounted for 63 members; there was also a large number of Independents who appear to have had no definite programme. The existence of the first Duma only covered a period of seven two days, and it was occupied by a struggle with the Government over the question of ministerial responsibility. The balance of power in the Duma was held by the Cadets, who were generally able to command a majority owing to the support which they received from the other groups in the Chamber. They demanded parliamentary institutions on the English model, that is a Cabinet responsible to the Duma, and not to the Emperor; they also claimed full authority over legislation and finance. Before the Duma met, its power had been greatly restricted by the Manifesto of March 5, and other enactments; for example, it could not alter the so-called ‘Fundamental Laws’; the army, navy, and foreign policy remained the sole province of the Emperor; and even the budget was safeguarded from parliamentary interference. In a word, the guarantees of civil liberties and genuine constitutional rule, foreshadowed in the October Manifesto, were rendered null and void. The struggle between the Duma and the Government lasted over two months, and eventually the Court seemed on the point of consenting to a Cadet Ministry. But this was strongly opposed by Stolypin, and his appointment as Premier was followed by the dissolution of the Duma on July 21. Nearly half the members withdrew to Viborg in Finland, where they issued a Manifesto calling on the nation to refuse taxes, and not to furnish recruits for the army. Yet while the country disapproved of the Government’s action, it had no means of offering organized resistance, and the protests of the Duma leaders were made without effect. The increased rigour of the new administration was shown in the unprecedented extension of capital punishment, which was now inflicted for
ordinary robberies, and even for insults to officials. More than six hundred persons suffered the death penalty under this regulation, while in a single year as many as 35,000 persons were actually banished, without trial, for alleged complicity in agrarian disturbances.

In the elections for the new Duma every conceivable pressure was brought to bear in favour of the Reactionaries and the Octobrists. “For the Cadets, political propaganda was made impossible. The Cadet party was refused legal recognition; officials were dismissed for belonging to it. Powers were freely used to disfranchise various classes of voters. Unsatisfactory candidates were struck off the rolls or exiled; Jews were told that if they voted they would be expelled. Lists of candidates were officially circulated for the Reactionaries and the Octobrists. Other parties were punished for naming their candidates. In towns voting papers were withheld by the police from a quarter or even a third of the voters; polling places were reduced in number; the days for polling were not announced or even deliberately announced wrongly; peasant farmers were called away to their communes, under threat of fines, on the days fixed for the polling of small landowners. A circular from the Synod instructed the priests to ‘take an active part and guide their flocks,’ threatening the refractory ‘with the wrath of God’; priests were to become candidates, wherever possible. In some towns the Reactionaries took away voting papers or even arrested their opponents.” In spite of these tactics, the Opposition carried the great majority of seats. Most constituencies deliberately chose candidates who were known to be in disfavour with the Government. In the case of twenty-five provinces, nearly one-third of the elected representatives had been imprisoned, or exiled, or dismissed from the public service. Of the Duma as a whole more than a quarter had suffered ‘administrative punishment.’ The Social Democrats, who had stood aloof from the first general election, now obtained between fifty and sixty seats.

The second Duma assembled on March 5, 1907. Its existence was stormy and short-lived. The crisis was reached when the Government suddenly demanded the exclusion of the Social Democrats on grounds of disloyalty to the throne. The Duma appointed a committee to investigate the charge, but the ministry had already resolved upon its course of action, and the Duma was dissolved on June 16. A new electoral law was now promulgated, although legally no modifications were valid without the Duma’s consent. A large number of seats were taken away from those parts of the Empire which had returned Opposition members; various
sections of the community were disfranchised; and the whole electoral system was so manipulated as to place the issue of the elections in the power of the landowners. The result was reflected in the third Duma, which met on November 14, 1907; the Octobrists obtained 153 seats, while the Cadets were reduced to 54. The most important action of this Duma was to liberate the peasant from the control of the Commune by substituting individual ownership of peasant lands for communal ownership. In 1912, after completing the appointed period of five years, the third Duma was dissolved. In the general election which followed, the Centre, composed of Nationalists and Octobrists, suffered a severe defeat; and, owing to the activity of the clergy, who took a prominent part in the elections, the victory was won by the Right. This gave the fourth Duma a reactionary character, since the Right contained no less than 155 members, while the Octobrists had only 132 and the Cadets only 52. A change now manifested itself in the attitude of the Octobrists. Hitherto they had supported the Government, but from this time they threw themselves into opposition owing to the failure of the Government to carry out the October Manifesto of 1905. This Manifesto, as we have already seen, promised personal inviolability, freedom of conscience, as well as freedom of parliamentary elections and the cessation of government by ‘exceptional’ laws. The formation of a Progressive Bloc in 1916 was intended to strengthen the hands of those who were endeavouring to transplant to Russian soil the conceptions of democratic liberty which are the bed-rock of Western life.

10.4 Self Check Exercise
1. What do you know the Bloody Sunday or Red Sunday?
2. What is Duma?

10.5 Summary
We have sought to trace the history of the Reform Movement in Russia over a period of one hundred years. Its progress was watched with sympathy by all who believed that free parliamentary institutions would afford scope for the progressive elements in the Russian nation to assert themselves; and that the removal of the shameful disabilities which refused to the Jewish people “the common rights of civilized man,” and the restoration of their independence to Poland and Finland, would be for Russia not a source of weakness but a source or strength. A distinguished Russian scholar voiced the Liberal standpoint of the more enlightened of his countrymen when he wrote: “The sooner it gets to be recognized that the dignity and welfare of Russia crave freedom as well as
authority, and that the only basis to unite both is law, the easier it will be to solve the problems set before a nation which has a great stake in the destinies of the world.” The blindness of the czarist regime to the imperious necessity of taking time by the forelock caused the Reform Movement to develop into a Revolution (1917) which destroyed not only the monarchy but the structure of Russian society itself.

10.6 Glossary

disillusion: to destroy somebody’s belief
assassinate: to murder by sudden
grievance: a cause of distress felt to afford reason for complaint
genuine: real; true
notorious: well known for something bad
exile: a person who is sent away from their own country, etc.

10.7 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. See ans. at 10.3

2. Duma is a legislative body in the ruling assembly of Russia and of some other republics of the former Soviet Union.

10.8 Suggested Readings


10.9 Terminal Question
1 Discuss the causes of the Russian Revolution. In what way did Russia’s participation in the First World War contribute to the success of the Russian revolution?
2 Throw a light on the Bloody Sunday.
3 What were the main features of Duma?
11.1 Introduction

Nichols had survived 1905 because his opponents were not united, because there was no central leadership (the whole thing having flared up spontaneously) and because he had been willing to compromise at the critical moment. Tsarism now had a breathing space in which Nicholas had a chance to make a constitutional monarchy work, and to throw himself in with the people demanding moderate reforms: improvements in industrial working condition and pay, cancellation of redemption payments (annual following the government the abolition of serfdom in 1861), which had reduced over half the rural population to abject poverty, more freedom for the press, and genuine democracy in which the Duma would play an important part in running the country. Unfortunately he seems to have had very little intention of keeping to the spirit of the October manifesto, having agreed to it only because he had no choice. The first Duma (1906) was not democratically elected, for although all classes were allowed to vote, the system was rigged so that landowners and middle classes would be in the majority. Even so it put forward far-reaching demands such as confiscation of large estates, a genuinely democratic electoral system and the right to approve the tsar's ministers. This was far too drastic for Nichols who had the Duma dispersed by troops after only ten weeks. The second Duma (1907) suffered the same fate, after which Nichols changed the franchise, depriving peasant and urban workers of the vote. The third and fourth Dumas were much more conservative and therefore lasted longer, covering the period 1907 to 1917. Though on occasion they
criticized the government, they had no real power, since the tsar controlled the ministers and the secret police. Some foreign observers were surprised at the ease with which Nicholas ignored his promises and dismissed the first two Dumas without provoking, another general strike. The fact was that the first two revolution impetus had subsided for the time being and many leaders were either in prison or exile.

11.2 Objective

After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:

Whether or not the 1917 revolutions were inevitable?

The Bolshevik Revolution

11.3 Whether or not the 1917 revolutions were inevitable

This together with the improvement in the economy beginning after 1906 has given rise to some controversy about whether or not the 1917 revolutions were inevitable:

(a) One theory is that given time plus gradually improving living standards, the chance of revolution would fade, and that if Russia had not become disastrously involved in the first world war, the monarchy might have survived; evidence to support this view:

(i) Peter Stolypin, prime minister from 1906 to 1911, made determined efforts to win over the peasants believing that given twenty years of peace, there would be no question of revolution. Redemption payments were abolished and peasants encouraged to buy their own land (about 2 million had done so by 1916 and another 3.5 million had immigrated to Siberia where they had their own farms). As a result there emerged a class of comfortably off peasants (called kulaks) whom, sloping hoped; the government could rely on for support against revolution.

(ii) As more factories came under the control of inspectors, there were signs of improving working conditions, and as industrial profits increased, the first signs of a more prosperous workforce could be detected. In 1912 a workers sickness and accident insurance scheme was introduced.

(iii) At the same time the revolutionary parties seemed to have lost heart:

They were short of money, torn by disagreements, and their leaders were still in exile.

(b) The other view is that, given the tsar’s deliberate flouting of his 1905 promises, there was bound to be a revolution sooner or later and the situation was
deteriorating again long before the first world war. The evidence to support this view seems more convincing:

(i) By 1911 it was becoming clear that Stolypin’s land reforms would not have the desired result, partly because the peasant population was growing too rapidly (at the rate of 1.5 million a year) for his schemes to cope with, and because farming methods were too inefficient to support the growing population comfortably. The assassination of Stolypin in 1911 removed one of the few really able tsarist ministers and perhaps the only man who could have saved the monarchy.

(ii) There was a wave of industrial strikes set off by the shooting of 270 strikers in the Lena goldfields (April 1912). In all there were over 2,000 separate strikers in that year, 2,400 in 1913, and over 4,000 in the first seven months of 1914—before war broke out. Whatever improvements had taken place, they were obviously not enough to remove all the pre-1905 grievances.

(iii) Apart from one or two exceptions there was little relaxation of the government repressive policy as the secret police rooted out revolutionaries among university students and professors and deported masses of Jews, thereby ensuring that both groups were firmly ant tsarist. Thus the situation was particularly dangerous since peasants, industrial workers and intelligentsia were all alike discontented.

(iv) As 1912 progressed, the fortunes of the various revolutionary parties, especially the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, revived. Both groups had developed from an earlier movement, the Social Democrat Labour Party, which was Marxist in outlook. (Karl Marx (1818-83) was a German Jew whose political ideas were set out in The Communist Manifesto (1848) and Das Kapital (1867). He believed that economic factors are the real cause of historical change, and that workers (proletariat) are everywhere exploited by capitalists (middle-class bourgeoisie), which must inevitably lead to revolution and the setting up of ‘the dictatorship of the proletariat’.) One of the leaders was Vladimir Lenin who helped to edit the revolutionary newspaper Iskra (The Spark). It was over an election to the Iskra editorial board in 1903 that the party had split into the Lenin supporters, the Bolsheviks (the Russian for ‘majority’) and the rest, the Mensheviks (minority). Both believed in strikes and revolution, but the as industrial workers, whereas the Mensheviks, doubting the value of peasant support, favoured close co-operation with the middle class; Lenin was strongly opposed to this. In 1912 appeared the
new Bolshevik newspaper Pravda (Truth), which was extremely important as a means of publicizing Bolshevik ideas and giving political direction to the already developing strike wave.

(v) The royal family was discredited by a number of scandals. It was widely suspected that Nicholas himself was a party to the murder of Stolypin, who was shot by a member of the secret police in the tsar’s presence during a gala performance at the Kiev Opera; Nothing was probably not sorry to see the back of Stolypin, who was becoming too liberal for their comfort. More serious was the royal family’s association with Rasputin, a self-professed Alexandra by his ability to help the ailing heir to the throne, Alexei. This unfortunate child had inherited’ haemorrhage. Eventually Rasputin became a real power behind the throne, but attracted public criticism by his drunkenness and his numerous affairs with court ladies. Alexandra preferred to ignore the scandals and the Duma’s request that Rasputin be sent away from the court (1912)

According to Richard Freedom, there was a ‘growing agitation among the workers, which in July 1914, in St Petersburg, had assumed the proportions of incipient revolution with street demonstrations, shootings and the building of barricades.’ However, the government still controlled the army and police and may well have been able to hold on even if a full-scale revolution had developed. What historians are sure about is that Russian failures in the war made revolution certain and caused troops and police to mutiny so that there was nobody left to defend autocracy. The war revealed the incompetent and corrupt organization and the shortage of equipment; it caused tremendous social upheaval with the recruitment of 15 million peasants and ruined the economy, bringing rising prices and chronic food shortages. Nicholas made the mistake of appointing himself supreme commander (August 1915) and thus drew upon himself the blame for all future defeats and for the high death rate, which destroyed the morale of the troops. Even the murder of Rasputin by a group of aristocrats (December 1916) could not save the monarchy.

11.4 Bolshevik Revolution

The Bolsheviks were in control in Petrograd as a result of their coup, but elsewhere the takeover was not so smooth. Fighting lasted a week in Moscow before the soviet won control and it was the end of November before other cities were brought to heel. Country areas were much more difficult to deal with and at first the peasants were lukewarm towards the new government, which very few
people expected to last long because of the complexity of the problems facing it. As soon as the other political groups recovered their composure, there was bound to be determined opposition to the Bolsheviks, who had somehow to extricate Russia from the war and then set about repairing the shattered economy while at the same time keeping their promises about land and food for the peasants and workers.

**How successful was Lenin in dealing with these problems?**

(a) **The Bolsheviks had nothing like majority support** in the country as a whole; the problem was how to keep them in power once the public realized what a Bolshevik government involved. One of Lenin’s first decrees therefore nationalized all land so that it could be redistributed among the peasants; this increases support for the Bolsheviks and was a great help in their fight with the Constituent Assembly. Lenin knew that he would have to allow elections, having criticized Kerensky so bitterly for postponing them, but he realized that a Bolshevik majority in the Assembly was highly unlikely. Elections were held (the only completely free and democratic elections ever to take place in Russia) but the Bolsheviks won only 168 seats out of about 700 while the right Social Revolutionaries had 380, a clear anti-Bolshevik majority. This would not do for Lenin who was aiming for a dictatorship of the proletariat by which he meant that he and the Bolshevik party working through the soviets would run the country on behalf of the workers and peasants. There was no room in the scheme for any other party. Accordingly, after some anti-Bolshevik speeches at its first meeting (January 1918), the Assembly was dispersed by Bolshevik Red Guards and never met again. Armed force had triumphed for the time being, but opposition was to lead to civil war later in the year.

(b) **The next pressing problem was how to withdraw from the war;** an armistice between Russia and the Central powers and been agreed in December 1917, but long negotiations followed, during which Trotsky tried without success to persuade the Germans to moderate their demand. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (March 1918) was cruel, Russia losing Poland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the Ukraine, Georgia and Finland; this included a third of Russia’s farming land, a third of her population, two-thirds of her coalmines and half her heavy industry. A terrible price indeed, but Lenin insisted that it was worth it pointing out that Russia needed to sacrifice space in order, to gain time to recover. He probably expected of get the land back anyway when, as he hoped, the revolution spread to Germany.
By April 1918 armed opposition to the Bolsheviks was breaking out in many areas leading to civil war. The Whites were a mixed bag including Social Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, ex-tsarist officers and any other groups which did not like what they had seen of the Bolsheviks; they were not aiming to restore the tsar, but simply to set up a parliamentary government on western lines. In Siberia Admiral Kolchak, former Black Sea Fleet commander set up a White government; General Denikin was in the Causes with a large White army; most bizarre of all the Czechoslovak Legion of about 40,000 men had seized long stretches of the Trans-Siberian Railway in the region of Omsk. These troops were originally prisoners taken by the Russians from the Austro-Hungarian army, who had later fought against the Germans under the Kerensky government. After Brest-Litovsk the Bolsheviks gave them permission to leave Russia via the Trans-Siberian Railway to Vladivostock, but then decided to disarm them in case they co-operated with the Allies, who were already showing interest in the destruction of the new Bolshevik government. The Czechs resisted with Great Spirit and their control of the railway was a serious embarrassment to the government.

The situation was complicated by foreign intervention to help the Whites with the excuse that they wanted a government which would continue the war against Germany. When intervention continued even after the defeat of Germany, it became clear that the aim was to destroy the Bolshevik government which was now advocating world revolution. The USA, Japan, France and Britain sent troops, with landings at Archangel Murmansk and Vladivostock. The situation seemed grim for the Bolsheviks when early in 1919 Kolchak, whom the Allies intended to head the next government, advanced with three armies towards Moscow, the new capital. However Trotsky, now Commissar for War, had done a magnificent job creating the well-disciplined Red Army, based on conscription and including thousands of experienced officers from the old tsarist armies. Kolchak was forced back, and later captured and executed by the Reds; the Czech Legion was defeated and Denikin, advancing form the south to within 250 miles of Moscow was forced to retreat; he later escaped with British help. By the end of 1919 it was clear that the Bolsheviks (now calling themselves communists) would survive though 1920 saw an invasion of the Ukraine by Polish and French troops which forced the Russian to hand over part of the Ukraine and White Russia (treaty of Riga 1921). From the communist point of view, however, the important thing was that they had won the civil war. The communist victory was achieved because.
(i) The whites were not centrally organized; Kolchak and Denikin failed to link up, and the nearer they drew to Moscow the more they strained their lines of communication. They lost the support of many peasants by their brutal behavior and because peasants feared a White victory would mean the loss of their newly acquired land.

(ii) The Red Armies had more troops plus the inspired leadership or Trotsky.

(iii) Lenin took decisive measure known as war communism to control the economic resources of the state: all factories of any size were nationalized, all private trade banned and food and grain seized from peasants to feed town workers and troops. This was successful at first in that it enabled the government to survive the civil war, but it had disastrous results.

(iv) Lenin was able to present the Bolsheviks as a nationalist government fighting against foreigners; and even though war communism was unpopular with peasants, the Whites became even more unpopular because of their foreign connection.

(d) From early 1921 Lenin had the formidable task of rebuilding an economy shattered by the First World War and then by Civil war. War communism had been unpopular with the peasants who, seeing no point in working hard to produce food which was taken away from them without compensation simply produced enough for their own needs. This caused severe food shortage aggravated by droughts in 1920-I. In addition industry was almost at a standstill. In March 1921 a serious naval mutiny occurred at Kronstadt suppressed only through prompt action by Trotsky, who sent troops across the ice on the Bay of Finland. This mutiny seems to have convinced Lenin that a new approach was needed to win back the faltering support of the peasants; he put into operation what became known as the New Economic Policy (NEPT). Peasants were now allowed to keep surplus produce after payment of a tax representing a certain proportion of the surplus. This, plus the reintroduction of private trade, revived incentives and food production increased. On the other hand heavy industry was left under state control, though some smaller factories were handed back to private ownership; Lenin also found that often the old managers had to be brought back, as well as such capitalist incentives as bonus and piece-rates. Lenin saw NEP as a temporary compromise a return to a certain amount of private enterprise until recovery was assured; his long-term aim remained full state control of industry, and of agriculture (through collective farms). Gradually the economy began to recover, though there were recurrent food shortages for many years.
(e) **Political problems** were solved with typical efficiency. Russia was now the world’s first communist state, the Union of Soviet Social Socialist Republics (USSR) with power held by the communist party (no other parties were allowed). In March 1921 Lenin banned groups who criticize his policies within the party, and during the rest of that year about one-third of the party members were purged or expelled with the help of the ruthless secret police (OGPU). control by Lenin and the party was complete. (For his successes in foreign affairs see Section 13.3 (a) and (b).

11.5 Self Check Exercise

1. Name the date and year of Bloody Sunday
   (a)- 20th January, 1904  
   (b)- 22nd January, 1904  
   (c)- 20th January, 1906  
   (d)- 22nd January, 1905

2. When did Bolshevik Revolution break out in Russia?
   (a)- November 1917  
   (b)- October 1917  
   (c)- July 1917  
   (d)- August 1917

3. Bolshevik Revolution was led by
   (a)- Lenin  
   (b)- Trotsky  
   (c)- Stalin

11.6 Summary

In May 1922 Lenin had his first stroke; after this he gradually grew weaker, suffering two more strokes until he died in January 1924 at the early age of 53. A.P.J. Taylor sums up his career well: Lenin did more than any other political leader to change the face of the twentieth century world. The creation of Soviet Russia and its survival were due to him. He was a very great man and even, despite his faults, a very good man

11.7 Glossary

reduce: to make something less or smaller in quantity  
deprive: to take away something from somebody  
provoke: to cause a particular feeling or reaction  
incipient: just beginning

150
demonstration: something that shows clearly that something exists or is true
equipment: the things that are needed to be a particular activity

11.8 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. (d) - 22nd January, 1905
2. (a) - November 1917
3. (a) - Lenin

11.9 Suggested Readings


11.10 Terminal Question

1. Whether or not the 1917 revolutions were inevitable? How.
2. What do you know the Bolshevik Revolution?
3. Why was the Bolshevik revolution important?
4. Is the Russian Revolution the same as the Bolshevik Revolution?
5. Critically assess the success of Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 in Russia.
Chapter-12
The October Revolution of 1917 and the socio-economic foundation of a socialist state

Structure:
12.1 Introduction
12.2 Objective
12.3 The Two Revolutions: March and November 1917
12.4 Self Check Exercise
12.5 Summary
12.6 Glossary
12.7 Answers to Self Check Exercise
12.8 Suggested Readings
12.9 Terminal Question

12.1 Introduction
In the decade before 1914, Russia was in a troubled state. The Tsar Nicholas II (1894-1917) insisted on ruling as an autocrat (someone who rules a country as he sees fit, ignoring such constraints as parliaments) but had failed to deal adequately with the country’s many problems. Unrest and criticism of the government had reached a climax with the Russian defeats in the war with Japan (1904-05) and in 1905 had burst out in a general strike and an attempted revolution, forcing Nichols to make concession (the October Manifesto) including the granting of an elected Parliament (Duma). When it become clear that the Duma was ineffective, unrest increased and culminated, after the disaster of the First world war, in two revolution and culminated, after the (march) overthrew the tsar and set up a moderate provisional government; but when this fared no better than the tsar, it was itself overthrown by the Bolshevik revolution (November). The new Bolshevik government was shaky at first and its opponents’ (Whites) attempts to destroy it caused a civil war (1918-20). Thanks to the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky the Bolsheviks (now calling themselves communists) survived and Lenin was able to begin the task of leading Russia to recovery (until his death in 1924).

12.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The Two Revolutions of Russia
The Revolution of March and November 1917

12.3 The Two Revolutions: March and November 1917
The revolutions are still known in Russia as the February and October Revolution. This was because the Russian were still using the old Julian calendar which was 13 days behind the Gregorian calendar used by the rest of Europe. Russia adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1918.

(a) **The first revolution began spontaneously on 8 March** when bread riots broke out in Petrograd (St Petersburg). The rioters were quickly joined by thousands of strikers from a nearby armaments factory, and when troops were ordered to open fire they refused and joined in the demonstrations. Mobs seized public building, released prisoners from jails and took over public stations and arsenals. Some of his senior generals told Nicholas who was on his way back to Petrograd and he would have to renounce the throne; on 15 March, in the imperial train standing in a siding near Pskov the tsar abdicated in favour of his brother, the Grand Duke Michael; when he refused the throne the Russian monarchy was at an end. There had been nothing organized about this first revolution; it was simply a spontaneous reaction to the chaotic situation which the imperial government had allowed to develop.

(b) **The provisional government.** The Duma, struggling to take control, set up a mainly liberal provisional government with Prince Georg Lvov as prime minister; in July he was replaced by Alexander Kerensky a moderate socialist. The new government was just as perplexed by the enormous problems facing it as the tsar had been, and in November a second revolution took place which removed the provisional government and installed the Bolsheviks.

Why did the provisional government fall from power so soon?

(i) It took the unpopular decision to continue the war, but the June offensive, Kerensky’s idea, was another disastrous failure, causing a complete collapse of army morale and discipline and sending hundreds of thousands of deserting troops streaming home.

(ii) The government had to share power with the Petrograd soviet, an elected committee of workers and soldiers representatives which tried to govern the city. Other soviets appeared in Moscow and the provincial cities and when the Petrograd soviet ordered all soldiers to obey only the soviet, it meant that in the last resort the provisional government could not rely on the support of an army.

(iii) Kerensky delayed the meeting of a Constituent Assembly (parliament) which he had promised and did nothing about land reform. This lost him support on all sides.
Meanwhile, thanks to the new political amnesty, Lenin was able to return from exile in Switzerland (April). The Germans allowed him to travel through to Petrograd in a special sealed train, in the hope that he would cause further chaos in Russia. After a rapturous welcome he urged that the soviet should case to support the provisional government.

In the midst of general chaos, Lenin and the Bolsheviks put forward a realistic and attractive policy. He demanded all power to the soviets, and promised in return an end to the war, all land to be given to the peasants, and more food. By October the Bolsheviks were in control of both the Petrograd and Moscow soviets though they were still in a minority over the country as a whole.

On 20 October, urged on by Lenin the Petrograd soviet took the crucial decision to attempt to seize power. Leon Trotsky, chairman of the soviet made most of the plans, which went off without a hitch. During the night of 6-7 November, Bolshevik Red Guards occupied all key points and later arrested the provisional government ministers except Kerensky who managed to escape.

12.4 Self Check Exercise
1. Who was the main leader of the Russian Revolution?
2. What was the name of the new country formed after the Russian Revolution?
3. Who was the last Russian Tsar?
4. Which Government did the first ruler after Tsar Nicholas II belong to?

12.5 Summary
It was almost a bloodless coup enabling Lenin to set up a new soviet government with him in charge. The coup had been successful because Lenin had judged to perfection the smoment of maximum hostility towards the Kerensky government and the Bolsheviks, who knew exactly what they wanted, were they wanted, were well disciplined and organized, whereas all other political groups were in disarray.

12.6 Glossary
insist: to be emphatic
fare: to be successful
enormous: very big or very great
exile: sent away from your own country, town

12.7 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. Vladimir Lenin
2. The Soviet Union
3 Nicholas 11
4 The Russian Provisional Government

12.8 Suggested Readings


12.9 Terminal Questions

1 Why this Russia withdraw from the war after the 1917 Revolution?
2 What were the main objectives of the Russian Revolutionaries?
3 The Russian Revolution of 1917 was a single revolution which developed two phases. Elucidate.
4 What was the impact of the October Revolution?
Structure:

13.1 Introduction
13.2 Objective
13.3 The Austro-German Alliance (1879)
13.3.1 The Triple Alliance (1882)
13.4 The Entente Cordiale (1904)
13.4.1 The Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907
13.5 Rivalry between Triple Alliance and Triple Entente
13.6 Self Check Exercise
13.7 Summary
13.8 Glossary
13.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise
13.10 Suggested Readings
13.11 Terminal Question

13.1 Introduction

Between 1871 and 1890, there was the hegemony of Germany in European affairs. Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany, seemed to be the arbiter of European politics. After 1871, Germany was a saturated country and as such had no desire to add to her territories. However, as Bismarck had wounded the pride of France and therefore feared an attack from that country, his main concern in foreign affairs was to isolate France so that she might not be able to have revenge against Germany. With that object in view, Bismarck created the Three Emperors’ League or the Dreikaiserbund in 1873. The rulers of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia agreed to co-operate with one another for the preservation of peace and to consult one another “in order to determine a common course of action” in case of a threat of war. This League continued up to 1878 when it was broken on account of the Congress of Berlin. Germany and Austria co-operated and Russia felt that she was betrayed by Germany. The relations between Germany and Russia were positively hostile between 1879 and 1881. However, Bismarck was able to renew the Three Emperors’ League in 1881. According to the new agreement, the three Powers mutually promised benevolent neutrality in case any of them was
involved in a war with a fourth Power. This arrangement was made for three years and was renewed in 1884 for another period of three years. It is to be observed that the Three Emperors’ League was not a strong union from the very beginning. Bismarck gave an undertaking to Austria that in the event of any difficulty between Austria and Russia, Germany would back Austria against Russia, and the understanding of 1881 would not stand in her way. Moreover, Germany followed a policy of protection which was partly against the import of Russian grain into Germany. As the rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia began to grow after 1878 in the Balkans, the relations between the two countries became bitter and consequently these two countries could not pull on together. The bitterness between these two countries weakened the Three Emperors’ League.

About the Three Emperors’ League of 1881 Taylor says that this treaty was a practical agreement about the Near East. Its only general principle was a pact of neutrality if one of the three Emperors was involved in a war with a fourth Power. As there was no immediate likelihood of a war between Germany and France, this was a straight gain for Russia. It was a promise that Germany and Austria-Hungary would not join England. The only limitation was with regard to Turkey. Neutrality was to apply if there had been agreement beforehand. The view of Taylor is that this was an unnecessary precaution because the Russians had no intention of going to war with Turkey. Moreover, the three Powers recognized “the European and mutually obligatory character” of the rule of the Straits and would insist that Turkey enforce it. This was the essential security against a British expedition to the Black Sea which the Russians had been seeking all along. As a Russian garrison at the Straits was impossible, this was the next best thing. The Russians gained still more. The Austrians promised not to oppose the union of the two Bulgarias although the British Government considered the division of Bulgaria as an essential achievement of 1878. In return, the Russians recognized the right of Austria-Hungary to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina. The League of 1881 was a victory for the Russians and perhaps for Bismarck. Germany was freed from having to choose between Russia and Austria-Hungary in the Balkans. Russia got security in the Black Sea in exchange for a promise of peaceful behaviours which her internal weakness compelled her to keep in any case. Austria-Hungary committed himself to an eventual breach with England although she owed her Balkan position to the cooperation with England in 1878. She got in exchange merely Russian promises which she regarded as worthless. The League of the
Three Emperors which was a pact of friendship with Russia, led in a round-about way to the Triple Alliance.

13.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
- The Austro-German Alliance (1879)
- The Triple Alliance (1882)
- The Entente Cordiale (1904)
- The Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907
- Rivalry between Triple Alliance and Triple Entente

13.3 The Austro-German Alliance (1879)

The immediate cause of the dual alliance between Germany and Austria was the Congress of Berlin. The policy of Bismarck since 1871 was one of maintaining friendship with Austria and Russia and thereby keeping France isolated. This he achieved by the Dreikaiserbund which he started in 1873 and which lasted till 1878. The interests of Austria and Russia conflicted in the Balkans. It was very difficult for Bismarck to keep them together. He managed it till 1878. But on the occasion of the Congress of Berlin, it became evident that they could not pull on together. Russia had established her hold over the Balkans by the Treaty of San Stefano. But Austria was not prepared to allow Russia to retain all that she had got. Austria had won over England to her side and on the occasion of the Congress these two powers acted together. He result was that Russia found herself alone before a combination of England and Austria. Bismarck who called himself the “honest broker” had to make a decision as to whether he would side with Austria or Russia. The choice had to be made as Russia and Austria were not prepared to pull on together. Ultimately, he decided to side with Austria. “The outstanding result,” says Dr. Gooch, “of the Congress of Berlin in the realm of high politics was the estrangement of Russia from Germany.”

The Russians felt bitter about the attitude of Germany. They were utterly disappointed at what they had got. It appeared to them that Bessarbia, Batoum, Kars and Ardahan were no compensation for the amount of money that they had spent and the amount of blood they had shed. Aksakoff remarked: “The Congress is a conspiracy against the Russian people in which the Russian representatives have taken a part. The diplomacy of St. Petersburg is more dangerous than Nihilism. It is a disgraceful treachery to the historic mission of Russia and has lost forever the respect and affection of the Slavs. Russia has been crucified by her own
statesmen. A fool’s cap and bells have been set upon her head.” Katkoff proclaimed that Germany had left Russia in the lurch. Milutin, the War Minister of Russia, worked openly for a French alliance. Schuvaloff who was the chief Russian plenipotentiary at the Congress was recalled from London and disgraced. Gortchakoff, the Foreign Minister of Russia, was hostile towards Bismarck and would like to have nothing to do with him. The Czar also was very bitter. He spoke bitterly of the European coalition under Bismarck’s leadership.

Another factor increased the bitterness of Russia. The German representatives on the international commission appointed to carry out the delimitations supported the Austrians against the Russians. Russia thought that it was being done intentionally. But the fact is that the German agents had got the instruction that they should side with the majority. Since Austria was supported by England and Russia was all alone, the German agents also supported Austria. It is wrong to say that they had special instructions to go against Russia. However, the fact remains that the siding of the German agents with the Austrians annoyed the Russians. The bitterness was so great that in 1879, Italy was approached as to whether she could co-operate in a war against Austria. Similarly, the French government was also approached regarding her attitude. But these soundings brought no result. The Russian troops were mobilized and concentrated on the German and Austrians frontiers. In June 1879, the czar was heard to say: “If Germany wished the friendship of hundred years to continue, she must alter her ways”. He reminded the Kaiser in which he complained of the German attitude. He reminded the Kaiser of his services in 1870, “Which you said you would never forget” and added that the consequences would be disastrous for both the countries. The Kaiser was pained by the violence of the letter and asked Bismarck to draft a reply. If the Kaiser had replied in a similar tone, there would certainly have been a war. Germany was not prepared to kneel before Russia. The Kaiser merely denied the charge.

But after this incident, Bismarck chalked out a new policy. He flared up at the conduct of Russia. The press campaign in that country annoyed him. He was denounced everywhere. He regarded this as the height of ingratitude on the part of Russia. In 1888, he wrote thus: “I conceived my role almost as if I were third Russian delegate. No Russian wish reached me which I did not adopt and fulfil. I behaved in such a manner that at the end of the congress I thought to myself, ‘If I did no already possess the highest Russian order in brilliance, I ought to receive it
now. ’ I had the feeling that I had performed a service for a foreign power which a minister is seldom in a position to render. The campaign therefore surprised me.”

Bismarck had to make a choice. He had already sided with Austria on the occasion of the congress of Berlin. He thought over once again. It is true that from the material point of view Russia would have been more advantageous. But he preferred Austria because it had a large population towards Germany.

Another event forced him to hurry up. He heard the news that Andrassy, the Foreign minister of Austria, was going to resign. Andrassy was the man whom he had favoured in the congress of Berlin. Before he resigned, Bismarck made up his mind to enter into an alliance with Austria. Andrassy was also anxious to insure against Russia. Both the statement was anxious for an alliance. There was to be no delay. The statement met at Gastein. They discussed the problem and the danger of Russia. They parted to meet again and in the meanwhile to consult their masters. Andrassy wrote back saying that Francis Joseph was willing to allow Austrian to join with Germany. But the Kaiser protested. He told the Iron Chancellor that he could not agree to it. The Kaiser refused to enter into an alliance with Austria against Russia whose ruler was his cousin. He had an interview with the Czar in September. The Czar apologized for the letter and told the Kaiser that he would like his country to remain a friend of Germany. The Kaiser was satisfied that the Czar had no ill-will. Next day, he met Giers and Milutin and assured himself that they also were not in any way against Germany. The result was that the Kaiser came back satisfied.

He refused to allow Bismarck to enter into an alliance with Austria against Russia. He refused to change the old traditional policy of Germany towards Russia. ‘’Put yourself in my place for a moment. I am in the presence of a personal friend, a near relative and an ally, in order to come to an understanding to some hasty and indeed misunderstood passages in the letter, and our interview also leads to a satisfactory result. I will not absolutely deny that the danger set forth in your memorandum may arise one day, particularly on a change of rulers; but I am utterly unable to see that there is any imminent danger. It is against my political convictions and my conscience to bind my hands for the sake of a possible eventuality, but I do not authorize you to convention, to say nothing of a treaty I cannot tell you how painful this episode has been to me, when it seemed, for the first time in 17 years, as if we do not agree.’’
In spite of what the Kaiser said, Bismarck was determined to bring about an alliance with Austria. He pointed out that there was no idea of attacking Russia. If Austria were attacked and in danger, Germany would be compelled by self-interest to support her, alliance or no alliance, since Germany’s position, confronted by a victorious Russia, a defeated Austria and a hostile France, would be untenable. The czar was only friendly till he could win France or Austria or both. The Chancellor persisted in his attitude. He won over the King of Bavaria to his side. He brought influence from all quarters on the Kaiser and tried to convert him. The Kaiser was virtually besieged. The Prince who was deputed to win over the Kaiser complained that while on the one side Bismarck threatened to resign, on the other Kaiser threatened to abdicate. The Kaiser was heard to remark: ‘‘Rather abdication than perfidy.’’ But Bismarck was determined to get it done. The Kaiser hesitated but ultimately had to give way on 5 October 1879. The treaty was signed in Vienna and ratified by both the Governments the same month.

Terms of the Alliance:
By the alliance, the two countries were bound together and the following were its important provisions:-
1. Should, contrary to their hopes and desires, one of the two was attacked by Russia, the other was bound to assist and to conclude peace only in common
2. Should any of the two be attacked by another Power supported by Russia, the other Power would assist. If any power attacked either Austria or Germany and was not helped by Russia, the other parts were to keep neutral.
3. The treaty was to remain secret.
4. The treaty was to last for five years and was to be prolonged for three years, unless the parties wanted to stop it.

13.3.1 The Triple Alliance (1882):
The Austro-German Alliance of 1879 was transformed into the Triple Alliance in 1882 with the accession of Italy to the Dual Alliance. Even before that year, Italy had tried to come to an understanding with Austria and Germany. Bismarck in 1877 had told Crispi: ‘‘If Italy is attacked by France, we should join and we will make a treaty for this purpose. But I do not expect such an attack unless France returns to monarchy, i.e., to clericalism. I could not, however, consider the possibility of Austrian hostility. I am your friend, but I will not break with Austria. If she takes Bosnia, you can take Albania.’’
In 1879, Bismarck was prepared to welcome to Italy as a third partner in the Austro-German alliance but the Italian Government did not accept the offer. However, the establishment of a French protectorate over Tunis by the Treaty of Bardo in 1881 brought about a change in Italian attitude. Italy had eye on Tunis as it was near that country and was also of French control over Tunis created a lot of indignation in Italy. The pride of the Italian patriots was feared that Tunis might be a prelude to Tripoli. France might “encircle her with a ring of iron.” There was some trouble at Marseilles. Many Italians were killed and many others left the city. There were anti-French demonstrations in Italy. It was felt that isolation was tantamount to annihilation. Italy would have loved to enter into a treaty with Great Britain as she was the strongest naval power in the Mediterranean, but Great Britain declined.

It was in these circumstances that the king of Italy, accompanied by his Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, visited Vienna. The alliance was not proposed by the hosts and the guests avoided the risk of a rebuff. However, a friendly welcome and a general discussion of the situation any agreement with Italy would be one-sided and Italy was not a trust-inclusion of Italy might not be of much value. However, the Italians were very anxious to have an alliance and were determined to have it at any cost. It is true that the negotiations were not easy but ultimately they came out successful and the Triple Alliance was made in 1882.

Prof. Fay points out that the view that Bismarck was responsible for the Triple Alliance is not a correct one. It is true that Bismarck encouraged France to pluck the ripe Tunisian fruit and also helped her in colonial adventures, but this does not mean that he felt that France would forget her humiliation of 1870-71 and keep peace with Germany. The fact is that the Triple Alliance originated with Italy. The Triple Alliance treaty was signed on 20 May 1882 between Italy, Germany and Austria-Hungary. It was to last for five years and its contents and existence were to be kept secret. By this treaty, Germany and Austria-Hungary bound themselves to assist Italy with their whole military strength if she was attacked by France without provocation. Italy bound herself to render reciprocal aid to Germany under similar circumstances. In the case of an unprovoked attack by Russia alone upon Germany or Austria, Italy was bound only to benevolent neutrality. If the attack was made by two or more Great Powers, her assistance was to be active. Italy was not informed of the contents of the secret alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary by which Germany was pledged to help Austria
against Russia. Italy wanted to bring Great Britain into the Triple Alliance. Austria was also in favour of it but Bismarck negatived the suggestion. However, declarations were made that the Triple Alliance was not “in any case to regarded as directed against England.”

13.4 The Entente Cordiale (1904):

The year 1898 is a great landmark in the history of Anglo-French relations. In that year, Anglo-French rivalry reached its high water-mark and there was every possibility of a clash between the two countries. Great Britain and France had been rivals for a long time. During the later half of the 19th century, the scramble for Africa had made them keen rivals. The Anglo-French African settlement of 1890 had solved some of the thorny problems and France was allowed to establish a protectorate over the Island of Madagascar, French influence was recognized as supreme in the Sahara. In spite of that, the rivalry between the two countries continued. That was due to the fact that the French wanted to penetrate from the west of Africa to the east of Africa and to do so as she was determined to link up her possession in North and South dominate the Sudan. The British Government was equally determined not to allow France Africa. The British Government regarded Anglo-Egyptian Sudan as their own preserve although it had not been conquered.

In 1897, Captain Marchand, a French soldier and explorer who was a passionate opponent of English colonialism, started his march across dark Africa, taking with him in pieces the steamer Faidherbe which he could reassemble when he reached the Nile. Its boiler was rolled on loges for hundreds of miles through the tropical forest. After more than a year, Marchand reached Fashoda on July 16, 1898. He restored the fort, made a treaty with the local chief who put his territory under the French rule and hoisted the French flag on the fort.

After a fortnight, Kitchener arrived on the scene with a much stronger force than that of Marchand. There was every likelihood of trouble, When Marchand undertook the expedition, he had been assured of his Government’s help by the then French Foreign Minister in these words: “You are going to fire a pistol shot on the Nile ; we accept all its consequences.”

However, both Kitchener and Marchand behaved with dignity and gallantry and the situation was saved. There was the following conversation between the two. Kitchener said: “I must hoist the Egyptian flag here.” The reply of Marchand was: “Why, I myself will help you to hoist it-over the village.” Kitchener said: “Do
you know, Major, that this affair may set France and England at war?” Marchand records that to that question he bowed without replying. Ultimately they agreed that Kitchener should hoist the Egyptian flag over an outlying part of the fort and the French flag should remain over the fort itself. They also agreed to refer the dispute to their respective home governments.

At this time, a new ministry was formed and Delcasse became the Foreign Minister of France. The latter brought a new approach to the whole problem. His view was that France could not afford to fight against England. That was due to the fact that if France was to get back Alsace and Lorraine from Germany, the only way to do so was by getting help from England. Under the circumstances a fight with England was suicidal, and no wonder Delcasse decided to retire from Fashoda and sent orders accordingly. Negotiations started between the two countries with regard to the territory claimed by France but on account of the stiff attitude of England, Delcasse had to give way. An Anglo-French convention of March 1899 fixed a line beyond which Great Britain was not to seek territory or influence westwards and France eastwards. Although Delcasse asked the British Government to settle the other outstanding disputes between the two countries and thereby bring them together, the British Government declined the offer. That was partly due to the fact that England was more favourably inclined towards Germany than towards France. Moreover, the British Government had no faith in the stability of the French ministries. The matter had to be dropped for the time being.

The settlement of 1899 between France and England was not popular in France. It was maintained by the French patriots that Delcasse had surrendered before Great Britain. In spite of the best efforts made by Delcasse to make Frenchmen understand his point of view, the feeling remained. When the Boer War started the relations between England and France became bitter once again. The French supported the Boers in their fight against the British stand. No wonder, there was too much of anti-French feeling in England. They visit of William II to London on the occasion of the death of Queen Victoria and his attitude there brought England and Germany together and nobody thought of France. However, events took a different turn when William II was approached to enter into an alliance with England and he tried to put off by saying that the road to Berlin lay through Vienna. It was then that statesmen like Chabmerlain who stood for an Anglo-German collaboration, felt disgusted with the German attitude and decided
to seek friends elsewhere. It was in that spirit that Great Britain decided to enter into an offensive and defensive alliance with Japan in 1902.

Negotiations were started with France in 1902 when Chamberlain made a formal proposal to Cambon, the French Ambassador in London. The scope of those proposals was colonial and their object was to solve the Anglo-French disputes in the colonial field.

The Anglo-French differences fell into two classes. In the first category fell a long string of local colonial disputes? The French claims rested on treaties and were more detrimental to Britain than of advantage to her. Their main value was a bargaining counter. France could be persuaded to surrender them only by giving her compensation elsewhere. Although it was a tedious job, yet it was not so hopeless. To the second category belonged two questions of high policy and those were Morocco and Egypt. France had not forgotten how in 1882 she was deprived of her interests in Egypt as a result of the unilateral action of Great Britain. The bitterness against Great Britain on that score was very great and it was difficult to reconcile her. France interest in Egypt had been long and intimate, dating back to the time of Napoleon I. At the same time, the Sultanate of Morocco was falling to pieces and could link the North and West African possessions of France. Moreover, the control of Morocco by any other rival power would have endangered French position. If this was the French view, the British Admiralty was not inclined to allow the falling of the southern shore of the straits of Gibraltar into the hands of France. Most of Morocco’s small trade was done by British merchants and they were not prepared to lose it so easily. However, a bargain was struck between the two countries. Great Britain was to have a free hand in Egypt and France was to have a free hand in Morocco and both of them were to support each other. The problem of the straits was solved by a non-fortification clause and by reserving a northern strip to satisfy the historic claim of Spain. It was also provided that equal liberty of commerce was to be given to England for thirty years.

The ratification of the treaty needed a feeling of friendship in France towards Great Britain. However, that feeling was lacking for some time. The French newspapers were most bitter against England. However, President Loubet and Foreign Minister Delcasse sent friendly messages to Edward VII on his accession to the throne. The King was greatly impressed by them. Moreover, Edward VII had an inborn hatred for the Germans and their king who had insulted him many a time. He was extremely popular with the people of Paris whom he
visited often. In 1903 when Edward VII visited France he was given a hearty welcome everywhere. The people ran after his carriage and cheered him. The visit was a grand success. In the same year, President Loubet and Delcasse went to London on a return visit and were warmly received. The result was that an Anglo-French Arbitration Treaty was signed in October 1903. However, the main treaty was signed in April 1904 and it dealt with Egypt, Morocco, Newfoundland, West Africa, Madagascar, Siam and New Hebrides. The Treaty was ratified both by Great Britain and France. The question of Newfoundland fisheries was amicably settled. France gave up her claim to the shores of Newfoundland where she had the right of fishing and drying her nets, but she was guaranteed the right of fishing as before. She got concessions in West Africa. She got 14,000 square miles of territory and uninterrupted access from her territories on the Niger to those in Lake Chad. The difficulties with regard to Siam, Madagascar and New Hebrides were also solved.

13.4.1 The Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907:

During the 19th century, England followed a policy of splendid isolation and refused to commit herself in spite of the efforts made by Bismarck. However, by the end of the 19th century she came to realize that the policy of splendid isolation was not in her best interests and was another name for annihilation. It was this realization that was responsible for the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902. It was with the same objective that the Entente Cordiale of 1904 was made with France and all the outstanding disputes between the two countries were amicably settled. Although the entente of 1904 was not a military alliance both the countries came nearer each other by the force of circumstance and England backed France in 1906, 1908 and 1911 on the question of Morocco.

It is rightly pointed out that the Anglo-Russians Entente was a complement of the Anglo-France entente. When Declasse was in office he felt that in the event of war between England and Russia, France position would be very much weakened and even the utility of the Franco Russian alliance of 1893 and the Entente Cordiale of 1904 would be very much lessened. France would be put in a very awkward position if her two partners’s quarreled among themselves. No wonder when the Dogger Bank accident took place Declassee worked hard to bring about a settlement between Russia and Great Britain. In spite of the tense atmosphere prevailing of a war between England against Russia the matter was hushed up and the possibility of a war between England and Russia was avoided.
Declassee felt that in the event of war between England and Russia the latter might join Germany and thereby endanger the very existence of France. Russia had been weakened very much in the Russo Japanese war and Japan in the future Russia needed peace for a long time to put herself on her feet and that was possible only if England the friend of Japan, ”could be won over”.

According to Taylor, “The Dogger bank affair marked, indeed, the end of an epoch in European history-the epoch in which an Anglo-Russian conflict had been expected in the Near East for fifty years in central Asia for twenty and in the Far East, with the greatest likelihood of all for ten. After November 1904 the conflict was indefinitely postpone. The British has settled their differences with France: they had escape war with Russia. Their security, and therewith their isolation from continental affairs, seemed at its height.”

It appears that Russo Japanese war, Edward VII and Izvolski, who later become the Foreign Minister of Russia, discussed the question of Anglo-Russian relations and possibility of rapprochement between two counties. Both of them seem to have approved of the idea of an Entente between the two countries. It was felt by Russia that if she could end her disputes with Great Britain, she could pursue an Anglo Russians Entente and reconciliation with Japan; there could come into existence a quadruplicate combination stronger than that of the triplicate.

Both Edward VII and Sir Edward Grey were in favour of an understanding with Russia. The first morocco crisis (1905-06) and the growing naval strength of Germany created a lot of anxiety in England and there was a genuine desire to come to an understanding with Russia so that in the event of a war with Germany, British position might not be weakened. Sir Charles Harding who had worked as British ambassador in Russia, was also a strong advocate of a friendly settlement with Russia. He exerted a lot of influence on Sir Edward Grey in favour of Russia. Sir Arthur Nicholson, the new British ambassador in Russia, also played an important part.

Negotiations started soon after Izolski became Russia’s Foreign Minister in May 1906. He admitted in October 1908 that such negotiations were going on. To begin with Russia was opposed to the partition of Persia into spheres of influence, but on account of the insistence in London, she had to give way. In March 1907, a Russian fleet visited Portsmouth. On the invitation of the British Government a deputation of Russian officers and sailors visited London and they were entertained as guests at the Admiralty. After the banquet, there was a gala
performance which was attended by Sir John Fisher, First Lord of the Admiralty and Sir Edward Grey. This was an unusual thing.

The progress of negotiations was hampered by certain difficulties. It was difficult to reconcile English liberalism and Russian autocracy. Both the Czar and the Russian reactionaries and militarists were opposed to an understanding with England and Izolski had to face great difficulties. The Liberal press of England condemned Russian pogroms and the reactionary and oppressive character of the Czarist regime. In spite of this, difficulties were overcome on account of the sincere efforts on both sides.

Another cause of delay was the British desire to bring Russia and Japan together. It was felt that there must be a satisfactory reconciliation between Japan and Russia on the question of China. An Anglo-Russian Entente was of no use if the two friends of Great Britain were to fight with each other. So great was the interest taken by the British Government with regard to the Russia-Japanese negotiations that they were actually concluded before an Anglo-Russian agreement was made on 31 August 1907.

The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 dealt with Tibet, Afghanistan and Persia. As regards Tibet, both England and Russia recognized the sovereignty of China and agreed not to interfere in her internal affairs or get any concessions there. The land of the Lamas was to remain a barrier between the Russian bears and the British lions.

As regards Afghanistan, Great Britain promised not to annex it and Russia pledged herself not to interfere with the affairs of Afghanistan. Russia declared Afghanistan outside the sphere of her influence. She withdrew her diplomatic agents from Heart. She agreed to deal with Afghanistan only through the British authorities. There were to be no more intrigues in Afghanistan either by England or by Russia.

Encirclement of Germany:

A reference may be made to the so-called encirclement of Germany by the Entente Powers. It is well known that in the time of Bismarck, Germany was the arbiter of Europe, but things changed after his resignation in 1890. There was a stage when England was anxious to enter into an alliance with Germany. However, that stage was over in 1901 when William II gave an evasive reply to a definite British proposal for an alliance between the two countries. It was then that Great Britain entered into an alliance with Japan in 1902. In 1904, the Entente
Cordiale was made with France. The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 brought Russia and England together. At the same time, the differences between Russia and Japan were amicably settled through the good offices of the British Government.

Germany was faced with a new situation and she felt that Great Britain had strengthened her position to such an extent that her position had become comparatively weak. Although outwardly she did not show any signs of nervousness, she felt at heart that the Triple Entente was stronger than the Triple Alliance both in economic resources and military and naval strength. Germany felt that her progress was checked in every quarter by the Entente Powers. On subjects like Alsace-Lorraine, Morocco, naval competition, the Berlin-Baghdad Railway, etc., one or the other Entente Power was opposed to Germany. Even in the case of the Balkans, there was a conflict between Russia and Austria for domination and if Austria was involved in a war, Germany was likely to be dragged into the same. In such an eventuality, Germany was either to surrender or fight and neither of the two alternatives was a happy one. Although both Russia and England protested that the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 was not aimed against Germany, the latter was not satisfied. It appeared to Germany that all the Entente Powers were opposed to her and she was actually being encircled by them.

The bitterness was intensified on the question of the Berlin-Baghdad Railway. Russia was opposed to the project for political, economic and strategic reasons. Déclassé was opposed to the project on account of the French alliance with Russia. He went to the extent of disallowing the bonds of the Baghdad Railway to be quoted on the Pairs Bourse. The British Government opposed the project as that was likely to affect adversely the British interests in Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf and also endanger the safety of the British Empire in India. The Germans completed a part of the railway in 1904 but they found their further progress blocked on account of the opposition of the Entente Powers. Germany was prepared to give up her claims in Morocco if France supported the Berlin-Baghdad railway project. This France refused to do. The British Government demanded either the internationalization of the whole of the project or British control over the Railway from Baghdad to the Persian Gulf. Germany felt that she could not oblige England up to that extent and the bitterness continued to increase. The naval competition between Germany and England forced Sir John Fisher to follow a “ruthless and remorseless” policy. Great Britain was determined to
maintain her naval supremacy and William II was equally determined to beat
England on that point. There was no possibility of a compromise and that is amply
proved by the following statement of William II: “Count Metternich must be
informed that good relations with England at the price of the building of German
Navy are not desired by him. If England intends graciously to extend us her hand
only with the intimation that we must limit our fleet, this is a groundless
impertinence which involves a heavy insult to the German people and their Kaiser,
which must be rejected in limine by the Ambassador. France and Russia might
with equal reason then demand a limitation of our land armaments. The German
fleet is not built against any one and not against England, but according to our
need. This is stated quite clearly in the Navy Law and for 11 years has remained
unchanged. This Law will be carried out to the last lota; whether it suits the
British or not, is no matter. If they want war, they can begin it; we do not fear it.”
In a speech to the German officers, William II gave expression to his inner feeling
in these words: “A strong navy, a strong army and powder dry.”

William II was himself determined to make Germany the strongest power
in the world. That could be done only if he was able to defeat Great Britain and her
allies. William II believed in a policy “World Power or Downfall” and was
prepared to go to any extent to achieve that objective. If he himself was prepared
to defeat everybody, he ought not to have grumbled when his potential victims
joined hands to offer joint resistance. There was no encirclement of Germany as
such. What actually happened was that William II felt that the realization of his
ambitions was blocked on account of the combined opposition of the Entente
Powers. Prof. Fay made the following observations on this point: “The effect on
Germany of England’s opposition to the Badhdad Railway, of her efforts to limit
the German Navy, entry of England into a Triple Entente was to produce a
conviction that Germany was being encircled. Germans believed that this
encirclement was Edward VII’s personal work and that it aimed at strangling
German commercial and colonial expansion, and even at crushing Germany’s
political and military position. There is no substantial evidence that there was any
deliberate encirclement with such aims on the part of King Edward or the British
Government. Such notions were the product of German imagination, fear and
suspicion.”

13.5 Rivalry between Triple Alliance and Triple Entente:
Between 1907 and 1914, there was a keen rivalry between the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance. While Germany tried to strengthen the Triple Alliance, Poincare tried to tighten and strengthen the triple Entente and the latter was more successful than the former. Although the Triple Alliance was renewed in 1907 and 1912, it became weaker and weaker on account of many causes. There were troubles within Austria herself. She was also too much entangled in the Balkan politics. There was distrust between Austria and Italy on account of “unredeemed Italy”. The Italians were determined to get back the Italian-speaking territories under the control of Austria. As Austria was not prepared to oblige Italy, there was no genuine co-operation between them. Moreover, both Austria and Italy were rivals in the Balkans and both of them were determined to control the Adriatic Sea. All these factors weakened the effectiveness of the Triple Alliance. Italy entered into an agreement with France in 1902 and with Russia in 1909. She voted with France against Germany on the occasion of the Algeciras Conference.

On the other hand, the Triple Entente was positively much stronger. The conflicting interests among the Powers were reconciled. Moreover, they were prepared to ignore petty differences for the sake of higher objects. The naval and military staff talks between England and France and Russia and France pooled together the resources of the Entente Powers. The Entente Powers were cautious to avoid any doubt or suspicion among the partners, Grey was prepared to allow the Haldane mission to fail rather than create any suspicion in France. He supported France wholeheartedly on the question of Morocco and was prepared even to risk a war with Germany.

13.6 Self Check Exercise
1. When Bismarck became the Chancellor of Germany?
2. Three Emperors League was formed by whom?
3. Triple Alliance was formed on dated
4. Which country is known as Dark Continent?

13.7 Summary
Europe was divided into armed camps, one represented by the Triple Entente and the other by the Triple Alliance. Every effort was made to lessen friction and suspicion and increase harmony, solidarity, and security of the camp. Sometimes, “blank cheques” were given by one ally to another. Sometimes, assurances of “complete fulfilment of the obligations of the alliance” were given. Regarding his interview in 1913 with William II, Berchtold, the Austrian Foreign Minister,
observed thus: “As often as opportunity offered during one hour and a quarter’s talk to touch upon our relations as Allies, His Majesty ostentatiously used the occasion to assure me that we could count absolutely and completely upon him. This was the red thread that ran through the utterances of the illustrious sovereign. His Majesty did me the honour of say that whatever came from the Vienna Foreign Office was a command for him.” The allies were coming to rely more and more on the support of one another. There was feverish activity for the growth of military and naval armaments. That led to suspicious and fears and that in turn gave an impetus to the race of armaments. According to Prof. Schmitt, “In 1907 the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente had stood side by side; in 1914 they stood face to face.” According to Grant and temporally, “This remarkable arrangement of international checks and balances for a long time preserved peace among the peoples, but by the very fact of its existence ultimately engendered strife. For the system was one of competing alliances, not of a universal league. It was a Balance, not a Concert, of Power. As one combination strengthened or developed its growth alarmed other States outside its orbit and mechanically produced a counter-combination. Competing alliances produced competing armaments, and the rivalry of Hatred and of fear ended in the two opposed groups carrying their competition to the battlefield.” According to J.A. Spender, “The stage which Europe had reached was that of a semi-internationalism which organized the nations into two groups but provided no bridge between them. There could scarcely have been worse conditions for either peace or war. The equilibrium was so delicate that a puff of wind might destroy it…” According to Lord Oxford, “We have often conscious that we were skating on the thinnest office and that the peace of Europe was at the mercy of a chapter of unforeseen and unforeseeable.” That accident took place on 28 June 1914 when Archduke Francis Ferdinand was murdered by the Serbians and that led to World War I.

13.8 Glossary

neutral: the state of not supporting either side in an argument, war, etc.
eventual: conditional
obligatory: that you must do
essential: completely necessary
straight: with no bends or curves
conviction: a strong belief
rivalry: competition between people, groups
13.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. March, 1871
2. Bismarck
3. 1882
4. Africa

13.10 Suggested Reading


13.11 Terminal Question

1. Discuss the causes of conflicts and tension among the Europeans power up to 1914. Trace the history of the formation of alliances in Europe?

2. What were the developments during the period between 1890 and 1914 that made the outbreak of the First World War inevitable?

3. Explain why the war which broke out in 1914 came to be known as the First World War.

4. What is meant by ‘Western front’ and the Eastern front”? On an outline map of Europe, show these ‘fronts’ along with the countries involved.
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14.1 Introduction

In 1914, a war began in Europe which soon engulfed almost the entire world. The damage caused by this war had no precedent in history. In the earlier wars, the civilian populations were not generally involved and the casualties were generally confined to the warring armies. The war which began in 1914 was a total war in which all the resources of the warring states were mobilized. It affected the economy of the entire world. The casualties suffered by the civilian population from bombing of the civilian population from bombing of the civilian areas and the famines and epidemics caused by the war far exceeded those suffered by the armies. In its impact also, the war had no precedent. In marked a turning point in world history. The battles of the war were fought in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Pacific, because of the unprecedented extent of its spread and its total nature. It is known as the First World War.

14.2 Objective

After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
The Imperialist Rivalries
The Conflicts within Europe
Formation of Alliances
Anglo-German War

14.3 Imperialist Rivalries
The underlying causes of the war were the rivalries and conflicts among the imperialist countries. You have seen before, in Chapter 9 that the imperialist conquest of Asia and Africa was accompanies with conflicts between the imperialist countries. Sometimes the imperialists were able to come to peaceful settlements and agree to divide a part of Asia of Africa among themselves without resorting to the use of force against each other. At other times their rivalries created situations of war. Wars were generally avoided at that time because the possibilities of further conquest were still there. If an imperialist country was excluded from a certain area, it could find some other area to conquer. Sometimes wars did break out between imperialist countries as happened for instance, between Japan and Russia. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the situation had changed. Most of Asia and Africa had already been divided up and further conquest could take place only by dispossessing some imperialist country of its colonies. So in the period beginning from the last decade of the nineteenth century, imperialist rivalries resulted in attempts to revived the world, creating conditions of war.

You have read before that Germany entered the scramble for colonies late. After the unification of Germany had been achieved, it made tremendous economic progress, by 1914 it had left Britain and France far behind in the production of iron and steel and in many manufactures. It had entered the shipping trade in a big way. One of its ships, the Imperator, built in 1912, was the largest in the world. Both Britain and France were alarmed at the expansion of German manufactures as they considered it a serious threat to their position. You have seen that Germany could not grab many colonies having arrived late on the scene. Most of Asia and Africa had already been occupied by the older imperialist powers. The German imperialists therefore, dreamed of expanding in the east. Their ambition was to control the economy of the declining Ottoman empire. For this purpose they had planned the construction of a railway from Berlin to Baghdad. This plan created a fear in Britain, France and Russia as the completion of the Berlin Baghdad railway would endanger their imperialist ambitions in the Ottoman empire. The Germans had imperialist ambitions elsewhere also, including in Africa.

Like Germany, all the major powers in Europe and Japan also had their imperialist ambitions. Italy, which after her unification had become almost an equal of France in power, coveted Tripoli in North Africa which was under the
Ottoman empire. She had already occupied Eritrea and Somaliland. France wanted to add Morocco to her conquest in Africa. Russia and her ambitions in Iran, the territories of the Ottoman empire including Constantinople, the Far East and elsewhere. The Russia plans clashed with the interests and ambitions of Britain Germany and Austria. Japan which had also become and imperialist power had ambitions in the Far East and was on way to fulfilling them. She defeated Russia in 1904-05 after having signed an agreement with Britain and was able to extend her influence in the Far East. Britain was involved in a conflict with all other imperialist countries because she had already acquired a vast empire which was to be defended. The rise of any other country was considered a danger to the British empire. She also had her vast international trade to defend against the competition from other countries, and to maintain her control over what she considered the lifeline of her empire. Austria had her ambitions in the Ottoman Empire. The United States of America had emerged as a powerful nation by the end of the nineteenth century. She had annexed the Philippines. Her main interest was to preserve the independence of trade as her trade was expanding at a tremendous rate. The expansion of other major powers influence was considered a threat to American interests.

14.3.1 Conflicts within Europe

Besides the conflicts resulting from rivalries over colonies and trade there were conflicts among the major European power over certain developments within Europe. There were six major powers in Europe at this time Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia France and Italy. One of the questions with which almost all these countries got involved concerned the countries comprising the Balkan peninsula in Europe. The Balkan countries had been under the rule of Ottoman Turks. However, in the nineteenth century the Ottoman rule had begun to collapse. There were revolts by various nationalities for independence. The Russian Czars hoped that these areas would come under their control once the Ottomans were ousted from there. They encouraged a movement called the pan-Slav movement which was based on the theory that all the Slavs of eastern Europe were one people. Many areas in Austria-Hungary were inhabited by the Slaves. Russia therefore encouraged movements both against the Ottoman empire and Austria-Hungary. The major Balkan country Serbia, led the movement for uniting the areas inhabited by the Slavs in the Ottoman Empire as well as in Austria-Hungary. The Serbian nationalism was encouraged by Russia. Other major European powers
were alarmed at the growth of Russian influence in the Balkans. They wanted to check the Russian influence, while Austria-Hungary had plans of expansion in this area.

Corresponding to the Pan-Slav movement there was a Pan-German movement which aimed at the expansion of Germany all over central Europe and in the Balkans Italy claimed certain areas which were under Austrian rule. France hoped to recover not only Alsace-Lorraine which she had lost to Germany in 1871 but also to wreak vengeance on Germany for the humiliating defeat that she had suffered in the war with Germany in 1870-71.

**14.3.2 Formation of Alliances**

The conflicts within Europe and the conflicts over colonies mentioned earlier had begun to create very tense situation in Europe from the last decade of the nineteenth century. European countries began to form themselves into opposing groups. They also started spending vast sums of money to increase the size of their armies and navies to develop new and more deadly weapons and to generally prepare themselves for war, Europe was gradually becoming a vast armed camp. Simultaneously propagandas for war to breed hatred against other countries to paint and to glorify war, was started in each started in each country. There were of course, people who raised their voice against the danger of war and against militarization. You have read of the attitude of the Second International and the various socialist parties. But soon all these voice were to be drowned in the drumbeats of War.

The opposing groups of countries of alliances that were formed in Europe not only added to the danger of war, but also made it inevitable that when the war broke out it would assume a worldwide magnitude. European countries had been forming and reforming alliances since the nineteenth century, two groups of countries or alliance emerged and faced each other with their armed might. In 1882 was formed the Triple Alliance comprising Germany Austria-Hungary and Italy. However Italy’s loyalty to this Alliance was uncertain as her main aim was to gain territories in Europe from Austria-Hungary and in conquering Tripoli with French support. As opposed to this emerged the Triple Entre comprising France Russia and Britain in 1907. Theory it was only a loose group based on mutual understanding as the word Entrant (meaning an understanding) indicates. The emergence of these two hostile camps made it inevitable that a conflict involving any one of these countries would become an all European war. As the aims of the
countries in these camps included the extension of their colonial possessions, an all European war almost certainly would become a world war. The formation of these hostile camps was accompanied with a race to build more and more deadly weapons and have larger and larger armies and navies.

A series of crises of crises took place during the years preceding the war. These crises added to the bitterness and tension in Europe and engendered national chauvinism. European countries also entered into secret treaties to gain territories at the expense of others. Often, these secret treaties leaked out and fear and suspicion grew in each country about such treaties. These fears and suspicions brought the danger of war near.

14.4 Anglo-German War

The outbreak of the war preceded by a series of incidents which added to the prevailing tension and ultimately led to the war. One of these was the clash over Morocco. In 1904 Britain and France had entered into a secret agreement according to which Britain was to have a free hand in Egypt and France was to take over Morocco and promised the Sultan of Morocco his full support for the independence of Morocco. The antagonism over Morocco it appeared, would lead to a war. However, the war was averted when in 1911 France occupied most of Morocco and, in exchange gave Germany a part of French Congo. Even though the war had been averted, the situation in Europe with each country preparing for war had become dangerous.

The other incidents which worsened the already dangerous situation in Europe occurred in the Balkans. In 1908 Austria annexed the Ottoman province were also coveted by Serbia which had the backing of Russia in establishing a united Slave state in the Balkans. Russia threatened to start war against Austrian annexation but Germany’s open support to Austria compelled Russia to retreat. The incident however, not only embittered feelings in Serbia but also created further enmity between Russia and Germany. The situation in Europe had become even more tense.

14.5 Self Check Exercise

1. When did Britain declare war on Germany in the First World War?
2. Which country lost the leadership at the world after the First World War?
3. Who was king of England during WW1?
4. Who was the leader of Germany in World War 1?

14.6 Summary
The crises resulting from the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria was followed by Balkan wars. In 1912 four Balkan countries Serbia Bulgaria, Montenegro and Grease started a war against the Turks. As a result of this war Turkey lost almost all her possessions in Europe. However, the Balkan countries fought another war over the question of distributing the former Turkish territory among themselves. Finally, Austria succeeded in making Albania which had been claimed by Serbia as an independent state. The frustration of Serbia’s ambitions further embittered her feelings against Austria. These incidents brought Europe on the verge of war.

14.7 Glossary

engulf: to cover
confined: very small
revived: to bring back to life or consciousness
inhabit: to live in a place
inevitable: that cannot be avoided
compel: to force somebody to do something

14.8 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. 1914
2. Germany
3. George V
4. Wilhelm 11

14.9 Suggested Readings


14.10 Terminal Question

1 What was the cause of Anglo-German rivalry in the First World War?
2 Why did Britain declare war on Germany in 1914?
3 How the Anglo-German naval Race cause First World War?
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15.1 Introduction
The war was precipitated by an incident which would not have created much stir if Europe had not stood divided into two hostile armed camps preparing for war for many years. On 28 June 1914 Archduke Francis Ferdinand the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary was assassinated at Sarajevo, capital of Bosnia. (Bosnia, it may be recalled had been annexed by Austria only a few years earlier.) Austria saw the hand of Serbia behind the assassination and served her with an ultimatum. Serbia refused to accept one of the demands of the ultimatum which went against the independence of Serbia. On 28 July 1914 Austria declared war on Serbia. Russia had promised full support to Serbia and started full scale preparations for war. On 1 August, Germany declared war on Russia and on 3 August on France. German troops marched into Belgium to press on to France on 4 August and on the same day Britain declared war on Germany.

15.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:
Causes of First World War
The Balkan Wars 1912 and 1913
Consequence of the War and the Peace Treaties

15.3 Causes of First World War

Many other countries soon entered the war. Japan declared war on Germany with a view to capturing German colonies in the Far East; Turkey and Bulgaria joined on the side of Germany Italy in spite of her membership of the Triple alliance, remained neutral for some time, and joined the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary in 1915.

Germany had hoped that through a lightning strike through Belgium, she would be able to defeat France within a few weeks and then turn against Russia. The plan seemed to succeed for a while and the German troops were within 20 km of Paris. Russia had opened attacks on Germany and Austria and some German troops had to be diverted to the eastern front. Soon the German advance of France was halted and the war in Europe entered a long period of stalemate. In the meantime the war had spread to many other parts of the world and battles were fought in West Asia, Africa and the Far East.

Many other countries soon entered the war. Japan declared war on Germany with a view to capturing German colonies in the Far East; Turkey and Bulgaria joined on the side of Germany Italy in spite of her membership of the Triple alliance, remained neutral for some time, and joined the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary in 1915.

Germany had hoped that through a lightning strike through Belgium, she would be able to defeat France within a few weeks and then turn against Russia. The plan seemed to succeed for a while and the German troops were within 20 km of Paris. Russia had opened attacks on Germany and Austria and some German troops had to be diverted to the eastern front. Soon the German advance of France was halted and the war in Europe entered a long period of stalemate. In the meantime the war had spread to many other parts of the world and battles were fought in West Asia, Africa and the Far East.

After the German advance had been halted, a new type of warfare developed. The warring armies dug trenches from which they conducted raids on each other. The kind of warfare that the armies were used to earlier – fighting in the open almost disappeared. On the Western Front, which included eastern France and Belgium, the troops of the warring sides dug trenches and continued their raids on each other's positions. For about four years, neither side could dislodge the other. The European countries made use of the troops recruited from their colonies
Labour from colonies was also used to dig trenches in Europe. On the Eastern Front, Germany and Austria succeeded in repulsing the Russian attack and capturing parts of the Russian empire. They were also successful against Rumania, Serbia and Italy. Outside Europe, there were campaigns against the Ottoman empire in Palestine, Mesopotamia and Arabia and against Germany and Turkey in Iran where they were trying to establish their influence. Japan occupied German possessions in East, Asia, and Britain and France seized most of the German colonies in Africa.

A large number of new weapons were introduced. The machine gun and liquid fire were two such weapons. For the first time, aircrafts were used in warfare and for bombing the civilian population. The British introduced the use of the tank which was to become a major weapon later. Both the warring groups tried to block each other’s supplies of food, manufactures and armland and the sea warfare played an important part in this. Submarines called U-boats were used by Germany on a large scale not only to destroy enemy ships but also ships of neutral countries heading for British ports. Another horrible weapon used in the war was poison gas. The war dragged on, taking a toll of hundreds of thousands of human lives.

On 6 April 1917, the United States of America declared war on Germany. USA had become the main source of arms and other essential supplies for the Entente countries. In 1915, the German U-Boats had sunk a British ship Lusitania. Among the 1153 passengers killed were 128 Americans. The Americans were generally sympathetic of Britain, and this incident further roused anti-German feelings in USA. Economic considerations had turned them even more in favour of the Entente countries. These countries had raised vast amounts of loans in USA to pay for the arms and other goods bought by them. Many Americans had subscribed to these loans which could be paid back only, if these countries won the war. There was also a fear that if Germany won the war, she would become a serious rival to USA. The sinking of ships, including American ships carrying American citizens, by the German U-boats finally led USA to join the war.

Another major development that took place in 1917 was the withdrawal of Russia from the war after October Revolution. The Russian revolutionaries had opposed the war from the beginning and, under the leadership of Lenin, had decided to transform it into a revolutionary war to overthrow the Russian autocracy and to seize power. The Russian empire had suffered serious reverses in the War. Over 6,00,000 Russian soldiers had been killed. The day after the
Bolshevik government came to power, it issued the Decree on Peace with proposals to end the war without any annexations and indemnities. Russia decided to withdraw from the war and signed a peace treaty with Germany in March 1918. Realizing that the Russian Government was not prepared to continue the war, Germany imposed terms which were very harsh on Russia. But the Russian government accepted these terms. The Entente powers which were opposed to the revolution in Russia and to the Russian withdrawal from the war started their armed intervention in Russia in support of the elements which were opposed to the revolution. This led to a civil war which lasted for three years and ended with the defeat of foreign intervention and of those Russians who had taken up arms against the revolutionary government.

(a) The Morocco crisis (1905-6) was an attempt by the Germans to test the recently signed Anglo-French agreement (the 1904 Entente Cordiale) with its understanding that France would recognize Britain’s position in Egypt in return for British approval of a possible French occupation of Morocco, one of the few remaining areas of Africa not controlled by a European power. The Germans announced that they would assist the Sultan of Morocco to maintain his country’s independence, and demanded an international conference to discuss its future. A conference was duly held at Algeciras in southern Spain (January 1906). The British believed that if the Germans had their way it would be an acknowledgement of German diplomatic domination. To the amazement of the Germans, Britain, Russia, Italy and Spain supported the French demand to control the Moroccan bank and police. This was a serious diplomatic defeat for Germany, who realised that the new line up of Britain and France was a force to be reckoned with, particularly as the crisis was soon followed by Anglo-French ‘military conversations’.

(a) The British agreement with Russia (1907) was seen by the Germans as a hostile move. In fact it was a logical step, since Russia and France, Britain’s Entente partners, had signed an alliance in 1894. For years the British had viewed Russia as a major threat to her interests in the Far East and India, but recently the situation had changed. Russia’s defeat by Japan (1904-5) had weakened her considerably, and she no longer seemed so much of a threat. The Russians were keen to end the long-standing rivalry and anxious to attract British investment. The agreement therefore settled their remaining differences. It was not a military alliance and not necessarily and anti-German move, but the Germans saw it as a
confirmation of their fears that Britain, France and Russia were planning to ‘encircle’ them.

(b) The Bosnia Crisis (1908) heightened the tension. The Austrians, taking advantage of a revolution in Turkey, annexed the Turkish province of Bosnia. This was a deliberate blow at the neighbouring state of Serbia which had also been hoping to acquire Bosnia since it contained about 3 million Serbs among its population. The Serbs appealed for help to their fellow Slavs, the Russians, who called for a European conference, expecting French and British support. When it became clear that Germany would support Austria in the event of war, the French drew back, unwilling to become involved in a war in the Balkans. The British, anxious to avoid a breach with Germany, did no more than protest to Austria. The Russians, still smarting from their defeat by Japan, dared not risk a war without the support of their allies. There was to be no help for Serbia, no conference took place, and Austria kept Bosnia. It was a triumph for the Austro-German alliance, but it had unfortunate results: Serbia remained bitterly hostile to Austria, and it was this quarrel which led to the outbreak of war. The Russians were determined to avoid any further humiliation and embarked on a massive build-up. They intended to be prepared in the event of any further Serbian appeals for help.

(c) The Agadir Crisis (1911) was a further development in the Morocco situation. French troops occupied Fez, the Moroccan capital, to put down a rebellion against the Sultan. A French annexation of Morocco seemed imminent; the Germans sent a gunboat, the Panther, to the Moroccan port of Agadir, hoping to pressurize the French into giving Germany some compensation, perhaps the French into giving Germany some compensation, perhaps the French Congo. The British were worried in case the Germans acquired Agadir, a possible naval base for threatening Britain’s trade routes. In order to strengthen France’s resistance, Lloyd George, in his famous Mansion House Speech, warned Germany that Britain would not stand by and be taken advantage of ‘where her interests were vitally affected’. The French stood firm, making no major concessions, and eventually the German gunboat was removed. The Germans agreed to recognize the French protectorate over Morocco in return for two strips of territory in the French Congo. This was seen as a triumph for the Entente powers but in Germany public opinion became intensely anti-British, particularly as the British were now drawing slowly ahead in the ‘naval race’: at the end of 1911 they had built eight of the new and more powerful ‘Dreadnought’ type battleships, compared with Germany’s four.
15.4 (D) The Balkan Wars (1912 and 1913)

(1) The first Balkan War (1912) broke out when Serbia, Greece, Montenegro and Bulgaria (calling themselves the Balkan League) attacked Turkey, capturing most of her remaining territory in Europe. Together with the Germans, Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, arranged a peace conference on London. He was anxious to avoid the conflict spreading, and also to demonstrate that Britain and Germany could still work together. The resulting settlement apportioned the former Turkish lands among the Balkan States; however, the Serbs were not happy with their gains as they wanted Albania, giving them an outlet to the sea, but the Austrians, with German and British support, insisted that Albania should become an independent state. This was a deliberate Austrian move to prevent Serbia becoming too powerful.

(2) The Bulgarians were also dissatisfied; they were hoping for Macedonia but most of it was given to Serbia. Bulgaria therefore attacked Serbia, starting the second Balkan war (1913). The Bulgarian plan misfired badly when Greece, Rumania and Turkey rallied to support Serbia. The Bulgarians were defeated, and by the treaty of Bucharest, forfeited most of their gains from the first war. Anglo-German influence had apparently prevented an escalation of the war by restraining the Austrians, who were itching to attack Serbia.

(3) In reality though, the consequences of the Balkan wars were serious. Serbia had been strengthened and was determined to stir up trouble among the Serbs and Croats inside Austria-Hungary; the Austrians were equally determined to put a stop to Serbia ambitions. The Germans took Grey’s willingness to co-operate as a sign that Britain was prepared to be detached from France and Russia.

(d) The assassination of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo (28 June 1914) was the event which sparked off the war. The Archduke, nephew and heir of the Emperor Franz Josef, was paying an official visit to Sarajevo, the Bosnian capital, when he and his wife were shot dead by a Serb terrorist. The Austrians blamed the Serbian government, and sent a stiff ultimatum. The Serbs accepted most of the points in it, but the Austrians, assured of German support, and were determined to use the incident as an excuse for war. On (28 July), Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. The Russians, anxious not to let the Serbs down again, ordered a general mobilization (29 July). The German government demanded that this should be cancelled (31 July). And when the Russians failed to comply, Germany declared war on Russia (1 August) and on
France (3 August). When German troops entered Belgium on their way to invade France, Britain (who in 1839 had promised to defend Belgian neutrality) demanded their withdrawal. When the Germans ignored this, Britain entered the war (4 August). The escalation was completed when Austria-Hungary declared war to Russia (6 August).

The war was to have profound effects on the future of the world. Germany was soon to be displaced, for a time at least, from her mastery of Europe, and Europe never quite regained its dominant position in the world.

It is difficult to analyse why the assassination at Sarajevo developed into a world war, and even now historians cannot agree. Some blame Austria for being the first aggressor by declaring war on Serbia; some blame Russia, the first to order full mobilisation, some Germany for supporting Austria, and others Britain for not making it clear that she would definitely support France—which, it is argued, might have dissuaded Germany from declaring war on France.

(a) The point which is beyond dispute is that the quarrel between Austria and Serbia, which had become increasingly more explosive since 1908, sparked off the outbreak of the war when Austria seized on the assassination as the pretext for a preventive war with Serbia. Austria genuinely felt that realisation of Serbian and Slav nationalist ambitions for a Yugoslav state would bring about the collapse of the Habsburg Empire: Serbia must be curbed. In fairness, they probably hoped the war would remain localised like the Balkans Wars. The Austro-Serb quarrel explains the outbreak of the war, but not why it becomes a world war. Several reasons have been suggested for the escalation of the war.

(b) The alliance system or ‘armed caps’ made war inevitable. This explanation is not convincing; there had been many crises since 1904 (Morocco, Bosnia, Agadir, Balkan Wars) none of which had led to a major war. In fact, there was nothing binding about these alliances. France had not supported Russia when she protested against the Austrian annexation of Bosnia, Austria took no interest in Germany unsuccessful attempts (Morocco and Agadir Crises, 1906 and 1911) to prevent France taking over Morocco, and Germany had restrained Austria from attacking Serbia during the Second Balkan war. Italy had agreements with both camps and though still a member of the Triple Alliance in 1914, entered the war against it in 1915. No power actually declared war because of an alliance treaty.

(c) Colonial rivalry in Africa and the Far East. Almost all the major European nations held wide territories outside Europe and so had become world...
powers. The Germans were late comers to this scramble for overseas colonies, markets and influence and hence had not managed to acquire the vast empires and riches which Britain, France and Russia had acquired. As the historian E. Lipson observes “Germany had as much, or as little claim as her neighbours to a share in the white man’s burden and white man’s plunder.” Using this logic the Germans disputed Britain’s control over South Africa and the Middle East and the French control over Morocco. The Germans and the Russians both sought control over the Balkans and there was rivalry in that region. The European nations also were at loggerheads over acquiring territorial and trade concessions in China. Some of these disputes were solved by treaties and pacts, but others continued to simmer.

(d) The naval race between Britain and Germany. Starting with the Tirpitz Navy Laws (1898), the growth of the German fleet probably didn’t worry Britain too much at first because she had an enormous lead; but with the introduction of the powerful British Dreadnought battleship in 1906, which rendered all other ships obsolete, the Germans could begin building Dreadnoughts on equal terms. The ensuing naval building race was the main bone of contention between the two rights up to 1914. According to Churchill, however, in the spring and summer of 1914 naval rivalry had ceased to be cause of friction, because ‘it was certain that we could not be overtaken as far as capital ships were concerned’

(e) Economic rivalry. It has been argued that the desire for economic mastery of the world caused German Businessmen and capitalists to want war with Britain, who still owned about half the world’s tonnage of merchant ships in 1912. There isn’t much evidence to support this theory; Germany was already well on the way to victory in that area;

(f) Russia made war more likely by backing Serbia. Probably making her more irresponsibly anti-Austrian than she might have been. Russia was the first to order a general mobilise. The Russians were worried about the Balkans situation where both Bulgaria and Turkey were under German influence: this would enable Germany and Austria to control the Dardanelles, the main Russian trade route thereby strangling the Russian economy (this happened during the war). Thus Russia felt herself threatened, and once Austria declared war on Serbia saw it as a struggle for survival. Also the Russians must have felt herself threatened, and once Austria declared war on Serbia, saw it as a struggle for survival. Also the Russians must have felt that their prestige as Slav leader would suffer irreparable damage if they failed to support Serbia. Perhaps the government even saw war as a good idea
to divert attention away from domestic problems. Perhaps the blame lies more with Austria; though she must have hoped for Russian neutrality, she ought to have realised how difficult this would be for Russia, and given possible Russian reaction the most careful consideration.

(g) German backing for Austria was crucially important. It is significant that in 1913 Germany restrained Austria from declaring war on Serbia, but in 1914 egged them on, the Kaiser urging them to attack Serbia and promising German help without conditions. The important question is: why did German policy towards Austria change? The answer is the subject of much controversy:

I. Some historians including the German, Fritz Fischer, claim that Germany deliberately provoked war with Russia, France and Britain in order to achieve world domination.

(ii) Other argues that Germany wanted war because she felt encircled and threatened by British naval power and by the massive Russian military expansion. The German generals decided that a ‘preventive’ war, a war for survival, was necessary, and that it must take place before the end of 1914; after that Russia would be too strong.

Some historians reject both (1) and (2) and suggest that Germany did not want a major war at all; the Kaiser and Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg believed a strong line in support of Austria would frighten the Russians into remaining neutral a sad miscalculation, if true.

(h) The mobilization plans of the various powers accelerated the tempo of events and reduced almost to nil the time available for negotiation. The German Schrieffer Plan, first approved in 1905 and modified by Moltke (German Commander-in-Chief) in 1911, assumed that France would automatically join Russia, so the bulk of German forces were to be sent through Belgium to knock France out in six weeks, after which they were to be switched across to face Russia, whose mobilization was expected to be show. Once Moltke knew that Russia had ordered a general mobilization, he demanded immediate German mobilization so that the plan could be put into operation as soon as possible. However, Russian mobilization did not necessarily the Schlieffen Plan, depending as it did on the rapid capture of Liege in Belgium, involved the first aggressive act outside the Balkans when German troops entered Belgium on 4 August. Almost at the last minute the Kaiser and Bethmann tried to avoid war and urged Austria to negotiate with Serbia (30 July), which perhaps supports points (iii) above. Withelm
also suggested a partial mobilization against Russia only, instead of the full plan, hoping that Britain would stay neutral if Germany refrained from attacking France. But it was too late: Moltke, scared of being caught on the hop by the Russians and French, insisted on the full Schlieffen Plan; there was no time to modify it. It looks as though the generals had taken over control of affairs from the politicians. It also suggests that a British announcement on 31 July of her intention to support France would have made no difference to Germany; it was the Schlieffen Plan or nothing even though Germany at the point had no specific quarrel with France.

The most convincing conclusion to be drawn from all these suggestions is that put forward by L. C. F. Turner. Perhaps the Germans did not deliberately provoke a war; it was caused by ‘a tragedy of miscalculation’. Most of the leading rulers and politicians seemed to be incompetent. The Austrians miscalculated by thinking Russia would not support Serbia, Germany did so by promising to support Austria, with no conditions attached; therefore the Germans were certainly blameworthy, as were the Austrians, because they risked a major war. Politicians in Russia and Germany miscalculated by assuming that mobilization would not necessarily mean war; plans in the belief that this would bring a quick decisive victory. No wonder Bethmann, when asked how it all began, raised his arms to heaven and replied: ‘Oh-if only know!’

The sides in the war were the Central Powers: Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey (entered November 1914) and Bulgaria (October 1915); and the Allies: Russia (left December 1917), France, Britain, Italy (entered May 1915), Rumania (August 1916) and the USA (April 1917).

The war turned out to be quite different from what most people had anticipated. It was widely expected to be a short decisive affair, like other recent European wars; hence Moltke’s nervous determination not to be left at the post when it came to mobilization. However, the Schlieffen Plan failed to achieve the rapid defeat of France. Although the Germans penetrated deeply, Paris did not fall, and stalemate quickly developed on the western front - with all hope of a short war gone. Both sides dug themselves in and spent the next four years attacking and defending lines of trenches which were difficult rifles and machineguns made frontal attacks suicidal and rendered cavalry useless.

In Eastern Europe there was more movement with Russian successes against the Austrians, who constantly had to be helped out by the Germans, causing friction between the two allies. But by December 1917, the Germans had captured Poland
(Russian territory) and forced the defeated Russians out of the war. Britain, suffering heavy losses of merchant ships through submarine attacks, and France, whose armies were paralysed by mutiny, seemed on the verge of defeat. Gradually the tide turned; the Allies, helped by the entry of the USA in April 1917, wore down the Germans, whose last despairing attempt at a decisive breakthrough in France failed in the spring of 1918. The success of the British navy in quietly blockading German ports and defeating the submarine threat by defending merchant convoys, was also telling on the Germans. By the late summer of 1918 they were nearing exhaustion. An armistice was signed on 11 November 1918 although Germany itself had scarcely been invaded; a controversial peace settlement was signed at Versailles the following year.

(a) **On the western front** the Schrieffler Plan was held up by unexpectedly strong Belgian resistance; it took the Germans over two weeks to capture Brussels, an important delay because it gave the French time to organize and left the Channel ports free so that the British Expeditionary Force was able to land. Instead of sweeping round in a wide arc, capturing the Channel ports and approaching Paris from the west, the Germans found themselves making straight for Paris just east of the city. They penetrated to within twenty miles of Paris and the French government withdrew to Bordeaux; but the nearer they got to Paris, the more the German impetus slowed up; there were problems in keeping the armies supplied with food and ammunition and the troops became exhausted by long marches in the August heat. In September the faltering Germans were attacked by the French under Joffre in the Battle of the Marne and driven back to the River Aisne, where they were able to dig trenches. This battle was vitally important; some historians even call it one of the most decisive battles of modern history. It ruined the Schlieffen Plan once and for all: France would not be knocked out in six weeks; hopes of a short war were dashed and the Germans would have to face full-scale war on two fronts. The war of movement was over; the trench lines eventually stretched from the Alps to the Channel coast, and there was time for the British navy to bring to bear its crippling blockade of German ports. The other important event of 1914 was that though the Germans took Antwerp, the British Expeditionary force held grimly on to Ypres, which probably saved the other Channel ports so that more British troops could be landed and kept supplied.

(b) **On the eastern front** the Russians, having mobilized more quickly than the Germans expected, made the mistake of invading both Austria and East Prussia
at the same time. Though they were successful against Austria, occupying the province of Galicia, the Germans called Hindenburg out of retirement and twice defeated the Russians at Tannenberg (August) and the Masurian Lakes (September), driving them out of Germany. These battles were important: the Russians lost vast amounts of equipment and ammunition which had taken years to amass. Although they had six and a quarter million men mobilized by the end of 1914, a third of them were without rifles. The Russians never recovered from this setback, whereas German self-confidence was boosted. When Turkey entered the war the outlook for Russia was bleak, since Turkey could cut her main supply line through the Dardanelles. One bright spot for the Allies was that the Serbs drove out an Austrian invasion in fine style at the end of 1914, and Austrian morale was at rock bottom.

(a) **In the west the stalemate continued**, though several attempts were made to break the trench line. The British tried at Neuve chapelle and Loos, the French in Champagne while the Germans attacked again at Ypres. These, like all attacks on the western front until 1918, failed; always the difficulties were the same; there was no chance of a surprise attack because a massive artillery bombardment always preceded the infantry attack to clear the barbed wire from no man’s land between the two lots of trenches, and generally to soften up the enemy; reconnaissance aircraft and observation balloons could spot troop concentrations on the roads leading up to the trenches. Even when the trench line was breached, advance was difficult because the ground had been churned up by the artillery barrage and there was deadly machinegun fire to contend with. Any ground won was difficult to defend since it usually formed a salient or bulge in the trench line, of which the flanks were vulnerable. At Ypres the Germans used poison gas but when the wind changed direction it was blown back towards their own lines and they suffered more casualties than the Allies, especially when the Allies released some gas of their own.

(b) **In the east Russia’s fortunes were mixed:** they had further successes against Austria, but met defeat whenever they clashed with the Germans, who captured Warsaw and the whole of Poland. The Turkish blockade of the Straits was beginning to hamper the Russians, who were already running short of arms and ammunition. It was partly to clear the Dardanelles and open up the vital supply line to Russia via the Black Sea that the Gallipoli Campaign was launched. This was an idea strongly pressed by Winston Churchill (First Lord of the Admiralty) to
escape the deadlock in the west by eliminating the truks, thought to be the weakest of the Central Powers because of their unstable government. Success against Turkey would enable help to be sent to Russia and might also bring Bulgaria, Greece and Rumania into the war on the Allied side; it would then be possible to attack Austria from the south. The campaign was a total failure; the first attempt in March, an Anglo-French naval attack through the straits to capture Constantinople, failed because of mines. This ruined the surprise element, so that when the British attempted landings at the tip of the Gallipoli peninsula, the Truks had strengthened their defences and no advance could be made (April). Further landings by Australian and New Zealand troops (Anzacs) in April and with great difficulty. In December the entire force was withdraw; the consequences were serious: besides being a blow to Allied morale, it turned out to be the last chance of relieving Russia via the black Sea and probably decided Bulgaria to join the Central Powers. A Franco-British force landed at Salonika in neutral Greece to try and relieve Serbia, but it was too late. When Bulgaria entered the war in October, Serbia was quickly overrun by Bulgarians and Germans. The year 1915 therefore was not a good one for the Allies; even a British army sent to protect Anglo-Persian oil interests against a possible. Turkish attack became bogged down in Mesopotamia as it approached Baghdad and was besides by Truks at Kut-el-Amara from December 1915 until March 1916, when it was forced to surrender.

(c) **In May Italy** declared war on Austria, hoping to seize Austria’s Italian speaking provinces as well as territory along the eastern shore of the Adriatic. A secret treaty was signed in London in which the Allies promised Italy Trentino, the south Tyrol, Istia, Trieste, part of Dalmatia, Adalia, some islands in the Aegean and a protectorate over Albamia. The Aliies hoped that by keeping thousands of Austrian troops occupied, the Italians would relieve pressure on the Russians. But the Italians made little headway and their efforts made no differences to the eventual Russian defeat.

(a) **On the western front** 1916 is remembered for two terrible battles, Verdun and the Somme.

Verdun was an important French fortress against which the Germans under Falkenhayn launched a massive attack in February; they hoped to draw all the best French troops to its defence, destroy them and the then carry out a final offensive to win the war. But the French under Petain defended stubbornly and the Germans had to abandon the attack in June. The French lost heavily (about 315,000 men) as
the German intended, but so did the German with over 280,000 dead, and nothing to show for it.

The Battle of the Somme was a series of attacks, mainly by the British, beginning on 1 July and lasting through to November. The aims was to relieve pressure on the French army weakened, and keep the Germans trench line as the French army weakened, and keep the Germans fully committed so that they would be unable to risk sending reinforcements to the eastern front against Russia. At the end of it all the Allies had made only limited advances varying between a few hundred yards and seven miles along a thirty-mile front. The real importance of the battle was the blow to German morale as they realised that Britain (where conscription was introduced for the first time in May) was a military power to be reckoned with.

Losses on both sides, killed or wounded, were appalling (Germans 650,000; British 418,000; French 194,000) and Haig (British Commander-in-Chief) came under severe criticism for persisting with suicidal frontal attacks. However, they probably helped to wear down the German armies: Hindenburg himself admitted in his Memoirs that they could not have survived many more campaigns like Verdun and the somme. The Somme also contributed to the fall of the British Prime Minister, Asquith, who resigned in December 1916, after mounting criticism.

(b) David Lloyd George became Prime Minister and his contribution to the Allied war effort and the defeat of the central powers was invaluable. His methods were dynamic and decisive; already as minister of munitions since May 1915 he had improved the supply of shells and machineguns, encouraged the development of new weapons (the stokes light mortar and the tank) which Kitchener (Minister for War) had turned down, and taken control of mines, factories and railways so that the war effort could be properly centralized. As Prime Minister during 1917 he set up a small war cabinet so that quick decision could be taken, brought shipping and agriculture under government control and introduced the Ministry of National Service to organize the mobilization of men into the army. He also played an important part in the adoption of the convoy system (see section 2.4(e)).

In the east the Russians under Brusilov attacked the Austrians in June (in response to a plea from Britain and France for some action to divert German attention away from Verdun), managed to break the front and advanced 100 miles, taking 400,000 prisoners and large amounts of equipment. The Austrians were demoralized, but the strain was exhausting the Russians as well. The Rumanians invaded Austria (August) but the German swiftly came to the rescue, occupied the
whole of Rumania and seized her wheat and oil supplies— not a happy end to 1916 for the Allies.

15.4.1 The War at Sea

The general public in Germany and Britain expected a series of naval battles of the Trafalgar type between the rival Dreadnought fleets. But both sides were cautious and dared not risk any action which might result in the loss of their main fleets. The British Admiral Jellicoe was particularly cautious; as Churchill points out, he ‘was the only man on either side who could have lost the war in an afternoon’. Nor were the Germans anxious for a confrontation because they had only 16 of the latest Dreadnoughts as against 27 British.

(a) The Allies aimed to blockade the Central Powers, preventing goods entering or leaving, and slowly starving them out. At the same time trade routes must be kept open between Britain, her empire and the rest of the world, so that the Allies themselves would not starve. A third function of the navy was to transport British troops to the continents and keep them supplied via the Channel ports. The British were successful in carrying out these aims: they went into action against German units stationed abroad and at the Battle of the Falkland Islands destroyed one of the main German squadrons. By the end of 1914 nearly all German armed surface ships had been destroyed, apart from their main fleet (which did not venture out of the Heligoland Bight) and the squadron blockading the Baltic to cut off supplies to Russia. In 1915 the navy was involved in the Gallipoli Campaign (see Section 2.2(b))

(b) The Allied blockade caused problems: Britain was trying to prevent the German using the neutral Scandinavian and Dutch ports to break the blockade; this involved stopping and searching all neutral ships and confiscating any goods suspected of being intended for enemy hands. The USA objected strongly to this, being anxious to continue trading with both sides.

(c) The Germans retaliated with mines and submarine attacks, which was their only alternative since their surface vessels were either destroyed or blockaded. At first they respected neutral shipping and passenger liners, but it was soon clear that the German U-boats and partly because was not effective, partly because of insufficient U-boats and partly because of problems of identification, as the British tries to fool the Germans by flying neutral flags and using passenger liners to transport arms and ammunition. In April 1915 the British liner Lusitania was sunk by a torpedo attack. (It has recently been proved that the Lusitania was
armed and carrying vast quantities of arms and ammunition, as the Germans well knew; hence their claim that the sinking was not just as act of barbarism against defenceless civilians.) This had important consequence: out of the thousand dead, 118 were Americans. Wilson therefore found that the USA would have to take sides to protest her trade; whereas the British blockade did not interfere with the safety to protect her trade; whereas the British blockade did not interfere with the safety of passengers and crews, German tactics certainly did. For the time being, however, American protests caused Bethmann to tone down the submarine campaign, rendering it even less effective.

**d) The Battle of Jutland** (31 May) was the main event of 1916, the only time the main battle-fleets emerged and engaged each other; the result was indecisive. The German Admiral von Scheer tried to lure part of the British fleet out from its base so that section could be destroyed by the numerically superior Germans. However, more British ships came out than he had anticipated, and after the two fleets had shelled each other on and off for several hours, the Germans decided to retire to base firing torpedoes as they went. On balance the Germans could claim that they had won the battle since they lost only 11 ships to Britain’s control of the surface complete. In desperation at the food shortages caused by the British blockade, they embarked, with fatal results, on:

**e) “Unrestricted submarine warfare” (January 1917).** As they had been concentrating on the production of U-boats since the Battle of Jutland this campaign was extremely effective. They attempted to sink all enemy and neutral merchant ships in the Atlantic and although they knew that this was bound to bring the USA into the war, they hoped that Britain and France would be starved into surrender before the Americans could make any vital contribution. They almost did it: the peak of German success came in April 1917 when 430 ships were lost; Britain was down to about six weeks corn supply and although the USA came into the war in April, it was bound to be several by Lloyd George who insisted that the Admiralty adopt the convoy system in which a large number of merchant ships sailed together protected by escorting warships. This drastically reduced losses and the German gamble had failed. The submarine campaign was extremely important because it brought the USA into war. The Britain navy therefore, helped by the Americans, played a vitally important role in the defeat of the Central Powers, and by the middle of 1918 had achieved its three aims.

**15.4.2 The Year 1917**
(a) In the west 1917 was a year of Allied failure. A massive French attack under Neville in Champagne achieved nothing except mutiny in the French army, which was successfully sorted out by Pétain. From June to November the British fought the Third Battle of Ypres, usually remembered as Passchendaele, in appallingly muddy conditions; British casualties were enormous -324,000 compared with 200,000 Germans for a four-mile advance. More significant was the Battle of Cambrai which demonstrated that tanks, properly used, might break the deadlock of trench warfare. 381 massed British tanks made a great breach in the German line, but lack of reserves prevented the success from being followed up. However, the lesson had been observed and Cambrai became the model for the successful attacks of 1918. Meanwhile the Italians were heavily defeated by Germans and Austrians at Caporetto (October) and retreated in disorder. This rather unexpectedly proved to be an important turning point. Italian morale revived perhaps because they were faced with having to defend their homeland against the hated Austrians. The defeat also led to the setting up of an Allied Supreme War Council. The new French premier Clemenceau, a Great War leader in the Lloyd George mould, rallied the wilting French.

(b) On the eastern front disaster struck the Allies when Russia withdrew from the war. Continuous defeat by the Germans, lack of arms and supplies and utterly incompetent leadership caused two revolutions (see Section 3.2) and the Bolsheviks, who took over in November, were willing to make peace. Thus in 1918 the entire weight of German forces could be thrown against the west; without the USA the Allies would have been hard pressed. Encouragement was provided by the British capture of Baghdad and Jerusalem from the Turks, giving them control of vast oil supplies.

(c) The entry of the USA (April) was caused partly by the German U-boat campaign, and also by the discovery that Germany was trying to persuade Mexico to declare war on the USA, promising her Texas, New Mexico and Arizona in return. The Americans had hesitated about siding with the autocratic Russian government, but the overthrow of the tsar in the March revolution removed this obstacle. The USA made an important contribution to the Allied victory; they supplied Britain and France with food, merchant ships and credit; actual military help came slowly. By the end of 1917 only one American division had been in action, but by mid-1918 over a half a million men were fighting. Most important was the psychological boost which the American potential in resources of men and
materials gave the Allies and the corresponding blow it gave to German morale.

**The Central Powers Defeated**

(a) **The German spring offensive** with launched by Ludendorff in a last desperate attempt to win the war before too many US troops arrived and before discontent in Germany led to revolution. It almost came off: throwing in all the extra troops released from the east, the Germans broke through on the Somme (March) and by the end of May were only 40 miles from Paris; the Allies seemed to be falling apart. However, under the overall command of the French Marshal Foch they managed to hold on as the German advance lost momentum and created an awkward bulge.

(b) **An Allied counter-offensive** began (8 August) near Amiens with hundreds of tanks attacking in short sharp jabs at many different points instead of on a narrow front, forcing the Germans to withdraw their entire line. Slowly but surely the Germans were forced back until by the end of September the Allies were through the Hindenburg Line. Though Germany itself had not yet been invaded, Ludendorff was convinced that they would be defeated in the spring of 1919. He insisted that the German government ask President Wilson for an armistice (3 October) hoping to get less severe terms based on Wilson’s 14 points (see Section 2.7 (a). By asking for peace in 1918 he would save Germany from invasion and preserve the army’s reputation. Fighting continued for another five weeks, but eventually an armistice was signed on 11 November.

(c) **Why did the Central Powers lose the war?** The reason can be briefly summarized:

i. Once the Schlieffen Plan had failed, removing all hope of a quick German victory, it was bound to be a strain for them, facing war on two fronts.

ii. Allied sea power was decisive, enforcing the deadly blockade which caused desperate food shortage, while keeping Allied armies fully supplied.

iii. The German submarine campaign failed in the face of convoys protected by British, American and Japanese destroyers; the campaign itself was a mistake because it brought the USA into the war.

iv. The entry of the USA brought vast resources to the Allies

v. Allied political leaders at the critical time- Lloyd George and Clemenceau- were probably more competent than those of the Central Powers; the unity of command under Foch in 1918 probably helped, while Haig learned lessons from the 1917 experiences about the effective use of tanks and the avoidance of salient’s
vi. The continuous strain of heavy losses was telling on the Germans – they lost their best troops in the 1918 offensive and the new troops were young and inexperienced; an epidemic of deadly Spanish flu did not help the situation, and morals was low as they retreated.

vii. Germany was badly let down by her allies and was constantly having to help out the Austrians and Bulgarians. The defeat of Bulgaria by the British (from Salonika) and Serbs (29 September) was the final straw for many German soldiers, who could see no change of victory now. When Austria was defeated by Italy at Vittorio- Veneto and Turkey surrendered (both in October), the end was near. The combination of military defeat and dire food shortages produced a Great War weariness leading to mutiny in the navy, destruction of moral in the army and revolution at home.

15.4.3 End of the War

Many efforts were made to bring the war to an end. In early 1917, a few socialist parties proposed the convening of an international socialist conference to draft proposals for ending the war without annexations and recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination. However, the conference could not be held. The proposal of the Bolshevik government in Russia to conclude a peace “without annexations and indemnities, on the basis of the self-dominion of peoples” was welcomed by many people in the countries which were at war. However, these proposals were rejected. The pope also made proposal of peace but these too were not taken seriously. Though these efforts to end the war did not get any positive response from the government of the warring countries, anti war feeling grew among the people. There was widespread unrest and disturbances and even mutinies began to break out. In some countries, following the success of the Russian Revolution, the unrest was soon to take the form of uprising to over throw the government. In January 1918, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, proposed a peace programme. This has become famous as President Wilson’s Fourteens Points. These includes the conduct of negotiations between states openly, freedom of navigation, reduction of armaments, independence of Belgium, restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France, creation of independence states in Europe, formation of an international organization to guarantee the independence of all states, etc. Some of these points were accepted when the peace treaties were signed at the end of the war.
Britain, France and U.S.A. launched a military offensive in July 1918 and Germany and her allies began to collapse. Bulgaria withdrew from the war in September, and Turkey surrendered in October. Political discontent had been rising in Austria-Hungary and Germany. The emperor of Austria-Hungary surrendered on 3 November. In Germany revolution broke out. Germany became a republic and the German emperor Kaiser William II fled to Holland. The new German government signed an armistice on 11 November 1918 and the war was over. The news was received with tremendous jubilation all over the world.

15.4.4 Peace Treaties

The victorious powers or the Allies, as they were called, met in a conference first in Versailles, a suburb of Paris, and later in Paris, between January and June 1919. Though the number of countries represented at the conference was 27, the terms of the peace treaties were really decided by three countries—Britain, France and U.S.A. The three persons who played the determining role in framing the terms of the treaties were Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Britain, and George Clemenceau, Prime Minister of France. The defeated countries were not represented at the conference. The victorious powers also excluded Russia from the conference. The terms of the treaty were thus not the result of negotiations between the defeated and the victorious powers but were imposed on the defeated by the victory.

The main treaty was signed with Germany on 28 June 1919. It is called the Treaty of Versailles. The republican government of Germany was compelled to sign this treaty under the threat of invasion. The treaty declares Germany and her allies guilty of aggression. Alsace-Lorraine was returned to France. The coal mines in the Germany area called Saar were ceded to France for 15 years while that area was to be governed by the League of Nations. Germany many also ceded parts of her pre-war territory to Denmark, Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The area of the Rhine valley was to be demilitarized. The treaty also contained provisions for disarming Germany. The strength of her army was to be limited to 100,000 and she was required not have any air force and submarines. She was dispossessed of all her all her colonies which were then taken over by the victors. Togo and the Cameroon were divided and shared by Britain and France. German colonies in South-West Africa and East Africa were given to Britain, Belgium, South Africa and Portugal. German colonies in the Pacific and the spheres under her control in China were given to Japan. China was aligned with the Allies during the war was
even represented at the Paris Conference. But her areas under German possession of control were given away to Japan. Germany was also required to pay for the loss and damages suffered by the Allies during the war. The amount of reparations was fixed at an enormous figure of $6,500,000,000.

Separate treaties were signed with the allies of Germany. Austria-Hungary was broken up and Austria was required to recognize the independence of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Poland. She had to cede territories to them and to Italy. Many changes were made in the Balkans where new states were created and transfers of territories from one state to another took place. Baltic States which earlier formed parts of the Russian empire were made independent. The treaty with Turkey stipulated the complete dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Britain was given Palestine and Mesopotamia (Iraq) and Syria went to France as what were called ‘mandates’. In theory, the ‘mandatory’ power, that is Britain and France, were to look after the interests of the people of the ‘mandates’ but actually they were governed as colonies. Most of the remaining Turkish territories were to be given to Greece and Italy and Turkey was to be reduced to a very small state. However, there was a revolution in Turkey under the leadership of Mustapha Kemal. The Sultan was deposed and Turkey was proclaimed a republic in 1992. Turkey regained control of Asia Minor and the city of Constantinople (Istanbul) and the Allies were forced to abandon the earlier treaty.

An important part of the peace treaties was the Covenant of the League of Nations. Wilson’s Fourteen Points included the creation of an international organization for the preservation of peace and to guarantee the independence of all states. The League of National was created. It was intended as a world organization of all independent states. It aimed at the preservation of peace and security and peaceful settlement of international conflicts, and bound its members ‘not to resort to war’. One of its important provisions was with regard to sanctions. According to this provision, economic and military action would be taken against any country which committed aggression. It also bound its members to improve labour and social conditions in their countries. For this the International Labour Organization was set up which is now one of the specialized agencies of the 15.4.5

The hopes of having a truly world organization devoted to the preservation of peace and independence of nations were, however, not realized with the formation of the League. Two major countries- Germany and the Soviet Union- were not allowed to become its members for many years while India, which was
not independent, was made a member. The United States which had played an important part in the setting up of the League ultimately decided not to join it. The League was never as effective organization. In the 1930s when many countries resorted to aggression, the League was either ignores or defied.

An important feature of the peace treaties which indicates its nature was the decision with regard to the colonies of the defeated powers. The Allies had entered into many secret agreements for dividing the spoils of war. The Soviet government, to bring out the imperialist nature of the war, made these treaties public. During the war, the Allies had been claiming that the war was being fought for freedom and democracy. President Wilson has said that the war was being fought ‘to make the world safe for democracy.’ The publication of secret treaties by the Soviet government exposed these claims. However, in spite of this, the distribution of the colonies of the defeated countries among the victors took place as has been mentioned before. Of course, the Soviet Union which had repudiated all the entire secret which had been promised to the Russian emperor. The League of Nations also recognized this division of the spoils. Legally most of the colonies which were transferred to the victorious powers were ‘mandates’ and could not be annexed.

15.5 Consequence of the War and the Peace Treaties

The First World War was the most frightful war that the world had so far seen. The devastation caused by it, as stated earlier, had no precedent. The number of persons who fought in the war is staggering. Estimates vary between 53 and 70 million people. The total number of those killed and dead in the war are estimated at about nine million, that is, about one- several ,million became invalids. The air raids, epidemics and famines killed many more among the civilian populations. Besides these terrible human losses, the economy of many countries was shattered. It gave rise to many serious social problems. The political institutions as they had been evolving in various countries also suffered a serious setback.

The war and the peace treaties transformed the political map of the world, particularly of Europe. Three ruling dynasties were destroyed- the Romanov in Russia during the war itself, the Hohenzollern in Germany and the Habsburg in Austria- Hungary. Soon after the war, the rule of Ottomans came to an end in Turkey. Austria and Hungary became separate independent states. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia emerged as independent states. Poland which had been divided
among Russia, Austria and Prussia in the eighteenth century was re-formed as an independent state.

The period after the war saw the beginning of the end of the European supremacy in the world. Economically and militarily, Europe was surpassed by the United States which emerged from the war as a world power. The Soviet Union was also to soon come up as a major world power. The period after the war also saw the strengthening of the freedom movements in Asia and Africa. The weakening of Europe and the emergence of the Soviet Union which declared her support to the struggles for national independence contributed to the growing strength of these struggles. The Allied propaganda during the war to defend democracy, and the participation of Asian and African soldiers in the battles in Europe also helped in arousing the peoples of Asia and Africa. The European countries had utilized the resources of their colonies had utilized the resources of their colonies in the war. The forced recruitment of soldiers and labourers for war, and the exploitation of resources of the colonies for war by the imperialist countries had created resentment among the people of the colonies. The population of the colonial countries had been nurtured on the myth that the peoples of Asia and Africa were inferior to the Europeans. The role played by the soldiers from Asia and Africa in winning the war for one group of nations of Europe against another shattered this myth. Many Asian leaders had supported the War was over, their countries would be given freedom. These hopes were, however, belied. While the European nations won the right to self-determination, colonial rule and exploitation continued in the countries of Asia and Africa. The contrast between the two situations was too glaring to be missed. Its increasing awareness led to the growth of nationalist feelings in the colonies. The soldiers who returned to their respective countries from the theatres of war in Europe and elsewhere also brought with them the new stirrings. All these factors strengthened nationalist movements in the colonies. In some countries, the first stirrings of nationalism were felt after the war.

15.6 Self Check Exercise
1. Archduke Francis Ferdinand was assassinated in
   (a)- Bosnia
   (b)- Serbia
   (c)- Sarajevo
   (d)- Berlin
2. First World War broke out in
(a) 1914
(b) 1915
(c) 1917
(d) 1918

3. Versailles is situated in
(a) Germany
(b) Italy
(c) France
(d) England

4. The Paris Peace conference took place in
(a) 1917
(b) 1919
(c) 1920
(d) 1922

5. The headquarters of the League of Nation was at
(a) Geneva
(b) Versailles
(c) Rome
(d) Berlin

6. Locarno Pact was signed in
(a) 1920
(b) 1921
(c) 1925
(d) 1926

15.7 Summary
The First World War had been believed to be ‘a War to end all war’. However, the Peace Treaties had failed to ensure this. On the country, the treaties contained certain provisions which were extremely harsh on the defeated countries and thus they sowed the seeds of further conflicts. Similarly, some victorious countries also felt cheated because all their hopes had not been fulfilled. Imperialism was not destroyed as a result of the war. The victorious powers had in fact enlarged their possessions. The factors which had caused rivalries and conflicts between
imperialist countries leading to the war still existed. Therefore, the danger that more wars would be fought for another red vision of the world remained lurking. The emergence of the Soviet Union was considered a danger to the existing social and economic system in many countries. The desire to destroy it influenced the policies of those countries. These factors, combined with certain developments that took place in the next twenty years created conditions for another world war.

15.8 Glossary

troops: soldiers on duty in a large group
halt: to cease marching or journeying
prevent: to stop something happening
collapse: to fall down
decisive: making something certain
insist: to state or demand forcefully

15.9 Answers to Self Check Exercise

1. (c)
2. (a)
3. (c)
4. (b)
5. (a)
6. (c)

15.10 Suggested Readings


15.11 Terminal Question
1 Discuss the causes and the results of the Balkan wars. How far were the Balkan wars responsible for the outbreak of the first world war of 1914?
2 What were the causes of the first world war of 1914?
3 Describe in detail the main events of the First World War.
4 What were the results of First World War?
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The war settlements
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16.1 Introduction

After the horrible and terrible battle of more than four year the First World War came to an end in 1918. Faced with the adverse situations, Kaiser William II, the Emperor of Germany had to abdicate the throne and flee to Holland. There came the total collapse of the Hohenzollern dynasty in Germany. The Socialistic Republic, established in Germany after the downfall of William II, had to surrender before the allies and signed an armistice on November 11, 1918. It was the first step towards peace, by which Germany was required to hand over a large amount of war material and to surrender her fleet to the Allies within fourteen days.

16.2 Objective

After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:

The problems of war settlements
16.3 The problems of war settlements

Though the war came to an end, it brought in its train many tangled problems. The responsibility of solving these problems lay upon the shoulders of the Great Powers. Some of these problems were:

(i) To ascertain the loss of money human lives and territories, having occurred in the course of war.
(ii) To decide the outlines on which the treaties be concluded with the defeated countries.
(iii) To make some provisions and arrangements in order to avoid to possibilities of war in future.
(iv) To compensate the allies.
(v) To establish peace on permanent basis.

In order to think over these problems, to find out the possibilities of the establishment of peace and to conclude the treaty with the defeated nations, the Great Powers decided to convene a conference at Paris, the capital of France. Paris was an appropriate place chosen for the purpose, for this city had been the nerve centre of the allied cause, the throbbing heart of the coalition, form the first day to the last of the racking struggle.”

16.3.1 Beginning of the conference

The conference was opened on January 18, 1919 in the Royal Palace of Versailles. This date coincided with the forty-eighth anniversary of the proclamation of the German Empire, i.e., forty-eight years ago, the formation of the German Empire was proclaimed on January 18, 1871 from that very Palace of Versailles. Not only this, Germany had also captured two important provinces of France, namely Alsace and Lorraine.

The delegates of the defeated nations were not invited to attend the conference. About seventy members of twenty-seven countries of the world came
to attend it. The delegates of each country were accompanied with diplomats, assistants, legal advisers, typists, press reporters etc. It was the first and the biggest gathering of the diplomats of the world. The President of France inaugurated the conference. In his speech, he laid much emphasis on the justice, self-decision and the League of Nations. Clemenceau, the great War Minister and the Prime Minister of France was unanimously elected President of the conference.

Several committees were constituted to investigate the methods of settlement and to report on different subjects, such as, responsibility for the war, International Labour Legislation, League of Nations etc. President Wilson of the United States was made chairman of all these committee. Under such constitution, the conference continued in session throughout the year. But the delegates could not draw any conclusion.

16.3.2 The Council of Ten

It was thought impossible to take any decision openly in the general assembly. The council of ten delegates was, therefore, constituted. It consisted of the delegates of five big powers, namely England, France, America, Italy and Japan. These powers were called the Big Five. The council held its meeting twice a day. The advisers and the specialists were called in when needed. With the passage of time, this council also appeared to be biggish and, therefore, it was decided to terminate this council.

16.3.3 The council of Big Four

In March 1919, the council of Big Four was constituted. It consisted of only four delegates of four big nations. They were as follows:


These four persons are famous as Big Four in History. Later on, the differences arose between Orlando and Clemenceau and, therefore, Orlando left the conference and went back to Italy. Thus, the decisions of the Peace conference of Paris were generally taken by three Great Personalities of the World.

Brief Introduction of the Big Four

1. Wilson. – Wilson was the President of the United States. He played an important and decisive role in the First World War. He was the True followers of the establishment of permanent peace in the world. The people called him an apostle who created a new system for the good for the mankind. He laid down fourteen points to establish peace in the world. In the Peace Conference of Paris,
his main aim was to establish the League of Nations for the purpose of the maintenance of peace. In the words of C. D. Hazen:

“The chief concern of President Wilson at the conference of Paris was to secure the creation of some international organization for the maintenance of peace, and it was largely through his efforts that the League of Nations came into existence.”

In order to lessen the possibilities of war in future and to establish permanent peace in the world, Wilson had laid down fourteen point programme before the delegates of the Peace Conference. In this programme, Wilson made it clear that there should be no secret treaty and the diplomacy of the future should be open. He also laid emphasis upon the reduction of national armaments and impartial decisions. It was his desire that the people should be granted the right of self-determination. In his own words:

“Establishment of peace in the world is possible only when respect is shown to the wishes and aspirations of the people. For this it is absolutely necessary that the people should be granted the right of self-determination.”

2. **Lloyd George.** Lloyd George was the Prime Minister of England and the prominent leader of the Liberal Party. He wanted to take revenges on Germany. He had won the election in 1918 on this basis only. He was of the view that Germany should be made too weak to raise its head again in future. In this way, his behaviour with Germany was not so harsh that of France. He was a man of extraordinary intelligence. In the Peace conference, he had solved many complicated problems.

3. **Clemenceau.** Clemenceau was the Prime Minister of France and the President of the Peace conference of Paris. He was the greatest of all the delegates in the conference. He was called the Old Lion of France. He had seen with his own eyes the disastrous defeat of France in the battle of Sedan in 1870. He had, therefore, great desire in his heart to take vengeance against Germany. He played a decisive and effective role in the Peace conference. His main aim in the conference was to secure the boundaries of France as they were before 1870, and to change the decisions of the Treaty of Frankfort of 1871. He was the follower of the policy of Bismarck. He had no faith in the fourteen points of Wilson. His personality was more effective than that of his colleagues.

4. **Orlando.** Orlando was the Prime Minister of Italy. He did not speak too much. He took interest in those problems only, which were directly related with Italy. That is why, he could not occupy decisive place in the conference. Most of
the decisions were taken by the above three persons, namely Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyed George.

16.4 The Base of the Treaty of Paris

Thus, the decisions of the Peace Conference were fully centralized into the hands of the Big Three. When the conference began, the controversy arose among the delegates in the very beginning as to what the real base of the decision should be. Wilson had laid down fourteen points before the Big Powers. These points included those terms on which Germany had signed the armistice in 1918. After a long discussion, it was decided that the fourteen points of President Wilson should be the basis of the treaty. The programme of Wilson included, according to C.D. Hazen the following clauses:

“There should be no secret understanding or treaties, but that the diplomacy of the future should be open, there should be an impartial adjustment of all colonial claims. Belgain, French and Russian Territories should be evacuated, the wrong done to France by Germany in 1871 in the matter of Alsace and Lorraine should be righted…the nationalities of the Turkish empire should receive autonomy…..there should be formed a general association of nations for the purpose of securing the independence and territorial integrity of great and small states alike.”

16.4.1 The Treaty of Paris

On the basis of the above pronouncements, the Peace Conference of Paris started its functioning. After the discussion and investigation spread over several months, the Big Powers succeeded in completing the draft of the Treaty of Versailles which was concluded with Germany. Germany signed on this treaty on June 28, 1919. After this, the treaties were also concluded with other defeated countries, viz., Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Turkey. All the above treaties including the Treaty of Versailles were combined into one treaty and that was called the Treaty of Paris. The provisions regarding establishment of the League of Nations were included in all the treaties.

16.4.2 The Treaty of Versailles

After the discussion of about four months, the Allies completed the draft of a treaty which was to be concluded with Germany. On May 7, 1919, this draft was submitted before the representatives of the German government to study the document and give their suggestions if any. After a thorough study of the draft of the treaty, the German government gave a few suggestions to modify and amend the provisions terms and clauses of the draft. Out of these suggestions, some were
accepted and the amended document was again submitted to Germany on June 16, with the condition that the document should be accepted in to latest by June 23. It was also made clear that in case Germany did not accept the draft within due date, an attack would be made upon Germany. The National Assembly of German Weimar Republic agreed to sign the peace document.

At last, Germany signed the draft of June 28, 1919. After that, other delegates of different countries also signed. Thus, the Treaty of Versailles was formalized. It was the same place, from where Prince Bismarck had proclaimed the German Empire in 1870, i.e., forty-eight years before. It was the same date on which Archduke Francis Ferdinand, the Price of Austria was assassinated five years before in 1914 at Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia. As regards the significance of this historical event, C.D. Hazen remarks;

“This historic event occurred in the same Hall of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles where forty-eight years before the German Empire had been proclaimed. Time had brought its complete revenge. By an appropriate coincidence the Treaty of Versailles was signed on the 28th of June, the fifth anniversary of the assassination of the Austrain Archduke, Francis Ferdinand, at Sarajevo, which had been made to have such amazing and lamentable consequences.

Main provisions of the Treaty of Versailles

The treaty of Versailles was the biggest and the most important of all treaties. It consisted of fifteen chapters, four hundred thirty nine clauses and eighty thousand words. It was written in English and French languages. Following were the main provisions of this treaty;

The Territorial Provisions

(i) The provinces of Alsace and Lorraine were taken away from Germany and they were given back of France.
(ii) Germany had to abandon Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium.
(iii) The province of Posen, most of West Prussia and a part of Upper Silesia were given to Poland.
(iv) According to the decision taken by a plebiscite, northern part of schleswing was given to Denmark, while the southern part remained under the control of Germany.
(v) Germany had to renounce the province of Memel to the Allies.
(vi) The polish territories were taken back from the possession of Germany, Austria and Russia. In this way, Poland again came to be established as an entity. A corridor was also given to Poland for reaching the Baltic Sea.

(vii) The port of Danzig was also snatched away from the possession of Germany and it was taken under the protection of the League of Nations.

(viii) During the course of war, Germany had destroyed the coal mines of France situated in the northern part of the country. France was, therefore, willing to take over the Saar Basin from Germany. This territory was very prosperous in coal. Keeping in view the destruction of the coal mines of France by Germany and with a view to compensating her, it was decided that France would have the right to use the coal mines of the Saar Basin, but this territory would remain under the protection of the League of Nations for fifteen years. After a period of fifteen years, the fate of this territory would be decided on the basis of plebiscite.

(ix) A great controversy arose in the conference on the issue of Shantung. According to the treaty of 1898, Germany was granted the right from China to exercise her control over Shantung. In the world war, Japan had fought in support of the Allies with the condition the Shantung would be given to Japan after the war. In this way, both Japan and China were interested in taking over this province. The delegates of Japan came to attend the conference of Paris only for getting Shantung. One the other hand, China was also the supporter of the Allies in the war. She, therefore, demanded this territory. Wilson was willing to give Shantung to China according to the principle of self-determination. The delegates of Japan were angered; they left the conference and returned to their country. Italy had already left the conference. Seeing the critical situation, the Allies decided that the economic rights of Shantung would be given to Japan, while China would have the political rights over this maritime province.

(x) Free nationhood of Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia was accepted, assured and guaranteed by Germany for ever.

(xi) Germany lost her rights in China, Turkey, Egypt, Morocco and Bulgaria.

(xii) All colonies where snatched away from Germany and these were divided among the Allied Powers according to the Mandate System.

**The Destruction of German Militarism**

The German militarism was generally considered one of the chief causes of the First World War the Allies. Therefore, decided to dismantle the German
military machine. For this purpose, many provisions were made in the Treaty of Versailles. Some of them were:

(i) The strength of the German army might not exceed one lakh soldiers, including four thousand officers.
(ii) The General Staff of Germany was dissolved.
(iii) The universal compulsory military service was abolished.
(iv) Germany had to abandon the fortification of the port of Heligoland, and she extended assurance not to make efforts in this connection in future.
(v) Germany was prohibited from maintaining any fortifications or stationing any soldiers on the left bank of the Rhine or in a Zone fifty kilometres wide on the right bank.
(vi) The German army was prohibited from having the characteristic equipment of the machine age and was obliged to renounce the use of heavy artillery, tanks, poisonous gas and aeroplanes.
(vii) Germany had to surrender her fleet to the Allies.
(viii) For the future, the German Navy was restricted to six battleships, six light cruisers, twelve torpedo boats and twelve destroyers.
(ix) Germany could not have any submarines, even for commercial purpose.

In brief, it can be said that the main purpose of the Allies behind the disarmament of Germany was to reduce the armed and naval power of Germany to a standard hitherto reached and exceeded by many a small state so that might no longer be able to alarm or terrify her neighbours. In this respect, F. Schevill remarks:

“The purpose behind the disarmament measures of the Paris diplomats is therefore clear; it was to drop Germany from the list of the great powers.”

Provisions Regarding the Reparations

The most harassing article of the Treaty of Versailles dealt with the reparations. At the time of the armistice agreement Germany had accepted the responsibility for all damages suffered by the populations of the Allied nations due to her aggression. According to this agreement, following provisions were made in the Treaty of Versailles regarding reparations:

(i) Germany was fully made responsible for the outbreak of the World War I. It was therefore, decided that maximum war indemnity should be realised from Germany both in cash and kind.
(ii) The Allies failed to fix the amount of indemnity, it was also resolved to call for an immediate payment of one billion pounds latest by May 1, 1921.
In order to fix the actual amount of the war indemnity, it was also resolved that a Reparations Commission would be established in Germany. This commission would finish its work by May 1, 1921.

The great economists of the world were of the opinion that Germany was not capable of paying the amount of war indemnity. It was, therefore, also resolved that Germany could pay the reparations in kind also. According to it, Germany handed over all her merchant ships to the Allies along with an immense number of cows, bulls, sheep, stallions, coal, horses etc.

The Allied powers were allowed to use military coercion as a means for collecting reparations. They occupied the area west of the river Rhine together with three important bridgeheads on the east bank opposite the cities of Mainz, Coblenz and Cologne. Germany had to pay the charge of this occupation also.

The above occupation was to continue for at least fifteen years.

If Germany should fail to pay the amount of war indemnity imposed upon her within fifteen years, the term of the occupation of above territory might be extended.

16.4.3 The Treaty of Saint Germaine

This Treaty was concluded with Austria. She signed this treaty on September 10, 1919. Main provisions of the treaty were:

The old House of Hapsburg was abolished in Austria and it was replaced by the republican government.

People of many races lived in Austrian Empire such as Germans, Czechs, Poles, Serbian Cretans, Rumanians, and Italians etc. According to the principle of self-determination, territories were allotted to these races separately.

Austria had to accept the free existence of Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Austria could not have any political and economic relations with Germany.

The industrial territory of Teacher was divided between Czechoslovakia and Poland.

The Austrian army could not exceed thirty thousand soldiers in strength in future.

Both the air and naval forces of Austria were disbanded completely.

Austria was entrusted with the responsibility to pay the amount of war indemnity. W
As a result of this treaty, the vast empire of Austria was divided into several states and, therefore, it was converted into a petty republic. In this living in the Austrian Empire were willing to live in Germany, but they were not allowed to do so.

16.4.4 The Treaty of Neuilly

This treaty was concluded with Bulgaria on November 27, 1919. According to it, the following decisions were taken:

(i) Four small provinces of Western Bulgaria were given to Yugoslavia.
(ii) Some important changes were also introduced regarding the boundaries of Greece and Bulgaria.
(iii) The strength of the Bulgarian Army was reduced to ten thousand.
(iv) Her naval force was disbanded completely.
(v) She also had to pay a heavy amount of war indemnity like Germany.

16.4.5 The Treaty of Trianon

The Allied powers concluded this treaty with Hungary, which was signed on June 4, 1920. According to this treaty:

(i) Hungary was separated from Austria.
(ii) Transylvania was given to Rumania.
(iii) Croatia was given to Serbia.
(iv) Slovakia was handed over to Czechoslovakia.
(v) The army of Hungary could not exceed thirty-five thousand soldiers.
(vi) Like other defeated countries, she was also made responsible for the payment of war indemnity.

As a result of this treaty, the population of Hungary was reduced to seven and a half million only in place of twenty-one million. Her area was also reduced to thirty-five thousand square miles, while it was one lace twenty-five thousand square miles before this treaty was concluded. Not only were these, three million people of Magyar race unwillingly forced to live with the foreigners.

16.4.6 The Treaty of Sevres

The last but not the least important treaty was concluded with Turkey. It was called the Treaty of Serves which was signed on August 10, 1920. The Turkish Empire was abolished. The Khalifa of Turkey was left with only the territory situated near Constantinople.

(i) Almenia was made free.
(ii) The internationalization of the Dardanelles and Bosporus was declared.
Turkey had to give up her rights over Egypt, Cyprus, Morocco, Tripoli, Syria, Palestine, Arabia and Mesopotamia.

Gallipoli and some territories in the Adriatic Sea were given to Greece.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the leader of the National Party of Turkey did not accept the terms of this treaty. He badly defeated the Greek army and, therefore, it had to flee.

In order to reconsider the terms and conditions of the Treaty of Sevres, the Allies convened a meeting at Lausanne in 1923. After a long discussion, the following amendments were made in the treaty of Sevres:

(i) Armenia, Eastern Thrace and Smyrna were returned to Turkey.
(ii) Turkey had to relinquish her rights over Mesopotamia, Syria, Sudan, Arabia, Egypt, Cyprus, Palestine and territories situated beyond the boundary of the Turkish Empire.
(iii) Turkey had to extend assurance for the protection of the rights and interests of the minorities.
(iv) No restriction was imposed upon her army and she was not forced to pay the war indemnity.

16.5 Self Check Exercise
1. Which country made the first declaration of war?
   A. Serbia
   B. Austria-Hungary
   C. Italy
   D. Germany

2. How many countries were involved in First World War?

3. The Paris Peace Conference 1919-1920 was signed at which place?

4. The Treaty of Versailles was signed with which country?

16.6 Summary

In January 1919, delegates from 32 countries met at the Palace of Versailles near Paris to make peace after the First World War - the peace they hoped would 'end all wars'. The conference was dominated by David Lloyd George, Georges Clemenceau and Woodrow Wilson: the leaders of Britain, France and America, often known as the 'Big Three'. No Germans were invited and this later made them come to resent the treaty because they felt that decisions were made about them, not with them.

The First World War had ended when Germany signed the Armistice. However, a long and lasting peace was another matter entirely and would not be achieved simply by the end of the fighting. There were still many problems to sort out, such as what would happen to the countries that were liberated, what would happen to
Germany and who would take control of the Sudetenland and Alsace-Lorraine (which Germany had taken control of in 1871 after the Franco-Prussian War).

16.7 Glossary
throb: happening
terminate: to make something end
renounce: to say publicly that you know longer own
restriction: an act of limiting; the condition of being limited

16.8 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. Austria-Hungary
2. 32 Countries
3. At Versailles near Paris
4. Germany

16.9 Suggested Readings

16.10 Terminal Questions
1. What do you know the Paris Peace Conference and the Treaty of Versailles?
2. Discuss the circumstances under which the peace conference was called in Paris. Also describe the organisation of the great institution.
3. How did World War First end what were some of the peace settlements?
4. How did the treaty of Versailles lead to World War 2?
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17.1 Introduction

The political factors which went to the making of European history in the past quarter of a century (1914-39) cannot be dissociated from the economic factors. The interplay of political and economic forces was so intricate and involved that it becomes difficult to unravel the tangled web of cause and effect, each reaching upon the other in an unbroken sequence. It was impossible to determine whether political insecurity, which prevented disarmament and closer co-operation between the nations, was the latter was the disturbing element which drew them apart. Accordingly European statement was unable to agree on the fundamental question whether politics should take precedence of economics or the reverse. M. Briand in his famous memorandum1 on the United States of Europe (1930) declared that “all possibility of progress towards economic union being strictly determined by the question of security, it is on the political plane that constructive effort should first of all be made.” His critics, however, averred that “the reduction of military armaments will be a natural consequence of better and more cordial relations in the domain of commercial policy.” In the economic sphere the dominating motif of these troubled years was the trend towards economic nationalism, which was the logical fruit and counterpart of the political nationalism inflamed and over-stimulated by the war of 1914-18. In its turn economic nationalism produced political repercussion, because it was a contributory cause of the general instability which eventually culminated in another European war in 1939. The economic rehabilitation of Europe was unquestionably an essential condition of its political pacification, yet no substantial
measure of economic recovery could be achieved so long as it remained distracted by political animosities and harassed by political anxieties. This was Europe’s Gordian Knot.’

17.2 Objective
After reading this unit, you will be able to learn about:

The Economic and social consequences

17.3 Economic and social consequences

While economic nationalism was the off spring of a distorted political nationalism, its growth was encouraged by a series of impediments which strewed the path of international economic co-operation. High protective duties and ‘quotas’ impeded the circulation of goods; restraints on immigration impeded the circulation of person; the curtailment of foreign loans impeded the circulation of capital; currency restrictions impeded commercial payments for commodities imported from abroad; the abandonment of the gold standard, together with the erratic movements of fugitive or ‘nervous’ money born of panic or distrust, impeded of stabilization of the monetary exchanges; the exaction of political debts, both reparations and inter- Allied liabilities, coupled with the uncertainties of the international situation, impeded the restoration of financial confidence. The crowing disaster of an economic depression which lasted for four years, instead of leading the nations back to economic sanity, had the reserve effect of stimulating economic nationalism since it eliminated the only great country adhering to Free Trade and threw the currencies of the world into the melting-pot. This great depression may be regarded in the light of a watershed dividing the economic history of Europe, 1918-39, into two periods. In the first the outstanding problems were those of political debts, excessive tariffs and emigration. In the second the problem of political debts was virtually shelved, but tariff barriers remained and were reinforced by other obstacles to international trade, such as ‘quotas’, recourse to the barter system, currency and credit restrictions. It addition, fresh complications were introduced by the collapse of the gold standard with its unsettling effects upon the monetary exchanges, and by the trend towards ‘autarky’ or economic self-sufficiency. Of these various disturbing influences in the economic—and political—life of Europe we shall speak in turn.

One of the many embarrassing problems bequeathed by the war of 1914-18 related to the exaction of reparations from the defeated countries and the liquidation of war debts by their victorious adversaries. The confusion produced by
the existence of vast and indeterminate obligations played an important part in retarding the recovery of Europe. Apart from the strain imposed on the national currencies and the structure of world credit by the payment of inter-government debts, the latter had psychological consequences in envenoming the political relations between creditors and debtors—and so creating and atmosphere of international discord. In recognition of their baneful influence, Great Britain—who had lent her Allies nearly twice as much as she had borrowed from the United States—urged the reduction or cancellation of inter-Allied debts. The rejection of this proposal made it inconceivable that the Allies should relieve the enemy of all liabilities, when they were expected to honour the obligations which they themselves had contracted. Although the original estimates of Germany’s indebtedness were fantastic, they were reduced to more reasonable dimensions once the subject was removed from the sphere of politics to that of economics. The reparations commission in 1921 fixed the total at 6,600 million pounds to be discharged by the issue of bonds; until they were redeemed Germany was to pay each year 100 million pounds plus 26 per cent. Subsequently in 1924 an international committee of experts formulated the ‘Dawes Plan’ under which the annual payments varied according to Germany’s economic condition, while in order to avoid upsetting the currency the amount transferred abroad was not to exceed the surplus which she obtained from her foreign trade. Five years later the ‘Young Plan’ assessed reparations at nearly 2,000 million pounds, which approximated to the advances made by the United States to the Allies; the sun due was to be paid in the form of annuities within a few years the total amount of Germany’s indebtedness had been scaled down to less than one-third; and the Allies now demanded only the equivalent of their own liabilities to the United States. However, the delay in arriving at a solution of the problem of reparations—on what may appear a reasonable basis of settlement—proved fatal to any chance of success which it might have had. For the very year in which was devised the ‘Young Plan’ witnessed an economic storm of unprecedented severity, which endured for four years; and when the storm had passed over the world uprooting financial institutions in different landscape was revealed, international trade had shrunk to under half its former value, the bulwark of Free Trade had collapsed, and the cast structure of reparations and war loans lay buried in the ruins.

Even in normal times the liquidation of inter-governmental debts had given rise to an intractable transfer problem. A country can discharge its indebtedness
abroad by the export of gold or goods or services, and by the sale of foreign securities. In the case of Germany the payment of reparations meant primarily stimulating the export of goods. Yet her creditors were also her trade competitors, and it was not in their interest that they should be undersold either in the home or in neutral markets.

The tariff walls, which all the creditor countries erected to protect their industries, enhanced the difficulties experienced by the debtor countries in meeting their obligations. The position, in short, was that each State insisted on its claims but was reluctant to accept payment in the most practicable way. This Gilbertown situation was exposed in its true aspect by the great economic depression of which it was a contributory, though by no means the sole cause. It became apparent that an attempt to collect the German annuities involved the danger of a financial catastrophe, whose consequences might prove to be world-wide. The United States offered to suspend temporarily her own demands upon Germany’s creditors, on condition that the latter suspended their demands upon Germany. The institution of a moratorium for year (1931-32) on reparations and war debts alike eased the position only for the moment. The root causes of the malaise remained to foster the whole economic system, and the remedies adopted to repress the symptoms served to aggravate the disease. Tariff walls mounted higher; import quotas multiplied; Great Britain discarded her traditional Free Trade policy; and as an inevitable result of this strangulation of international trade Germany’s market abroad continued to shrink. In 1932 the German chancellor announced that Germany would never be in a position to resume her payments. The Western Powers were constrained to recognize that the problem of reparations, which had been a disturbing factor for over a decade, was virtually self-liquidated. Apprehensive of financial chaos if they pressed for a resumption of payment, they entered into an arrangement with Germany under which she undertook to pay 150 million pounds in final settlement of her reparation liabilities. The Lausanne Agreement (1932), as it was termed, was not to come into effect until after a satisfactory settlement had been reached between Germany’s creditors and their own creditor, namely, the United States. Actually it put an end to the exaction of reparations from all the defeated countries.

Europe had now to face the problem of the American debt. During and after the war of 1914-18 the United States had made loans to the Allies of approximately 2,055 million pounds, while Great Britain advanced 1,600 million
pounds and France nearly 500 million pounds. Repayment of its loans was claimed by the United States Government on the ground that many of its loans made before the armistice 1918, and substantially all the loans made after the armistice, were not for destruction; very large amounts were spent for food, tobacco, cotton, etc. The alleged difficulties of repayment were met with the rejoinder that the expenditure of American tourists in foreign lands (1924-30) was more than double the amounts received by the United States on account of debt settlement, and that the immigration remittance alone were almost equal to the receipts in the same period. “Again, in measuring the transfer question, account must be taken not only of trade directly with the United States but of the whole area of international dealings. In the total of receipts and outgoings arising from international transactions of both our debtors and ourselves, debt payments have been a relatively minor item.” It was also denied that repayment drained the gold reserves of the debtor countries, since the gold holdings of the United States (apart from temporary deposits by foreign bankers) had only increased by about 8 per cent. At the same time, it was apparent that the British Government had made great exertions to fulfil its obligations. It borrowed approximately 850 million pounds, which was roughly one-third of its war expenditure in the United States, and its payments totalled nearly 50 per cent but the advance extended 1,150 million pounds on which their payments amounted to about 12 per cent. Moreover, Great Britain had waived her claims upon Germany and sacrificed the loans to her Allies amounting to 1,600 million pounds. It is ironical to observe that while the victors remained bound by their war debts although they unwisely suspended further payments the vanquished repudiated liability even for the final settlement to which they had pledged themselves, despite its relatively insignificant amount. The sympathy lavished upon Germany as the victim of unconscionable taskmaster may be tempered by the reflection that – apart from deliveries in kind to make good the wilful and systematic ruin of the industrial regions in northern France—her reparations were discharged by the Allied and Associated Powers themselves. The McKenna committee of experts reported in 1924 that the amount of foreign money, lost through investments in German marks, was equal to the total payment which the German Government had furnished in cash. Between 1924 and 1927 the influx of loan capital into Germany, attracted by the high rate of interest, exceeded the payments transferred abroad under the Dawes Plan.
The primary cause of the disturbed economic condition of Europe, after peace was restored in 1918, was attributed to high protective duties. The fresh frontiers created by the Treaties of Versailles, St. German and Trianon, to satisfy national aspirations, added more than twelve thousand miles to the existing customs barriers; and the new States vies with one another in the emulo0us pursuit of an economic policy which had successfully wrecked the collaboration of the old States. In these fateful years (1918-39) the world’s outstanding need was the enlargement of the economic market, in order to enable the different nations to absorb a larger share of each other’s products, improve their industrial processes, and provide guarantees against overproduction and unemployment. The more far-sighted readily recognized that a rational division of labour, corresponding with the situation prevailing in the various countries, would avoid the dispersion of energies in agriculture and industry which was hampering the economic life of the Continent. M. Briand’s memorandum had visualized the ideal of European economic co-operation to mould the economic organization of Europe on lines which would ensure the establishment of a common market, to raise to the maximum the level of human well-being over all the territories of the European community,” This implied a rational plan of production and exchange based on the progressive liberation of the circulation of goods, capital and persons. In the comments made on the memorandum by the Government to which it was submitted, it was observed that “an endeavour to restrict the armaments of customs policy is as important as an attempt to reduce armies and navies.” Notwithstanding the force of the argument, circumstances were not propitious for the adoption of a more moderate tariff policy, and the tendency of the European Powers was to raise their customs barriers still higher. They turned a deaf ear to the remonstrance’s uttered by Great Britain whose system of Free trade was placed in jeopardy by the rising tide of tariffs, and they followed instead the lead given by the United States who erected a Chinese wall around her manufactures. The malign influence of excessive tariffs was not confined to the economic sphere; it proved also a fertile source of acrimony in the political sphere.

The counterpart of tariffs, which hinder the circulation of goods, is restraints on immigration which hinder the circulation of persons. Just as a country needs outlets for its every community experiences at some time or another phenomenon of what is termed overpopulation. This is essentially an economic system at the moment to absorb the whole of the working population. It is usually
temporary in its nature, and disappears when the economic system recovers its
elasticity and is expended to cope with the fresh demands made upon it. Thus
overpopulation is not a question of the extent of territory but of economic mal
adjustments. England’s in the early seventeenth century was believed to be
overpopulated, whereas she now supports perhaps seven times the number of
inhabitants. Yet whenever the economic structure of nation becomes rigid for a
time, internal difficulties are created by the presence of a surplus which cannot be
absorbed. Productive capacity is taxed to support the burden of those who are non-
productive labour unrest is fostered by the existence of an army of unemployed
with its potential menace to the standard of life of the working community political
instability is generated by the psychological effects of economic disequilibrium.
Germany affords the most striking example of the dangers of mass unemployment,
for it was the mounting waves of social distress that carried the National Socialists
to power. Hence the question of the circulation of persons is second only in
importance to that of the circulation of goods.

Prior to the war of 1914-18 emigration from Europe took place on a
considerable scale. About 160,000 persons on an average left Great Britain every
year; but in the twenties and thirties the number was halved. The decline in
emigration was commonly attributed to the social services, which were supposed
to diminish the incentive to seek a new life abroad; actually the arrest of
emigration was general in all countries. The annual average of Italians who
emigrated before 1914 was approximately half a million. Their remittances home
constituted an important item in Italy’s balance of international payments, though
against this must be set the loss occasioned by the drain of enterprising elements.
Subsequently Italian emigration fell off for reasons which affected other European
nations—namely, the restraints laid on admission into the United States, the British
Empire, and South America. Of these the first had been Europe’s most important
outlet. America wrote Israel Zangwill, is god’s crucible, the great Melting Pot, where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming. In the decade 1901-10
nearly 9 million immigrants entered the United States, and in the next decade
which included four years of war nearly 6 millions. To check further influx on this
scale quota laws were enacted (in 1921 etc.) which limited the annual number of
emigrants from outside the western hemisphere to 150,000. It was not perhaps a
coincidence that the decade which witnessed this restrictive measure also
experienced the greatest depression in the history of the United States, whose
industrial structure being based on the mass production of standardized goods demands an expanding population to prevent saturation of the market. Meanwhile a serious problem was created by the fact the New world had ceased to encourage free emigration from the Old World. The pressure of population in Europe produced two significant effects. Firstly, in conjunction with the decline in world trade it stimulated the trend toward economic self-sufficiency, for a country which is unable to exchange domestic for foreign goods or relieve itself of surplus people must reorganize its economic system. Secondly, it reinforced the demand for colonies both as sources of foodstuffs and raw materials, which could be directly bartered for the commodities and services of the mother country, and as outlets for emigrants.

The most dramatic episode in the recent economic history of Europe (1918-39) was the great depression which began in the autumn of 1929 and lasted until 1933. It was attended by momentous consequences in the economics as well as in the political sphere. It induced Great Britain to dissociate her national currency from gold- her example in this being followed by the whole world- and to reverse her traditional fiscal policy by abandoning free Trade. It induced the United States, where the dying system of laissez-faire had found its last asylum, to throw her cherished economic dogmas to the winds and subject economic enterprise to an unwonted degree of official direction. It induced the Allied Powers to renounce their claims upon Germany for reparations. It induced the German people to substitute an authoritarian government for the political regime established by the Weimar constitution. And, finally, it gave an immense impetus to the movement for economic self-sufficiency.

There has been much speculation as to the causes of the economic blizzard. In a general sense it takes its place in the sequence of booms and depressions which follow each other in our productive process with unfailing regularity. The phenomenon is at least three hundred year old, for in 1620-24 England suffered from a commercial crisis that contracted her market abroad, caused wide-spread unemployment at home, and led to the appointment of a royal commission-which in its analysis of the alleged causes anticipated in a remarkable way most of the explanations (including that of an overvalued currency) assigned for the crisis of 1929-33. Leaving aside the enigma of the trade cycle, we may observe some contributory factors which throw light on the reasons for the severity of the blizzard. The war of 1914-18 left behind it an economic legacy which imposed
heavy mortgages upon the resources of all the belligerents. For the unparallel
destruction of wealth there was nothing to show beyond national debts of
unprecedented magnitude. Moreover, the normal economic equilibrium had been
disturbed by the substitution of a war economy for a peace economy. Industries
such as coal-mining, engineering and ship-building were inflated to meet the
insatiable demands there arose the acute problem of the distressed areas. In
addition the lavish expenditure both of Government and of individuals during the
war, the emotional reaction which unsettled the minds of the post-war generation,
the fluctuating currencies which caused bank balances to melt away overnight, the
high rate of taxation which discouraged saving, the swift vicissitudes of
international trade which might suddenly sweep away the accumulated profits of
industry, the orgy of public speculation of the stock exchange markets— all these
phenomena combined to produce a psychological situation in the twenties in which
wasteful extravagance was rampant. While the symptoms of economic
disequilibrium varied in different states, they all alike suffered which were
ruthlessly brought to light by the great depression.

The coming storm was heralded by a drastic reduction in the prices of
foodstuffs and raw materials. There was bound to be a recession from the high
level which had prevailed during and after the war of 1914-19 in the absence of a
corresponding adjustment of world currencies— but the sharpness of the fall was
due to overproduction.

Mechanization came later to agriculture than to industry; it was in a large
measure the outcome of the war itself since it stimulated the use of mechanical
methods of production and transport. The effects on agriculture were similar to
those experienced in industry when machinery displaced hand processes, namely,
overproduction and a collapse in prices: this reduced the spending power of the
nations adversely affected. The fall in the prices of manufactured goods lagged
considerably behind the fall in farm prices, owing to the existence of accumulated
stocks and because raw materials often constitute the smallest element in the cost
of production. As a result the agricultural countries, engaged in producing primary
products, grew too poor to buy the finished products of the industrial countries—
so that the latter in their turn began to suffer from overproduction and consequent
unemployment. Thus the wheels of international commerce were clogged and a
depression became unavoidable. The signal for the crisis came from the United
States, whose fortune it was to provide an example of unprecedented prosperity
followed by an unprecedented set-back. For some years after the war of 1914-18 it was believed that she had conquered poverty, and that economic laws were suspended in her favour. Europe sent its emissaries to discover the secrets of her success and then in the autumn of 1929 the bubble burst. The course of events served to illustrate the economic interdependence of the nations. The collapse of trade soon extended from America to Europe, and early in the next year its malign influence had become world-wide. The economic and financial chaos which ensured may be gauged from the facts that before the end came in 1933 the prices of raw materials had fallen more than 50 per cent; wholesale commodity prices more than 30 per cent; while the value of international trade had shrunk even 60 per cent. The catastrophic sequel to these sweeping reductions is reflected in the statistics of unemployment. The international labour office’s index of unemployment for the sixteen principal industrial nations shows that unemployment in 1932 was three times its volumes in 1929.

To devise appropriate remedies a world Monetary and Economic Conference met in London, in June 1933, attended by sixty-four states. Unhappily the dilatoriness which invariably clogs international action had postponed its summons, until the swift Mercury of events had outpaced the leaden-footed and cumbersome mechanism of a world conference. If it had been held while the storm was still at its height, the Governments might have consented to make the sacrifices which were needed to effect a radical improvement to scale down the tariff barriers and remove the other hindrances in the path of international trade. However, by the middle of 1933 the fury of the storm had abated and the natural forces of economic recovery were re-asserting themselves the glut of commodities had been absorbed; trade was reviving; unemployment was on the decline; and economic nationalism which had caught a glimpse of the abyss yawning beneath its feet, had regained its self-confidence. No sooner did the conference meet than a sharp and fatal cleavage of opinion manifested itself. On the one hand, the European countries were insistent that monetary stabilization should take precedence of all other problems, for it was impossible to carry out tariff reductions. On the other hand, the United States was pursuing a reconstruction programme (the New Deal) designed to raise the level of commodity prices by depreciating the value of the dollar. In the absence of agreement on the fundamental question of currency stabilization, the conference was unable to arrest the trend toward economic nationalism and bring
back the nations to economic sanity. It had failed completely in its main objectives, and the only thing which it accomplished was its own adjournment. In the economic as in the political sphere it was found to be impossible to achieve any substantial measure of international co-operation on the vital issues of the day. Following an unprecedented stock market crash in the United States in 1929, European stock exchanges also began to sag. By 1930 the situation was critical, as the structure of western political economy seemed to be breaking under the strain of post war adjustments. Relief proposals were legion, but the only really important one in 1930 was a scheme for the creation of an economic federation of Europe, placed before the League of Nations by the French. Many objected that the idea of an economic Pan-Europe was visionary and that the situation was too critical for a plan whose development was bound to involve long-drawn-out negotiations. Instead, it was indicated, particularly by Austria, that a beginning could be made toward economic federation by the prompt conclusion of regional agreements.

The concept of an Aeschylus or union between Austria and Germany had been traditionally popular in those countries. Now (1931) the idea was given economic expression in an Austro-German agreement to establish a customs union. This proposal was well received in Great Britain as a promising bilateral or regional trade pact. But elsewhere there were immediate storms of protest. Italy, and especially France, was profoundly agitated. French pressure forced Austria and Germany to suspend negotiations and the matter was placed before the World Court. The latter, by a vote of eight to seven, supported the French objection that Anschluss would jeopardize Austria’s independence. Austria was left to struggle alone with a worsening economic situation.

Soon the major banking concern in Vienna, the Kredit Anstalt, which had interest in the financial systems of the whole Danubian area, became insolvent. Caught in a deepening crisis, Austria ignored politically weighted French offers of help and asked England for aid. The aid was forthcoming in the form of loans, but the temporary saving of one bank could not save the weakening economic structure of all Central Europe. By the end of May 1931, Germany, too, was forced to ask for help. Several large German businesses declared bankruptcy and rumors of a default on reparation spread. German President Paul von Hindenburg issued emergency edicts and then telegraphed an appeal to President Herbert Hoover of the United States calling for help in the Reich’s financial crisis.
President Hoover, in the interest of the “economic recovery of the world,” proposed a world moratorium, postponing for one year “all payments on intergovernmental debts.” The scheme was agreeable to every country except France, which objected that the Hoover proposal bore no relation to the Young Plan. After a number of telegrams were exchanged between Washington and Paris, the Hoover Moratorium was agreed upon (July 1931). Meanwhile more German banks closed.

The worsening international economic situation forced a July meeting of premiers, foreign ministers and finance ministers. This assemblage, however, produced little more than an assertion that nothing should be done to aggravate the international financial situation, other conferences. And conversations followed, resulting merely in the slowing down of international financial transactions to avoid panic withdrawals from banks. Panic withdrawals, nonetheless, became the order of the day. But the end of July, the Bank of England was losing gold at the rate of 2,50,000 per day. By September 1931 the pound, the basic unit of the world’s money market, had dropped in value by 30 per cent.

Now even the French began to feel the financial pinch. The banque National de credit was saved only through government aid. By December it was admitted that the French also suffered from rapidly rising unemployment.

At the end of 1931, too, an Advisory Committee provided for by the young Plan reported that Germany probably could not pay reparation in 1932. Debtor countries simply could not continue to pay out huge sums annually to creditor countries that were putting obstacles in the way of the free movement of goods. The Young Plan evidently was defunct and a conference met at Lausanne in June 1932 to certify the fact. At this conference, a convention was signed in July that in effect abolished reparation.

The end of German reparation also brought up the question of the Inter-Allied war debts. During the War the various Allied powers had borrowed several billion dollars from Great Britain. After the United State entered the conflict it also loaned large amounts. At the end of the war the British announced their willingness to cancel the war debts owed them by the other Allies if the United States adopted a similar stand. But President Wilson had rejected this proposal and succeeding administrations, Democratic and Republican alike, chose the course of collection.
As long as Germany met her reparation instalments, the Allies fulfilled their obligations to the United States. All payments, however, were suspended by the Hoover Moratorium, after the expiration of the moratorium, and with the appearance of the Great Depression, an increasing number of nations failed to pay their debt instalments to the United States. American public opinion was divided on the subject of collection, but congress stood firm against cancellation. To many Americans it seemed that Europeans always appeared able to find funds for war, but were short of cash to meet their contractual obligations.

In the hope that another international conference might solve the world’s financial problems, a world Economic conference was called in London in 1933. The conference met for some six weeks and adopted a few temporary expedients and pious resolutions. The general view was that the conference had failed.

Soon after the World Economic conference adjourned there began a general debt default. In April 1934, the United States congress passed the Jobson Act, closing American security markets to any foreign government which had defaulted on its debts. By June 1934, almost all the debtor states had defaulted. Throughout the remaining years before the beginning of World War II, nations placed more and more obstacles in the path of international trade. Nazi Germany, readily followed by the sister nations, led the way in erecting political barriers to the international movement of goods.

Thus, an internal economic equilibrium could not be established. On the contrary, during the 1930s extreme economic nationalism so retarded international trade that many people came to look on the use of force as the only way to reinstitute a normal state of world financial and economic relations.

Economic stability was not the only form of international order that proved difficult to establish. In the political relations established among nations there developed widespread uncertainty and eventual crisis as well. Long before the last echoes of war had died, France embarked upon a search for security against another German invasion. Twice within memory the pounding of German military boots had been heard on French soil, and Frenchmen were fearful of still another incursion. As long as Germany remained economically and militarily strong and as long as her population increased at a faster rate than that of France, it seemed necessary to Frenchmen to seek ironclad guarantees of protection and help. The leader in this hunt for security was Raymond Poincare who, born in Lorraine, had nourished from early youth a hatred of Germany. The foreign policies of other
French premise, however, were all motivated by the same fear. Differ as they might on domestic the statesmen of France invariably sought one goal in international affairs: security.

The first practical step in reach of security was the signing, in June 1919, of identical treaties between France and Great Britain, and France and the United States. The Guarantee Treaties provided that Great Britain and the United States, respectively, should come immediately to [France's] assistance in the event of any unprovoked movement of aggression against her being made by Germany. Whatever comfort France might have got from these agreements, it was short lived. The United States senate would have nothing to do with President Wilson’s treaty and thereupon the one with Great Britain, already ratified, automatically became void; its acceptance had been made contingent upon the United States Government undertaking the same obligation.

France looking upon the development as little short of betrayal, turned to the smaller states that also had cause to fear any change in the political status quo. First (1920) came a military alliance with Belgium. The secret terms of this agreement provided that each signatory should come to the support of the other in case of attack by Germany.

Next, France sought a substitute a take the place occupied in the pre war alliance scheme by Russia. The logical candidate was Poland, for the latter stood in as much fear of Germany as did France. The natural attachment between the two republics was increased when France in 1920 lent Poland men, money, and munitions with which to fight the Bolsheviks, Whom the French feared only less then they did the Germans. Therefore, a Franco-Polish mutual defence treaty was signed in 1921.

France, the pivot of two alliances, also determined once more to approach Great Britain. Late in 1921, accordingly, Paris advanced plans for a political alliance. The British, however, would promise immediate assistance only in case of a direct German invasion of France. But France was more apprehensive lest Germany attack Poland, for in that event the Third Republic was bound to aid her ally; it was against such a contingency the Paris sought assurance of Britain military support. Meanwhile, other differences had arisen between France and Great Britain. At the Washington conference for the Limitation of Armaments in 1921-1922, an Anglo-American proposal to abolish submarines was laid aside, largely because of opposition by France. The breach between the two former allies
was widened still more by their opposing views on the reparation question. In the summer of 1922, therefore, alliance negotiations lapsed.

Worried by the complications arising from the Ruhr occupation, France set out find additional friends. In 1924 a Franco-Czechoslovak pact was concluded. Two years later (1926), France concluded a security agreement with Romania. In 1927 France signed a similar treaty with Yugoslavia.

Meanwhile, the eastern allies of France had formed a partnership among themselves. In 1920 and 1921 a little Entente was organized by Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Romania to keep intact the Treaty of Trianon and prevent a restoration of the Habsburgs. In 1921, moreover, Romania signed a treaty of alliance with Poland. During 1922 cordial relations were established between the remaining member of the Little Entente and Poland. Finally, to make possible economic as well as diplomatic cooperation, the foreign minister of the entente states decided to hold periodic conferences to which Poland might be invited. The new French hegemony, thus created in the name of security, was founded upon an armed camp of type that had proved so futile and so dangerous in 1914. It was one of the moving factors behind the conclusion of the two other treaty system centering, respectively, in the Soviet Union and Fascist Italy.

It happened that in April 1922 the representatives of thirty-four nations, including Germany and Russia, met at Genoa to devise means for improving the European situation. Discussions on loans and credits were well advanced when news reached the gathering that Walter Rathenau and George Chicherin, chiefs, had signed a treaty at the Italian watering place of Rapallo.

It was understandable that these two powers should have been drawn together. Neither had as yet been restored to membership in good standing among the nations of Europe. Both were fearful of an unfriendly Allied- or French-controlled coalition and both were anxious to establish new trade contacts. To Germans, the pact seemed to clear the way toward an alliance with Russia and to make possible a defiance of the Allies and their treaty demands. To the Russian leaders it meant the restoration of diplomatic relations with a great power, the opportunity to secure credits, and lessened fear of the Franco-Polish alliance. By the terms of the treaty, the Soviet Government was accorded recognition by Germany, and all prewar debts and claims were mutually canceled. The news of the treaty angered the Allied delegates, and the Genoa conference broke up without settling any any major issue.
Soon after the conclusion of the Rapallo Treaty, the Bolsheviks began to fear the formation of a European bloc against Russia. Hence Moscow determined to negotiate nonaggression pact with neighboring countries. The first such achievement was the signing in 1925 of a treaty of friendship and neutrality with Turkey, since the Turkish Republic shared the Soviet union’s distrust of the western states.

Four months later (April 1926) a similar covenant was signed in Berlin with Germany. The Reich was indignant over bickering attending the vote on its admission to the League in that year and consequently looked with favour on closer relations with Moscow. Before the end of 1926 the Bolsheviks had concluded similar agreement with Afghanistan and Lithuania, and in 1927 a nonaggression treaty was negotiated with Iran.

It was not to be expected that Italy would remain isolated while the other continental states were engaged in so lively a search for security. The post war period saw the development of a struggle between Italy and France for control of the western Mediterranean. The result was an armament race, and military preparations were made on both sides of the Franco-Italian border. Hostilities were further heightened by the fact that France had land in Europe and North Africa which, according to some Italians, should have been theirs. Finally, Italy placed chief blame upon France for Italian inability in 1919 to get more colonies.

Steps to protect Italy against French diplomatic maneuvers were undertaken shortly after Benito Mussolini’s advent to power. Treaties of friendship and neutrality were signed in 1924 with Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In 1926 similar agreements were reached with Romania and Spain. A political treaty of 1926 with Albania was strengthened in the following year by a defensive alliance. An Italo-Hungarian Treaty was negotiated in 1927.

17.4 Self Check Exercise

1. What is an Economic Depression?
2. What do you know about New Deal?
3. Who makes the Five Year Plans firstly?

17.5 Summary

Thus, in 1927, nice years after the armistice, Europe was again divided into armed camps. In place of the two big pre war alliances (Triple Alliance and Triple Entente), each with a host of satellites, there now were three major groups. The outlook was hardly one to inspire confidence in the hearts of Europeans. France, in
particular, was virtually bound by her various treaties to defend the frontiers of five protégés not one of which was a first class power and each of which had numerous enemies.

17.6 Glossary
phenomenon: an observable factor event
anxiety: feelings of worry
exaction: a sum of money exacted from someone
reinforced: to make something stronger
reveal: disclose
erect: to build

17.7 Answers to Self Check Exercise
1. An economic depression is an occurrence wherein an economy is in a state of financial turmoil, often the result of a period of negative activity based on the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is a standard measure of a country’s economic health and an indicator of its standard of living. Also, GDP can be used to compare the productivity levels between different countries at rate. It is a lot worse than a recession, with GDP falling significantly, and usually lasts for many years. In the US, the Great Depression was a worldwide economic depression that took place from the late 1920s through the 1930s. For decades, debates went on about what caused the economic catastrophe, and economists remain split over a number of different schools of thought. lasted for a decade, with the unemployment rate reaching 25% and wages falling by 42

2. New Deal, domestic program of the administration of U.S. Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt between 1933 and 1939, which took action to bring about immediate economic relief as well as reforms in industry, agriculture, finance, waterpower, labour and housing, vastly increasing the scope of the federal government’s activities. The term was taken from Roosevelt’s speech accepting the Democratic nomination for the presidency on July 2, 1932. Reacting to the ineffectiveness of the administration of Pres. Herbert Hoover in meeting the ravages of the Great Depression, American voters the following November overwhelmingly voted in favour of the Democratic promise of a “new deal” for the “forgotten man.” Opposed to the traditional American political philosophy of laissez-faire, the New Deal generally embraced the concept of a government-regulated economy aimed at achieving a balance between conflicting economic interests.

17.8 Suggested Readings


17.9 Terminal Question

1. The treaties made at the Paris Peace conference in 1919-20 were replete with unstable compromises, reflecting more, materialism than idealism. Elucidate.

2. The Industrial revolution brought about great changes in the social and economic life of Europe. Explain.

3. In Russia, Lenin was ‘the father of socialism’ organiser of the revolution and the founder of the new Russian Society. Examine the statement.

4. 5. Throw light on the problem of Reparation and Inter-Allied war.

6. Describe in brief the early career, policies, ideologies and works of Adolf Hitler.

7. What were the social political and economic effects of World War First?
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NOTE: Attempt any five (05) of the following questions.
किन्हीं पाँच प्रश्नों को कीजिये।

All questions carry equal marks.
सभी प्रश्नों के अंक समान हैं।

All questions carry equal marks.

1. Why is the study of contemporary history important? Discuss समकालीन इतिहास का अध्ययन क्यों महत्वपूर्ण है? वर्णन करे।
2. Give an estimate of Bismarck’s achievements after 1870. 1870 के बाद बिस्मार्क की सफलताओं का आकलन कीजिये।
3. Describe the brief history of the Civil War of America and throw light on its consequences. अमेरिका के गृहयुद्ध के संक्षिप्त इतिहास का वर्णन कीजिये और इसके परिणामों पर प्रकाश डालिये।
4. Trace the causes of Chinese revolution of 1911 and through light on its failure. 1911 की चीनी क्रांति के कारणों का पता लगाओ और इसकी असफलता पर प्रकाश डालिए।
5. Briefly describe the causes of Russian revolution of 1905. What were its main consequences? 1905 की रूसी क्रांति के कारणों का संक्षेप में वर्णन करे | इसके मुख्य परिणाम क्या थे |
6. Trace the rise of socialism in Europe during your period of study. अपने अध्ययन के दौरान यूरोप में समाजवाद के विकास की पहचान करे।
7. Discuss the chief factors which resulted in the outbreak of the First World War. उस मुख्य कारणों की चर्चा करे जिसके परिणामस्वरूप प्रथम विश्व युद्ध हुआ।